

12. ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

12.1 Introduction

12.1.1 This Chapter of the ES has been prepared by CgMs Consulting and is based upon various specialist baseline studies. As a result, this Chapter presents a synthesis of the results of those studies, identifies impacts resulting from the proposed development on the archaeological resources identified and scopes appropriate measures in order to mitigate the impacts identified.

12.1.2 An archaeological desk based assessment was prepared to inform the Land Use Parameters Plan of the site (Chadwick 2000). A revised archaeological desk-based assessment (Chadwick & Dicks 2009) is included at Appendix 12.1. Both assessments drew together the available published and unpublished archaeological, historic and topographic information concerning the site and an area around it. Following the completion of the 2000 desk study, which indicated that part of the site had a potential to contain important archaeological remains, further discussions were held with the Council's Archaeological Officer in order to agree a programme of non-invasive survey and, subsequently, invasive archaeological field evaluation in order to clarify the extent, character, date and significance of archaeological evidence within the site.

12.1.3 As a result of those discussions, in addition to the initial desk based assessment, a rectified plot of aerial photographic information covering the site was commissioned (Cox 2002: Appendix 12.2). In parallel, a geophysical survey (GSB 2002: Appendix 12.3) scanned all land where development was proposed and, subsequently, a more detailed survey was targeted at areas thought to contain archaeological sub-surface features. Finally, a number of evaluation trenches were targeted on anomalies identified by the air photo and geophysical surveys (Foundations Archaeology 2003: Appendix 12.4).

12.1.4 More recently (2009), during pre-application discussions with the City's Archaeological Officer it has been agreed that no further baseline surveys are required to inform this planning application.

12.2 Site Description

12.2.1 The site, also referred to as the study site, is approximately 93.1 hectares roughly triangular in shape and includes land required for pedestrian/cycle link to Worthy Road. It is bounded to the west by the B3240 (which follows the line of a Roman Road) from Winchester towards Andover, to the south by residential properties on the northern edge of Winchester, to the east by the London to Southampton railway line and to the north by Well House Lane and Well House Farm

12.2.2 The site occupies parts of two historic parishes, Headbourne Worthy and St Bartholomew Hyde, and is centred at National Grid Reference SU 4476 315 within the administrative area of Winchester District.

12.3 Assessment Methodology

12.3.1 The significance of the impact is dependant on:

- The importance of the archaeological receptor effected; and
- The magnitude of the impact.

12.3.2 In assessing the importance of any cultural heritage remains within the project, the Secretary of State's non-statutory criteria for Scheduled Ancient Monuments (set out in Annex 4 of PPG16: Archaeology and Planning (November 1990)) have been used. Similarly, the criteria for the selection of Listed Buildings set out in PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment (September 1994) (paragraphs 6.10-6.12) have been applied as appropriate.

12.3.3 The criteria for establishing the importance of cultural heritage remains are set out in Table 12.1.

Table 12.1: Criteria for Assessing Importance

Importance	Criteria
National	Scheduled Ancient Monuments Archaeological sites of schedulable quality & importance (see criteria at Annex 4 to PPG 16) Registered Historic Parks and Gardens Registered Battlefields Listed Buildings Grade 1 and 2* Listed Buildings Grade 2 Conservation Areas
Regional/ County	Undesignated archaeological sites of demonstrable regional importance County Council designated sites
Local	Sites with specific and substantial importance to local interest groups. Sites whose importance is limited by poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations
No Importance	Sites with no surviving heritage component

Prediction of Effect Magnitude

12.3.4 The appraisal of the magnitude of impacts (Table 12.2) will derive from the extent or proximity of the proposed works to the receptor, but it will not take into account the importance or sensitivity of the receptor which is taken into account in assessing the overall significance of the impact (Table 12.3).

Table 12.2 Criteria for Appraisal of Effect Magnitude

Magnitude	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts
High Adverse	Complete removal of an archaeological site. Complete destruction of a historic building or structure.	Radical transformation of the setting of an archaeological monument. A fundamental change in the setting of a building.
Medium Adverse	Removal of a major part of an archaeological site and loss of research potential. Extensive alteration (but not demolition) of a historic building or feature resulting in an appreciable change.	Partial transformation of the setting of an archaeological site eg the introduction of significant noise or vibration levels to an archaeological monument leading to changes to amenity use, accessibility or appreciation of an archaeological site. Partial transformation of the setting of a historic building
Low Adverse	Removal of an archaeological site where a minor part of its total area is removed but the site retains a significant future research potential. Change to a historic building or feature resulting in a small change in the resource and its historical context and setting.	Minor change to the setting of an archaeological monument or historic building.

Magnitude	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts
Negligible/ Neutral	No impact from changes in use, amenity or access. No change in the ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.	No perceptible change in the setting of a building or feature.
Low Beneficial	Land use change resulting in improved conditions for the protection of archaeological remains.	Decrease in visual or noise intrusion on the setting of a building, archaeological site or monument. Improvement of the wider landscape setting of a building, archaeological site or monument.
Medium Beneficial	Land use change resulting in improved conditions for the protection of archaeological remains plus interpretation measures (heritage trails, etc)	Significant reduction or removal of visual or noise intrusion on the setting of a building, archaeological site or monument; and Improvement of the wider landscape setting of a building, archaeological site or monument Improvement of the cultural heritage amenity, access or use of a building, archaeological site or monument.
High Beneficial	Arrest of physical damage or decay to a building or structure;	Exceptional enhancement of a building or archaeological site, its cultural heritage amenity and access or use

Assessment of Effect Significance

12.3.5 The assessment of scale of effects has been undertaken utilising the criteria set out in Table 12.1 and 12.2 above.

Table 12.3: Criteria for assessing Effect Significance

Magnitude of Impact	Negligible	Low	Medium	High
National	Negligible	Minor	Moderate/Major	Major
Regional/County	Negligible	Minor	Minor Moderate	Moderate
Local	Negligible	Negligible	Minor	Minor/Moderate
None	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

12.4 Planning Policy

12.4.1 PPG16 provides guidance for Planning Authorities, property owners, developers and others on the preservation and investigation of archaeological remains. More recently the Government published PPG15 which sets out Government policy in relation to Historic Buildings, Conservation Areas, Historic Parks and Gardens, Battlefields and the wider historic landscape.

12.4.2 In short, Government guidance provides a framework which protects Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and the settings of these sites. In addition, the framework has a presumption in favour of in-situ preservation of nationally important archaeological monuments, in appropriate circumstances requires adequate information (from field evaluation) to enable informed planning

decisions, and provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not important enough to merit in-situ preservation.

12.4.3 On July 24 2009 the Departments of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) jointly published draft Planning Policy Statement 15 (PPS15) entitled "Planning for the Historic Environment". It is intended that this document will ultimately replace both PPG15 and PPG16. The draft was subject to consultation until the end of October 2009, but in the meantime PPG16 still represents Government policy and guidance.

12.4.4 In considering any proposal for development, the determining Authority will be mindful of the policy framework set by Government guidance on heritage issues, in this instance PPG15 and PPG16, by current Development Plan policy and by other material considerations.

12.4.5 The Strategic Development Plan Policy is provided by the South East Plan (published May 2009). The South East Plan contains Policy BE7 which relates to the Management of the Historic Environment. Following the publication of the final version of the South East Plan, the saved policies in the Hampshire County Structure Plan are no longer in force.

12.4.6 The Local Plan framework is provided by the "saved" policies in the Winchester District Local Plan (adopted 2006). The Plan contains Policies HE1, HE2 and HE3 which protect archaeological sites.

12.5 Baseline Conditions

12.5.1 In accordance with the guidance in PPG 16 "Archaeology and Planning", an archaeological desk-based assessment of the proposed development has been prepared (Appendix 12.1). That assessment comprised an examination of evidence in the National Monuments Record (NMR), Hampshire Archaeology & Historic Buildings Record (HA&HBR), the Winchester Urban Archaeological Database (WUAD) and other relevant sources, and considered this evidence within the context provided by PPG 16 and Development Plan policy. Similarly, in accordance with the guidance in PPG15 "Planning and the Historic Environment", the desk-based assessment considered the evolution of the landscape forming the application site.

12.5.2 The desk-based assessment is reproduced in full at Appendix 12.1, thus in this section only a summary is presented.

12.5.3 The desk study suggested that, given the geological background of the site and evidence in the HA&HBR/WSMR, the area north of Winchester forms a component of an extensive archaeological landscape largely of later prehistoric and Romano-British date, with elements of the Medieval and Post-Medieval agricultural landscape, a landscape that extends across the Chalk Downland of Wessex. Within this context, the desk study recognised the general archaeological richness of Chalk Downland landscapes and, with the exception of unsystematic and unrecorded metal detecting, acknowledged an absence of field survey in the area.

12.5.4 In places within the application site, its topography are such that settlement in prehistoric or more recent times is unlikely due to the gradient of slopes. However, elsewhere within the site, in addition to a potential for artefactual evidence of Neolithic date, air photographic evidence indicates the presence in the north-western part of the site of an area of later prehistoric (Iron Age) and Romano-British fields. Within this area of fields, an area (approx. 1 hectare in extent) containing two smaller enclosures was identified as a focus of settlement.

12.5.5 In the historic period settlement shifts into the Itchen Valley and develops at Headbourne Worthy and during this period the study site was in agricultural use with Wildens Drove (now Well House Lane) suggesting that the higher Downs were grazed by stock.

12.5.6 More recently, between 1756 and 1761 a number of military encampments occupied part of the application site, although at the desk study stage their location could not be identified with certainty.

12.5.7 In short, the archaeological “signature” of the application site was characterised as artefact scatters in the ploughsoil and sub-surface features, evidenced as cropmarks, representing plough-flattened prehistoric and Roman occupation.

12.5.8 As a result of the findings of the desk-based assessment, which established that parts of the proposed development site had a potential to contain important archaeological remains, discussions were held with the Council’s Archaeological Officers to agree an overall evaluation strategy and the methodology of individual studies. In the first instance, given the base geology and the cropmark evidence in the WUAD, all available aerial photographs of the application site were inspected for archaeological information and, where crop, soil or parch marks were evident, these were plotted and rectified using a specialist computer programme (see Appendix 12.2). In parallel, a programme of geophysical (magnetometry) scanning and more detailed survey was phased to follow harvest (see Appendix 12.3). Together the air photographic and geophysical surveys extended the known archaeological resource within the application site and confirmed the general character of resources suggested at the desk study stage. Finally, and again in consultation with the Council’s Archaeological Officer, a programme of targeted evaluation trenching (see Appendix 12.4) was designed to investigate specific features identified by the air photographic plotting and geophysical surveys.

12.5.9 As a result of these desk and field studies, it is evident that the application site contains a number of archaeological sites and finds and that these sites sit within, and form an element of, an evolving historic landscape. The following section therefore provides a brief summary of archaeological resources within the application site:

i) Field 1 (see Figure 12.1):

Air photo evidence indicates that the north-western part of Field 1 contains an extensive field system evidenced by cropmarks and confirmed, in places, as sub-surface geophysical anomalies. The field system runs down slope into a dry valley and beyond, to the east ditches suggest a continuation albeit of a less complex system. In the centre of this complex of paddocks and fields, a trackway accesses two enclosures (within Area 5 on Fig. 12.1) and the available air photo and geophysical evidence suggests that one or more huts, pits and other settlement evidence may occur here. Although undated, this field system and small settlement is dated by morphological characteristics to the Later Prehistoric/Romano-British period.

Towards the south-western corner of Field 1 (Area 11 on Fig. 12.1) a ring ditch, identified by geophysical survey (but not air photography), suggests the presence of a ploughed down Bronze Age round barrow or similar mortuary feature.

Also in the south-western corner of Field 1 (Area 11), the sub-surface ditches of a series of sub-rectangular enclosures were recorded by geophysical survey. These are perhaps associated with an Iron Age settlement investigated ahead of development to the west of Andover Road.

Immediately north of the southern boundary of Field 1 a sinuous linear ditch recorded on air photos and detected by geophysical survey (Areas 10 and 11) is of unknown date, but could form a component of the field system in Fields 1 and 2.

The western boundary of Field 1 and of the application site is formed by the alignment of the Roman Road from Winchester to Mildenhall.

The southern boundary of Fields 1 and 2 is identified in the desk-based assessment as a probable Saxon estate boundary between estates centred on Winchester and Headbourne Worthy.

ii) Field 2 (see Figure 12.1):

Air photo evidence indicates the presence of linear ditches, probably forming a continuation of the field system in Field 1. One sub-surface pit was identified by both the air photographic and the geophysical surveys, suggesting the possibility of occupation here. However, the absence of other air photo or convincing geophysical evidence suggests this may be an isolated feature rather than a further settlement.

iii) Field 3 (see Figure 12.1):

Air photographic evidence indicates a large, rectilinear enclosure in this field. The geophysical survey added further detail suggesting that the western side of this enclosure is formed by a ditched trackway which (in Area 16) swings northwest heading towards the Iron Age settlement investigated to the west of the Andover Road. The evaluation trenching located part of this ditched trackway, although no dating evidence was recovered.

Elsewhere within this field the geophysical survey suggested isolated pit-like anomalies, although their interpretation as archaeological features remained tentative.

Although not identified by the air photo survey, the geophysical survey located a number of sub-rectangular and sub-circular features (Area 16), which were suggested as possible Roman burials or, alternatively, features associated with the Hessian or subsequent Militia Camps. Evaluation trenching established that these features, where they were identified within the various trenches, are probable camp kitchens associated with the mid 18th Century military camps on the site. Other geophysical anomalies and a line of stake holes identified in an evaluation trench (Trench 3) also relate to this military occupation of the site.

iv) Field 4 (see Figure 12.1):

Although not detected on air photos, the geophysical survey identified a series of large rectangular ditched enclosures, one with internal sub-circular features and other linear responses that may represent settlement. Again, on morphological characteristics activity in this area (Areas 19 and 20) is accorded a late prehistoric/Romano-British date.

Elsewhere within Field 4, the geophysical survey a number of pits confirm the impression that settlement activity occurs within and around the large enclosures identified in this field.

v) Field 5 (see Figure 12.1):

The air photo assessment identified no archaeological features in this field and although the geophysical survey identified a number of pit-like and linear anomalies (Areas 21 and 22), none of these were identified as archaeological features with any confidence.

vi) Field 6 (see Figure 12.1):

The air photo assessment identified no archaeological features in this field and although the geophysical survey identified a number of pit-like and linear anomalies (Area 23), none of these were identified as archaeological features with any confidence.

12.5.10 Documentary, air photographic, geophysical and archaeological evidence indicate that archaeological features within the application site will be heavily plough-damaged. For instance, sites in Fields 1 (Areas 5 and 11), 3 (Area 16) and 4 (Area 19) undoubtedly had upstanding earthwork elements in their original form and field evidence indicates that these have been flattened by ploughing over many hundreds of years. This prolonged ploughing has had the effect of generally reducing the significance of archaeological resources from perhaps regional or national importance, had they survived as earthwork monuments, to remains of more local interest.

12.5.11 In addition, by its very nature, the detection and characterisation of archaeological remains is an imprecise science and archaeological evaluation is, by design, a sampling exercise, therefore whilst the various desk and field surveys undertaken to-date are likely to have located many of the archaeological resources within the application site, other sub-surface features no doubt remain to be discovered. Equally, given the nature of the various evaluation surveys undertaken, it can be suggested with a reasonably high confidence rating, that no sites of regional or national importance remain to be discovered on the application site. Accordingly, the blank areas on Figure 12.1, whilst not necessarily devoid of archaeological evidence are, it is concluded, devoid of nationally important archaeological evidence.

12.6 Identification and Evaluation of Key Impacts

12.6.1 The outline planning application proposes the development of a mixed-use development, comprising residential, retail, leisure and community uses together with open space, infrastructure and landscaping. The proposed development is described in greater detail elsewhere in this document and is shown on Figure 4.1.

12.6.2 The Land Use Parameters Plan has evolved through various stages as the results of initial inquiries and the detailed baseline studies became available. However, as a result of various discussions held with the Council's Archaeological Officers none of the archaeological resources identified within the application site have been considered to be of sufficient importance to warrant a presumption in favour of in-situ preservation. As a result, although the Land Use Parameters Plan incorporates a number of areas of open space, none of these have been allocated to specifically achieve the in-situ preservation of archaeological remains. Nevertheless, within these areas, subject to appropriate management, preservation of sub-surface archaeological remains would occur. The preservation of hedgerows within the site is considered at Chapter 10: Ecology.

12.6.3 Based on details of the proposed development set out on Figure 4.1 Land Use Parameters Plan, it is possible to predict the following impacts on archaeological and cultural heritage resources.

Fields 1 to 6: Areas 1 to 23

Soil stripping, the excavation of foundations and trenching for services will extensively damage or destroy archaeological deposits in these fields. Accordingly, without appropriate mitigation, an adverse impact on archaeological resources of local interest would result.

Site 7: Roman Road

The application proposes the diversion of Andover Road North (B3420) from the junction with Harestock Road/Wellhouse Lane and the formation of New Andover Road on an alignment to the east of the current route to immediately north of Park Road. This proposal will include the downgrading of the Andover Road and Andover Road North between Stoney Lane and Harestock Road to provide vehicular access to properties fronting the road, the closure of Andover Road to vehicular traffic in the vicinity of Henry Beaufort School and the creation of a pedestrian and cycle route along the route of the Andover Road. The downgrading of the Andover Road and Andover Road North from a major to a minor road route will change the roads historic significance as part of the strategic Roman road network. However, although the significance of the road will change there will be little change to the road alignment as a whole and any alterations to the signalling, and road layout will have only a localised below ground impact. Therefore, overall there will be a Negligible impact on this cultural heritage resource of Regional/County Importance.

Site 8:

The majority of the hedgerow marking the Saxon Charter Boundary is to be retained. However, the proposed development would require the removal of a small section of the hedgerow to allow for the construction of an access road. As a result there will be a Low Adverse impact on this cultural heritage resource of Regional/County Importance.

Assessment of Impact Significance

12.6.4 The non-statutory criteria for scheduling Ancient Monuments published by the Secretary of State (at Annex 4 to PPG16) have been used as the basis against which to assess the significance of archaeological resources within the application site. This is summarised in the following table:

Table 12.4 Significance of Impacts on Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Resources

Field/ Site No.	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Resource	Importance of Resource	Impact	Nature	Significance Without Mitigation
1	Extensive Late Prehistoric/ Romano-British field system with settlement	Local importance	High Adverse	Direct and Long- term	Minor/Moderate Adverse
2	Late Prehistoric/ Romano- British field system	Local importance	Medium Adverse	Direct and Long -term	Minor/Moderate Adverse
3	Late Prehistoric/ Romano- British field system with elements of Hessian and Militia Camps	Local importance	Adverse	Direct and Long -term	Minor/Moderate Adverse
4	Extensive Late Prehistoric/ Romano-British field system with settlement	Local importance	Adverse	Direct and Long- term	Minor/Moderate Adverse
5	Limited archaeological resources identified	Local interest	Adverse	Direct and Long- term	Minor Adverse
6	Limited archaeological resources identified	Local interest	Adverse	Direct and Long- term	Minor Adverse
7	Roman Road	Regional/ County	Negligible	Indirect and Long- term	Minor Adverse
8	Hedgerow marking Saxon Charter Boundary	Regional/ County	Low Adverse	Direct and Long- term	Minor Adverse

12.7 Assessment of Construction Phase

12.7.1 Where effects have been identified which would result in the destruction of archaeological remains associated with the late prehistoric and Romano-British settlement, a programme of archaeological evaluation followed by archaeological investigation and recording will be phased ahead of the construction programming of the proposed development. The excavation, analysis and publication of the results of these investigations will satisfactorily mitigate the effects identified.

12.8 Enhancement and Mitigation Proposals

12.8.1 Within the application site (Fields 1 to 6), given the more local significance of the remains, "preservation by record" comprising archaeological excavation, recording and dissemination of the results is appropriate. Indeed, a programme of archaeological investigations phased ahead of the phased development of the site would afford opportunities to bring archaeology to a wider public audience and would assist create a "sense of place" for this new community. Additionally, the investigation of a large area of late prehistoric/Romano-British rural landscape in relative close proximity to the major Roman settlement in central Winchester would yield valuable information to better understand the nature and chronological development of Iron Age and Roman settlement and farming activity, and the relationships between Roman town and countryside.

12.8.2 The majority of the hedgerow following the alignment of the Saxon Charter Boundary will be preserved. Chapter 10 Ecology addresses the preservation of the hedgerows within the site.

12.8.3 The proposed mitigation measures can be secured by a Planning Condition which could be based on the model in PPG16 at paragraph 30 and Model Condition 55 in Circular 11/95 which states:

“No development shall take place within the area indicated until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority”.

12.9 Summary

12.9.1 This assessment has established that the site contains the remains of a late prehistoric and Romano-British settlement. Development at Barton Farm, Winchester would result in the loss of these archaeological remains. However, these remains are considered to be of local importance. Accordingly, given the more local significance of the remains, “preservation by record” comprising archaeological excavation, recording and dissemination of the results is appropriate.

12.9.2 However, if the proposed development does not take place, a so-called “do-nothing option”, the continued ploughing and cultivation of this land will result in the long-term erosion and destruction of the archaeological resources now known to exist here. Accordingly, the “do-nothing option” would not achieve the long-term conservation of the archaeological resource at Barton Farm (either by in-situ preservation or by “preservation by record”).

12.9.3 Equally, the proposed development can generate beneficial effects. In particular, archaeological investigation of the site will enable a better understanding of the evolution of this landscape through the prehistoric, Roman and early Medieval periods, will provide opportunities for educational and heritage promotion and can create a sense of place for this new community.

12.9.4 The proposed mitigation measures can be secured by a Planning Condition which could be based on the model in PPG16 at paragraph 30 and Model Condition 55 in Circular 11/95.

