

7.0 ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

7.1 INTRODUCTION

- 7.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) assesses the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment comprising above ground heritage assets (built heritage) and below ground heritage assets (archaeological remains). This assessment has been researched and prepared by MOLA (Museum of London Archaeology). The chapter is supported by Technical Appendix 7.1 and Technical Appendix 7.2, which comprise a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, respectively, completed by L – P : Archaeology (now MOLA).
- 7.1.2 The historic environment comprises archaeological remains, structures, monuments or heritage landscape within or immediately around the development Site that are considered to be ‘significant’ (in heritage terms, rather than the EIA definition) because of their evidential, historic, aesthetic or communal interest. The chapter contains a description of the heritage planning policy context and the methods used in the assessment. It describes the baseline historic environment currently existing at the Site and in its immediate vicinity; provides a statement of significance of known or possible buried heritage assets; assesses the magnitude of change (impact) of the Proposed Development upon the significance of known or potential buried heritage assets and the resulting environmental effect; identifies the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or off-set any significant adverse environmental effects; and reports on residual effects (those that might remain after mitigation has been implemented).
- 7.1.3 An assessment of operational phase effects on buried heritage remains has been scoped out on the basis that once the Proposed Development has been completed, no further ground disturbance would occur and consequently there would be no additional impacts or resulting environmental effects upon buried heritage assets.
- 7.1.4 A 1 km radius study area around the Site was used. The study area was considered through professional judgement to be appropriate to characterise the historic environment of the Site.
- 7.1.5 The Site is an irregular parcel of land measuring approximately 26 hectares (ha) located to the east of Purbrook, north of Portsdown Hill, on land east of College Road. It is bounded to the northwest by HSDC South Downs College, to the east by the A(M)3, to the west by College Road and to the southwest by Portsmouth golf course. The Site is currently grassland.

7.2 METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE

Policy Background

National Planning Policy Framework

- 7.2.1 The revised NPPF was issued in July 2021 (Ref 7.1.1) constitutes the Government’s current national guidance and policy regarding development in the historic environment. It is a material

consideration and includes a succinct policy framework for local planning authorities and decision-takers. It relates to planning law by stating that applications are to be determined in accordance with the local plans unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- 7.2.2 Paragraphs 184 to 202 of the NPPF deal with conserving and enhancing the historic environment with much emphasis on “significance”, defined in Annex 2 as: “*The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.*”
- 7.2.3 Annex 2 of the NPPF describes the setting of a heritage asset as: “*The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.*”
- 7.2.4 Paragraph 189 of the NPPF places a duty on the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, providing a proportionate level of detail. The effects of any development on a heritage asset therefore need to be assessed against the four components of its heritage significance: its archaeological, architectural, artistic and historic interests.
- 7.2.5 Paragraph 190 requires LPAs to identify and assess “*the particular significance of any heritage asset*”. This should be taken into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, including by development affecting its setting.
- 7.2.6 Paragraph 192 requires local planning authorities to take account of the desirability of new development, making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- 7.2.7 Paragraph 193 applies specifically to designated heritage assets. It states that great weight should be given to their conservation and it requires a proportionate approach (i.e. the more important the asset, the greater the weight attached to its conservation).
- 7.2.8 Conservation (for heritage policy) is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF: “*The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.*”
- 7.2.9 The importance and relevance of this definition is that it does not suggest conservation to be the same as preservation. Indeed, what sets conservation apart is the emphasis on proactively maintaining and managing change and not on a reactive approach to resisting change. In its simplest interpretation conservation could amount to a change that at least sustains the significance of a heritage asset.
- 7.2.10 Paragraph 194 deals with substantial harm to, or total loss of, significance of a designated heritage asset. In cases of substantial harm or total loss of significance, applications should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit that outweighs that harm or loss. Paragraph 195 deals with cases of less than substantial harm and notes that any such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Heritage protection and the conservation of heritage assets are recognised as of benefit to the public.

- 7.2.11 Harm is defined by Historic England as a change which erodes the significance of a heritage asset.
- 7.2.12 Paragraph 200 notes that proposals which preserve those elements of the setting of heritage assets that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of that asset should be treated favourably.

Local Planning Policy

- 7.2.13 The Havant Borough Local Plan is formed by two documents: the Local Plan (Core Strategy), adopted in March 2011 (Ref 7. 1.2), and; the Local Plan (Allocations), adopted in July 2014 (Ref 7.1.3). These policies are set to be superseded by a new Local Plan, this new plan has yet to be finalised and adopted, and is to be re-submitted for examination in 2023. The Council has adopted a Housing Delivery Position Statement (Ref 7.1.4), which sets out how planning applications for housing not in accordance with the Adopted Local Plan will be considered in an advance of a new Local Plan (Ref 7. 1.5). Though it is a non-statutory document, the Position Statement forms a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in Havant Borough (Ref 7. 1.5).
- 7.2.14 Policy CS11 from the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) refers to constraints on development with regards to built and buried heritage in the historic environment. The wording of Policy CS11 is reproduced in full in Technical Appendix 7.1.
- 7.2.15 A significant amount of new development is planned for the Borough up to 2026 and it is fundamental to the achievement of the council's vision that the Borough's natural and built environment assets are central to the delivery of this development (Ref 7. 1.2). The council will seek ways of ensuring that new development not only protects the borough's environmental assets but also uses them to generate higher quality development, to bring environmental enhancement benefits and put the assets at the centre of the regeneration of the Borough (Ref 7. 1.2).
- 7.2.16 In accordance with government guidelines and best practice, this report has been completed at the early stages of the planning process to accompany a planning application and to inform all parties of any archaeological and built heritage concerns affecting the development Site.

Key Legislation

Scheduled Monuments

- 7.2.17 Nationally important archaeological sites (both above and below-ground remains) may be identified and protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (Ref 7.1.6). An application to the Secretary of State is required for any works affecting a Scheduled Monument or its setting.

Scoping Assessment Stage

- 7.2.18 Consultation has been undertaken with Historic England. Historic England's initial response is in a letter dated 26th October 2022. Consultation is ongoing. Key points from consultation with Historic England relate to preserving intervisibility between the Roman villa and Bevi's Grave Long Barrow

sites, the importance of a softened development edge along the southern boundary of the villa SAM, and the enhancement of the route of the Roman road. Consultation with the LPA heritage advisor has also taken place. Consultation has helped inform and guide the proposal to ensure the identified heritage assets are safeguarded and celebrated.

Assessment Methodology

- 7.2.19 The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and to standards specified by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Ref. 7.1.7 and Ref. 7.1.8). The methodology used to determine the significance of buried heritage assets (i.e. archaeological remains), the severity of any impacts upon them and the resulting significance of environmental effect is based on that typically used in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) (Ref. 7.1.9 and Ref. 7.1.10). Following the characterisation of the baseline conditions, the methodology used to characterise the potential effects on likely archaeological buried heritage assets at the Site included:
- Evaluating the significance of buried heritage assets, based on existing designations and professional judgment where such resources have no formal designation, and considering evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value as outlined in Historic England's Conservation Principles (Ref. 17.1.11);
 - Predicting the magnitude of change (impact) upon the known or potential heritage significance of buried assets and the likely resulting significance of environmental effect;
 - Considering the mitigation measures that have been included within the development proposals and any additional mitigation that might be required in the design and construction of the Proposed Development in order to mitigate likely adverse effects; and
 - Quantifying any residual effects (those that might remain after mitigation).

Receptor Sensitivity

- 7.2.20 In line with the NPPF, for the purposes of this ES Chapter, archaeological 'receptors' are referred to as 'buried heritage assets', and heritage 'significance' is used in place of 'value' or 'importance'. The use of heritage 'significance' and 'significance of (environmental) effect' are clearly differentiated throughout.
- 7.2.21 'Significance' lies in the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations. Known and potential heritage assets within the Site and its vicinity have been identified from national and local designations, HER data and expert opinion. The significance of a heritage asset can be seen as the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting (Ref 17.1.11).
- 7.2.22 Historic England has also recently published guidance on analysing significance in heritage assets (Ref 7.1.12); and The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment's (IEMA) Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK also provides relevant guidance (Ref 7.1.13).
- 7.2.23 There is no single defining criterion that dictates the overall asset significance; each asset has to be evaluated against the range of criteria listed above on a case by case basis. Unless the nature and exact extent of buried archaeological remains within any given area has been determined through

prior investigation, significance is often uncertain. Table 7.1 gives examples of the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Table 7.1 Significance of Heritage Assets

Heritage Asset Description	Heritage Significance
World Heritage Sites Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives Scheduled Monument Listed Buildings (Grade 1, 2 and 2*) Registered Parks and Gardens Registered Battlefields Designated assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives Undesignated heritage assets identified within this assessment considered to be of national importance	High
Conservation Areas Heritage assets identified that can contribute significantly to acknowledged regional and local objectives Undesignated heritage assets identified within this assessment considered to be of regional and local importance	Medium
Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations Assets of limited value, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives	Low
Assets with little or no surviving archaeological or heritage interest	Negligible
The importance of the asset has not been ascertained	Unknown

Impact Magnitude

7.2.24 Determination of magnitude of change upon the significance of known or potential heritage assets is based on the severity of the potential physical impact (e.g. any activity that would entail ground disturbance, from piling, ground reduction, etc). Table 7.2 describes the criteria used in this assessment to determine the magnitude of change.

Table 7.2 Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of Change	Description of Change
---------------------	-----------------------

High	Complete removal of asset. Change to asset significance resulting in a fundamental change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context, character and setting. The transformation of an asset’s setting in a way that fundamentally compromises its ability to be understood or appreciated. The scale of change would be such that it could result in a designated asset being undesignated or having its level of designation lowered.
Medium	Change to asset significance resulting in an appreciable change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting. Notable alterations to the setting of an asset that affect our appreciation of it and its significance; or the unrecorded loss of archaeological interest.
Low	Change to asset significance resulting in a small change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting.
Negligible	Negligible change or no material change to asset significance. No real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting.
Uncertain	Level of survival/condition of resource in specific locations is not known: magnitude of change is therefore not known.

Effect Significance

7.2.25 The environmental effect is determined by comparing the 'significance of baseline assets' with the 'magnitude of change', as outlined in Table 7.3. Effects may be either adverse (negative) or beneficial (positive) and are defined initially without mitigation. Where information is insufficient to be able to quantify either the resource significance or magnitude of change with any degree of certainty, the effect is given as 'uncertain'. ‘Significant’ effects are those that are moderate or major. Effects that are not ‘significant’ are minor or negligible effects.

Table 7.3 Significance of Environmental Effect (Prior to Mitigation)

Magnitude of Change	Heritage Asset Significance				
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible	Uncertain
High	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor	Uncertain
Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Uncertain
Low	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Uncertain
Negligible	Minor/Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Uncertain
Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain	Uncertain

Determination of Baseline

- 7.2.26 The methodology and information sources consulted during the baseline characterisation are set out in detail within Technical Appendix 7.1. In summary this desk-based study entailed:
- Setting the Site into its archaeological and historical context, by collecting information on the known historic environment within a 1km radius study area around the Site, as held by the primary repositories of such information within Hampshire. These comprise the Hampshire Historic Environment Record (HHER) and Historic England. The study area was considered through professional judgement to be appropriate to characterise the historic environment of the Site. Occasionally there may be reference to assets beyond this study area, where appropriate, e.g., where such assets are particularly significant and/or where they contribute to current understanding of the historic environment.
 - Consultation of a broad range of relevant documentary and cartographic sources, including published histories and journals, British Geological Survey data, available geotechnical data, and historic Ordnance Survey maps.
- 7.2.27 A site visit was carried out on 27th of June 2022 in order to determine the topography of the Site and to visit the various heritage assets, where possible, which have the potential to be affected by development of the Site.

Limitations of the Assessment

- 7.2.28 The main limitation to the assessment is the nature of the archaeological resource - buried and not visible - which means it can be difficult to predict accurately the presence and likely significance of buried assets, and consequently the impact upon them, based primarily on a desk-based sources. The principal source of information is the HHER, which list all known archaeological sites and finds. The information provides an initial indication of assets present rather than a definitive list of all potential archaeological assets because the full extent of a buried heritage resource cannot be known prior to site-specific archaeological field investigation.
- 7.2.29 Current understanding of the nature and extent of past human activity, in particular for periods not present or poorly presented in the historical record (Prehistoric, Roman and early Medieval periods), is limited due to a lack of past archaeological investigation in the study area. Therefore, the presence and extent, date, nature, survival and significance of possible, previously unrecorded, buried heritage assets within the Site are largely uncertain.
- 7.2.30 Documentary sources may be biased, inaccurate or difficult to interpret unless they can be corroborated by other sources of information.
- 7.2.31 Cartographic resources have been addressed as part of this assessment. These documents may have inaccuracies, dependent upon the date, method and scale of survey. Earlier surveys tend to be less accurate, and it is important to note that errors in this mapping are usually accumulated into upland areas or along watercourses.
- 7.2.32 Grid coordinates for heritage assets may be rounded to such an extent that the actual location of the asset can no longer be identified.

- 7.2.33 The radial boundaries used in this report have been established in order to maintain the focus and manageability of the data but still be large enough to rigorously consider context and character or the archaeological resource. It is important to note that any set boundaries on the report should be considered as permeable. Areas do not develop in isolation, and thought must always be given to significant relationships with places and events outside the area selected or defined.
- 7.2.34 Notwithstanding this limitation, the methodology is robust, utilising reasonably available information, and conforms to the requirements of local and national guidance and planning policy. Typically, appropriate standard archaeological prospection and evaluation techniques are utilised to reduce the uncertainties inherent in any desk-based assessment, as part of an overall EIA mitigation strategy.

7.3 BASELINE ENVIRONMENT

Existing baseline

Designated heritage assets

- 7.3.1 The Site contains one Scheduled Monument. The Roman villa and section of Roman road southwest of Littlepark Wood is located in the northern part of the Site (National Heritage List for England (NHLE) Ref: 1001859).
- 7.3.2 Within the study area there are two further Scheduled Monuments. Bevi's Grave Long Barrow (NHLE: 1012831) is located approximately 260m south of the Site on Portsdown Hill. Bevi's Grave Long Barrow is a Neolithic long barrow and is east to west aligned. Fort Purbrook (NHLE: 1001842), including the covered-way to the east, is southwest of the Site. Only the covered-way extends into the study area, with the main body of the fort outside the study area. Fort Purbrook was built for the landward defense of Portsmouth in the 1860s. Fort Purbrook is also a Grade II* listed building.
- 7.3.3 There are two Grade 2 Listed Buildings in the study area. The Towers (NHLE: 1303449) is a house in the form of a Tudor castle, dating to the early 19th century, 270m south of the Site. Sunspan is a house dated to 1934-35, 380m south of the Site.

Non-Designated heritage assets

- 7.3.4 Farlington Redoubt (PRN23262) was planned for construction due to Fort Purbrook's vulnerability on its northeast and east sides. Farlington Redoubt was built to defend the eastern approach, its principal façade faced towards Bedhampton to the east. The structure was never fully constructed to plan due to costs. Only the ditches and gun positions were completed. After the Second World War the Site was used as a chalk quarry. The last remains of the fort were demolished in the 1970s, and the Site is currently in use as a waste management centre.

Assets scoped into the assessment

- 7.3.5 As a result of the scoping exercise, the assets which have the potential to be affected by development of the Site comprise:
- Roman villa and section of Roman road (Scheduled Monument)

- Bevi's Grave Long Barrow (Scheduled Monument)
- Fort Purbrook and covered-way (Scheduled Monument)
- The Towers (Grade 2 Listed Building)
- Farlington Redoubt (Non-Designated asset)

Site topography and geology

- 7.3.6 The Site comprises an irregular parcel of land that generally slopes from the north at c. 57m (Ordnance Datum) OD to the southeast at c. 28m OD.
- 7.3.7 British Geological Survey (BGS) data shows a varied bedrock geology of the Site, reflecting its location upon the Bere Forest Syncline, the downward curve of the geological fold that formed Portsdown Hill at the southernmost edge of the Hampshire Basin.
- 7.3.8 Superficial Head (clayey hillwash) is more prevalent towards the southern part of the Site, where the profile rises towards the foot of Portsdown Hill. Head is a very gravelly, silty, sandy clay to clayey sandy gravel, with variable proportions of coarser granular material.
- 7.3.9 The most recent geological bedrock formation (clay deposits of the Wittering Formation) is found across the northernmost part of the Site, with the majority of the Site area lying above London Clay Formation, with the oldest bedrock deposit (Portsdown Chalk Formation) running east to west across the southernmost area of the Site.
- 7.3.10 Borehole information for the Site suggests a sequence of topsoil, head deposits, London clay and gravel. This data is at relatively low resolution and offers only a rough indication of the Site geology.

Past archaeological investigations

- 7.3.11 Six archaeological investigations have been carried out within the Site.

1925 Excavation

- 7.3.12 In 1925 part of the footings of the Roman villa in the northern part of the Site were discovered and partially excavated.

1993 Evaluation

- 7.3.13 In 1993 an evaluation was undertaken comprising 76 trenches, including 59 trenches across the southern half of the Site. A layer of small to medium fragments of burnt flint was revealed around in the southwest area of the Site. The layer contained a flint blade with characteristically Mesolithic retouch and a possible burin was recovered, raising the possibility of a small Mesolithic site. A shallow layer of colluvial buried soil along the base of the tributary valley in the southernmost area of the Site contained quantities of worked flint and burnt flint, including a possible Mesolithic blade. Elsewhere within the area of the evaluation, flint bearing characteristically Mesolithic retouch and Neolithic or Bronze Age period scrapers were recorded. Prehistoric and Roman pottery and Roman ceramic building material were also found in small quantities throughout the Site.

2005 Watching Brief

- 7.3.14 In 2005 an archaeological watching brief was carried out on the Site during the excavation of seven geotechnical test-pits in 2005.
- 7.3.15 No archaeology was observed in the majority of the trenches, which measured 3.5m long by 0.7m wide. The topsoil was typically approximately 0.2m deep, but was twice as thick at the southernmost area of the Site, where it overlay almost a meter of colluvial deposits.
- 7.3.16 Two of the trenches contained archaeology. These were at separate locations approximately 40m to the south of the route of the Roman Road. An undated north-south linear feature was observed in Trench 5. It was suggested that this could have been Roman or Prehistoric, as the fill had contained no organic material and several rounded flints had been retrieved which may have been pot-boilers. Roman ceramic building material was recovered from the topsoil in Trench 6.

2016 Geophysical Survey

- 7.3.17 In 2016 a geophysical survey was undertaken across 15.5ha of the northern area of the Site. The survey detected several archaeological anomalies north of the Roman road. These indicated the previously known Roman villa complex to the north of the Roman road, consisting of a rectangular enclosure, possible remains of a building and burnt/fired material, ditches in the vicinity of the villa probably representing associated enclosures, and a track. The Roman road was also tentatively identified.

2016–2017 Geophysical Surveys

- 7.3.18 In 2016 a geophysical survey was undertaken across 6.9ha of the northernmost area of the Site. A significant number of magnetic anomalies were recorded, the majority of which related to the Roman villa complex in the northern area of the Site, the trackway connecting it to the Roman road and the Roman road itself. To the south of the Roman road, a linear anomaly was identified following the same orientation as the road with a short section running perpendicularly for approximately 10m. Also to the south of the road another linear anomaly with an associated perpendicular one crossing its eastern end was recorded. These were interpreted as possibly representing field enclosures of similar date to the Roman occupation. Other linear anomalies represented a modern raised trackway or suggested the presence of underground services.
- 7.3.19 A follow-on survey was carried out in 2017 across 7.6ha across the central area of the Site. This revealed several magnetic anomalies, the majority of which were not considered to be archaeological in origin.

2018 Evaluation

- 7.3.20 A total of 61 trenches were opened in an archaeological evaluation targeting a 7ha area around the Scheduled Monument in the northeast area of the Site. Several sections of the Roman road were recorded, defined by metallised surfaces and in one instance parallel side ditches. Within one of the trenches two linear ditches were recorded set 9m apart, which were interpreted as roadside ditches.
- 7.3.21 A sub-rectangular feature measuring 2m by 0.6m and 0.37m deep was revealed. The feature had vertical sides and a flat base and was filled with orange clay containing flint nodules. The density of the fill may be an indication that it was associated with a structure.

- 7.3.22 A possible kiln was recorded. A dark red-brown deposit with charcoal inclusions possibly represented a clay lining with in-situ burning, which may indicate the presence of a kiln.
- 7.3.23 A series of walls were recorded across the Site. These were constructed from flint bonded in one of the walls with a sandy mortar. One of the walls was buttressed and held at least five courses. Several sections of wall foundation were also recorded across the Site. These were composed of flint nodules some set in a sandy clay mortar.

Chronological Summary

Prehistoric (450,000 BC – AD 43)

- 7.3.24 A Mesolithic tranche axe was identified from a pipeline cutting near the northwest corner of the Site in the 1970s. The 1993 evaluation recorded evidence of activity from the Mesolithic to the late Iron Age across the southern area of the Site. This included an unstratified Mesolithic flint blade, struck flint cores and debitage from 25 of the 76 trenches, a late Neolithic flint axe fragment, and seven late Iron Age pot sherds.
- 7.3.25 The Neolithic long barrow and Scheduled Monument Bevis' Grave is located approximately 260m south of the Site on the crest of east end of Portsdown Hill. Two possible ploughed-out barrows were also discovered just to the southwest of the study area at Farlington Reservoir, on the south facing slope of Portsdown Hill.
- 7.3.26 Evidence of a Bronze Age linear earthwork or ranch boundary is recorded in the vicinity of Bevis' Grave. Linear cropmarks observed to the south of the Site may also be indicative of early field systems.
- 7.3.27 A small Iron Age settlement was excavated 130m to the east of the Site. The settlement contained two roundhouses, pits, postholes and curvilinear boundary ditches and stakeholes for a fence line. Iron Age pits have been recorded excavated 50m to the east and 100m to the northeast of the Site.
- 7.3.28 There is evidence for human activity and settlement within the study area and especially around Portsdown Hill, to the south of the Site, as well as evidence of multiple phases of Prehistoric activity on the Site itself. The presence of the freshwater source would have been attractive for early settlers. Evidence of Mesolithic activity has been found in at least two separate occasions within the Site area and it has already been suggested that there may have been a small Mesolithic camp on the Site. This would be of regional interest, offering a rare example of a Mesolithic small settlement within a landscape that was later dominated by a Neolithic monument and very likely to have been farmed. Furthermore late Prehistoric settlement is known to have existed very near to the Site as well as elsewhere in the wider environs of Portsdown Hill. There is therefore high potential for the presence of further Prehistoric remains within the Site. Finds could range from ex-situ artefacts to cut features indicative of settlement, which could be of at least medium significance.

Roman (AD 43 – AD 410)

- 7.3.29 Littlepark Wood Roman Villa occupies almost 2ha in the northern part of the Site. The villa was partially excavated in 1925 and two phases of construction were identified; the first was dated to c. AD150-200 from Samian pottery recovered from an associated midden, and the second to c. AD250 from numismatic evidence. Pottery evidence indicated a demolition date of the mid to late 4th

century. Additional buildings with associated infrastructure were confirmed through the 2016 geophysical survey, including a possible villa service road. Further foundations, walls and a possible kiln were revealed during the 2018 evaluation on the Site. A sandy layer with waste including Roman tile and pottery, probably related to villa occupation, was excavated less than 25m northeast of the Site near a small stream.

- 7.3.30 The Roman road that ran from Chichester (*Noviomagnus*) in the east to Bitterne (*Clausentum*) in the west crosses the Site just south of the villa complex. Sections of the road and its surrounding ditches were recorded during the 2018 evaluation on the Site.
- 7.3.31 Within the study area another Roman building, known as Crookhorn Roman villa, was located approximately 280m to the northwest of the Site. A 'corn drying' oven in a building was also excavated and ditches were found to the east and west of the villa complex. A possible quarry pit and an up-draught tile kiln were located to the north of the villa. The main building at Crookhorn Roman Villa may have been a tilery workshop associated with Littlepark Wood Villa.
- 7.3.32 Further Roman remains recorded in the study area including another possible Roman villa site at the eastern extremity of the study area. A scatter of Roman pottery and tile was found in a garden in 1974 amid reports that a mosaic had also been found in a neighboring garden. A possible Roman enclosure was identified from aerial photography less than 30m away to the east of the Site. A Roman waste pit was intersected by a pipeline trench in 1965 at the south of the study area, which was found to contain Roman pottery, glass objects and animal bone. A Claudian coin was also found in a pipeline trench nearby. Traces of a Roman cobbled surface were excavated around Bevis' Grave.
- 7.3.33 There is clear evidence of Roman period occupation on the Site and within the study area. There seems to have been a small roadside settlement which included a villa complex and a small-scale tile production industry. Beyond the southern boundary of the Site there is further evidence of Roman occupation on the southern slope of Portsdown Hill. Although there is known to have been Roman occupation on the Site, evidence of Roman activity may yet be found on the Site that could enhance the significance of the Scheduled Monument, and would therefore be of at least medium significance.

Early Medieval (AD 410 – AD 1066) and Medieval (AD 1066 – AD 1485)

- 7.3.34 The Site is situated between the parishes of Farlington and Bedhampton in Portsdown Hundred. The nearest known early Medieval settlement is at Bedhampton beyond the study area. The earliest known reference to Bedhampton is the grant of the Manor to the Cathedral Church of Winchester in the 9th century AD.
- 7.3.35 An early Medieval cemetery was excavated at the site of Bevis' Grave approximately 300m to the south of the Site. This consisted of around 80 graves dating AD595 to AD1020 which were clustered around the end of the earlier barrow.
- 7.3.36 The northern part of the study area was in a well wooded area that once formed part of the Forest of Bere. The Forest of Bere was noted for its pig farming. The Site probably belonged to Creuquer (14th century Creuker) manor, a sub-manor of Farlington Manor.

- 7.3.37 No early Medieval or Medieval remains have been recorded on the Site. Within the study area a house platform with two flint packed postholes, possible well and associated boundary ditch was found in an area 400m northwest of the Site. Part of a Medieval holloway was identified 100m to the east of the Site during the A3(M) roadworks where it was clearly visible as two ditches and three banks.
- 7.3.38 Within the study area the early Medieval evidence is minimal and focused to the south of the Site around the reused Prehistoric barrow. However, during the Medieval period there was a small settlement to the northwest of the Site and evidence of land management nearby, at the edge of the afforested area of Bere. It is very likely that the site area itself lay within agricultural lands between the nucleated settlements of Bedhampton and Farlington throughout these periods. Therefore, there is a low potential for archaeology dating to these periods on Site and, if present it would likely be in the form of ditches or a holloway and would be of low significance.

Post Medieval (AD 1485 – AD 1901) and Modern (AD 1901 – Present)

- 7.3.39 Farlington and Bedhampton continued to exist as small rural settlements into the 19th century, against a backdrop dominated by the urban and industrial development at Havant and Portsmouth.
- 7.3.40 Historic mapping shows that from the end of the 18th century the Site itself was open field, which was probably worked from Crookhorn Farm. The Site remained relatively unchanged in the 20th century, with the exception of the appearance of a cart track leading to an isolated building, probably a barn, in the southeast part of the Site, which aerial photography shows was built sometime between 1938 and 1949.
- 7.3.41 There is a low potential for archaeology dating to this period on the study Site, which would be limited to the fairly recent modification of field boundaries and a modern agricultural building and would be of low significance.

Future baseline

- 7.3.42 There will be no change to the historic environment baseline of the Site and the surrounding area in the absence of the Proposed Development. The baseline would remain as currently understood and as presented within this ES chapter.

7.4 MITIGATION WITHIN THE SUBMITTED DESIGN

Design

- 7.4.1 There will be no development around the Roman villa area north of the Roman road and no development over the area of the Scheduled Monument, including the projected line of the Roman road through the Site. The entire proposed development is to take place south of the Roman road, thereby ensuring the *in-situ* preservation of this heritage asset.
- 7.4.2 The proposed development is located in the ‘basin’ between Portsdown Hill and the villa site. From the north of site, the ground slopes south and southeast. Between the two Scheduled Monuments buildings are predominately two storeys, three storey structures placed between the monuments have been proposed where the ground level at the site is lowest. Views to the west side of the site, where the buildings are higher in the North-Western Quarter and Core, and Campdown Hills

character areas, are obscured by the boundary line of the college campus and topography. Visibility to the west side of the North-Western Quarter and Core area would be intermittent through the tree lined boundary of the campus and would comprise third floor levels and the roofscape. Ground levels indicate that the north facing slope of Portsdown Hill to the southwest, would still be visible. Views to the south towards Bevi’s Grave, across the development area from the location of the villa site would comprise the roofscape of the Roman Road Quarter, which would be diffused by the tree line along the south side of the Roman road, once established. Beyond the development the visibility of the north side slope of Portsdown Hill, its Crest and out towards Bridge Lake would be retained. Due to topography visibility towards the proposed development core would be limited, with increased visibility of the development obtained closer towards the Roman road, here the arterial viewing corridors would come into play, securing visibility along the identified significant viewing corridor towards Bevi’s Grave.

- 7.4.3 At present the alignment of the Roman road within the landscape is largely imperceptible. The proposal looks to form a tree line along the road’s southern side, this would not only diffuse the transition between the development and SAM spaces, and reinstate the historic character of the area, but would also demarcate the alignment of the road in an unobtrusive way, securing its placement within the landscape. With the addition of a relevant information panel at the site and this demarcation, the asset would be enhanced through the visual reinstatement and promotion of its presence. Enhancing perception and public engagement with the asset for a wider audience.
- 7.4.4 The impact of the development edge against the setting of the SAM villa site has been mitigated through the landscape led design. The proposal has incorporated a cycle path along the southern side of the route of the Roman road, and a public open green space to the central south side of the Roman road, with a triangular plan form. The road network in this area and the arrangement of the buildings is sinuous in nature, allowing for a softened boundary edge between the development and the heritage assets. The block plan of the proposed development has also been led by the historic landscape. Viewing corridors and block alignment draw the eye towards Bevi’s Grave and the villa site, instilling a synergy between the two historic places.

Construction

- 7.4.5 In order to reduce any adverse impacts upon the setting and heritage value of heritage assets in the vicinity of the Site during the construction phase, standard environmental controls will be put in place to manage temporary factors such as noise and dust, and construction activities should be screened from view, as far as practicable, by suitable boundary treatments to construction areas.

7.5 LIKELY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE SCHEME

Construction Phase Effects

- 7.5.1 During the Construction Phase, the potential for direct, adverse effects on the heritage value of heritage assets arises out of physical removal of buried heritage assets, through construction of foundations within the footprint of the proposed buildings, levelling groundworks take for access and landscaping, and excavation for below ground services. Such effects would be permanent.

7.5.2 Indirect effects may affect the setting of above ground heritage assets, through construction traffic, and other environmental effects, including an increase in construction noise, dust and vibrations, as well as visual effects such as the presence of cranes and other associated structures and vehicles. All indirect effects during this phase will be of a temporary nature.

Littlepark Wood Roman villa

7.5.3 Littlepark Wood Roman villa scheduled monument is of **High** heritage significance. There would be no direct impacts on the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Negligible** resulting in a **Negligible** Significance of Effect (**Not Significant**). However, there could be indirect, temporary impact on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Low**, resulting in a **Moderate Adverse** Significance of Effect (**Significant**).

Bevi’s Grave Long Barrow

7.5.4 Bevi’s Grave Long Barrow scheduled monument is of **High** heritage significance. There would be no direct impacts on the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Negligible** resulting in a **Negligible** Significance of Effect (**Not Significant**). However, there could be indirect, temporary impact on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Low** resulting in a **Moderate Adverse** Significance of Effect (**Significant**).

Fort Purbrook and covered-way

7.5.5 Fort Purbrook and covered-way scheduled monument is of **High** heritage significance. There would be no direct impacts on the asset or indirect impacts on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Negligible** resulting in a **Negligible** Significance of Effect (**Not Significant**).

The Towers

7.5.6 The Towers is a Grade 2 Listed Building is of **High** heritage significance. There would be no direct impacts on the asset or indirect impacts on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Negligible** resulting in a **Negligible** Significance of Effect (**Not Significant**).

Farlington Redoubt

7.5.7 Farlington Redoubt is a non-designated heritage asset of **Negligible** heritage significance. There would be no direct impacts on the asset or indirect impacts on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Negligible** resulting in a **Negligible** Significance of Effect (**Not Significant**).

Previously Unrecorded Buried Heritage Assets

7.5.8 Potential unrecorded Prehistoric heritage assets on the Site are uncertain, but if present are likely to have **Low** or **Medium** heritage significance. There would be direct, permanent impacts on the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **High** resulting in a **Major Adverse** Significance of Effect (**Significant**).

7.5.9 Potential unrecorded Roman heritage assets on the Site are uncertain, but if present are likely to have **Medium** heritage significance. There would be direct, permanent impacts on the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **High** resulting in a **Major Adverse** Significance of Effect (**Significant**).

7.5.10 The potential for surviving remains dating to the Medieval period upon the site is **low**. If present such remains would be likely to relate to agricultural practices and be of **low** heritage significance. There would be direct, permanent impacts on the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **High** resulting in a **Moderate Adverse** Significance of Effect (**Significant**).

7.5.11 The potential for archaeology dating to the Post Medieval period on site is **low** and it is very likely that this would be limited to evidence of agricultural activity. This would be of **negligible** heritage significance. The Magnitude of Change would be **High** resulting in a **Minor Adverse** Significance of Effect (**Not Significant**).

Operational Phase Effects

7.5.12 Effects arising from the Operational Phase of the Proposed Development are mainly focused on the contribution of the setting of heritage assets, and its contribution to their respective heritage values, through the completion of the Proposed Development and the alteration from an open field to a finalised development.

7.5.13 Direct effects upon any known (or previously unknown archaeological remains which may be present on the site) would cease with the completion of the groundworks stage of construction and landscaping, and consequently no direct impacts or resultant archaeological effects are anticipated following completion of the Proposed Development since no further ground disturbance will occur.

Littlepark Wood Roman villa

7.5.14 Littlepark Wood Roman villa scheduled monument is of **High** heritage significance. There would be indirect, permanent impact on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **low** resulting in a **Moderate Adverse** Significance of Effect (**Significant**).

Bevi’s Grave Long Barrow

7.5.15 Littlepark Wood Roman villa scheduled monument is of **High** heritage significance. There would be indirect, permanent impact on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **low** resulting in a **Moderate Adverse** Significance of Effect (**Significant**).

Fort Purbrook and covered-way

7.5.16 Fort Purbrook and covered-way scheduled monument is of **High** heritage significance. There would be no indirect impacts on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Negligible** resulting in a **Negligible** Significance of Effect (**Not Significant**).

The Towers

7.5.17 The Towers is a Grade 2 Listed Building of **High** heritage significance. There would be no indirect impacts on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Negligible** resulting in a **Negligible** Significance of Effect (**Not Significant**).

Farlington Redoubt

- 7.5.18 Farlington Redoubt is a non-designated heritage asset of **Negligible** heritage significance. There would be no indirect impacts on the setting of the asset. The Magnitude of Change would be **Negligible** resulting in a **Negligible** Significance of Effect (**Not Significant**).

Previously Unrecorded Buried Heritage Assets

- 7.5.19 There would be no operational effects of buried heritage assets, as these will have been removed during the Construction Phase.

7.6 ADDITIONAL MITIGATION, COMPENSATION AND ENHANCEMENT MEASURES

- 7.6.1 Means by which Additional Mitigation Measure may be Secured is presented in Table 7.9.

Construction Phase

- 7.6.2 For above ground heritage assets no additional mitigation to that described Section 7.4 is required.
- 7.6.3 For buried heritage assets, a programme of archaeological work in the form of a trial trench evaluation is required, this future programme has been guided through consultation with the LPA heritage advisor.
- 7.6.4 Following this evaluation, further mitigation comprising the opening up of open areas for further excavation, depending on results of the evaluation. If significant remains are found, provision will be made for the analysis and publication of those remains in an appropriate format to be agreed with The County Archaeologist at Hampshire County Council.

Operational Phase

- 7.6.5 For above ground heritage assets, a land management plan will be developed to allow and enhanced understanding of the historic development of the landscape to be clearly read and appreciated by a wider audience. Additional measures will be put in place to enhance the setting of the heritage assets in consultation with Historic England.
- 7.6.6 For buried heritage assets, no additional mitigation is required.

7.7 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY AND LIKELY SIGNIFICANT RESIDUAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

- 7.7.1 All of the residual effects resulting from the Proposed Development are presented in Table 7.4 and Table 7.5, identifying whether the effect is significant or not.

Construction Phase

Table 7.4 Residual Effects (Construction Phase)

Receptor	Description of the Residual Effect	Scale and nature	Significant/Not Significant	Geo	D/I	P/T	St Mt Lt
Littlepark Wood Roman villa	Setting of the asset	Moderate Adverse	Significant	L	I	T	St
Bevi’s Grave Long Barrow	Moderate Adverse impact on the setting of the asset	Minor Adverse	Not Significant	L	I	T	St
Fort Purbrook and covered-way	Negligible impact on the setting of the asset	N/A	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
The Towers	Negligible impact on the setting of the asset	N/A	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Farlington Redoubt	Negligible impact on the setting of the asset	N/A	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Previously unrecorded Prehistoric heritage assets of Low or Medium significance	Major Adverse impact from foundation construction buildings, levelling groundworks and excavation for below ground services	Minor Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt
Previously unrecorded Roman heritage assets of Medium significance	Major Adverse impact from foundation construction buildings, levelling groundworks and excavation for below ground services	Minor Adverse	Not Significant	L	D	P	Lt

Notes:
Residual Effect Scale = Negligible / Minor / Moderate / Major Nature = Beneficial or Adverse Geo (Geographic Extent) = Local (L), Borough (B), Regional (R), National (N) D = Direct / I = Indirect P = Permanent / T = Temporary St = Short Term / Mt = Medium Term / Lt = Long Term N/A = not applicable / not assessed

Operational Phase

Table 7.5 Residual Effects (Operational Phase)

Receptor	Description of the Residual Effect	Scale and nature	Significant/Not Significant	Geo	D/I	P/T	St Mt Lt
Littlepark Wood Roman villa	Moderate Adverse impact on the setting of the asset	Moderate Adverse	Significant	L	I	P	Lt
Bevi’s Grave Long Barrow	Moderate Adverse impact on the setting of the asset	Minor Adverse	Not Significant	L	I	P	Lt
Fort Purbrook and covered-way	Negligible impact on the setting of the asset	N/A	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
The Towers	Negligible impact on the setting of the asset	N/A	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Farlington Redoubt	Negligible impact on the setting of the asset	N/A	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Previously unrecorded Prehistoric heritage assets	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Previously unrecorded Roman heritage assets	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Notes:
Residual Effect Scale = Negligible / Minor / Moderate / Major Nature = Beneficial or Adverse Geo (Geographic Extent) = Local (L), Borough (B), Regional (R), National (N) D = Direct / I = Indirect P = Permanent / T = Temporary St = Short Term / Mt = Medium Term / Lt = Long Term N/A = not applicable / not assessed

Table 7.6 Assessment Summary and Residual Environmental Effects

Summary description of the identified impact	Sensitivity of Receptor	Impact Magnitude	Significance and Nature of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Residual Impact Magnitude	Residual Significance and Nature of Effect	Confidence Level
Construction							
Littlepark Wood Roman villa	High	Low	Temporary Indirect Moderate Adverse (Significant)	None. Mitigation is within the submitted design.	Low	Temporary Indirect Minor Adverse (Not Significant)	High
Bevi's Grave Long Barrow	High	Low	Temporary Indirect Moderate Adverse (Significant)	None. Mitigation is within the submitted design.	Low	Temporary Indirect Minor Adverse (Not Significant)	High
Fort Purbrook and covered-way	High	Negligible	Negligible	None	Negligible	Negligible	High
The Towers	High	Negligible	Negligible	None	Negligible	Negligible	High
Farlington Redoubt	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	None	Negligible	Negligible	High
Previously Unrecorded Prehistoric Buried Heritage Assets	Low or Medium	High	Permanent Direct Major Adverse (Significant)	Further archaeological evaluation in the form of targeted trenches. Further mitigation comprising the opening up of open areas for further excavation, depending on results of the evaluation	High	Permanent Direct Minor Adverse (Not Significant)	High
Previously Unrecorded Roman Buried Heritage Assets	Medium	High	Permanent Direct Major Adverse (Significant)	Further archaeological evaluation in the form of targeted trenches. Further mitigation comprising the opening up of open areas for further excavation,	High	Permanent Direct Minor Adverse (Not Significant)	High

				depending on results of the evaluation			
Operation							
Littlepark Wood Roman villa	High	Low	Permanent Indirect Moderate Adverse (Significant)	Development of a land management plan to enhance setting	Negligible	Permanent Indirect Minor Adverse (Not Significant)	High
Bevi’s Grave Long Barrow	High	Low	Permanent Indirect Moderate Adverse (Significant)	Development of a land management plan to enhance setting	Negligible	Permanent Indirect Minor Adverse (Not Significant)	High
Fort Purbrook and covered-way	High	Negligible	Negligible	None	Negligible	Negligible	High
The Towers	High	Negligible	Negligible	None	Negligible	Negligible	High
Farlington Redoubt	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	None	Negligible	Negligible	High
Previously Unrecorded Prehistoric Buried Heritage Assets	Low or Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Previously Unrecorded Roman Buried Heritage Assets	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

7.1 REFERENCES

- 7.1.1 DLUHC (2021) Revised National Planning Policy Framework.
- 7.1.2 Havant Borough Council (2011) Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.
- 7.1.3 Havant Borough Council (2014) Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations).
- 7.1.4 Havant Borough Council (2022) Housing Delivery Position Statement.
- 7.1.5 Havant Borough Council (2022) Havant Borough Council: Local Plan. Available at: <https://www.havant.gov.uk/local-plan> [Accessed May 9, 2022].
- 7.1.6 HMSO (1979) Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act.
- 7.1.7 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2020) Standards and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment.
- 7.1.8 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2020) Standards and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment
- 7.1.9 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) (2019) LA 101, Introduction to environmental assessment.
- 7.1.10 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)(2020), LA 106, Cultural heritage assessment.
- 7.1.11 Historic England (2017) 'Conservation Principles for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (consultation draft)'. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/guidance/conservation-principles-consultation-draft-pdf/>.
- 7.1.12 Historic England (2019) Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets, Historic England Advice Note 12.
- 7.1.13 The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2021) Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK.