

One Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire: Green Infrastructure

Archaeology and Heritage Statement



Report prepared for:
Eastleigh Borough Council

CA Project: AN0615

CA Report: AN0615_2

Decmeber 2023



One Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire: Green Infrastructure

Archaeology and Heritage Statement

CA Project: AN0615

CA Report: AN0615_2

prepared by	Natalia Hunt, Heritage Consultant
date	December 2023
checked and approved by	Rebecca Wills, Senior Heritage Consultant
date	December 2023
issue	1

This report is confidential to the client. Cotswold Archaeology accepts no responsibility or liability to any third party to whom this report, or any part of it, is made known. Any such party relies upon this report entirely at their own risk. No part of this report may be reproduced by any means without permission.

Cirencester Building 11 Cotswold Business Park Cirencester Gloucestershire GL7 6BQ t. 01285 771022 f. 01285 771033	Milton Keynes Unit 8 – The IO Centre Fingle Drive Stonebridge Milton Keynes Buckinghamshire MK13 0AT t. 01908 564660	Andover Stanley House Walworth Road Andover Hampshire SP10 5LH t. 01264 347630	Suffolk Unit 5, Plot 11 Maitland Road Lion Barn Industrial Estate Needham Market Suffolk IP6 8NZ t. 01449 900120
e. enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk			

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	5
2.	METHODOLOGY	9
3.	SUMMARY OF HERITAGE RESOURCE	13
4.	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	28
5.	CONCLUSIONS.....	32
6.	REFERENCES.....	34

ILLUSTRATIONS

- Fig. 1 Site location plan
- Fig. 2 Previous Archaeological Investigations
- Fig. 3 Historic Environment
- Fig. 4 LiDAR imagery of the Site (DTM 2016 0.5m PCA)
- Fig. 5 Extract of Milne's map of 1791
- Fig. 6 Extract from 1825 Great Allington Enclosure Map
- Fig. 7 Extract from 1825 Little Allington Enclosure Map
- Fig. 8 Extract from 1844 South Stoneham Tithe Map

SUMMARY

Project Name: One Horton Heath: Green Infrastructure
Location: Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire
NGR: 448741, 117145

In June 2022, Cotswold Archaeology was commissioned by Eastleigh Borough Council to undertake an Archaeology and Heritage Statement with regards to a planning application for construction of the Green Infrastructure including open space landscaping, bridleways, footpaths, SuDS, play areas and ecological and biodiversity enhancements at One Horton Heath.


This assessment has determined that there is some potential to encounter artefacts of Mesolithic date, based on a previously recorded artefact within the Site, as well as further discoveries in the surrounding study area.

Whilst there is a slight potential for the presence of further buried archaeological remains within the Site, due to a focus on agriculture and the lack of development from at least the early medieval period onwards, such remains are likely to be of little to no significance. Any such features are likely to reflect evidence of agricultural practice in the form of infilled field boundaries, plough furrows and residual or unstratified artefacts.

The remains of a bank, likely of modern date, is recorded within the northern part of the Site. This is thought to represent a former duck shooting pond.

It is not considered that the significance of the potential archaeological resource within the Site is of such a level that would require preservation *in situ*, or that it would influence development design. However, A programme of further archaeological investigation may be required by the archaeological advisor to Hampshire County Council, likely as a condition to planning permission. It is expected that any archaeological mitigation would primarily target areas of more extensive groundworks, such as basins.

This assessment has also considered the potential effects of development of the Site on surrounding designated heritage assets, through the alteration of their settings. It was established that, primarily due to the nature of the development, there would be no non-physical harm to the significance of any designated heritage assets, specifically Listed Buildings, within the study area. The proposals are in accordance with the Planning Act 1990, the NPPF and local planning policy.



 Site Boundary



Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
 Suffolk 01449 900120

w www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
 e enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE
 One Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire:
 Green Infrastructure

FIGURE TITLE
 Site Location Plan

0 1 km

© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 0100031673

DRAWN BY NH **PROJECT NO.** AN0615
CHECKED BY RW **DATE** 11/12/2023
APPROVED BY RW **SCALE @ A4** 1:25,000

FIGURE NO.
 1

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. In June 2022, Cotswold Archaeology (CA) was commissioned by Eastleigh Borough Council to undertake an Archaeology and Heritage Statement with regards to a planning application for the construction of the Green Infrastructure including open space landscaping, bridleways, footpaths, SuDS, play areas and ecological and biodiversity enhancements at One Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire. The application boundary (hereafter referred to as 'the Site') comprises elements of woodland, fields, public rights of way and streams (Fig. 1, NGR: 448741, 117145).

Project background

- 1.2. The northern and southern parts of the wider OHH site were previously subject to two separate outline planning applications for mixed use developments, with permission granted in November 2017 (O/16/79354) and December 2017 (ref. O/14/75735), respectively.
- 1.3. Subsequently, a new outline planning application was submitted, bringing together the two previous application areas under a single masterplan (ref. O/20/89498), submitted in December 2020. This planning application was supported by a Heritage Assessment (Cotswold Archaeology 2020).
- 1.4. The proposed development has been designed in full accordance with the Development Plan and Outline Planning Application (OPA) O/20/89498, which has a resolution to grant consent subject to S106 negotiations relating to education. The application is for full planning consent due to the time for these negotiations to complete. Submitting details of the Green Infrastructure Landscaping (GI) as a full planning application will deliver the GI in accordance with, and as part of the OPA, but enable commencement more quickly than waiting for the resolution of the OPA S106 and the determination of an application for reserved Matters Approval of details of the GI.
- 1.5. Several archaeological investigations have been undertaken within the in the immediately surrounding the Site as part of wider OHH development site as a planning condition for planning applications F/20/89500 and X/19/86303. These are detailed below.

Objectives and professional standards

- 1.6. This report is a focussed assessment, concerned specifically with the green infrastructure element of the development, and is informed by the previous Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (CA 2020), which considered the One Horton Heath development as a whole.
- 1.7. The composition and development of the historic environment within the Site and wider landscape are discussed in this report. A determination of the significance of any heritage assets located within the Site, and any heritage assets beyond the Site boundary that may potentially be affected by the development proposals, is then presented. Any potential development effects upon the significance of these heritage assets (both adverse and/or beneficial) are then described.
- 1.8. CA is a Registered Organisation (RO) with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). This report has been prepared in accordance with appropriate standards and guidance, including the *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment* published by CIfA in 2014 (updated 2020). This states that, insofar as they relate to the determination of planning applications, heritage Desk-Based Assessments should:

‘...enable reasoned proposals and decisions to be made [as to] whether to mitigate, offset or accept without further intervention [any identified heritage] impact’ (CIfA 2020, 4).

- 1.9. The Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England 2015), further clarifies that a Desk-Based Assessment should:

‘...determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature, extent and significance of the historic environment within a specified area, and the impact of the proposed development on the significance of the historic environment, or will identify the need for further evaluation’ (Historic England 2015, 3).

Statute, policy and guidance context

- 1.10. The Site is located in the local authority of Eastleigh Borough Council. Planning and development are currently guided by the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036, which was adopted on 25 April 2022.

Statute	Description
Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979)	Act of Parliament providing for the maintenance of a schedule of archaeological remains of the highest significance, affording them statutory protection.
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990)	Act of Parliament placing a duty upon the Local Planning Authority (or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State) to afford due consideration to the preservation of Listed Buildings and their settings (under Section 66(1)), and Conservation Areas (under Section 72(2)), in determining planning applications.
Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023	Sets out duties of regard to certain heritage assets (comprising Scheduled Monuments, Registered parks and Gardens, Protected Wrecks, and World Heritage Sites) where development may affect a relevant heritage asset or its setting.
National Heritage Act 1983 (amended 2002)	One of four Acts of Parliament providing for the protection and management of the historic environment, including the establishment of the Historic Monuments & Buildings Commission, now Historic England.
Conservation Principles (Historic England 2008)	Guidance for assessing heritage significance, with reference to contributing heritage values, in particular: <i>evidential</i> (archaeological), <i>historical</i> (illustrative and associative), <i>aesthetic</i> , and <i>communal</i> .
National Planning Policy Framework (2023)	Provides the English government's national planning policies and describes how these are expected to be applied within the planning system. Heritage is subject of Chapter 16 (page 57).
National Planning Practice Guidance (updated July 2019)	Guidance supporting the National Planning Policy Framework.
Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 2 (GPA2): Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2015)	Provides useful information on assessing the significance of heritage assets, using appropriate expertise, historic environment records, recording and furthering understanding, neglect and unauthorised works, marketing and design and distinctiveness.
Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 3 (GPA3): The Setting of Heritage Assets, Second Edition (Historic England, 2017)	Provides guidance on managing change within the settings of heritage assets, including archaeological remains and historic buildings, sites, areas, and landscapes.
Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036	Comprises the local development plan (local plan), as required to be compiled, published and maintained by the local authority, consistent with the requirements of the NPPF (2023). Intended to be the primary planning policy document against which planning proposals within that local authority jurisdiction are assessed. Where the development plan is found to be inadequate, primacy reverts to the NPPF (2023).
Hedgerows Regulations (1997)	Provides protection for 'important' hedgerows within the countryside, controlling their alteration and removal by means of a system of statutory notification.

Table 1.1

Key statute, policy and guidance

-
- 1.11. This assessment has been undertaken within the key statute, policy and guidance context presented within Table 1.1 above. The applicable provisions contained within these statute, policy and guidance documents are referred to, and discussed, as relevant, throughout the text. Fuller detail is provided in Appendix 1.

2. METHODOLOGY

Data collection, analysis and presentation

- 2.1. This assessment has been informed by a proportionate level of information sufficient to understand the archaeological potential of the Site, the significance of identified heritage assets, and any potential development effects. This approach is in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF (2023) and the guidance issued by ClfA (2020).
- 2.2. This assessment primarily utilises the results of the data and analysis presented in the earlier Desk Based Assessment (CA 2020) which was compiled for the One Horton Heath outline application. This included analysis of aerial photographs, satellite and LiDAR imagery, consultation of historic sources, particularly maps, at the Hampshire Record Office, and review of grey literature reports.
- 2.3. An updated HER search was undertaken for this Statement, in case of any additional information of relevance to the Site's archaeological potential, based on a 1km study area. Not all HER records are referred to, discussed or illustrated further within the body of this report, only those that are relevant. These are listed in a cross-referenced gazetteer provided at the end of this report (Appendix 2) and are illustrated on the figures accompanying this report.

Assessment of heritage significance

- 2.4. The significance of known and potential heritage assets within the Site, and any beyond the Site which may be affected by the proposed development, has been assessed and described, in accordance with paragraph 200 of the NPPF (2023), the guidance issued by ClfA (2020), Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 (HE 2015) and *Advice Note 12: Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets* (Historic England 2019). Determination of significance has been undertaken according to the industry-standard guidance on assessing heritage value provided within *Conservation Principles* (English Heritage 2008). This approach considers heritage significance to derive from a combination of discrete heritage values, principal amongst which are: i) evidential (archaeological) value, ii) historic (illustrative and associative) value, iii) aesthetic value, iv) communal value, amongst others. Further detail of this approach, including the detailed definition of those aforementioned values, as set out, and advocated, by Historic England, is provided in Appendix 1 of this report.

Assessment of potential development effects (benefit and harm)

- 2.5. The report sets out, in detail, the ways in which identified susceptible heritage assets might be affected by the proposals, as well as the anticipated extent of any such effects. Both physical effects, i.e. resulting from the direct truncation of archaeological remains, and non-physical effects, i.e. resulting from changes to the setting of heritage assets, have been assessed. With regard to non-physical effects or ‘settings assessment’, the five-step assessment methodology advocated by Historic England and set out in the Second Edition of GPA3 (Historic England, 2017), has been adhered to (presented in greater detail in Appendix 1).
- 2.6. Identified effects upon heritage assets have been defined within broad ‘level of effect’ categories (Table 2.2 below). These are consistent with key national heritage policy and guidance terminology, particularly that of the NPPF (2023). This has been done in order to improve the intelligibility of the assessment results for purposes of quick reference and ready comprehension. These broad determinations of level of effect should be viewed within the context of the qualifying discussions of significance and impact presented in this report.
- 2.7. It should be noted that the overall effect of development proposals upon designated heritage assets are judged, bearing in mind both any specific harms or benefits (an approach consistent with the Court of Appeal judgement *Palmer v. Herefordshire Council & ANR* Neutral Citation Number [2016] EWCA Civ 1061).
- 2.8. In relation to non-designated heritage assets, the key applicable policy is paragraph 209 of the NPPF (2023), which states that:
- ‘The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the **scale of any harm or loss** and the **significance of the heritage asset** [our emphasis].’*
- 2.9. Thus, with regard to non-designated heritage assets, this report seeks to identify the significance of the heritage asset(s) which may be affected, and the scale of any harm or loss to that significance.

Level of effect	Description	Applicable statute & policy
Heritage benefit	The proposals would better enhance or reveal the heritage significance of the heritage asset.	Enhancing or better revealing the significance of a heritage asset is a desirable development outcome in respect of heritage. It is consistent with key policy and guidance, including the NPPF paragraphs 196 and 212.
No harm	The proposals would preserve the significance of the heritage asset.	Preserving a Listed building and its setting is consistent with s66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990). Preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area is consistent with s72 of the Act. Sustaining the significance of a heritage asset is consistent with paragraph 190 of the NPPF and should be at the core of any material local planning policies in respect of heritage.
Less than substantial harm (lower end)	The proposals would be anticipated to result in a restricted level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset, such that the asset's contributing heritage values would be largely preserved.	In determining an application, this level of harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals, as per paragraph 208 of the NPPF.
Less than substantial harm (upper end)	The proposals would lead to a notable level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset. A reduced, but appreciable, degree of its heritage significance would remain.	Proposals involving change to a Listed building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses or change to the character or appearance of Conservation Areas, must also be considered within the context of Sections 7, 66(1) and 72(2) of the 1990 Act. <i>The provisions of the Act do not apply to the setting of Conservation Areas.</i> Proposals with the potential to physically affect a Scheduled Monument (including the ground beneath that monument) will be subject to the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979); <i>these provisions do not apply to proposals involving changes to the setting of Scheduled Monuments.</i> With regard to non-designated heritage assets, the scale of harm or loss should be weighed against the significance of the asset, in accordance with paragraph 209 of the NPPF.
Substantial harm	The proposals would very much reduce the heritage asset's significance or vitiate that significance altogether.	Paragraphs 205 - 208 of the NPPF would apply. Sections 7, 66(1) and 72(2) of the Planning Act (1990), and the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979), may also apply. In relation to non-designated heritage assets, the scale of harm or loss should be

Level of effect	Description	Applicable statute & policy
		weighed against the significance of the asset, in accordance with paragraph 209 of the NPPF.

Table 2.2 Summary of level of effect categories (benefit and harm) referred to in this report in relation to heritage assets, and the applicable statute and policy

- 2.10. The July 2019 revision of the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) defines non-designated heritage assets as those identified as such in publicly accessible lists or documents provided by the plan-making body. Where these sources do not specifically define assets as *non-designated heritage assets*, they will be referred to as *heritage assets* for the purpose of this report. The assessment of *non-designated heritage assets* and *heritage assets* will be equivalent in this report, in line with industry standards and guidance on assessing significance and impact. They may not, however, carry equivalent weight in planning as set out within the provisions of the NPPF.

Limitations of the assessment

- 2.11. This assessment is principally a desk-based study and has utilised secondary information derived from a variety of sources, only some of which have been directly examined for the purpose of this assessment. The assumption is made that this data, as well as that derived from secondary sources, is reasonably accurate. The records held by HER are not a record of all surviving heritage assets, but a record of the discovery of a wide range of archaeological and historical components of the historic environment. The information held within these repositories is not complete and does not preclude the subsequent discovery of further elements of the historic environment that are, at present, unknown.

3. SUMMARY OF HERITAGE RESOURCE

3.1. This section provides an overview of the known and potential heritage resource within the Site, summarising the results of the Desk Based Assessment (CA 2020) and subsequent archaeological investigations within the proposed One Horton Heath scheme. An updated HER search was undertaken, in case of any additional information of relevance to the Site's archaeological potential.

3.2. The following section is focused on the heritage potential of the present application boundary, and further background on the wider environs of the Site can be found in the full Desk Based Assessment (CA 2020).

Landscape context


3.3. The Site comprises elements of woodland, fields, footpaths, hedgerows and streams; tributaries of the River Itchen. The village of Horton Heath lies immediately to the east, and Fair Oak c.200m to the north. The outskirts of Hedge End extend c.600m to the south. The surrounding area is encompassed by the surviving agricultural landscape north-east of the M27.

3.4. The Site occupies a gently undulating parcel of land, lying at an elevation of between 16m and 27m above Ordnance Datum (aOD).

3.5. The Site lies within the South Hampshire Lowlands National Character Area; a low-lying, gently undulating plain, with fast-flowing chalk rivers in wide, open valleys, water meadows, woodland and mixed agricultural landscape dominated by pasture with small pockets of horticulture and arable. The settlements are small, clustered or dispersed, intermixed with isolated farmsteads (Natural England 2014).

3.6. The underlying geology of the Site consists of sand, silt and clay of the Wittering Formation, sedimentary bedrock formed approximately 41 to 56 million years ago in the Palaeogene Period. Where the Site follows the stream valleys, the bedrock is overlain by narrow bands of alluvium, comprising clay, silt, sand and gravel laid down in the Quaternary period (Fig. 2). No superficial deposits are recorded within the western portions of the Site (British Geological Survey 2023).

3.7. Trial trench evaluations carried out in the immediate vicinity of the Site (Fig. 2: **1 - 4**) encountered the natural clay geology at levels of between 0.35m and 0.56m below the present ground surface, underlying the topsoil and subsoil.



- Site
- Previous Investigation
- Alluvium
- River terrace deposits (sand & gravel)



Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
 Suffolk 01449 900120

w www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
 e enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE

One Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire:
Green Infrastructure

FIGURE TITLE

Previous Archaeological Investigations

0 500m

Previous archaeological investigations

- 3.8. As a condition of previous planning consent related to the wider One Horton Heath scheme (refs: F/20/89500 and X/19/86303), four phases of trial trench evaluation were conducted immediately beyond the present application (Fig. 2: **1 - 4**) in 2020 and 2021 by Thames Valley Archaeological Services. No archaeological remains have been recorded within the Site.
- 3.9. A total of 11 trenches were opened between Lake Farm and Firtree Farm (Fig. 2: **1**), and the majority of these recorded no archaeological finds or features. Three linear features were identified; one medieval and two of uncertain date (although one was interpreted as possibly prehistoric or medieval) (TVAS 2020a).
- 3.10. An evaluation at land at West Horton Heath (Fig. 2: **2**) comprised 33 trenches, none of which lay within the present application boundary. A single linear feature, thought to be of 19th or 20th century date, was recorded (TVAS 2020b).
- 3.11. A total of 123 trenches were opened at Lower Acre (Fig. 2: **3**), and the vast majority of these recorded no archaeological finds or features. The few features recorded were agricultural in nature, likely to be of post-medieval date, and no artefacts were recovered (TVAS 2021a). Whilst a small portion of the evaluation site lay within the present application boundary, none of the trenches were located within the Site.
- 3.12. The Horton Heath Road 3 evaluation (Fig. 2: **4**) comprised 33 trenches, none of which lay within the present application boundary. No deposits or features of archaeological interest were recorded (TVAS 2021b).
- 3.13. Within the wider study area, a number of investigations have been undertaken, comprising trial trench evaluations and watching briefs (Fig. 2). These investigations identified little to no archaeological evidence, and where present, features reflected earlier agricultural practices.

Designated heritage assets

- 3.14. There are no designated heritage assets within the Site, and no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas or Registered Parks and Gardens within the study area. There are nine Grade II Listed Buildings within the 1km study area, comprising:
- Firtree Farmhouse (NHLE: 1111949), c.70m of the Site boundary (Fig. 3: **7**)

- Saxon Court (NHLE: 1111947), c.490m north-east of the Site
- The Cockpit (NHLE: 1111948), c.980m to the north-east
- West Horton Farm Cottages (NHLE: 1204020), c.980m to the north-west
- The Bush (NHLE: 1204040), c.710m north-east of the Site
- Ramblers Cottage (NHLE: 1281402), c.370m to the north-east
- Moorgreen Farmhouse (NHLE: 1204633) and associated Granary (NHLE: 1322695), c.870m south-west of the Site
- The Old George Public House (NHLE: 1111946), c.860m to the north

3.15. Designated heritage assets are illustrated on Fig. 3 and are discussed further below and in Section 4, where relevant.

Prehistoric period (pre- AD 43)

3.16. Within Hampshire, remains of the Palaeolithic period occur most commonly within riverine and coastal contexts, and in particular within the complex sequences of Quaternary deposits associated with the Solent and its tributaries (Hampshire County Council 2010). A single Palaeolithic handaxe was recorded in a former sandpit in the north of the study area. Given the lack of such deposits within the Site, the potential for remains of Palaeolithic date to be present is considered to be very limited.

3.17. There is prolific evidence for Mesolithic activity within Hampshire, with the distribution pattern suggesting a focus around watercourses and on areas of Greensand geology (Hampshire County Council 2010). Within the study area, activity of this period is well represented by a number of small scatters and isolated finds of flintwork, including tranchet axes, consistent with a general background level of transient exploitation, probably extending from the adjacent river valley. The HHER records the findspot of a perforated macehead of igneous stone immediately beyond the central part of the Site, although the precise location of the find is uncertain (Fig. 3: 5).


3.18. Neolithic and Bronze Age activity within Hampshire is most visibly attested by funerary monuments. Bronze Age round barrows in particular are widespread across the region, with the greatest concentration occurring on the chalk downland areas (Hampshire County Council 2012a). No features of this type, nor settlement and agricultural activity of these periods are recorded within the study area.

3.19. The Iron Age in Hampshire represents a period of increasing population growth, technological change and socio-economic complexity. Sites in this period are typically characterised by enclosed and unenclosed settlements, set within often extensive

systems of rectangular fields. No Iron Age remains have been identified within the study area, or immediately beyond it.

Potential and significance

- 3.20. Evidence for early prehistoric activity, particularly Mesolithic, has been identified within the Site and within the surrounding study area, indicating potential for further such remains to be present within the Site. The remains may comprise small assemblages of flintwork or isolated artefacts.
- 3.21. The recorded Mesolithic findspot within the Site no longer constitutes an 'asset' at this location, in that the isolated artefact has been removed since discovery.
- 3.22. Areas within the Site most likely to contain early prehistoric remains are those in which superficial deposits of alluvium and river terrace gravels are recorded (Fig. 2); deposits most commonly associated with early prehistoric artefacts. The potential of encountering Mesolithic artefacts within the Site is therefore considered moderate.
- 3.23. If present, remains of this nature would contribute to the wider understanding of the distribution of early prehistoric activity in the local landscape, but would not comprise highly significant heritage assets (i.e. of such a level that would warrant their preservation *in situ*).
- 3.24. There is little definitive evidence for later prehistoric activity within the immediate vicinity of the Site, and the potential for encountering such remains within the Site is considered low. However, the presence of the watercourses within the Site may have rendered it a favourable location for activity in these periods. No evidence of any cropmarks or earthworks potentially relating to settlement were identified on the aerial photographs or Lidar imagery, and it is considered very unlikely that significant remains would be present within the Site. However, it is possible that later agricultural practices have removed and/or obscured any later prehistoric remains.
- 3.25. The significance of any prehistoric remains would be associated with their potential evidential value, based on their ability to contribute to the understanding of prehistoric activity in the area (as per research aims of the Solent-Thames Research Framework; Hind and Hey 2014).



- | | |
|--|---|
| Site | ● Prehistoric (other) |
| Study Area | ● Romano-British |
| Ancient Woodland | ● Early Medieval |
| ■ Grade II Listed Building | ● Medieval |
| — Cropmarks | ● Post-medieval |
| ● Mesolithic | ● Modern |

0 1km



Andover 01264 347630
Cirencester 01285 771022
Milton Keynes 01908 564660
Suffolk 01449 900120

www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE

One Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire:
Green Infrastructure

FIGURE TITLE

Historic Environment

DRAWN BY NH
CHECKED BY NH
APPROVED BY RW

PROJECT NO AN0615
DATE 12/12/2023
SCALE A4 1:18,000

FIGURE NO.

3

Roman Period (AD 43 – AD 410)


- 3.27. The general settlement patterns established in the preceding prehistoric periods appear to have continued broadly unchanged into the Roman period. The surrounding landscape in this period was primarily rural, characterised by dispersed villas and farmsteads (Hampshire County Council 2010) with a network of well-constructed Roman roads linking the major settlements. A major urban centre was established at Winchester 10km to the north of the Site, and was served by a small, defended town and port at Bitterne, 6.5km to the south-west.
- 3.28. Roman period activity is represented within the study area predominantly by chance finds between c.440-810m to the west of the Site (Fig. 3); two coin hoards and a small concentration of pottery sherds. Such finds may reflect some level of activity in the local landscape, but do not necessarily denote the existence of any intensive or substantial settlement in these areas.

Potential and significance

- 3.29. There is no indication of a potential for significant (i.e. settlement-related) remains of Roman date to be present within the Site. Any less significant buried remains, such as those associated with agriculture, would not warrant preservation *in situ*.

Early medieval and medieval periods (AD 410 – 1540)

- 3.30. No archaeological evidence for early medieval activity is recorded within the study area. The place-name Knowle Hill, to the north-east of the Site, was first documented in AD 901 as *Cnollgette*. Allington Manor Farm, to the west of the Site, represents the site of the deserted medieval settlement of *Aldiotona*, already well established by the time of the Domesday Survey of 1086. There is no indication that settlement extended into the Site.
- 3.31. The Site straddles the two parishes of Bishopstoke (the northern part of the Site) and South Stoneham (southern half), both of which are mentioned in the 1086 Domesday Survey and therefore appear to be of early medieval origin (Powell-Smith 2023). The parish boundary is today marked within the centre of the Site by an east-west aligned tree-lined stream valley (Fig. 4).



 Site



Andover 01264 347630
 Cirencester 01285 771022
 Milton Keynes 01908 564660
 Suffolk 01449 900120

www.cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk
enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

PROJECT TITLE

One Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire:
 Green Infrastructure

FIGURE TITLE

**LiDAR imagery of the Site
 (DTM 2016 0.5m PCA)**

DRAWN BY NH
 CHECKED BY RW
 APPROVED BY RW

PROJECT NO AN0615_2
 DATE 12/12/2023
 SCALE@A4 1:8,000

FIGURE NO.
4

0 500m

-
- 3.32. The landscape in the medieval period comprised a scattered settlement pattern of manors and farmsteads, reflecting a rural, agricultural-based society (Hampshire County Council 2010). Chalcroft Farm, c.250m west of the Site (Fig. 3: 6), has recorded medieval origins, first appearing in a document of AD 1233 as *Chalfecroft*, meaning 'Calves Paddock'.
- 3.33. During the medieval period, the Site and its surroundings fell within the bounds of the Royal Forest of Bere, which was established by the late 12th or early 13th century as a hunting ground for the Bishops of Winchester (Pile 1989). Medieval forests typically comprised varied landscapes, incorporating areas of managed woodland, heathland, agricultural land and settlement. By the later part of the medieval period, an increasing demand for timber, along with a decline in the forest's value for hunting, led to the gradual assarting of the forest and the creation of a patchwork of irregular fields and tracts of surviving woodland. As a result, little evidence of medieval activity has been recorded within the study area.
- 3.34. The Site appears to have been situated within Allington Manor in the medieval period. In the early 14th century, the manor was split into two parts (Page 1911), with the northern part of the Site subsequently forming part of Great Allington, and the southern part situated within Little Allington. Much of the land within both portions of the manor was acquired by Winchester College in the 15th century.
- 3.35. Lidar imagery and post-war aerial photographs indicate the presence of ridge and furrow earthworks, typical of medieval and later post-medieval cultivation, within parts of the Site, particularly in the southern part of the Site (Fig. 4). The presence of these earthworks indicate that the Site was under agricultural use in this period.

Potential and significance

- 3.36. Situated away from any medieval settlements, it is likely that the Site comprised a mixture of heath and woodland during in the earlier medieval period, coming into agricultural use by the end of the period. As such, there is considered to be low potential of encountering settlement remains within the Site. No evidence of any cropmarks or earthworks of such remains were identified on the aerial photographs or Lidar imagery.
- 3.37. Therefore, there is no indication of a potential for significant remains of this period to be present within the Site. Any less significant buried remains, such as remnants of

ridge and furrow, or other medieval agricultural features, would not warrant preservation *in situ*.

Post-medieval and modern periods (1540 – present)

- 3.38. The pattern of settlement in the study area established in the medieval period largely continued through the post-medieval period, and the area surrounding the Site remained rural and agricultural in nature, interspersed with isolated farmsteads. All of the Grade II Listed buildings within the study area (Fig. 3) were constructed during this period, including the 18th century farmhouse at Firtree Farm c.150m north of the nearest part of the Site (Fig. 3: 7).
- 3.39. The gradual assarting of the Forest of Bere continued into the post-medieval period through a process of piecemeal enclosure and, subsequently, in a more formal manner under the 18th and 19th century Enclosure Acts. Despite the loss of woodland and resultant formation of a more regular field pattern, numerous copses survive within the existing landscape as remnants of the former medieval forest. Traces of this ancient woodland (that which has existed since at least AD 1600) extend immediately beyond the Site (Fig. 3).



Fig. 5 Extract of Milne's map of 1791, with approximate location of Site marked in red

- 3.40. The landscape surrounding the Site appears to have remained largely undeveloped and rural in character throughout the post-medieval period. Milne's map of 1791 (Fig.

5) depicts the approximate location of the Site within an area of (presumably) agricultural land. Several pockets of woodland are depicted within the surrounding landscape, including within the centre of the Site and towards the southern boundary. Foxholes Farm, which lies c.100m east of the Site, is annotated as Foxhall Farm; a small group of buildings. Chalcroft Farm too is depicted as a small cluster of buildings at the south of the Site, while a further group of buildings are depicted to the south of Fir Tree Lane and appear to be associated with Lake Farm, to the west of the Site. None of these structures extend into the Site. Milne's map does not appear to show Fir Tree Farm, although this is depicted on the 1806 First Series Ordnance Survey map.

3.41. The Great Allington Enclosure Map of 1825 (Fig. 6), which incorporates the northern part of the Site, records that the land at this time comprised a number small, fairly irregular fields, which were probably created through gradual, informal enclosure during the medieval or early post-medieval periods. Many of the existing field boundaries, demarcated by mature hedgerows, are visible on the map, particularly along the northern and eastern Site boundaries. The area of extant woodland in the northern portion of the Site is visible here.




Fig. 6 Extract from 1825 Great Allington Enclosure Map

3.42. The southern part of the Site is depicted on the 1825 Little Allington Enclosure map (Fig. 7). The landscape comprises a mixture of small rectangular and irregular fields, along with several small strips of woodland, separated by fields from a larger area of woodland to the south of the Site. The majority of the depicted field boundaries within the Site follow the alignments of existing boundaries delineated by hedgerows/woodland. Chalcroft Farm is depicted, at the centre of the Site, as a small group of buildings surrounding a farmhouse, with a pond to the east. The farmstead, along with some of the land in the south-west, is identified as being held by Lady Hollan.




Fig. 7 Extract from 1825 Little Allington Enclosure Map

3.43. The southern portion of the Site is next depicted on the 1844 South Stoneham Tithe Map (Fig. 8). This illustrates the Site encompassing and skirting pockets of woodland, and the edges and boundaries of fields. No activity beyond agriculture is recorded within the Site. The Owton family are named in the Tithe Apportionment as the principal landowners within this half of the Site, while the land-use is indicated to have comprised a mixture of pasture, arable and woodland.

3.44. The 1840 Bishopstoke Tithe Map (not reproduced), depicting the north of the Site, does not record any notable change within the Site, which appears to have remained predominantly within agricultural land, with the small copse still present in the north-west; this is named as 'Venus Copse' in the accompanying Tithe Apportionment. The

apportionment indicates that the land was predominantly in use as pasture, with some arable fields.




Fig. 8 Extract from 1844 South Stoneham Tithe Map

- 3.45.** The 1871 First Edition Ordnance Survey map (reproduced in CA 2020) records relatively little change within the Site, with the majority of the field boundaries depicted as shown on the previous Tithe Maps. No structures are visible within the Site. Quobleigh Ponds are shown to the immediate north of the Site, and appear to drain into a (still extant) stream which crosses the north-eastern part of the Site. At least part of this stream appears to have been modified or artificially created. Former footpaths cross the site, connecting the ponds to nearby farms and Horton Heath beyond.
- 3.46.** A semi-circular earthwork bank is recorded by the HER in the northern part of the Site boundary (Fig. 3: **8**). Thought to represent a retaining bank for Quobleigh Ponds, it is considered to be of post-medieval or modern date. It is not visible on the 1871 OS map, and no traces of this earthwork could be identified within the Site during the previous site visit.

-
- 3.47. Subsequent Ordnance Survey Editions (reproduced in CA 2020) record relatively little change within the Site over the course of the late 19th and 20th centuries, with some minor arrangements to the field layout, including removal and repositioning of some boundaries.

Historic Landscape Character

- 3.48. The Historic Landscape Character (HLC) within the Site and in its environs, as defined by the Hampshire Historic Landscape Assessment, comprises a number of different HLC types, as listed below:

- HLC type 1.16 - Small Wavy Fields. Recorded across the majority of the north of the Site, this HLC type is composed of moderately regular fields with wavy boundaries, and are distinguished from assarts by a lack of scattered woods and copses. Within the Site, this HLC type has been subject to some boundary loss over the course of the late 19th and 20th centuries.
- HLC type 1.9 - Small Regular Fields with Straight Boundaries. Recorded within the north-east of the Site, this HLC type consists of small, typically rectangular fields which were created as a result of the 18th and 19th century Parliamentary Enclosure Acts.
- HLC type 1.10 - Medium Regular Fields with Straight Boundaries. This HLC type is recorded across the central portion of the Site, and comprises regular fields created through the 18th and 19th century Parliamentary Enclosure Acts.
- HLC type 1.2 Medium Irregular Assarts and Copses. This HLC type is recorded within the south-west of the Site, around Chalcroft Farm, and consists of medium sized enclosures with wavy boundaries, which were created through the clearance of woodland for agricultural use in the early medieval to early post-medieval periods.

Potential and significance

- 3.49. The Site is believed to have comprised agricultural land by the post-medieval period and has continued as such to the present.
- 3.50. The remains of bank recorded by the HER are thought to represent the location of a pond constructed for duck shooting (Fig. 3: 8). However, the exact purpose and age is unknown. Given that the pond does not appear on late-19th century mapping, it is like to date to the modern period, and as such would be of little to no heritage significance.

-
- 3.51. Post-medieval and later maps of the Site do not suggest the presence of any structures or development with the application boundary. There is no indication of any structures in Lidar or satellite imagery.
- 3.52. Buried remains of former agricultural features such as field boundaries, drainage ditches and stock enclosures, would be of little to no heritage significance.
- 3.53. The 1825 Enclosure and 1840s Tithe Maps illustrate that the majority of the extant boundaries within the Site, demarcated by hedgerows, were established by these dates. As such, these hedgerows may qualify as historically important under the archaeology and history criteria of the 1997 Hedgerows Regulations (Appendix 1). However, 'important' hedgerows do not comprise designated heritage assets, and do not confer a specific level of heritage significance.
- 3.54. The boundary between the historic parishes of Bishopstoke and South Stoneham remains visible within the Site as a tree-lined stream valley. This boundary does not comprise an important hedgerow, but is of historic interest as an extant landscape feature.

4. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Previous impacts

- 4.1. A review of the available cartographic, documentary and satellite evidence indicates that, with the exception of current PROW, the Site has remained undeveloped throughout its documented history.
- 4.2. The Site encompasses four types of land use, each resulting in a different type and level of previous impact on any potential archaeology. These include:
- Centre of Field – These areas will have been subjected to earlier agricultural impacts such as plough activity, fencing and land drainage. These activities are expected to have had a fairly limited impact on any underlying archaeological remains, mainly affecting the upper soil horizons.
 - Vegetation – The majority of the Site follows the extant field boundaries, running closely alongside, or formed of, hedgerows. Localised, higher areas of impact are anticipated to have been experienced within the footprint of current field boundaries where these are represented by ditches and hedgerows. Given the dense, established nature of the hedgerows, any potential archaeology within their footprint is likely to be heavily disturbed or destroyed by rooting. Any field boundary ditches associated with the hedgerows are likely to have removed any underlying archaeological remains. The same level of impact is anticipated within wooded areas of the Site.
 - Public Rights of Way – No previous impact is anticipated within the footprint of the current PROW.
 - Stream – The banks of the streams may have been subject to some slight adjustment or redirection in the past. No archaeological features are anticipated to have been located here.

Summary

- 4.3. Overall, there is some potential for archaeological remains to have survived within the Site, due to lack of development within the fields throughout recorded history.
- 4.4. Past agricultural and road construction impacts will have reduced the completeness of any remains that may be present and therefore partly reduced their significance, although these activities are expected to have impacted mainly upper soil horizons.

Potential development effects

- 4.5. Any disturbance or truncation (physical development effects) of archaeological remains identified within the Site would primarily result from groundworks associated with construction. Such groundworks might include:
- pre-construction impacts associated with ground investigation works;
 - ground reduction for footpath network;
 - excavation of attenuation (suds) features;
 - landscaping;
 - Additional tree planting
- 4.6. It is considered that works such as stripping for the footpath network, removal of vegetation and soft landscaping, are unlikely to extend below topsoil. As such, these would not have notable sub-surface impacts.

Known features within the Site

- 4.7. The remains of a (likely) modern pond retaining bank are recorded within the northern part of the Site. These were not identified during the previous site visit. Boundary enhancements are proposed in this area, and whilst tree planting here may result in localised impacts to the bank, this would not be considered a notable loss, due to the limited significance of the remains.
- 4.8. The 1825 Enclosure and 1840s Tithe Maps illustrate that the majority of the extant boundaries within the Site, demarcated by hedgerows, were established by these dates. As such, these hedgerows may qualify as historically important under the archaeology and history criteria of the 1997 Hedgerows Regulations (Appendix 1). Impacts to these hedgerows are not anticipated, though any localised impacts would not result in significant removal or loss of the features. These hedgerows are common and well-understood landscape features that are in themselves of only limited evidential and historical value. The Hedgerow Regulations are a notification mechanism by which sufficient notice of removal must be given to the local authority. The planning application would serve as an appropriate notification.
- 4.9. The boundary between the historic parishes of Bishopstoke and South Stoneham remains a tree-lined stream valley at the centre of the Site. Whilst this boundary is of historic interest as an extant landscape feature, any potential impacts would affect only a small section of the feature overall, and it would continue to be understood from historic sources.

Potential archaeological remains

- 4.10. No designated archaeological remains are located within the Site; no *designated* archaeological remains would therefore be adversely physically affected by development within the Site.
- 4.11. The available information, including the results of previous archaeological investigations in the immediate vicinity, suggest a low potential for significant buried archaeological remains to be encountered within the Site.
- 4.12. Given the small footprint of the abovementioned groundworks, the proposed green infrastructure development is likely to result in limited impacts to any buried archaeological features that may be present within their footprint. However, the works have the potential to result in the damage to or loss of any such features, resulting in a total or partial loss of significance of these assets. Any adverse impacts upon the buried archaeological resource would be permanent and irreversible in nature.
- 4.13. It is unlikely, however, that significant archaeological remains would be encountered. Where any archaeological remains might be present these are likely to reflect evidence of agricultural practice in the form of infilled field boundaries, plough furrows and residual or unstratified artefacts. Any such remains are likely to be of low and local significance, and it is therefore considered that the potential archaeological resource within the Site would not require preservation *in situ*, nor would it influence development design.

Further works

- 4.14. A programme of further archaeological investigation may be required by the archaeological advisor to Hampshire County Council, the scope and methodology of which would need to be discussed and agreed in advance. In response to the outline planning application for the One Horton Heath development (0/20/89498), David Hopkins, Hampshire County Archaeologist, recommended that an archaeological condition be attached to any planning permission to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation (via email, dated 13/01/21). It is considered likely that this would also be the case for the current application. It is expected that any archaeological mitigation would primarily target areas of more extensive groundworks, such as SuDS basins and heavy landscaping.

Non-physical impacts

- 4.15. Heritage assets potentially susceptible to impact as a result of changes to their setting have been identified, taking into consideration, amongst other factors, the surrounding topographic and environmental conditions, built form, vegetation cover, and lines of sight, within the context of the assets' heritage significance. Only the Grade II Listed Firtree Farmhouse (NHLE: 1111949, Fig. 3: 8) c.150m north of the Site boundary, was considered to be potentially sensitive to the proposed development, due to proximity (see below).
- 4.16. It was determined that there would be no non-physical impact upon the significance of any further designated heritage assets. No settings would be altered, due to distance and lack of inter-visibility between the Site and these assets, and there are no discernible (non-visual) historical or landscape associations between them. As such, the proposals would result in no harm to the significance of these assets, and they have not been assessed in any further detail.

Firtree Farmhouse

- 4.17. The previous assessment for the outline planning application (CA 2020) presented detailed assessment of the Grade II Listed Firtree Farmhouse, and it will not be repeated here. This assessment determined that as an isolated 18th century farmhouse, the asset is presently experienced within the rural area with which it shares a historic functional relationship, and would therefore be sensitive to development within its settings, relative to their significance.
- 4.18. The architectural, aesthetic and historic interest of the asset is best experienced from within the private garden and from Fir Tree Lane. By virtue of the visual and functional relationship to its surrounding rural context, the agricultural setting of Fir Tree Farmhouse makes a considerable contribution to the asset's significance as a Grade II Listed Building. Lying away from Firtree Lane, and low-lying in nature, the proposed green infrastructure additions and enhancements would not constitute a significant change to the setting of the Farmhouse.
- 4.19. No aspect of the Listed Building's immediate surroundings would be impacted by the proposed green infrastructure considered here and there would be **no harm** to the significance of this designated heritage asset.

5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. This assessment has identified known and potential heritage assets located within the Site and its environs, which may be affected by the proposals. The significance of known and potential heritage assets has been determined, as far as possible, on the basis of available evidence. The potential effects of the proposals on the significance of identified heritage assets, including any potential physical effects upon buried archaeological remains, and potential non-physical effects resulting from the anticipated changes to the settings of heritage assets, have been assessed. Any physical or non-physical effects of the proposals upon the significance of the heritage resource will be a material consideration in the determination of the planning application for the proposal.

Physical effects

- 5.2. This assessment has determined that there is some potential to encounter artefacts of Mesolithic date, based on a previously recorded artefact within the Site, and as well further discoveries in the surrounding study area.
- 5.3. Development is likely to remove some hedgerows considered ‘important’ under the archaeology and history criteria of the 1997 Hedgerows Regulations (Appendix 1). However, their loss would not be considered a significant heritage impact. Likewise, any minor impact to the historic parish boundary at the centre of the Site would not be considered significant.
- 5.4. Whilst there is a slight potential for the presence of further buried archaeological remains within the Site, due to a focus on agriculture and the lack of development from at least the early medieval period onwards, such remains are likely to be of little to no significance. Any such remains are likely to reflect evidence of agricultural practices in the form of infilled field boundaries, plough furrows and residual or unstratified artefacts.
- 5.5. Any buried archaeological remains within the Site would be impacted by the proposed groundworks, however they would be unlikely to represent an absolute constraint on development. A programme of further archaeological investigation may be required by the archaeological advisor to Hampshire County Council, likely as a condition to planning permission. It is expected that any archaeological mitigation would primarily target areas of more extensive groundworks, such as basins.

Non-physical effects

- 5.6. The assessment has considered the potential impact of the proposed development on assets within a 1km radius of the Site. It is considered that the proposed development would not alter any key element of the setting of any designated heritage asset and on that basis would not result in harm to the significance of any designated heritage asset.

6. REFERENCES

- Allen, M., Blick, N., Brindle, T., Evans, T., Fulford, M., Holbrook, N., Richards, J.D. & Smith, A. 2016 *The Rural Settlement of Roman Britain: an online resource*
- British Geological Survey 2023 *Geology of Britain Viewer, 1:50,000 geological mapping, bedrock and superficial* - <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/3d/index.html>
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2020 *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment*
- Cotswold Archaeology 2020 *Land at Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire Heritage Desk-Based Assessment*
- Cotswold Archaeology 2021 *One Horton Heath, Phase 3 Road 'The Avenue', Eastleigh, Hampshire: Heritage Desk-Based Assessment* CA Report: AN0270_1
- Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities 2023 *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*; published December 2023
- Eastleigh Borough Council 2022 *Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036*
<https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/11234/eastleigh-borough-local-plan.pdf>
- English Heritage 2008 *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*
- Hampshire County Council 1999 *Hampshire Historic Landscape Assessment*
- Hampshire County Council 2010 *An Overview of the Hampshire Landscape* - http://www3.hants.gov.uk/an_overview_of_the_hampshire_landscape-2.pdf
- Hampshire County Council 2012 *The Atlas of Hampshire's Archaeology*.
- Hey, G. and Hind, J., 2014 *Solent-Thames Research Framework for the Historic Environment Resource Assessments and Research Agendas* Oxford Archaeology/Wessex Archaeology
- Historic England 2010, *The Light Fantastic: Using Airbourne LiDAR in Archaeological Survey*
- Historic England 2015 *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment*
- Historic England 2016 *Historic England Advice Note 1: Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management*

Historic England 2017 *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second Edition)*

Historic England 2019 *Historic England Advice Note 12: Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets*

Historic England 2023 *The National Heritage List for England*

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/>

Lambrick, G. 2010 *Solent Thames Research Framework Resource Assessment: The Late Bronze Age and Iron Age Period*

Natural England 2014 *National Character Area 128: South Hampshire Lowlands*

Page, W. 1911 'Parishes: South Stoneham', in *A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 3*, British History <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/hants/vol3/pp481-489>

Pile, J. 1989 *Aspects of the Forest of Bere from the Late Iron Age to the Middle Ages*, Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society, Vol. 45, 113-119

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Act of UK Parliament

Powell-Smith, A. 2023 <https://opendomesday.org/>

Thames Valley Archaeological Services 2020a *Access Road, Land at North West Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire: Archaeological Evaluation*. Site Code HHE20/08

Thames Valley Archaeological Services 2020b *Access Road, Land at West Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire: Archaeological Evaluation*. Site Code WHHE20/09

Thames Valley Archaeological Services 2021a *Land at Lower Acre, Horton Heath, Eastleigh, Hampshire Project specification for an archaeological evaluation*. Ref. 19e105evLAE

Thames Valley Archaeological Services 2021b *Land at Horton Heath, Road 3, Eastleigh, Hampshire Project specification for an archaeological evaluation*. Site Code SHHE 21/208

Wymer, J. 1999 *The Lower Palaeolithic Occupation of Britain* Wessex Archaeology & English Heritage

Cartographic sources

1646 Blaeu, *Hantonia sive Sovthantonensis comitatvs vulgo Hant-shire*

1751 Hinton, *A new improved map of Hampshire*

1759 Blatt, *Map of Hampshire, inc. the Isle of Wight*, 2

1791	Milnes, <i>Map of Hampshire</i>
1806	Crocker, <i>Bishop Waltham</i>
1825	<i>South Stoneham: Great Allington Manor Enclosure Map (Q23/2/122/1)</i>
1825	<i>South Stoneham: Little Allington Manor Enclosure Map (Q23/2/122/2)</i>
1840	<i>Bishopstoke Parish Tithe Map</i>
1845	<i>South Stoneham Parish Tithe Map</i>
1871	Ordnance Survey 1:10,560 scale
1897	Ordnance Survey 1:10,560 scale
1910	Ordnance Survey 1: 10,560 scale
1939	Ordnance Survey 1: 10,560 scale
1962-3	Ordnance Survey 1: 10,000 scale
1962-3	Ordnance Survey 1: 10,000 scale

Aerial photographs

1985 – 2023 Google Earth Imagery

Sortie Number	Library Number	Date	Frame Number
RAF/106G/UK/649	28	12 AUG 1945	6118
RAF/106G/UK/649	28	12 AUG 1945	6119
RAF/106G/UK/649	28	12 AUG 1945	6120
RAF/106G/UK/649	28	12 AUG 1945	6180
RAF/106G/UK/649	28	12 AUG 1945	6181
RAF/106G/UK/649	28	12 AUG 1945	6182
RAF/106G/UK/649	28	12 AUG 1945	6183
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6056
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6057
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6058
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6170
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6171
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6172
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6280
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6281
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6282
RAF/106G/UK/600	35	04 AUG 1945	6283
RAF/106G/UK/737	43	27 AUG 1945	6073
RAF/106G/UK/737	43	27 AUG 1945	6074
RAF/106G/UK/737	43	27 AUG 1945	6075

Sortie Number	Library Number	Date	Frame Number
RAF/106G/UK/737	43	27 AUG 1945	6076
RAF/106G/UK/737	43	27 AUG 1945	6095
RAF/106G/UK/737	43	27 AUG 1945	6096
RAF/106G/UK/737	43	27 AUG 1945	6135
RAF/106G/UK/737	43	27 AUG 1945	6136
RAF/106G/UK/728	48	26 AUG 1945	6036
RAF/106G/UK/728	48	26 AUG 1945	6037
RAF/106G/UK/728	48	26 AUG 1945	6038
RAF/106G/UK/861	82	29 SEP 1945	6207
RAF/106G/UK/861	82	29 SEP 1945	6208
RAF/106G/UK/861	82	29 SEP 1945	6209
RAF/106G/UK/861	82	29 SEP 1945	6210
RAF/106G/UK/917	102	11 OCT 1945	5012
RAF/106G/UK/917	102	11 OCT 1945	5013
RAF/106G/UK/917	102	11 OCT 1945	5014
RAF/106G/UK/917	102	11 OCT 1945	5015
RAF/106G/UK/917	102	11 OCT 1945	5040
RAF/106G/UK/917	102	11 OCT 1945	5041
RAF/106G/UK/917	102	11 OCT 1945	5042
RAF/106G/UK/917	102	11 OCT 1945	5043
RAF/106G/UK/1322	313	28 MAR 1946	5138
RAF/106G/UK/1322	313	28 MAR 1946	5139
RAF/106G/UK/1322	313	28 MAR 1946	5140
RAF/106G/UK/1566	394	07 JUN 1946	5126
RAF/106G/UK/1566	394	07 JUN 1946	5127
RAF/106G/UK/1566	394	07 JUN 1946	5128
RAF/CPE/UK/1749	468	21 SEP 1946	4414
RAF/CPE/UK/1749	468	21 SEP 1946	4415
RAF/CPE/UK/1768	484	07 OCT 1946	4095
RAF/CPE/UK/1768	484	07 OCT 1946	4096
RAF/CPE/UK/1992	591	13 APR 1947	3215
RAF/540/258	1013	20 OCT 1949	5009
RAF/82/765	1421	20 APR 1953	311
RAF/82/765	1421	20 APR 1953	340
RAF/82/765	1421	20 APR 1953	366
RAF/82/765	1421	20 APR 1953	367
RAF/58/2860	1920	14 MAY 1959	260
RAF/58/2860	1920	14 MAY 1959	261
RAF/106G/UK/493	4958	08 JUL 1945	5044
RAF/106G/UK/493	4958	08 JUL 1945	5047
RAF/106G/UK/493	4958	08 JUL 1945	5048
RAF/106G/UK/493	4958	08 JUL 1945	5049
RAF/106G/UK/493	4958	08 JUL 1945	5050
OS/71019	9080	22 MAR 1971	84
OS/71019	9080	22 MAR 1971	85

Sortie Number	Library Number	Date	Frame Number
OS/71019	9080	22 MAR 1971	86
OS/66187	10542	22 JUL 1966	41
OS/66187	10542	22 JUL 1966	42
OS/66187	10542	22 JUL 1966	43
OS/90036	13658	01 APR 1990	48
OS/90036	13658	01 APR 1990	49
OS/95214	14443	29 JUN 1995	138
OS/95214	14443	29 JUN 1995	139
OS/95214	14443	29 JUN 1995	164
OS/95214	14443	29 JUN 1995	165
OS/00998	15755	07 APR 2000	2350
OS/00998	15755	07 APR 2000	2351
OS/00998	15755	07 APR 2000	2376
OS/00998	15755	07 APR 2000	2377

APPENDIX 1: HERITAGE STATUTE POLICY & GUIDANCE

Heritage Statute: Scheduled Monuments

Scheduled Monuments are subject to the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. The Act sets out the controls of works affecting Scheduled Monuments and other related matters. Contrary to the requirements of the Planning Act 1990 regarding Listed buildings, the 1979 Act does not include provision for the ‘setting’ of Scheduled Monuments.

Heritage Statute: Listed Buildings

Listed buildings are buildings of ‘special architectural or historic interest’ and are subject to the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (‘the Act’). Under Section 7 of the Act ‘no person shall execute or cause to be executed any works for the demolition of a listed building or for its alteration or extension in any manner which would affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, unless the works are authorised.’ Such works are authorised under Listed Building Consent. Under Section 66 of the Act ‘In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any feature of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses’.

Note on the extent of a Listed Building

Under Section 1(5) of the Act, a structure may be deemed part of a Listed Building if it is:

- (a) fixed to the building, or
- (b) within the curtilage of the building, which, although not fixed to the building, forms part of the land and has done so since before 1st July 1948

The inclusion of a structure deemed to be within the ‘curtilage’ of a building thus means that it is subject to the same statutory controls as the principal Listed Building. Inclusion within this duty is not, however, an automatic indicator of ‘heritage significance’ both as defined within the NPPF (2023) and within Conservation Principles (see Section 2 above). In such cases, the significance of the structure needs to be assessed both in its own right and in the contribution it makes to the significance and character of the principal Listed Building. The practical effect of the inclusion in the listing of ancillary structures is limited by the requirement that Listed Building Consent is only needed for works to the ‘Listed Building’ (to include the building in the list and all the ancillary items) where they affect the special character of the Listed building as a whole.

Guidance is provided by Historic England on '[Listed Buildings and Curtilage: Historic England Advice Note 10](#)' (Historic England 2018).

Heritage Statue: Conservation Areas

Conservation Areas are designated by the local planning authority under Section 69(1)(a) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ('the Act'), which requires that *'Every local planning authority shall from time to time determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'*. Section 72 of the Act requires that *'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'*.

The requirements of the Act only apply to land within a Conservation Area; not to land outside it. This has been clarified in various Appeal Decisions (for example APP/F1610/A/14/2213318 Land south of Cirencester Road, Fairford, Paragraph 65: *'The Section 72 duty only applies to buildings or land in a Conservation Area, and so does not apply in this case as the site lies outside the Conservation Area.'*).

The NPPF (2023) also clarifies in [Paragraph 213](#) that *'Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance'*. Thus land or buildings may be a part of a Conservation Area, but may not necessarily be of architectural or historical significance. Similarly, not all elements of the setting of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance, or to an equal degree.

Levelling up and Regeneration Act

Section 58B: Duty of regard to certain heritage assets in granting permissions

- 1) In considering whether to grant planning permission or permission in principle for the development of land in England which affects a relevant asset or its setting, the local planning authority or (as the case may be) the Secretary of State must have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the asset or its setting.
- 2) For the purposes of subsection (1), preserving or enhancing a relevant asset or its setting includes preserving or enhancing any feature, quality or characteristic of the asset or setting that contributes to the significance of the asset.

National heritage policy: the National Planning Policy Framework

Heritage assets and heritage significance

Heritage assets comprise 'a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its

heritage interest’ (the NPPF (2023), Annex 2). Designated heritage assets include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and Conservation Areas (designated under the relevant legislation; NPPF (2023), Annex 2). The NPPF (2023), Annex 2, states that the significance of a heritage asset may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Historic England’s (then, English Heritage) ‘Conservation Principles’ looks at significance as a series of ‘values’ which include ‘evidential’, ‘historical’, ‘aesthetic’ and ‘communal’.

The July 2019 revision of the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) expanded on the definition of non-designated heritage assets. It states *that ‘Non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified by plan-making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets.’* It goes on to refer to local/neighbourhood plans, conservation area appraisals/reviews, and importantly, the local Historic Environment Record (HER) as examples of where these assets may be identified, but specifically notes that such identification should be *made ‘based on sound evidence’*, with this information *‘accessible to the public to provide greater clarity and certainly for developers and decision makers’*.

This defines *non-designated heritage assets* as those which have been specially defined as such through the local HER or other source made accessible to the public by the plan-making body. Where HERs or equivalent lists do not specifically refer to an asset as a *non-designated heritage asset*, it is assumed that it has not met criteria for the plan-making body to define it as such, and will be referred to as a *heritage asset* for the purpose of this report.

The assessment of *non-designated heritage assets* and *heritage assets* will be equivalent in this report, in line with industry standards and guidance on assessing significance and impact. They may not, however, carry equivalent weight in planning as set out within the provisions of the NPPF, should there be any effect to significance.

The setting of heritage assets

The ‘setting’ of a heritage asset comprises ‘the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral’ (NPPF (2023), Annex 2). Thus it is important to note that ‘setting’ is not a heritage asset: it may contribute to the value of a heritage asset.

Guidance on assessing the effects of change upon the setting and significance of heritage assets is provided in 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets', which has been utilised for the present assessment (see below).

Levels of information to support planning applications

Paragraph 200 of the NPPF (2023) identifies that 'In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance'.

Designated heritage assets

Paragraph 195 of the NPPF (2023) explains that heritage assets 'are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance'. Paragraph 205 notes that 'when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'. Paragraph 206 goes on to note that 'substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building...should be exceptional and substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance (notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites)...should be wholly exceptional'.

Paragraph 208 clarifies that 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.

Development Plan

Current local planning policy within Eastleigh Borough is guided by the Local Plan (2016-2036), which was adopted in April 2022. Those of relevance to heritage include:

Strategic Policy 8: Historic Environment

The Borough Council will continue to conserve and/or enhance the Boroughs heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This includes all heritage assets including listed buildings and structures, Conservation Areas as designated on the policies map, landscapes and archaeology. This will be through the preparation of Conservation

Area Appraisals and Management Plans and other strategies and in the determination of planning applications for new development (see policy DM12). This will involve:

- a. identifying the assets by means of an on-going programme of survey and review;
- b. identifying their key features and measures to manage and enhance these, e.g. through Conservation Area Appraisals;
- c. restricting development likely to harm them or their settings through management of development proposals; and
- d. encouraging development that enhances them, ensures their long-term management and maintenance and where possible, enables public enjoyment and the interpretation of the asset.

Policy DM12, Heritage Assets:

Development of a heritage asset or within their setting will be permitted provided:

- i. it does not harm or detract from the significance or special interest of the asset, and sustains and enhances its special character and qualities. The more important the asset, the greater the weight that should be accorded to this criterion. Permission for development which results in substantial harm to, or loss of, designated assets of the highest significance will be exceptional. Development which involves the demolition or destruction of any part of other heritage assets will not be permitted unless its removal or replacement would enhance or better reveal the significance of the asset. In these circumstances, the developer will be required to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost, in a manner appropriate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence publicly accessible. Development that affects an archaeological site either above or below ground that is already identified or discovered through development proposals will only be permitted provided:
 - a. if the remains cannot be preserved in situ, the clear and convincing overriding public benefits of the development that cannot be achieved by any other means is sufficient to outweigh the value of the remains; and
 - b. prior to the commencement of the development, provision has been made for a programme of archaeological investigation and recording and for this evidence to be made publicly accessible;

-
- ii. it achieves a high standard of design which respects and complements the character and qualities of the heritage asset(s);
 - iii. where necessary, it secures the long-term future maintenance and management of the asset;
 - iv. where possible, it enables public enjoyment and interpretation of the asset; and
 - v. a heritage statement is submitted with the application explaining the significance of the assets affected including the contribution made by their setting, at a level of detail proportionate to the asset's significance; the impact of the proposal on the significance of the asset; and how proposals have been developed to avoid harm or, if this is not possible, minimise the harm; with mitigation measures proposed.

In permitting development involving a heritage asset the Borough Council may seek a legal agreement to secure the long-term management and enhancement of the asset.

Good Practice Advice 1-3

Historic England has issued three Good Practice Advice notes ('GPA1-3') which support the NPPF. The GPAs note that they do not constitute a statement of Government policy, nor do they seek to prescribe a single methodology: their purpose is to assist local authorities, planners, heritage consultants, and other stakeholders in the implementation of policy set out in the NPPF. This report has been produced in the context of this advice, particularly 'GPA2 – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment' and 'GPA3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets'.

GPA2 - Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment

GPA2 sets out the requirement for assessing 'heritage significance' as part of the application process. Paragraph 8 notes 'understanding the nature of the significance is important to understanding the need for and best means of conservation.' This includes assessing the extent and level of significance, including the contribution made by its 'setting' (see GPA3 below). GPA2 notes that 'a Desk-Based Assessment will determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature, extent and significance of the historic environment within a specified area, and the impact of the proposed development on the significance of the historic environment, or will identify the need for further evaluation to do so' (Page 3).

GPA3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets

The NPPF (Annex 2: Glossary) defines the setting of a heritage asset as ‘the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced...’. Step 1 of the settings assessment requires heritage assets which may be affected by development to be identified. Historic England notes that for the purposes of Step 1 this process will comprise heritage assets ‘where that experience is capable of being affected by a proposed development (in any way)...’.

Step 2 of the settings process ‘assess[es] the degree to which these settings and views make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated’, with regard to its physical surrounds; relationship with its surroundings and patterns of use; experiential effects such as noises or smells; and the way views allow the significance of the asset to be appreciated. Step 3 requires ‘assessing the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the asset(s)’ – specifically to ‘assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on the significance or on the ability to appreciate it’, with regard to the location and siting of the development, its form and appearance, its permanence, and wider effects.

Step 4 of GPA3 provides commentary on ‘ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm’. It notes (Paragraph 37) that ‘Maximum advantage can be secured if any effects on the significance of a heritage asset arising from development liable to affect its setting are considered from the project’s inception.’ It goes on to note (Paragraph 39) that ‘good design may reduce or remove the harm, or provide enhancement’.

Heritage significance

Discussion of heritage significance within this assessment report makes reference to several key documents. With regard to Listed buildings and Conservation Areas it primarily discusses ‘architectural and historic interest’, which comprises the special interest for which they are designated.

The NPPF provides a definition of ‘significance’ for heritage policy (Annex 2). This states that heritage significance comprises ‘The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic’. This also clarifies that for World Heritage Sites ‘the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance’.

Regarding ‘levels’ of significance the NPPF (2023) provides a distinction between: designated heritage assets of the highest significance; designated heritage assets not of the highest significance; and non-designated heritage assets.

Historic England's (then, English Heritage) 'Conservation Principles' expresses 'heritage significance' as comprising a combination of one or more of: evidential value; historical value; aesthetic value; and communal value:

- Evidential value – the elements of a historic asset that can provide evidence about past human activity, including physical remains, historic fabric, documentary/pictorial records. This evidence can provide information on the origin of the asset, what it was used for, and how it changed over time.
- Historical value (illustrative) – how a historic asset may illustrate its past life, including changing uses of the asset over time.
- Historical value (associative) – how a historic asset may be associated with a notable family, person, event, or moment, including changing uses of the asset over time.
- Aesthetic value – the way in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a historic asset. This may include its form, external appearance, and its setting, and may change over time.
- Communal value – the meaning of a historic asset to the people who relate to it. This may be a collective experience, or a memory, and can be commemorative or symbolic to individuals or groups, such as memorable events, attitudes, and periods of history. This includes social values, which relates to the role of the historic asset as a place of social interactive, distinctiveness, coherence, economic, or spiritual / religious value.

Effects upon heritage assets

Heritage benefit

The NPPF clarifies that change in the setting of heritage assets may lead to heritage benefit. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF (2023) notes that 'Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably'.

GPA3 notes that 'good design may reduce or remove the harm, or provide enhancement' (Paragraph 28). Historic England's (then, English Heritage) 'Conservation Principles' states that 'Change to a significant place is inevitable, if only as a result of the passage of time, but can be neutral or beneficial in its effects on heritage values. It is only harmful if (and to the extent that) significance is reduced' (Paragraph 84).

Specific heritage benefits may be presented through activities such as repair or restoration, as set out in Conservation Principles.

Heritage harm to designated heritage assets

The NPPF (2023) does not define what constitutes ‘substantial harm’. The High Court of Justice does provide a definition of this level of harm, as set out by Mr Justice Jay in *Bedford Borough Council v SoS for CLG and Nuon UK Ltd*. Paragraph 25 clarifies that, with regard to ‘substantial harm’: ‘Plainly in the context of physical harm, this would apply in the case of demolition or destruction, being a case of total loss. It would also apply to a case of serious damage to the structure of the building. In the context of non-physical or indirect harm, the yardstick was effectively the same. One was looking for an impact which would have such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced’.

Effects upon non-designated heritage assets

The NPPF (2023) paragraph 209 guides that ‘The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgment will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset’.

Important Hedgerows

Extracted from Statutory Instruments 1997 No. 1160 The Hedgerows Regulations 1997.

Provision 4. For the purposes of section 97 (hedgerows) of the Environment Act 1995 and these Regulations, a hedgerow is “important” if it, or the hedgerow of which it is a stretch,

(a) has existed for 30 years or more; **and**

(b) satisfies at least one of the criteria listed in Part II of Schedule 1.

Schedule 1: *Additional criteria for determining ‘Important’ hedgerows;*

PART II

Criteria

Archaeology and history

1. The hedgerow marks the boundary, or part of the boundary, of at least one historic parish or township; and for this purpose “historic” means existing before 1845.
2. The hedgerow incorporates an archaeological feature which is-

-
- a. included in the schedule of monuments compiled by the Secretary of State under section 1 (schedule of monuments) of the Ancient Monuments and Scheduled Areas Act 1979**(g)**; or
 - b. recorded at the relevant date in a sites and Monuments Record.
 3. The hedgerow-
 - a) is situated wholly or partly within an archaeological site included or recorded as mentioned in paragraph 2 or on land adjacent to and associated with such a site; and
 - b) is associated with any monument or feature on that site.
 4. The hedgerow-
 - a) marks the boundary of a pre-1600 AD estate or manor recorded at the relevant date in a sites and Monuments Record or on a document held at that date at a Record Office; or
 - b) is visibly related to any building or feature of such an estate or manor.
 5. The hedgerow-
 - a) is recorded in a document held at the relevant date at a Record Office as an integral part of a field system pre-dating the Inclosure acts **(a)**; or
 - b) is part of, or visibly related to, any building or other feature associated with such a system, and that system-
 - i. is substantially complete; or
 - ii. is of a pattern which is recorded in a document prepared before the relevant date by a local planning authority, within the meaning of the 1990 Act**(b)**, for the purposes of development control within the authority's area, as a key landscape characteristic

APPENDIX 2: GAZETTEER OF SELECTED RECORDED HERITAGE ASSETS

Ref	Description	Period	NGR	HER ref. <i>HE ref.</i>
1	Access road Land at North West Horton Heath	Previous Investigation	448394 117788	70958
2	Access Road Land at West Horton Heath		448874 116048	70968
3	Land at Lower Acre		448900 116300	72250
4	Road 3 Land at Horton Heath		448500 117000	72251
5	Mesolithic Macehead	Mesolithic	449000 117000	37067
6	Chalcroft Farm	Medieval	448500 116600	41429
7	Grade II Listed Firtree Farmhouse	Post-medieval	448583 117488	1111949
8	Post-medieval Earthwork		449150 117740	25915

Andover Office

Stanley House
Walworth Road
Andover
Hampshire
SP10 5LH

t: 01264 347630

Cirencester Office

Building 11
Cotswold Business Park
Cirencester
Gloucestershire
GL7 6BQ

t: 01285 771022

Milton Keynes Office

Unit 8 - The IO Centre
Fingle Drive, Stonebridge
Milton Keynes
Buckinghamshire
MK13 0AT

t: 01908 564660

Suffolk Office

Unit 5, Plot 11, Maitland Road
Lion Barn Industrial Estate
Needham Market
Suffolk
IP6 8NZ

t: 01449 900120

e: enquiries@cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk

