



**Land South of
Mortimers Lane, Fair
Oak**

**Archaeology and
Heritage Baseline
Assessment**

Prepared by:
**The Environmental Dimension
Partnership Ltd**

On behalf of:
Bloor Homes Limited

December 2024

Report Reference
edp7852_r006e

Document Control

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Client	Bloor Homes Limited
Report Title	Archaeology and Heritage Baseline Assessment
Document Reference	edp7852_r006e

VERSION INFORMATION

	Author	Formatted	Peer Review	Proofed by/Date
006_ DRAFT	EBR	GGi	-	-
006a	EBR	-	ACr	NHa 071123
006b	EBR	-	-	FMi 151123
006c	EBR	-	-	MWi 210824
006d	EBR	-	-	MWi 221024
006e	EBR	-	-	MWi 021224

DISCLAIMER TEXT

No part of this report may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd. If you have received this report in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control and notify The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd.

This report (including any enclosures and attachments) has been prepared for the exclusive use and benefit of the commissioning party and solely for the purpose for which it is provided. No other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of the report.

We do not accept any liability if this report is used for an alternative purpose from which it is intended, nor to any third party in respect of this report.

Opinions and information provided in the report are those of The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd using due skill, care and diligence in the preparation of the same and no explicit warranty is provided to their accuracy. It should be noted, and it is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd has been made.

Contents

Executive Summary 4

Section 1 Introduction..... 6

Section 2 Legislation and Planning Guidance..... 8

Section 3 Methodology..... 14

Section 4 Existing Information 17

Section 5 Impact Assessment..... 34

Section 6 Conclusions..... 38

Section 7 References..... 40

APPENDICES

- Appendix EDP 1 Images
- Appendix EDP 2 Development Proposals
- Appendix EDP 3 Geophysical Survey Report
- Appendix EDP 4 Hampshire County Council Advice
- Appendix EDP 5 Pre-Application Response from the Built Heritage Consultant

PLANS

- Plan EDP 1: Overview of Designated Heritage Assets
(edp7852_d014c 02 December 2024 GYo/EBR)
- Plan EDP 2: Overview of HER Data
(edp7852_d015c 02 December 2024 GYo/EBR)
- Plan EDP 3: Extracts of Historic Mapping (1840 Bishopstoke Parish Tithe Map)
(edp7852_d016c 02 December 2024 GYo/EBR)
- Plan EDP 4: Extracts of Historic OS Mapping
(edp7852_d017c 02 December 2024 GYo/EBR)
- Plan EDP 5: Overview of Listed and Historic Buildings at Mortimer’s Farm and East Horton Farm
(edp7852_d020c 02 December 2024 GYo/EBR)

Executive Summary

- S1 This Archaeology and Heritage Assessment has been prepared for Bloor Homes Ltd by The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd, in order to inform and support the preparation, submission and positive determination of an outline planning application for development of Land south of Mortimers Lane, Fair Oak in Hampshire.
- S2 It shows that the Site does not contain any 'designated' heritage assets, and it is also not included (either wholly or in part) within the boundary of a designated heritage asset, and so its residential development would not result in a direct impact in this respect.
- S3 Consideration has been given to the (existing) contribution which the land at the Site makes to the setting and significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets in its wider surroundings and to inform an understanding of whether, and to what extent, development would result in a reduction of that contribution and hence harm.
- S4 The assessment concludes that the farmland within the Site is an element of the setting of Mortimers Farm that makes a 'small' contribution to its significance, with that contribution focused on the northern field. It also concludes that the implementation of the development proposals would result in a very small loss of significance from the Mortimer's Farm complex of historic listed and unlisted buildings.
- S5 This would constitute 'less than substantial harm' in terms of the NPPF and it would require to be balanced against the public benefits which would be delivered by the implementation of this housing development.
- S6 There would be no impact on the East Horton Farm complex of historic buildings south-east of the Site. There would be no harm to any of them and there is hence no need for them to be included in the planning balance described in paragraph 208 of the Framework.
- S7 The approval and subsequent implementation of the planning proposals is likely to result in the complete removal of any archaeological sites, features or deposits within the boundary of the Site as a consequence of the construction groundworks required to deliver the roads, buildings and supporting infrastructure.
- S8 Whilst it is highly unlikely that the Site contains archaeological deposits that are of national importance and worthy of physical conservation, the anomalies of potential archaeological interest across the centre of the Site warrant further investigation to confirm their origins, as well as their nature, date and significance if it turns out that they are of archaeological interest and the remainder of the Site will also require some lesser degree of archaeological investigation in order to confirm the low interest or potential which is suggested by the data collected so far.
- S9 The loss of 'potential' archaeological remains from across the Site during construction could be dealt with through the imposition and agreement of a condition on the outline planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority. This would provide for the completion of an initial phase of targeted trial trenches and then the excavation of any archaeological

features or deposits prior to commencement and the deposition of the project archive in a local museum once the results have been published to an appropriate standard.

- S10 In light of the conclusions above, there is no archaeological or heritage reason why planning consent should not be forthcoming when the outline application comes before the Council for its evaluation and determination.

Section 1

Introduction

- 1.1 This report has been prepared by The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd (EDP) for Bloor Homes Ltd and provides an identification and assessment of impacts in terms of the preparation, submission, validation and determination of an outline planning application for residential development on the historic environment at Land south of Mortimers Lane, Fair Oak, which is referred to as being ‘the Site’ from hereon.
- 1.2 In that regard, it identifies and assesses the likely impacts of development within the Site on the setting of heritage assets located outside its boundary and thereafter determines whether and to what extent, they might affect their heritage significance.
- 1.3 The report also considers the available historical and archaeological information for the Site and its immediate surroundings, in order to establish the Site’s likely archaeological interest and/or potential in accordance with the requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) and local planning policy.
- 1.4 In accordance with best practice guidance, desktop sources have been augmented through the completion of a Site walkover survey, which was undertaken by a highly experienced surveyor in good weather conditions, in November 2022.

LOCATION AND BOUNDARIES

- 1.5 The Site is located on the eastern edge of Fair Oak and measures 11.05 hectares (ha) in area, formed of two fields of agricultural farmland used for pastoral grazing that are centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) 450778 18951. Its location is depicted on **Plan EDP 1**.
- 1.6 The Site comprises two fields of permanent pasture, which are defined by the course of Mortimers Lane to the north, existing residential dwellings within the Pembers Hill Drive and Kingsmill Drive developments to the west, and field boundaries defined by a mixture of fences, hedgerows, tree lines and plantations to the east and south.
- 1.7 Hence, the adjoining land to the west is already developed for housing, the land to the east is used as a golf course and the land to the north (on the north side of the road) comprises undeveloped farmland. To the south of the Site and across the ditch is a now remediated landfill site.

TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

- 1.8 The topography within the Site is relatively complex, with a general slope downwards from north to south, as well as from east to west, albeit there is the ‘toe-end’ of an east-west aligned ridge that peters out within the centre of the Site to the south of the central field boundary and tree line.
- 1.9 The highest point within the Site is at c.58m Above Ordnance Datum (aOD) in the north beside Mortimers Lane and the lowest point is in the far south along the northern edge of the stream, where it is at c.46m aOD.
- 1.10 In terms of geology, the Site is predominantly located on London Clay Formation, a sedimentary bedrock formed between 56 and 47.8 million years ago during the Palaeogene period. However, a small band across the centre consists of Whitecliff Sand Member, a sedimentary bedrock formed between 66 and 23.03 million years ago during the Palaeogene period. No superficial geology is recorded (www.bgs.com).

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 1.11 Development proposals for the Site focus on the preparation, submission and validation of the following (**Appendix EDP 2**):
- “Outline application for up to 245 dwellings (Use Class C3), up to 350sqm multi-functional space, mobility infrastructure (Use Class Sui Generis), with associated open space, landscaping, infrastructure, and vehicular access off Mortimers Lane, Fair Oak; all matters reserved except for vehicular access off Mortimers Lane and pedestrian/cycle connections to the site boundary”*
- 1.12 This report aims to identify the nature and magnitude of any impacts that would result from the approval and implementation of these proposals.

Section 2

Legislation and Planning Guidance

- 2.1 This section summarises the key legislative and planning policy context relating to the proposed development of the Site, at both national and local levels.

LEGISLATION

- 2.2 Section 66(1) of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* sets out the statutory duty of the decision-maker, where proposed development would affect a listed building or its setting. It sets out the statutory duty as follows:

“In considering whether to grant planning permission [or permission in principle] 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 features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

- 2.3 This ‘special regard’ duty has been tested in the Court of Appeal and confirmed to require that *“considerable importance and weight”* should be afforded by the decision-maker to the desirability of preserving a listed building along with its setting. The relevant Court Judgement is referenced as *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northants DC, English Heritage and National Trust* [2014] EWCA Civ 137.

- 2.4 However, it must be recognised that section 66(1) of the 1990 Act does not identify that the local authority or the Secretary of State must preserve a listed building or its setting. Neither is it the case that a proposed development that does not ‘preserve’ is unacceptable and should be refused. It is for the decision-maker to evaluate and determine.

- 2.5 The discussion of ‘harm’ is of relevance in the judgement in respect of *R (Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council* [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin) which also makes this clear at paragraph 49 when it states that:

“This does not mean that an authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to [the character or appearance of] a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgement. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasised in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to [the character or appearance] of a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. But an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.”

- 2.6 This key point is also made in paragraph 54 of *Forest of Dean DC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2013] EWHC 4052; i.e.:

“...Section 66 (1) did not oblige the inspector to reject the proposal because he found it would cause some harm to the setting of the listed buildings. The duty is directed to 'the desirability of preserving' the setting of listed buildings. One sees there the basic purpose of the 'special regard' duty. It does not rule out acceptable change. It gives the decision-maker an extra task to perform, which is to judge whether the change proposed is acceptable. But it does not prescribe the outcome. It does not dictate the refusal of planning permission if the proposed development is found likely to alter or even to harm the setting of a listed building.”

- 2.7 In other words, it is up to the decision-maker (such as a local authority) to assess whether the proposal which is before them would result in ‘acceptable change’.
- 2.8 Paragraph 205 of the NPPF (MHCLG 2023) transposes section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the 1990 Act into the NPPF.
- 2.9 The balancing exercise to be performed - between the harm arising from a proposal and the benefits which would accrue from its implementation - is then subsequently presented in paragraphs 207 and 208 of the NPPF.

National Planning Policy

- 2.10 The NPPF was revised in December 2023. Section 16 sets out the government’s approach to the conservation and management of the historic environment, including listed buildings and archaeological remains, through the planning process.
- 2.11 The opening paragraph, 195, recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner proportionate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.
- 2.12 Paragraph 200 concerns planning applications, stating 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. As a minimum, the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.”

- 2.13 Paragraph 205 considers the weighting given within the planning decision, with regard to impacts on designated heritage assets, stating 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.”

- 2.14 Paragraph 206 considers the level of harmful effects on designated heritage assets and states that:

“Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a. Grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; and*
- b. 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.”*

- 2.15 With regard to the decision-making process, paragraphs 207 and 208 are of relevance. Paragraph 207 states that:

“Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a. the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;*
- b. no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;*
- c. conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d. the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.”*

- 2.16 Paragraph 208 states 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.”

- 2.17 In this regard, under the heading of “*Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment*”, the Government’s *Planning Practice Guidance* highlights the following details in respect of the identification of substantial harm:

“Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.”

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all.”

- 2.18 The key points are that substantial harm is a “*high test*” that “*may not arise in many cases*”, highlighted by the example whereby ‘partial destruction’ may not necessarily result in there being substantial harm. It is a question of whether that “*adverse impact seriously affects a key element of [the specific listed building’s] special architectural or historic interest*” and so its contribution to the building’s significance is an important question.

- 2.19 In this context, the Secretary of State’s agreement (04 July 2022) with the approach taken by the Inspector in their report (IR) on the Edith Summerskill House Inquiry (04 April 2022), referenced as APP/H5390/V/21/3277137, is of course noteworthy.

- 2.20 The key paragraphs in the Inspector’s Report (IR) are paragraphs 12.49 and 12.50, where in the first the Inspector highlights that:

“Essentially, substantial harm is set at a high bar, such that a good deal (or all) of the significance of a designated heritage asset would have to be removed for it to be reached. That means that the range for a finding of less than substantial harm is very wide indeed, from a harmful impact that is hardly material, to something just below that high bar.”

- 2.21 This leads to the important observation in paragraph 12.50 of the IR, when the Inspector identifies the approach to be taken to the assessment of where on this broad spectrum of ‘less than substantial harm’ an individual impact is located:

“In cases where the impact is on the setting of a designated heritage asset, it is only the significance that asset derives from its setting that is affected. All the significance embodied in the asset itself would remain intact. In such a case, unless the asset concerned derives a major proportion of its significance from its setting, it is very difficult to see how an impact on its setting can advance a long way along the scale towards substantial harm to significance.”

- 2.22 The Planning Inspector subsequently sums up their approach to the identification of harm through changes within the setting of heritage assets in paragraph 12.54, when they clearly articulate the following judgement:

“It is often argued that such an approach leads to harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset being underestimated. However, what is under consideration is the impact of change on the significance of a designated heritage asset. If that change would come about as a result of development in the setting of that asset, then it is only the component of significance that the asset derives from its setting that would be affected. This is the outcome of the approach the Framework takes.”

- 2.23 The decision to grant planning permission in accordance with the Planning Inspector’s recommendation was made by the Minister of State for Housing, Stuart Andrew MP, on behalf of the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and this is set out in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Decision Letter.

- 2.24 The Minister of State’s consideration and assessment of the heritage issues identified by the Inspector is set out in paragraphs 11 to 15 of the Decision Letter, with paragraph 13 being of specific relevance to the above:

“For the reasons given at IR12.46-12.54, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the Church of St. Thomas of Canterbury does derive something of its significance from its setting, but the overwhelming proportion is locked into its form and fabric (IR12.51) and that the harm that would be caused to the setting and thereby the significance of the church would be less than substantial, and very much at the lower end of the scale (IR12.52). He further agrees that the harm that would be caused to the setting and thereby significance of the Central Fulham Conservation Area as a result of the proposal would be very minor indeed and even further toward the bottom of the scale of less than substantial harm than would be caused to the significance of the church (IR12.53). The Secretary of State attaches great weight to the harm to the Church of St. Thomas of Canterbury and the Central Fulham Conservation Area.”

- 2.25 In short, the Secretary of State clearly endorses the approach that the Inspector sets out for the identification and assessment of harm caused to designated heritage assets by the development proposals.

- 2.26 In other words, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector’s reasoning that, where the majority of a heritage asset’s significance is bound up in its physical form and fabric, the harm which would be caused to that asset by development proposals that affect only its wider setting (and leave that physical form and fabric unchanged) are likely to be towards the lower end of the spectrum of ‘less than substantial harm’ as a consequence.

- 2.27 With regard to non-designated heritage assets, paragraph 209 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.”

- 2.28 Furthermore, footnote 72 to paragraph 206 states that *“Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.”*
- 2.29 Footnote 72 is clear in advising that, for a heritage asset of archaeological interest to be subject to the policies for designated heritage assets, it must first be ‘demonstrated’ that it is of sufficient interest to justify that protection.

Local Planning Policy

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036)

- 2.30 The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) was adopted in April 2022 and contains Strategic Policy S8 ‘Historic Environment’ which is of relevance to this report:

“Strategic policy S8, Historic Environment

1. *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.”*
- 2.31 The plans and policies identified above have all been taken into account in the preparation of this assessment.

Section 3

Methodology

INTRODUCTION

- 3.1 This assessment has been researched and produced in accordance with the *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment* issued by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA, 2020). These best practice guidelines provide a national standard for the completion of assessments such as this one.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

- 3.2 The assessment principally involved consultation of readily available archaeological and historical information from documentary and cartographic sources. The major data sources comprised:
- The National Heritage List for England (NHLE) curated by Historic England;
 - Winchester Historic Environment Record (HER) and Hampshire Historic Environment Record (HER) on known archaeological sites, monuments, events and findspots within the vicinity of the Site;
 - Maps and documents held by online sources;
 - Aerial Photographs held by Historic England; and
 - LiDAR data from the Environment Agency.
- 3.3 This report provides a synthesis of relevant information for the Site derived from a search area extending up to 1km from its boundary (hereafter known as the ‘study area’), to allow for additional contextual information regarding its archaeological interest and/or potential to be gathered.
- 3.4 The information gathered from the repositories and sources identified above was checked and augmented through the completion of a Site visit and walkover undertaken by a highly experienced surveyor in fine and dry weather conditions, in November 2022. This walkover considered the nature and significance of known and/or potential archaeological assets within the Site, identified visible historic features and assessed possible factors that may affect the survival and/or condition of known or potential assets.
- 3.5 The report thereafter concludes with an assessment of the Site’s likely archaeological interest and/or potential, made with regard to current best practice guidelines, in order to provide a baseline against which the impact of proposed development within the Site on the conservation of archaeological remains can be made.

SETTING ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

- 3.6 Although the Site does not contain any known/recorded heritage assets and is not located within a designated area such as a conservation area identified and adopted by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), this report still identifies and assesses the nature and magnitude of effects upon heritage assets as a result of changes to their 'setting'.
- 3.7 This exercise employed current Historic England guidance set out in *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets* (HE, 2017), which provides best practice guidance for the identification and assessment of potential setting issues in the historic environment. Given that the Site does not contain any known heritage assets and is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory heritage designations, the completion of the 'setting assessment' focused entirely on the identification of indirect impacts on any off-site heritage assets situated in its wider surroundings.
- 3.8 On a practical level, the HE guidance (2017) identifies an approach to assessing setting, which is based on a five-step procedure, i.e.:
- Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected;
 - Step 2: Assess the degree to which these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s), or allow significance to be appreciated;
 - Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance or the ability to appreciate it;
 - Step 4: Explore ways of maximising enhancement and avoid or minimise harm; and
 - Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.
- 3.9 Set within that context, the Site visit and walkover survey, undertaken in November 2022, concentrated on the following three main areas:
1. Identifying those heritage assets that could potentially be affected by the Site's development and the manner (if any) in which they would be affected (Step 1);
 2. Defining the contribution made to their significance by their setting; and
 3. Assessing whether the Site forms a part of their setting and then whether, how, in what way(s) and to what extent it contributes to their significance.
- 3.10 Steps 1 and 2 of GPA 3 are applied in **Section 4** of this report and Steps 3 and 4 are then applied in **Section 5** in light of the finalisation and circulation of the development proposals underpinning the outline planning application.

LIDAR DATA

- 3.11 Airborne LiDAR data (light detection and ranging) was utilised as a source of primary data for the current assessment. LiDAR scanning records height data and has applications in the recording of archaeological earthworks.
- 3.12 A Digital Terrain Model (DTM) for the Site was acquired from the Environment Agency Data available online. Resolution of the data is at one data point for each 1m², a low resolution which, for archaeological prospection, has a fairly limited application, aside from in the identification of larger earthworks.
- 3.13 The DTM was processed using the Relief Visualisation Toolbox (ver. 1.3 ZRC SAZU, 2016). This software allows for a range of visualisation techniques to be applied to the data. Different techniques have varying degrees of successful application, depending on the nature of the environment where the data was collected.
- 3.14 As such, the whole suite of visualisations was produced and then, the individual images appraised as to their usefulness in the current context. This appraisal identified that of the visualisation techniques, multiple direction hill-shades produced the best quality and most useful imagery for the archaeology assessment.

Multiple Direction Hill-shades

- 3.15 Relief shading or hill-shading is the most commonly used LiDAR visualisation technique. It illuminates the DTM from a specific angle, imitating the sun, and as such produces the most 'natural' and intuitively readable imagery. However, it is limited, in that areas facing directly towards or away from the illumination source are saturated (homogeneously bright or dark respectively) and little detail can be perceived; plus, features that lie parallel to the light source can be imperceptible.
- 3.16 This effect can be overcome by combining hill-shades from different directions in three different colour bands into a single image. This technique was used to produce useful images for the assessment, providing an additional source of data on the Site's archaeological potential.

Section 4 Existing Information

INTRODUCTION

- 4.1 The Site does not contain any 'designated' heritage assets – as defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF (December 2023). In the wider study area there are six listed buildings, the locations of which are all shown on **Plan EDP 1**.
- 4.2 The Site does not contain any non-designated buildings of historic interest, as recorded on the Hampshire HER, but there are nine Historic Buildings located within the study area, excluding the five listed buildings mentioned above. These are shown on **Plan EDP 2**.
- 4.3 The Winchester HER and Hampshire HER do not contain any records for previously identified archaeological remains at the Site, but there are 12 records in the wider study area relating to archaeology dating from the prehistoric to modern periods, the locations of which are identified on **Plan EDP 2**.
- 4.4 A number of archaeological events and interventions are also recorded by the Winchester HER and Hampshire HERs within the study area, these are illustrated on **Plan EDP 2**. Extracts from historic maps, insofar as they are relevant to the aims of this assessment, are reproduced as **Plans EDP 3** and **EDP 4**.

DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS

- 4.5 The following section identifies the heritage assets and their settings (if any) that would be affected by the proposed development (i.e. Step 1 of HE, 2017).
- 4.6 Consideration of desktop sources and the completion of the Site visit and walkover survey concluded that proposals for the residential development of the Site are very unlikely to have any impact upon the setting or significance of heritage assets located beyond its immediate surroundings because of the natural topography, the extent of intervening built form and vegetation and the nature and positions of the assets themselves.
- 4.7 With that in mind, it is assessed that the settings of five heritage assets could be changed by the development of the Site in a way or to an extent that could potentially generate a loss of their significance and therefore harm. These five are all Grade II listed buildings and brief descriptions are set out below.

Mortimers Farmhouse (1281407) Granary (1204077) and Barn (1111950)

- 4.8 Mortimers Farm is located c.105m to the east of the Site and includes three Grade II listed buildings within its extents:
 - 1. Mortimers Farmhouse (**1281407**);
 - 2. Granary to West of Mortimers Farmhouse (**1204077**); and

3. Barn to South West of Mortimers Farmhouse (**1111950**).
- 4.9 As shown on **Plan EDP 1**, Mortimers Farmhouse is located at the north-west corner of the farm complex and the Grade II listed granary and barn are in fact (contrary to the above) located to the south-east of the farmhouse, towards the centre and at the south-east corner of the broadly rectangular farmstead respectively.
- 4.10 The listing citation for Mortimers Farmhouse (**1281407**) is as follows (reproduced in full):
- “A traditional group of buildings. House of C17, C18, of 2 storeys. Interior shows old framework, partly exposed on upper east gable; external finish is in brickwork, English bond (red with many blue headers) partly painted, also some Flemish Garden Wall bond. Massive red tile roof with central stack, half-hips at end, tied in at west by gabled cross unit. Casements. At some time 2 dwellings.)*
- 4.11 The listing citation for the Barn (**1111950**) records the building as “C18. Barn with red tile roof, half-hipped, central doorway, weatherboard, interior having typical double aisled sections, of 5 bays with narrower end bays”, and the Granary (**1204077**) to the north-west is recorded as “C18. Granary on 9 straddle stones, red tile pyramid roof; weatherboarded”. The form and appearance of the buildings are illustrated here in **Images EDP A1.1** to **A1.4** and they should be reviewed alongside the text in paragraphs 4.85 to 4.104 (below).

East Horton Farmhouse (1204057) and Barn (1322702)

- 4.12 East Horton Farm is located c.180m south of the Site’s south-eastern corner and includes the following two Grade II listed buildings:
1. East Horton Farmhouse (**1204057**); and
 2. Barn to South East of East Horton Farmhouse (**1322702**).
- 4.13 The farmhouse is located on the north side of the former farmstead and the associated barn is in fact positioned to the south-west, on the southern edge of the former farmstead, now surrounded by the East Horton Golf Club complex.
- 4.14 The listing citation for East Horton Farmhouse (**1204057**) is as follows (reproduced in full):
- “C16, C17. E-shaped of 2 storeys, the original wood framing now seen only in the upper gables. Massive red tile roof with Tudor stacks, one gable, the remainder half-hips. The front has a 2 storeyed projecting gabled porch; to the north are 4 windows to south a forward extension at ground floor level of 2 windows. Walling in red brickwork (Flemish Garden Wall bond), projecting 1st floor band, flat arches, high plinth with moulding above English bond base. Windows are small, being mainly double casements, 2 dormers. Recently modernised.”*
- 4.15 The listing citation for the Barn (**1322702**) records it as a “Barn of simple form with massive red tile roof, hipped, leading to low eaves. Central door with hipped gable. Long side wall in brick, otherwise vertical boarding”.

- 4.16 The form and appearance of the buildings are depicted here in **Images EDP A1.5 to A1.6**, and they should be reviewed in connection with the setting assessment which is presented in paragraphs 4.105 to 4.121 (below).

NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS

Historic Buildings

- 4.17 The Site does not contain any non-designated buildings of historic interest, but there are nine located within the study area, excluding the listed buildings at Mortimers Farm and East Horton Farm, which are discussed in the paragraphs above.
- 4.18 These Historic Buildings include an additional building at both Mortimers Farm and East Horton Farm, as well as a group of seven buildings at Hall Land Farm, located c.600m to the north-west of the Site.
- 4.19 In view of the natural topography and intervening vegetation, as well as the presence of modern built development on the north side of Mortimers Lane to the north of the Site boundary, it is assessed that none of the Historic Buildings recorded by the Hampshire HER at Hall Land Farm would be adversely affected by the proposed residential development of the Site and none of these will be considered further here.
- 4.20 The two non-designated Historic Buildings at Mortimers Farm and East Horton Farm will, however, be described in the paragraphs below.

Barn 55m ESE of Mortimers Farmhouse

- 4.21 The Barn 55m ESE of Mortimers Farmhouse (**HER 41797**), c.105m to the east of the Site's eastern boundary, is described as follows in the HER (reproduced in full):

"Unlisted former cartshed at Mortimers Farm, now used as a cattle shed. Date not known. Rectangular plan, open on west elevation. Brick north elevation, with roof of clay tile, hipped at brick elevation end, and having four 'velux-style' vents in the west-facing slope. South end is attached to the east end of the listed barn (MONUID.5725). On the rear (east) elevation of the cattle shed, is a corrugated iron, pent-roofed lean-to, which extends to the south, across the end of the same listed barn. Note that at the time of the SUIAG survey (1988), all the buildings here had been extensively restored, so some of the materials or features described, may not be original."

- 4.22 Whilst the HER does not assign a date to the building, a review of cartographic sources demonstrates that the former cart shed is depicted on the 1840 Tithe Map, and therefore dates from at least the earlier decades of the 19th century.
- 4.23 The assessment which is set out in paragraphs 4.85 to 4.104 should also be read in tandem with the photograph which is reproduced as **Image EDP A1.7**, which illustrates the form and appearance of the non-designated cart shed.

Barn 20m NW of Horton Farmhouse

- 4.24 The Barn 20m NW of Horton Farmhouse (**HER 41794**), c.200m to the south of the Site's south-eastern corner, is described as follows by the Hampshire HER:

“Unlisted barn at East Horton Farm. Late Victorian. The rectangular plan, with elevations of brick and a slate roof, is basically of pitched roof form, although the ridge section forms a narrow flat roof, which is half-hipped at each end. The 'rear' (south-east side) is a contiguous extension, with the roof of 'catslide' form. The north-east, north-west and south-west elevations have windows and ventilation holes (circular brick) in recessed panels falling to ground level, giving the effect of brick buttresses. north-west elevation has, in each 'panel'; a low level, 3-light casements, with brick cill and concrete lintel, as well as vertically-paired ventilation holes and there is a pair of double doors to eaves height, in one bay. South-west elevation has ventilation holes, and one cambered-head opening at higher level ('pitching hole'?). North-east elevation has low level windows (as north-west) on either side of central doors (cambered head), having another window at higher level over. The low, 'rear' south-east elevation has small windows with cambered brick heads, a double door and two single doors (all cambered heads). Now used or general storage, the barn was used as a cattle shed.”

- 4.25 In common with the listed and unlisted buildings at Mortimers Farm (above), the potential impact of residential development at the Site on the setting and significance of this heritage asset will be covered in **Section 5** of this report.

ARCHAEOLOGY

Previous Archaeological Investigations

- 4.26 No previous archaeological investigations are recorded as having been undertaken within the Site area. The following paragraphs provide a summary of the previous archaeological investigations that are recorded within the 1km study area.
- 4.27 The Winchester HER records three archaeological events, all located to the south-east, between 700m and 900m from the Site. These records relate to historic building surveys undertaken at Greenwood Lodge (**EW C1888**) and surveys undertaken at potential Bronze Age barrows at Greenwood and North Greenwood respectively (**EW C1902** and **EW C1903**). No further information is provided by the HER and, as they are recording exercises without implications for the archaeological interest or potential of the Site, they are not discussed further here. The barrows are discussed within the period-specific section below.
- 4.28 The Hampshire HER records five investigations within the surrounding study area, including one immediately adjacent to the western boundary of Site. In 2015 an archaeological field evaluation (**HER 68643**) was carried out across Land at The Corner of Knowles Lane and Mortimer's Lane. The work was carried out by Thames Valley Archaeological Services (TVAS) and involved the excavation of 32 trial trenches.
- 4.29 Four of these trenches revealed linear ditches which contained modern finds of brick and glass fragments. Two additional trenches contained pairs of linear features which were undated but correlated with the aforementioned ditches. These features were interpreted

to be components of a late post-medieval field system (TVAS, 2015). A sondage revealed a large feature interpreted to be a pit and possible linear ditch; no clear stratigraphic relationship between the two was identified and no finds were recovered from either so the features remained undated (TVAS, 2015). However, given the nature of the surrounding features, these most likely form part of the same post-medieval field system.

- 4.30 A single ditch was identified at the north-west corner and was found to contain medieval ceramic building material. No interpretation is given, but this ditch could either reflect an earlier field system or the incorporation of residual artefactual material within the same post-medieval field system described above. Either way, there is no indication or evidence that the medieval find was not an isolated deposit or that the ditch is not part of an agricultural field system of little or no archaeological interest.
- 4.31 Residual finds of flint debitage were recovered from the subsoil, but no associated archaeological features were uncovered. Whilst the recovery of the flint artefacts might suggest a local presence around the Site during the prehistoric period, there is no evidence to suggest it was anything more than limited or transient and overall, it has left just a limited trace in the archaeological record. As such, TVAS considered these possible prehistoric finds to indicate *“no more than a low level of activity within the area and are likely to represent no more than casual loss”* (TVAS, 2015).
- 4.32 Located approximately 175m to the north of the Site, an archaeological evaluation was also carried out in 2019 by TVAS on Land at Pembers Hill Farm (**HER 70254**). Some 80 trial trenches were opened across the footprint of the site ahead of housing development, but no features or deposits of archaeological interest or significance were recorded in any of them. A field boundary shown on the 1869 1st edition OS map within Digenwood Copse was revealed in the north-west corner of the evaluation (TVAS, 2019), but in the main this extensive evaluation identified no archaeological constraints.
- 4.33 Approximately 250m to the south of the Site, an archaeological watching brief was carried out at East Horton Farm (**55646**). This comprised monitoring by Wessex Archaeology at intervals between 1987 and 2000. This monitoring revealed Mesolithic, Bronze Age and Roman occupation.
- 4.34 The 1987 monitoring revealed an indistinct feature from which 24 pieces of worked flint were recovered. These were dated to the prehistoric period and the 1994 monitoring then subsequently uncovered 10 sub-circular features which are possibly hearths and from where 50 worked Mesolithic flint artefacts were recovered from the surface. The 1989 monitoring also revealed a number of Bronze Age pits.
- 4.35 The remaining features were dated to the Roman period and included an enclosure and field system identified during the 1989 monitoring. This was characterised as a small farm. The possible enclosure was indicated by three ditches, c.30m wide and 80m long, and forming part of a wider field system which comprised both 'V' shaped and flat-bottomed ditches, mainly orientated east-west and north-south. A number of postholes were seen associated with the enclosure, six of which were seen to form one structure, possibly a raised granary.

- 4.36 Within the wider study area, the other two archaeological investigations (**70453** and **71796**) are located c.900m to the west and north-east of the Site respectively. In the case of the former, the only archaeological 'feature' was a pit of post-medieval or modern date, but some sherds of residual Bronze Age pottery were of interest and indicate the presence of later prehistoric activity in this location.
- 4.37 The watching brief to the north-east of the Site (**71796**) identified a number of pits and post holes concentrated within the central and northern fields of the excavation. Although largely undated, they were interpreted as being likely to relate to field systems and possible settlement remains of Romano-British date.
- 4.38 Where relevant to an understanding and assessment of the Site's interest or potential, the results of these various archaeological investigations are discussed in further detail, in the period-specific sections below.

Palaeolithic to Iron Age (c.500,000 BC-AD 43)

- 4.39 No records of prehistoric date are held by the Winchester or Hampshire HERs within the Site, however several are recorded within the wider 1km study area.
- 4.40 Aside from the hearths of possible Mesolithic date and Bronze Age pits recovered during the watching brief at East Horton Farm (**55646**), discussed in full above, these records predominantly relate to findspots.
- 4.41 Approximately 230m south of the Site adjacent to East Horton Farm, worked flint was recovered during fieldwalking undertaken in 1987 prior to the development of a sand extraction site (**HER 31017**), no features or deposits associated with the flint were identified and thus the findspots may reflect casual loss, however given the proximity to the prehistoric settlement evidence identified by (**55646**), it is considered likely that these surface finds are associated with this occupation.
- 4.42 Further to the south, approximately 825m from the Site, two additional findspots of Mesolithic surface scatters are recorded (**31020** and **31021**); no associated features or deposits were identified, however the Hampshire HER records that these scatters may indicate seasonal or short-term occupation.
- 4.43 The final records held by the Hampshire HER are located c.300m and c.650m to the south-west of the Site boundary and comprise additional scatters of findspots, including 10 flint cores and five retouched microliths (**65923**), as well as 10 Mesolithic cores and five microliths, recovered from a sandpit at Knowle Hill in 1977 (**25927**). No associated features or deposits were identified.
- 4.44 The Winchester HER records two possible Bronze Age barrows located c.900 metres and c.940 metres south-east of the Site, referred to as 'Greenwood' and 'North Greenwood' respectively (**MWC1902** and **MWC1903**). Both barrows are based on conjectural evidence, with Greenwood being mentioned in a charter of c.900AD and North Greenwood being identified from a cropmark on aerial photographs. However, surveys of the area revealed no extant evidence for either barrow.

- 4.45 The evidence from the two HERs indicates a level of prehistoric activity within the local landscape around the Site, dating from the Mesolithic to Bronze Age and including evidence of settlement features identified during the long running watching brief at East Horton, c.250m to the south of the Site.
- 4.46 However, the evidence is difficult to assess with confidence, with much relating to the recovery of uncontextualized or residual artefacts and *in situ* features and deposits being identified only in association with the exploitation of sand and gravel beds along the low ground to the south, around East Horton Farm. Otherwise, there is some indication of transient prehistoric activity on the areas of elevated ground to the west of the Site, and more distantly to the south, but the extensive trench evaluations ahead of development around the west and north sides of the Site identified little of archaeological interest.
- 4.47 Based on the evidence above, the Site is assessed as having a **low to moderate** potential to contain archaeological features and/or remains of archaeological interest from the prehistoric period, with the east-west ridge and the southern fringe of the Site considered to possess greatest potential and the land further to the north and east holding the least. Even so, it is most likely that any remains of this period will comprise uncontextualized artefacts and possibly scattered features or deposits, which are very unlikely to be of any more than low or local significance.

Romano-British (AD43-410)

- 4.48 No records of Romano-British date are held by the Winchester or Hampshire HERs within the Site, but several are recorded within the wider 1km study area.
- 4.49 Aside from the Roman ditches and enclosure forming a field system, recorded by the watching brief at East Horton Farm (**55646**) discussed in full above, these records include a further ditch system (**21662**) found in the edge of a sand pit in 1963, containing pottery dated to 1st century AD, as well as two pits and a ditch of early Roman date observed after topsoil stripping during development of a site for sand extraction (**31015** and **31014**). The records are located c.210 and c.280m south of the Site respectively and in close proximity to the remains that were identified by the East Horton watching brief.
- 4.50 The HER thus indicates a level of Roman occupation within the local landscape, primarily comprising features related to localised land management, such as ditches and pits. However, recorded Romano-British features are largely focused around 250m to the south of the Site and no features, deposits or finds of this date were recorded by either of the extensive archaeological investigations located immediately to the west and north; thus suggesting that the focus of that activity in this period was the free draining and easily worked soils on the sand and gravel beds rather than the more elevated ground to the north and the west.
- 4.51 Based on the above evidence, the Site is considered to have only a **low** potential to contain archaeological remains from the Roman period. Such features would most likely relate to localised land management features, such as ditches or pits, and are unlikely to be of greater than low, local significance as a result.

Early Medieval to Medieval (AD 410-1485)

- 4.52 No records of early medieval or medieval date are held by the Winchester or Hampshire HERs within the Site and only two are recorded within the wider 1km study area.
- 4.53 These include a surviving section of a park pale (**60748**) which relates to a deer park north-east of Fair Oak. The extent of the deer park 'Marwell Park' is mapped by the Winchester HER (289), however no further information on the park is provided. The extent of the deer park is illustrated on **Plan EDP 2**.
- 4.54 The Hampshire HER also includes documentary evidence for 'Knowle Lodge' as being located c.980m to the south-west of the Site (**39161**). The HER identified that this place is first documented in AD 901 as 'CNOLLGETTE', although no further evidence of settlement of this date is recorded.
- 4.55 The cartographic sources (discussed in full below) show that the Site comprised agricultural farmland from at least the mid-19th century onwards, but the relatively long, narrow fields illustrated at the southern end of the Site and immediately to the south may potentially indicate that these post-medieval fields incorporate an earlier strip field system typical of the medieval period. As a result, it is most likely that the Site also comprised undeveloped agricultural farmland during the medieval period and it is assessed as possessing no more than a **low potential** to contain significant archaeological features and/or deposits.

Post-medieval to Modern (AD 1485-Present)

- 4.56 No records of post-medieval to modern date are held by the Winchester or Hampshire HERs within the Site and only two are recorded within the wider 1km study area.
- 4.57 These records include post-medieval pottery recovered (**31018**) during fieldwalking prior to the development of a sand extraction site, approximately 280m south of the Site, as well as a group of large quarries which are visible on aerial photographs (**58315**). The HER notes that these quarries are considered most likely to be of late 19th century or early 20th century origin.
- 4.58 The cartographic sources (discussed in full below) indicate that the Site comprised agricultural land from the mid-19th century onwards and was most likely already under agricultural use in the post-medieval period as well. The Site is therefore considered to have a **very low** potential to contain significant archaeological remains from this period, with the expectation being that any features or deposits which are encountered will be related to agricultural exploitation and management of the farming landscape.

CARTOGRAPHIC SOURCES

- 4.59 The earliest map assessed was the 1840 Bishopstoke Tithe map (**Plan EDP 3**). This shows the Site as being located within an agricultural fieldscape, comprising parts of four enclosed fields of various sizes. The two southernmost fields and the north-western field are largely rectangular in shape and relatively regular in plan form. In contrast, the central field is long and narrow in shape and exhibits slightly curved boundaries that perhaps suggest it originated as a medieval strip field that was later enclosed.

- 4.60 The Tithe apportionment indicates that the Site was used as agricultural land, with each of the fields recorded as being subject to arable cultivation. All fields within the Site are recorded as being owned by Sir Raymond Jarvis and occupied by Mr James Sparkes, thereby connecting them to the farmstead at Mortimers Farm.
- 4.61 The next map assessed was the First Edition OS map of 1871 (**Plan EDP 4**). This largely shows the same field formation as the 1840 Tithe map, albeit with some amalgamation and enlargement towards the north.
- 4.62 The 1897 OS map shows the two southern fields to have been amalgamated into one larger field (**Plan EDP 4**). The map also illustrates some minor changes to the ancillary buildings at Mortimers Farm (discussed in the designated assets section below), as well as the identification of the existing sand pit south-west of the Site, the clearance of a small woodland at 'Hardings Copse' to the west and the depiction of 'Fair Oak Park' immediately to the north of Mortimer's Lane.
- 4.63 The available OS maps show that the layout of the Site remained unchanged during the early to mid-20th century, although additional sand pits are recorded to the south-west on the 1945 edition OS map (see **Plan EDP 4**). The 1962 edition OS map (**Plan EDP 4**) illustrates that the southern boundary of the Site had been partially removed, but otherwise it highlights that the wider residential expansion of Fair Oak had not yet extended this far east and the Site area remained separated from the urban area.
- 4.64 This review of the available cartographic sources underlines the agricultural use of the Site throughout the 19th and 20th centuries and supports the conclusions of the period-specific sections (see above).

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS

- 4.65 A total of 24 vertical aerial photographs, covering the Site and its immediate environs, were identified within the collection maintained by the Historic England Archive in Swindon. None of the photographs are reproduced here due to copyright restrictions.
- 4.66 The available images span the period from September 1946 to April 2000 and confirm the land use and development sequence shown on those historic maps available online.
- 4.67 The photographs demonstrate that, in the mid-20th century, the layout and boundaries at the Site appeared much as they did on the contemporary historic mapping. The Site appears as two fields, albeit the larger (southern) field is separated into sections for different crops but without physical boundaries.
- 4.68 There is limited crop mark evidence of ploughing running largely north to south in these mid-20th century photographs, but no other crop marks indicating features of archaeological interest are noted. Given the straight, regular nature of the ploughing, this is most likely related to post-medieval or modern farming and such features would be of no greater than negligible heritage value.

- 4.69 By the photograph from May 1971, the settlement of Fair Oak is seen to have expanded east, although not yet reaching the Site boundary, however the formation of the Site, and the adjacent Mortimers Farm, remain unchanged.
- 4.70 This photo shows several dark, discrete crop marks. These features are not seen on other photographs and given their irregular and amorphous nature, are most likely to reflect geological conditions or current water levels in the soil rather than archaeological features.
- 4.71 Similar amorphous crop marks of irregular shape and form are seen in the July 1966 photograph and are considered most likely to reflect geological variations rather than archaeological features. However, a more linear crop mark running largely north to south through the centre of the southern field of the Site is considered to reflect the route of a former field boundary in this location, as is seen on the Tithe map.
- 4.72 No crop marks or earthwork features suggesting the presence of any form of significant archaeological activity were identified within the Site on aerial photographs, with only features related to post-medieval and/or modern agriculture activity visible.

LIDAR

- 4.73 The LiDAR data for the Site, which dates from 2020, was obtained from the Defra website (<https://environment.data.gov.uk/DefraDataDownload/?Mode=survey>). LiDAR Composite Digital Terrain Model (DTM) data was downloaded at the resolution of 1m. It was then converted to a VRT file and imported into QGIS 3.10 with GRASS 7.8.4, before being processed to show hill shade at an altitude of 45° with an azimuth of 315° in a multidirectional format.
- 4.74 The LiDAR data shows evidence for modern agricultural activity across the Site through a series of parallel linear features representing ploughing, but there are no features of archaeological interest or likely potential and so the data is not reproduced in the plans.

FIELD EVALUATION

- 4.75 The land at the Site was subject to a 'non-intrusive' field evaluation in autumn 2023, which involved a 100% detailed magnetometer survey completed by Archaeological Surveys under EDP's management.
- 4.76 The resulting AS report (which has been shared with the Council's archaeological advisor) can be found here in **Appendix EDP 3**. It details these conclusions in paragraphs 4.1.1/2 and supports the baseline position that is presented in this report:

"The survey located numerous generally weak and poorly defined positive anomalies within the central part of the site. The anomalies include discrete and linear responses but their morphology does not tend to form coherent features and as such interpretation is uncertain. This could indicate a zone of past human activity, but it is possible that many relate to geological and/or pedological features."

Several linear and rectilinear anomalies have been located that indicate former field boundary ditches or banks. Some of these are mapped and most are similar to the orientation of extant field boundaries. Evidence of former ridge and furrow cultivation has been located in the southern part of the site with other linear anomalies likely to be associated with land drainage.”

- 4.77 The principally east-west orientated band of discrete and linear responses running through the southern section of the northern field and the northern part of the southern field could identify the presence of sub-surface archaeological features and deposits, but elsewhere it seems that the non-intrusive survey has picked up only evidence for the presence of former field boundaries and associated cultivation etc.
- 4.78 The LPA’s archaeological advisors were contacted and consulted in terms of the results of the geophysical (magnetic) survey and in terms of any requirement for further fieldwork to inform and support the preparation of the outline planning application.
- 4.79 Thom Hayes – Senior Archaeologist at Hampshire County Council (HCC) – provided a written response on 09 February 2024 and containing the following comments in terms of the need for further investigation and information:

“Whilst is generally support the conclusion presented in this document, I cannot endorse the wider assessment of archaeological potential as it appears to understate the archaeological potential of all periods. Although not submitted with the pre-application documents, I am aware that an archaeological geophysical survey has been undertaken on the proposed development site and it has identified a range of anomalies which are consistent with archaeological remains. As such, the site has a high potential for archaeological remains. However, I agree that archaeological matters are unlikely to be overriding and that they can be suitably addressed through condition. I would recommend that any planning application includes an updated archaeological heritage statement that includes an assessment of the geophysical survey and puts forward a suitably mature archaeological mitigation strategy.”

- 4.80 This assessment has therefore been revised and updated in light of this advice, including the results of the non-intrusive (geophysical) survey and setting out a proposed approach to the investigation and assessment of the magnetic anomalies visible in the data in the first instance and the mitigation of any adverse impacts thereafter (**Section 5**). The advice from HCC is reproduced in full as **Appendix EDP 4**.

SITE WALKOVER

- 4.81 The Site area was visited by a highly experienced surveyor in fine, dry, and bright weather conditions with good visibility in November 2022.

Heritage Assets

- 4.82 The following paragraphs apply the guidance at Step 2 of GPA 3 (HE, 2017) to the two historic farm groups situated within the Site’s wider surroundings, and which could potentially be affected by its proposed development.

- 4.83 These two groups of listed and unlisted buildings are the only heritage assets which are identified as being located sufficiently close to the Site and having relationships with it that could potentially bear upon their significance.
- 4.84 This means that they have both been identified as warranting investigation and assessment to determine whether they are potentially sensitive receptors which could experience a loss of significance by the proposed development of the Site (and hence harm).

Mortimers Farm

- 4.85 Mortimers Farm is located c.105m from the Site's boundary, east from the eastern boundary of the northern field and north from the northern boundary of the larger southern field downslope.
- 4.86 As set out above in paragraphs 4.8 and 4.21, Mortimers Farm contains three Grade II listed buildings and one non-designated historic building. They are shown on **Plan EDP 5**:
1. Mortimers Farmhouse (**1281407**);
 2. Granary to West of Mortimers Farmhouse (**1204077**);
 3. Barn to South West of Mortimers Farmhouse (**1111950**); and
 4. Barn 55m ESE of Mortimers Farmhouse (**HER 41797**).
- 4.87 As they form part of the same functionally related and tight-knit group, the four designated and non-designated historic buildings will be assessed altogether in order to determine their potential sensitivity to the proposed development and the likelihood that any of them could be affected by its approval and then implementation.
- 4.88 The available historic maps illustrate that the form and extent of the farmstead was largely confirmed by the later 19th century, with the core of the buildings visible on the Tithe map of 1840 and the remainder identifiable on the first edition of the 25" Ordnance Survey map of 1871. In each case, the historic maps illustrate the tightly defined rectangular plan form of the farmstead and with the farmhouse set away and apart to the north-west. Its enclosed rectangular garden is marked to the south, defining the west edge of the farmstead and separated it from the wider landscape of enclosed agricultural fields to the west, east and south and extending to take in the land at the Site.
- 4.89 Each of the historic farm buildings is still clearly recognisable today and, whilst agricultural modernisation and industrialisation have had a clear impact in terms of the construction of the large steel portal frame shed to the south, the addition of the dwelling(s) to the east and the remodelling of the central space at the heart of the farmyard, the form and character of the farmstead also continue to be reflective of the historic maps and maintain the internal relationships between the principal structures.
- 4.90 In each case, it is assessed that the majority of the assets' significance is derived from the architectural and historic interest of their built form and fabric and with that recognised by their designation as being of special architectural or historic interest.

- 4.91 For the most part, the four buildings are not considered to possess or exhibit any particular artistic or archaeological interest in themselves; the exception being the farmhouse, on the basis that the listing citation recognises that it derives from a number of phases starting in the 17th century and running on to the present day, and the rear extensions and alterations. Otherwise, the buildings are relatively functional, unsurprisingly given that their use was for the administration and delivery of the agricultural operations at the historic farmstead.
- 4.92 It is assessed that the following represent elements of the farm buildings' setting that make a positive contribution to their significance:
1. The spatial, functional and historic inter-relationships between the historic buildings of the farmstead and the central farmyard that forms its focus because they express and illustrate the processual form of the complex;
 2. The farm's relationship with Mortimers Lane to the north, which still provides the main point of access to the complex and still affords the best public location from which to experience and appreciate the architectural and historic interests of the farm buildings collectively and individually;
 3. Their historic relationship with the former landholding which is identified in the Tithe apportionment and would have supported the operation and administration of the farm group, albeit where:
 - a. It is not an existing or ongoing relationship and instead, Mortimers Farm and the Site are no longer under the same control and ownership;
 - b. This relationship is intangible and based around the availability and accessibility of historic documents instead of the ability to experience or appreciate features in the modern landscape;
 - c. There is nothing unusual or distinctive about the enclosed farmland within the Site which distinguishes it from other agricultural fields in the surrounding area or that points towards a relationship with Mortimers Farm; and
 - d. Mortimers Farm is no longer engaged in agricultural management or exploitation, with the Council's approval of planning and Listed Building Consent applications for residential conversion of the farm buildings (L/23/94460, F/22/94435 etc.) showing a change away from farming operations and to solely residential use(s).
 4. The spatial and functional relationships between the farmstead and the farmland that runs up to meet its edges to the south, west and east and that shows it originated and developed as an agricultural enterprise separate from the built-up urban extent of Fair Oak and continues to be distinct and legible as an historic farming complex despite the expansion of the town eastwards in the last century or so.
- 4.93 Insofar as they can be, these aspects of the buildings' setting are shown in the photographs that are included here as **Images EDP A1.9 to A1.12**.
- 4.94 The Site is assessed as forming a part of the assets' setting which makes a contribution to their heritage significance, albeit it is also assessed that the contribution is a relatively small

one when it is contextualised in the sense of the significance of the four assets as a whole and all the elements which contribute to that.

- 4.95 The contribution made by the land within the Site to the setting and significance of the listed and unlisted buildings of Mortimers Farm is illustrated in **Images EDP A1.13 to A1.16**.
- 4.96 The Site is assessed as contributing to the architectural and historic interest of the heritage assets as buildings, designed and used as the administrative and operational focal point of a farming business, by virtue of comprising an area of enclosed farmland historically under the same ownership as (and farmed from) Mortimers Farm.
- 4.97 There is no public access to the farmland within the Site, but it is possible to experience the Mortimers Farm buildings from Mortimers Lane looking south-east across the Site and over the mature hedgerow that bounds its southern margins.
- 4.98 In a similar vein, there are views of the buildings forming the Mortimers Farm complex, and in particular the charming, thatched farmhouse facing towards the road, looking south from the public footpaths that run across the agricultural fields to the north from Mortimers Lane. The southwards views across the road highlight the continued separation of the farmstead from the eastern edge of Fair Oak because the farm buildings are flanked by fields on either side to underline their functional form and character.
- 4.99 Likewise, the farm buildings can similarly be experienced looking outwards from the eastern fringes of the residential housing estate along Pembers Hill Drive from beyond the western edge of the Site, looking through the thin fringe of boundary vegetation.
- 4.100 In that sense, the northern field within the Site serves to separate Mortimers Farm from the early 21st century housing estates that represent and characterise the eastern fringe of Fair Oak, located c.200m further west along the curving alignment of Mortimers Lane. The land at the Site (as such) performs a role in maintaining Mortimers Farm as an historic farmstead located within an area of undeveloped farmland, distinct and separate away from the built-up urban extent of Fair Oak.
- 4.101 This role is primarily restricted to the northern field within the Site and the southern field is assessed as being an element of the assets' setting that makes a negligible contribution to their heritage significance. This is due to a combination of (1) the natural topography, where the land slopes quite steeply away and downwards to the south, restricting the experience and appreciation of the four buildings, (2) the effective screening which is provided by the east-west aligned field boundary and the mature trees it contains and (3) the impact of the large steel portal-framed barn erected to the south of the historic farmstead, which restricts both the experience and appreciation of the historic farm buildings situated beyond and on the edges of the farmyard.
- 4.102 The functional and visual separation between the former farm complex and the land within the site area to the south is further underlined by the Council's recent grant of permission for Planning Application F/22/94435 covering *"Alterations and extensions and conversion of 4 existing barns including Grade 2 listed Threshing Barn and Granary to create 4 dwellings, demolition of modern barn and construction of 5 new dwellings with associated*

gardens parking and car port/bat barn new sewerage treatment and new footpath on the southern side of Mortimers Lane”.

- 4.103 As well as converting the existing barns in the farmyard for residential uses, the proposals also involve the addition of five new residential houses in a ‘close’ located beyond the south side of the existing farmyard and as a result severing its relationships with the agricultural land which runs to the south and thus making it clear that the historic farm buildings within the farmyard at Mortimers Farm are unlikely to lose significance as a result of development within the larger southern field within the site boundaries.
- 4.104 Therefore, insofar as the proposed development of the Site could cause a loss of heritage significance from Mortimers Farm (or the ability to appreciate that significance), this is likely to be (a) relatively limited because of the generally small contribution made by this aspect to the assets’ significance as a whole and (b) focused on the northern field situated to the west of the farm because this is where much of the contribution comes from, whereas the larger field to the south is well separated and also well screened from the farm by a mixture of intervening built form trees and the natural downward slope to the south.
- 4.105 As far as this approved (full) planning is concerned, it is worthy of note that an application was validated by the Council on 24 September 2024 for the discharge of condition 07 that covers materials and represents the second such application following the validation of the first (in terms of conditions 03, 04, 06 and 18) on 18 March 2024 and thus underlines the expectation that the development will progress shortly.

East Horton Farm

- 4.106 East Horton Farm is located c.180m south of the Site’s south-eastern corner, where the complex includes two (designated) Grade II listed buildings and one non-designated historic building. These buildings are shown on **Plan EDP 5**:
1. East Horton Farmhouse (**1204057**);
 2. Barn to South East of East Horton Farmhouse (**1322702**); and
 3. Barn 20m NW of Horton Farmhouse (**HER 41794**).
- 4.107 As they form part of the same tight-knit group, these three designated and non-designated historic buildings will be assessed altogether to determine their potential sensitivity to the proposed development.
- 4.108 The 1840 Tithe map shows the Grade II listed 16th century farmhouse as being located on the eastern side of a rectangular farmstead, with one barn range to the south and another barn range situated to the west. The original means of access was via a dog-legged track coming up from the south and turning to the east, but this was realigned in the latter part of the 19th century so that it ran south-east from a junction on Knowle Lane adjacent to the south-western corner of the Site and entered the farmyard from the western side.
- 4.109 The historic Ordnance Survey maps also show that the mid to late 19th century witnessed the addition of a number of outbuildings around the margins of the farmyard, especially to the south and south-east. These maps also illustrate that the farmhouse was provided with

a long, enclosed garden aligned south-eastwards towards the stream. It is the OS revision of 1909 which first illustrates an unenclosed track running northwards from the farmyard, but it only appears to have accessed the adjacent agricultural fields and did not get close to meeting up with Mortimers Lane. In fact, the access track that runs southwards from the main road is a relatively recent feature that is not depicted on the available OS map revisions pre-dating World War II.

- 4.110 The available 25" Ordnance Survey map editions (up to the 1946 revision) show that East Horton Farm was positioned within a large area of enclosed agricultural farmland, with the nearest elements of Fair Oak still located on the opposite side of Knowle Hill and a dispersed scatter of farms and other rural dwellings widely distributed in the surrounding landscape. The development of East Horton Golf Club in the latter part of the 20th century (it was first opened in 1992) represented a pronounced and profound change to the setting of the barn and farmhouse at East Horton Farm, which were listed in 1976.
- 4.111 The Grade II listed farmhouse is located at the south end of the unenclosed access track running south from Mortimers Lane (via a short spur) and the similarly listed barn is located a short distance to the south, on the opposite side of the farmhouse's enclosed garden. The unlisted barn 20m NW of East Horton Farmhouse is then located on the western side of the farmhouse's garden.
- 4.112 In each case, it is assessed that the majority of the assets' significance is derived from the architectural and historic interest of their built form and fabric and with that recognised by their designation as being of special architectural or historic interest.
- 4.113 For the most part, the three buildings are not considered to possess or exhibit any particular artistic or archaeological interest in themselves; the exception being the farmhouse on the basis that the listing citation recognises that it dates from the 16th century and 17th century. Thus, the farmhouse could hold evidence for its origins, development and changing use over time and associated with the economic status of the farming operations.
- 4.114 It is assessed that the following represent elements of the farm buildings' setting that make a positive contribution to their significance:
1. The spatial, functional and historic inter-relationships between the historic buildings of the farmstead as they express and illustrate the processual form of the complex even despite the farmyard's domestication and conversion to a central garden;
 2. The surviving spaces associated with the historic farmstead, most notably the long and linear garden running down towards the stream to the east of the farmhouse; and
 3. The openness of the farmstead's surroundings, preserved by the formation of the golf course and concentrated to the north, south and east, particularly because these areas contain the fairways and greens.
- 4.115 Insofar as they can be, these aspects of the buildings' setting are shown in the photographs that are included here as **Images EDP A.17 to A.19**.

- 4.116 The contribution which the assets' setting makes to their heritage significance is, however, considered to be only small because of the extent to which the land around them has been altered by (1) mineral extraction and remediation and (2) creation of East Horton Golf Club, where the car park is situated to the west and so are the buildings which collectively make up the administrative facilities.
- 4.117 With regard to the formation of the East Horton Golf Club, it is recognised that the fairways and greens do retain a sense of openness around the surviving farm buildings and similarly the remediated mineral workings preserve the spatial separation of the farmstead from the built-up urban edge of Fair Oak on the opposite side of Knowle Lane.
- 4.118 However, on the other hand, their development has had a marked effect on the integrity of the wider landscape in the surroundings of East Horton Farm and degraded its character, therefore restricting its contribution to the assets' significance. The quality of the buildings' setting is markedly reduced by the development of their former farmland surroundings and their incorporation into the administrative centre of this leisure complex.
- 4.119 Although the Site occupies rising land to the north of the farmstead, it is assessed as making no contribution to its significance one way or the other. It is an entirely neutral aspect of the assets' setting.
- 4.120 This assessment is made on the basis that there is no experience of the land within the Site from the farm because of the screening effect of the mature and well wooded plantation in the south-eastern corner and the more restricted vegetation along the banks of the stream further to the west. Likewise, the same woodland and streamside screening precludes an experience of the designated and non-designated farm buildings looking southwards from within the Site area, an effect which is accentuated by the natural landform.
- 4.121 The contribution made by the land within the Site to the setting and significance of the listed and unlisted buildings is illustrated here in **Images EDP A1.20 and A1.21 to A1.22**.
- 4.122 Therefore, it is assessed as being highly unlikely that the development of the Site would give rise to a loss of significance from any of the designated and non-designated heritage assets within the East Horton Farm complex.

Archaeological Remains

- 4.123 This identified no features or deposits of actual or potential archaeological significance within the boundary of the Site, with the close-cropped permanent pasture not preserving or exhibiting any earthworks illustrating archaeological potential or interest.
- 4.124 The boundaries in the east and south are well defined with a mixture of hedgerows, trees and plantations; and so too is the boundary on Mortimers Lane in the north, whereas the boundaries separating the Site from the 21st century residential estates to the west and the retained farmland west of the buildings of Mortimers Farm are more open and afford less screening and containment.

Section 5

Impact Assessment

INTRODUCTION

- 5.1 This section provides an assessment of the likely impact of the Site's proposed residential development on the significance of the heritage assets and archaeological sites, features and/or remains detailed in the previous section.
- 5.2 In that respect it builds on the details which are set out in **Section 5** of this report and takes forward the rest of the staged approach detailed in HE (2017) for the identification and then assessment of setting effects in relation to heritage assets.
- 5.3 It also defines and assesses the nature and magnitude of any impacts upon archaeological remains which would be caused by construction groundworks.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

- 5.4 The identification and assessment of impacts is based on the information that is presented on the following plans and in these supporting documents:
- Development Framework Plan [DRWG. P23-2261_DE_007_01_C]; and
 - Design and Access Statement.
- 5.5 The development proposals for the Site concentrate the vast majority of the new dwellings into the southern field downslope and to the rear of the Mortimers Farm complex of listed buildings. A small number of new residential units would be erected in the northern field to the west and also to the south of Mortimer's Lane.
- 5.6 Vehicular access to the Site would be from the north (from Mortimer's Lane) and here new development would be set back away from the road frontage behind retained aspects of the hedgerow on the northern boundary and new soft landscape features which are proposed and designed to soften the entrance into the scheme.
- 5.7 Residential development in the northern field would retain space for new landscaping within the proposals, whilst new landscape features would be created on the east side of the field to blend the development into its surrounding context and to create a distinct and physical boundary from the Mortimers Farm group of heritage assets and the new houses which will be constructed around them under F/22/94435.
- 5.8 As far as this approved (full) planning is concerned, it is worthy of note that an application was validated by the Council on 24 September 2024 for the discharge of condition 07 that covers materials and represents the second such application following the validation of the first (in terms of conditions 03, 04, 06 and 18) on 18 March 2024 and thus underlines the expectation that the development will progress shortly.

- 5.9 The DAS for the proposals states that residential dwellings in the northern field would be of a maximum two storeys in height as a means to respond positively to the size and scale of Mortimer's Farm c.105 metres to the east, whereas the topography of the southern field is such that residential dwellings of 2.5 storeys are proposed in this area.
- 5.10 In the southern field, the proposed residential development would be set back south of the northern hedgerow and beyond a broad swathe of new landscaping. The boundary feature would be retained, strengthened (where necessary and appropriate) and thereafter subject to improved management going forwards beyond completion.
- 5.11 A 'mobility hub and multifunctional space' (to measure 350 square metres) is indicatively located on the west side of the northern field at the Site, flanking the west side of the access and offering facilities to support the proposed new properties to the south/east.
- 5.12 The Council's Built Heritage Consultant, Tim Dyer, was formally consulted on the emerging proposals at the pre-application stage and responded in a note dated 23 December 2023. A copy is included as **Appendix EDP 5** and the focus on boundary treatments and their early delivery is clearly articulated in the formal response.

HERITAGE ASSETS

- 5.13 The assessment concludes that the farmland within the Site is an element of the setting of Mortimers Farm that makes a 'small' contribution to its significance, with that contribution focused on the northern field. Hence, the development of the Site has the potential to cause a loss of heritage significance (and therefore 'harm') from the three listed and one unlisted historic buildings within the Mortimers Farm complex.
- 5.14 Having inputted to the design of the proposals and having carefully considered them in the round, it is considered that their approval and then implementation would represent nothing more than a very small loss of significance in terms of the Mortimers Farm group as a result of the changes within its current agricultural setting.
- 5.15 The very small loss of significance would result from the reduction in the farm's separation from the current east edge of Fair Oak, in turn reducing the extent of agricultural farmland adjoining the historic building complex and to a very limited degree reducing its contribution to significance and the ability to appreciate its significance.
- 5.16 Indeed, insofar as the proposed development of the site area would cause a loss of heritage significance from Mortimers Farm (and the ability to appreciate that significance), this would be (a) limited because of the generally small contribution which is made by this aspect to the assets' significance seen as a whole and (b) focused on the northern field to the west of the farm because this is where much of the contribution comes from, whereas the larger field to the south is well separated and also well screened from the farm by a mixture of intervening built form, trees and the natural slope away from the buildings.
- 5.17 The functional and visual separation between the former farm complex and the land within the site area to the south is further underlined by the Council's recent grant of permission for Planning Application F/22/94435 covering "*Alterations and extensions and conversion*

of 4 existing barns including Grade 2 listed Threshing Barn and Granary to create 4 dwellings, demolition of modern barn and construction of 5 new dwellings with associated gardens parking and car port/bat barn new sewerage treatment and new footpath on the southern side of Mortimers Lane” and validation of two applications for the discharge of the planning associated conditions in more recent months.

- 5.18 As well as converting the existing barns in the farmyard for residential uses, the proposals also involve the addition of five new residential houses in a ‘close’ located beyond the south side of the existing farmyard and as a result, severing its relationships with the agricultural land which runs to the south and thus making it clear that the historic farm buildings within the farmyard at Mortimers Farm are unlikely to lose significance as a result of development within the larger southern field within the site boundaries.
- 5.19 As far as Step 4 of GPA 3 is concerned, there are no additional mitigatory or compensatory measures which could be designed or applied to either reduce or offset the very small loss of heritage significance from the Mortimers Farm group of historic buildings.
- 5.20 Refinements could be made to the proposed layout, landscaping and boundary treatments in the north (especially) through the preparation and determination of the Reserved Matters applications, following the approval of outline planning permission by the LPA, but otherwise it is expected that the very small impact would persist.
- 5.21 This would constitute ‘less than substantial harm’ in terms of the NPPF and it would require to be balanced against the public benefits which would be delivered by the implementation of this housing development.
- 5.22 There would be no impact on the East Horton Farm complex of historic buildings south-east of the Site. There would be no harm to any of them and there is hence no need for them to be included in the planning balance described in paragraph 208 of the Framework.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS

- 5.23 The approval and subsequent implementation of the planning proposals is likely to result in the complete removal of any archaeological sites, features or deposits within the boundary of the Site as a consequence of the construction groundworks required to deliver the roads, buildings and supporting infrastructure.
- 5.24 There is no reason to believe or expect that the Site contains any archaeological remains of sufficient significance to require or warrant physical conservation *in situ* and hence either prevent or restrict the Site’s deliverability or capacity for residential development.
- 5.25 The desktop information and (particularly) the non-intrusive geophysical survey have shown that there is potential for the presence of sub-surface archaeological features and remains in a band through the central reaches of the Site and that they could be of moderate interest and worthy of further investigation and recording as a condition of outline planning consent and ahead of construction.
- 5.26 Elsewhere, in the north and far south of the Site, the desktop data and geophysical survey have not identified the presence of potentially significant archaeological features, deposits

or remains and, in these areas, the likelihood of previously unknown or unrecorded finds of significance being made is considered to be low.

- 5.27 Nevertheless, whilst it is highly unlikely that the Site contains archaeological deposits that are of national importance and worthy of *in situ* physical conservation, those anomalies of potential archaeological interest across the centre of the Site warrant further investigation to confirm their origins, as well as their nature, date and significance if it does turn out that they are of archaeological interest. At the same time, it is expected that the remainder of the Site will also require some (lesser) degree of archaeological investigation in order to confirm the low interest or potential which is suggested by the data collected so far.
- 5.28 Accordingly, it is anticipated that a condition for further archaeological evaluation and then mitigation (where it is found to be relevant and necessary) ahead of construction would be imposed by the Council in light of outline planning permission being granted. This condition would therefore provide for a preliminary intrusive evaluation of the Site using trial trenches to build on the geophysical survey data, followed thereafter by excavation of any features, deposits or remains found to be of archaeological significance.
- 5.29 It is proposed that the programme of phased archaeological work would be presented in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and it is also proposed that the agreed WSI will cover the full programme through to the preparation of an appropriate level of analysis following the completion of the on-site fieldwork, the publication of the results as necessary and the deposition of the project archive in the relevant local museum.

Section 6

Conclusions

- 6.1 This Archaeology and Heritage Assessment has been prepared for Bloor Homes Ltd by EDP, to inform and support the preparation, submission and positive determination of an outline planning application for residential development of land south of Mortimers Lane, Fair Oak, Hampshire.
- 6.2 It shows that the Site does not contain any 'designated' heritage assets, and it is also not included (either wholly or in part) within the boundary of a designated heritage asset, and so its residential development would not result in a direct impact in this respect.
- 6.3 Consideration has been given to the (existing) contribution which the land at the Site makes to the setting and significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets in its wider surroundings and to inform an understanding of whether, and to what extent, development would result in a reduction of that contribution and hence harm.
- 6.4 The assessment concludes that the farmland within the Site is an element of the setting of Mortimers Farm that makes a 'small' contribution to its significance, with that contribution focused on the northern field. It also concludes that the implementation of the development proposals would result in a very small loss of significance from the Mortimer's Farm complex of historic listed and unlisted buildings.
- 6.5 This would constitute 'less than substantial harm' in terms of the NPPF and it would require to be balanced against the public benefits which would be delivered by the implementation of this housing development.
- 6.6 There would be no impact on the East Horton Farm complex of historic buildings south-east of the Site. There would be no harm to any of them and there is hence no need for them to be included in the planning balance described in paragraph 208 of the Framework.
- 6.7 The approval and subsequent implementation of the planning proposals is likely to result in the complete removal of any archaeological sites, features or deposits within the boundary of the Site as a consequence of the construction groundworks required to deliver the roads, buildings and supporting infrastructure.
- 6.8 Whilst it is highly unlikely that the Site contains archaeological deposits that are of national importance and worthy of physical conservation, the anomalies of potential archaeological interest across the centre of the Site warrant further investigation to confirm their origins, as well as their nature, date and significance if it turns out that they are of archaeological interest and the remainder of the Site will also require some lesser degree of archaeological investigation in order to confirm the low interest or potential which is suggested by the data collected so far.
- 6.9 The loss of 'potential' archaeological remains from across the Site during construction could be dealt with through the imposition and agreement of a condition on the outline planning permission granted by the Local Planning Authority. This would provide for the completion of an initial phase of targeted trial trenches and then the excavation of any archaeological

features or deposits prior to commencement and the deposition of the project archive in a local museum once the results have been published to an appropriate standard.

- 6.10 In light of the conclusions above, there is no archaeological or heritage reason why planning consent should not be forthcoming when the outline application comes before the Council for its evaluation and determination. This aligns with the pre-application advice from EBC's Bult Heritage Consultant on 23 December 2023 regarding the emerging proposals which were submitted to the Council for comment, when it clearly states that *"Provided the visual separation [between the proposed development and the Mortimers Farm building complex] is achieved at the earliest opportunity in order to minimise the harm to the setting of these listed buildings, no objection"*.

Section 7

References

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) 2020 *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment*

Eastleigh Borough Council 2022 *Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036)*

Historic England (HE) 2015 *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2*

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

Ministry of Housing, Community and Local Government (MHCLG) 2023 *National Planning Policy Framework*

LIST OF CONSULTED MAPS

Bishopstoke Tithe Map 1840

First Edition Ordnance Survey map 1871

Ordnance Survey map 1897 Edition

Ordnance Survey map 1921 Edition

Ordnance Survey map 1946 Edition

Ordnance Survey map 1962 Edition

Appendix EDP 1 Images



Image EDP A1.1: Mortimers Farmhouse Grade II listed building, looking south across Mortimers Lane from the fields to the north.



Image EDP A1.2: Mortimers Farmhouse Grade II listed building, looking north from within the fields to the south and illustrating the rear elevation.



Image EDP A1.3: View of the Grade II listed barn at Mortimers Farm, looking east.



Image EDP A1.4: View of the Grade II listed granary at Mortimers Farm, viewed looking north.



Image EDP A1.5: View of East Horton Farmhouse Grade II listed building, looking south.



Image EDP A1.6: View of the Grade II listed barn at East Horton Farm, looking north from the spaces of the golf course.



Image EDP A1.7: View of the locally listed open-fronted cart shed at Mortimers Farm, looking west from within the farm complex.



Image EDP A1.8: View of the clubhouse at East Horton Golf Club, which appears to occupy the site of the barn identified on the Local List.



Image EDP A1.9: View of Mortimers Farm, looking south-west from the course of Mortimers Lane.



Image EDP A1.10: View of Mortimers Farm, looking east-south-east from the gate at the entrance to the Site on the south side of the road.



Image EDP A1.11: View of Mortimers Farm, looking north from the south-eastern corner of the Site and showing the current experience of the historic buildings.



Image EDP A1.12: View of Mortimers Farm, looking east-north-east from the field to the east of the Site and here illustrating the setting in this location.



Image EDP A1.13: View of Mortimers Farm, from the eastern boundary of the northern field within the Site and showing the experience of the buildings.



Image EDP A1.14: View of Mortimers Farm from the northern boundary of the southern field within the Site and illustrating the impact of the large shed on the south side of the farmyard.



Image EDP A1.15: View of Mortimers Farm, looking north-east from the north-west side of the southern field within the Site, and highlighting the extent and character of the experience.



Image EDP A1.16: View of Mortimers Farm from the southern boundary of the southern field within the Site, and here illustrating the screening effect of the natural topography and the mature field boundary south of the farm buildings.



Image EDP A1.17: View of East Horton Farm, looking east from within the car park of the golf club and with the farmhouse in the background.



Image EDP A1.18: View of East Horton Farm from alongside the approach road from the north and Mortimers Lane.



Image EDP A1.19: View showing the wider setting of East Horton Farm, here looking south from the approach road to the golf course.