



7.0 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

7.1 Introduction

- 7.1.1 This chapter presents the approach and findings of the assessment of effects of the Proposed Development, as detailed in Chapter 3, on archaeological and cultural heritage features and resources. This chapter details the methodology followed and provides a review of the baseline archaeological resource and cultural heritage assets of the Site and study area, together with an assessment of their value.
- 7.1.2 The chapter then presents the results of the assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on the baseline cultural heritage features and resources in order to determine the magnitude of change and the corresponding significance of effect anticipated. Where required, mitigation measures are presented and discussed to reduce identified significant effects of the Proposed Development during construction and operation phases.
- 7.1.3 Within the context of this chapter, cultural heritage should be taken to mean the above and below ground archaeological resource, built heritage and historic landscape. The Site referred to in this chapter includes all the area shown within the red line boundary. A study area of 1km radius from the Site boundary has been examined to assess the nature of the surrounding cultural heritage assets and place the recorded sites within their context. This study area was defined in consultation with Havant Borough Council (HBC). Additional cumulative sites are also considered within this study area.
- 7.1.4 This chapter discusses the potential for the Proposed Development to significantly affect the historic environment. Data has been collected from Historic England, the Hampshire Historic Environment Record (HER) and relevant record offices and archives. A site walkover survey has also been undertaken, with the results informing a comprehensive Heritage Statement (WYG, 2019) and an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (TVAS, 2016) included here as Technical Appendices 7.1 and 7.2, respectively.

7.2 Methodology and Scope

Policy Background

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019)

- 7.2.1 The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. When determining Planning Applications, the NPPF directs LPAs to apply the approach of a presumption in favour of sustainable development; the 'golden thread' that is expected to run through the plan-making and decision-taking process. This is expected to apply unless conflicting with other NPPF policies, inclusive of those covering the protection of designated heritage assets.
- 7.2.2 Section 16 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment' (Paragraphs 184-202), relates to development proposals that have an effect on the historic environment. This is the guidance to which LPAs need to refer to when setting out a strategy in their Local Plans for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. It is noted that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.
- 7.2.3 When determining applications for development proposals, LPAs should require applicants to describe the significance of the identified heritage assets affected and the contribution made by their setting. The level of detail provided should be proportionate to the significance of this heritage asset, and sufficient to understand the impact of development proposals on that significance (Paragraph 189).
- 7.2.4 Paragraph 192 advises LPAs to consider the following points when drawing up strategies for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, and when determining planning applications:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them into viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

7.2.5 Paragraphs 193-202 consider the impact of development proposals on the significance of a heritage asset. It is recorded that great weight should be given to the heritage asset's conservation, and that the more important the heritage asset, the greater this weight should be applied (Paragraph 193).

7.2.6 Where there is substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset a number of criteria must be met alongside achieving substantial public benefits (Paragraph 195). Where there is less than substantial harm the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development (Paragraph 196). Balanced judgements should be made when weighing applications that affect non-designated heritage assets (Paragraph 197).

7.2.7 Where loss of significance as a result of development is considered justified, the NPPF includes provision to allow for the recording and advancing understanding of the asset before it is lost in a manner proportionate to the importance and impact. The results of these investigations and the archive should be made publicly accessible. The ability to record evidence should not however be a factor in deciding whether loss should be permitted (Paragraph 199).

National Guidance Documents

7.2.8 The following provides an overview of the primary national guidance documents which have been consulted in the assessment of impacts.

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (2019)

- 7.2.9 The Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG') was launched by the Government on the 6th March 2014, and last updated in July 2019. It provides a web-based resource in support of the NPPF. It includes a section entitled 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' which reiterates that conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance is a core planning principle.
- 7.2.10 It also states, conservation is an active process of maintenance and managing change, requiring a flexible and thoughtful approach. Furthermore, it highlights that neglect and decay of heritage assets is best addressed through ensuring they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation. Importantly, the guidance states that if complete, or partial loss of a heritage asset is justified, the aim should then be to capture and record the evidence of the asset's significance and make the interpretation publicly available.
- 7.2.11 The PPG also includes a section called 'Design' which emphasises the importance of good design, the planning objectives that good design can help to achieve, the qualities of a well-designed place, and how buildings and the spaces between them should be considered. The planning objectives of design are stated to include promoting, among other things, local character; safe, connected and efficient streets; a network of green spaces and public places; and cohesive and vibrant neighbourhoods.
- 7.2.12 The PPG states that a well-designed place should:
- *'Be functional';*
 - *Support mixed uses and tenures;*
 - *Include successful public spaces;*



- *Be adaptable and resilient;*
- *Have a distinctive character;*
- *Be attractive; and*
- *Encourage ease of movement.'*

7.2.13 The guidance identifies the following considerations which may be relevant in terms of how buildings and the spaces between them should be considered:

- *'Layout – the way in which buildings and spaces relate to each other;*
- *Form – the shape of buildings;*
- *Scale – the size of buildings;*
- *Detailing – the important smaller elements of buildings and spaces; and*
- *Materials – what a building is made from'.*

Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (2008)

7.2.14 Conservation Principles outlines Historic England's approach to the sustainable management of the historic environment. While primarily intended to ensure consistency in Historic England's own advice and guidance, the document is recommended to LPAs to ensure that all decisions about change affecting the historic environment are informed and sustainable.

7.2.15 The guidance describes a range of heritage values which enables the significance of assets to be established systematically, with the four main 'heritage values' being:

- **Evidential value:** which derives from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.
- **Historical value:** which derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present.
- **Aesthetic value:** which derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
- **Communal value:** which derives from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (GPA 3): The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd Edition) (2017)

7.2.16 Historic England's GPA 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd edition) (2017) provides more detailed advice on how to approach setting assessments and expands upon the NPPF and the associated PPG. A five-step process is proposed for proportionate setting assessments, of which the first four steps have been taken into account in preparing this ES Chapter.

7.2.17 The following advice is also of particular relevance to the Proposed Development:

- The setting of a heritage asset may reflect the character of the wider townscape or landscape in which it is situated, or be quite distinct from it, whether fortuitously or by design; and
- The settings of heritage assets change over time. Understanding the history of change will help to determine how further development within the asset's setting is likely to affect the contribution made by setting to the significance of the heritage asset.

- The former 'Seeing History in the View' (2011) document has been merged with this guidance. Together these two sets of guidance form a single document which address the assessment of potential indirect impacts through changes within the setting of built heritage assets.

Key Legislation

7.2.18 Legislation regarding Scheduled Monuments is set out in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.

7.2.19 Scheduled Monuments are designated by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport on the advice of Historic England as selective examples of nationally important archaeological remains. Under the terms of Part 1 Section 2 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 it is an offence to damage, disturb or alter a Scheduled Monument either above or below ground without first obtaining permission from the Secretary of State. This Act does not allow for the protection of the setting of Scheduled Monuments.

7.2.20 Legislation regarding Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas is set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 1990 Act).

7.2.21 The relevant legislation in this case extends from Sections 16 & 66 of the '1990 Act'. Section 16 states that, in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, the LPA shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the Listed Building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. Section 66(1) states that, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority (LPA) or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

7.2.22 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) specifies that when considering an application under the Planning Acts, regard must be given to the objectives within an adopted Development Plan. Furthermore, the decision must accord with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Local

Pre-Submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036

Policy E13

7.2.23 *The Council recognises the contribution of the historic environment to the distinctive character of our landscape and townscape, and to the quality of life of current and future residents. As such, heritage assets must be conserved and, where possible, enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance. In understanding this, new development will be expected to complement and enhance the historic environment, helping to shape modern communities by giving them a sense of history and distinct local identity.*

7.2.24 *Development proposals will be permitted which:*

- *Protect, conserve, and, where possible, enhance the significant of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings;*
- *Respect heritage assets and their contribution to local distinctiveness and sense of place; and,*
- *Make sensitive use of heritage assets, especially those at risk, through regeneration and re-use.*



Havant Borough Council Core Strategy 2009

- 7.2.25 Planning policies and references related specifically to cultural heritage and archaeology are outlined below:

Policy CS1: Health and Wellbeing

- 7.2.26 *Planning permission will be granted for development which:*

13. Supports the improvement of existing cultural assets with regard to the arts, sport, heritage, museums, and creative activities.

- 7.2.27 *More needs to be done to promote existing cultural assets. These include Havant's water and parchment heritage, Roman connections, historical marine industries and Waterloo's association with the battle of Waterloo.*

Policy CS11: Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough

- 7.2.28 *Planning permission will be granted for development that:*

4. Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest.

Scoping Assessment Stage

- 7.2.29 A Scoping Report was prepared by WYG in February 2018 and included a section on Cultural Heritage. This identified that, given the high sensitivity of the setting and views of heritage assets within the study area and the presence of archaeological remains and the potential for further previously unrecorded remains, a Cultural Heritage Chapter should be prepared.

Assessment Methodology

- 7.2.30 The following provides an overview of the methodology employed in the assessment of impact that the Proposed Development is likely to have on the cultural heritage assets identified within the Site and its surroundings.
- 7.2.31 The following methodology is based primarily based upon guidance found within the following documents:
- NPPF (2019);
 - PPG (2019);
 - Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance (Historic England, 2008); and
 - GPA 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd Edition) (Historic England, 2017).
- 7.2.32 With additional guidance and in reflection of policies, taken from the Havant Core Strategy (2011) and the emerging Havant Borough Local Plan 2036.
- 7.2.33 The Chapter will assess the effects of the Proposed Development upon the significance of heritage assets, including both designated and non-designated heritage assets. The NPPF defines a heritage asset as "A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing)".

- 7.2.34 The NPPF defines 'significance' to be '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'. The term 'receptor' is used throughout this chapter in reference to a structure, view or group of townscape features which may be affected by the Proposed Development.

- 7.2.35 During the production of this chapter, Site walkovers (undertaken in September 2016 and April 2017), desktop analysis of ordnance survey maps and archival research, alongside archaeological works such as geophysical survey (2017) and archaeological evaluation (2018), have been carried out in order to inform:

- The planning context;
- The location of the Site and its context;
- Historical background and development of the Site and surrounding area;
- The location and sensitivity of heritage assets.

- 7.2.36 The archaeological reports that have informed the chapter comprise of:

- Thames Valley Archaeological Services, 2016. *Land at College Road, Campdown, Purbrook, Portsmouth, Hampshire: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment.*
- Thames Valley Archaeological Services, 2016. *Land at College Road, Campdown, Purbrook, Portsmouth, Hampshire: Geophysical Survey (Magnetic).*
- AOC Archaeology Group, 2019. *Land at Campdown, Havant, Hampshire: An Archaeological Interim Evaluation Report.*

Heritage Asset Receptors

Assessing the significance of Heritage Receptors

- 7.2.37 The term 'heritage receptor' is used throughout the assessment to describe a heritage asset (e.g. World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, protected Wreck site, Registered Park and Garden, Conservation Area or non-designated heritage asset).
- 7.2.38 Although there is no prescriptive method for assessing significance, this Chapter utilises the heritage values set out in Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (English Heritage, 2008), and considers each heritage asset against these values. Whilst the British Standard suggests a variety of additional potential values, the ones set out by in Conservation Principles are generally recognised as appropriate and proportionate values to assess.
- 7.2.39 To avoid confusion with the term 'significance' as used in the conventional EIA, here on in this assessment will refer to 'heritage significance' (NPPF term) as 'heritage value' (EIA term).
- 7.2.40 The following assessment will ascertain what effects will arise on the heritage value of these heritage assets, by virtue of a change within their respective settings. The term 'setting' is defined 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'.
- 7.2.41 In order to understand the extent and contribution of the setting of each heritage asset receptor identified as requiring assessment, and the potential impact of the Proposed Development on setting and heritage value, the 5-step process set out in Historic England's GPA3 (2nd edition) (2017) has been used. The five steps are:

Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected;



- Step 2: Assess the degree to which these settings and views make a contribution to the heritage value of the heritage asset(s) or allow such value to be appreciated;
- Step 3: Assess the effects of the Proposed Development, whether beneficial or harmful, on the heritage value or on the ability to appreciate it;
- Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm; and,
- Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

Receptor Sensitivity

- 7.2.42 The determination of a receptor's sensitivity used in this assessment primarily considers the criteria outlined English Heritage's Conservation Principles (2008) criteria, and also expresses the results using a scale of heritage value derived from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, (DMRB 2 Volume 11, 2009) (Table 7.1).

Table 7.1 Receptor's Heritage Value

Value	Examples
Very High	World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments of exceptional quality, or assets of acknowledged international importance or can contribute to international research objectives.
High	Scheduled Monuments, or assets of national quality and importance or that can contribute to national research objectives. Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings and built heritage of exceptional quality. Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens and historic landscapes and townscapes of international sensitivity, or extremely well-preserved historic landscapes and townscapes with exceptional coherence, integrity, time-depth, or other critical factor(s).
Medium	Grade II Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas with very strong character and integrity, other built heritage that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association. Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and historic landscapes and townscapes of outstanding interest, quality and importance, or well preserved and exhibiting considerable coherence, integrity time-depth or other critical factor(s). Designated or non-designated assets of regional quality and importance that contribute to regional research objectives. Designated or non-designated special historic landscapes and townscapes with reasonable coherence, integrity, time-depth or other critical factor(s). Assets that form an important resource within the community, for educational or recreational purposes.
Low	Locally Listed Buildings, historic buildings that can be shown to have good qualities in their fabric or historical association. Non-designated assets of local importance. Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations but with potential to contribute to local research objectives. Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association. Historic landscapes and townscapes with limited sensitivity or whose sensitivity is limited by poor preservation, historic integrity and/or poor survival of contextual associations.

Value	Examples
	Assets that form a resource within the community with occasional utilisation for educational or recreational purposes.
Negligible	Assets with very little or no surviving cultural heritage interest. Buildings of no architectural or historical note. Landscapes and townscapes that are badly fragmented and the contextual associations are severely compromised or have little or no historical interest.

- 7.2.43 Following the identification and description of baseline condition, the effect of the Proposed Development on each of the receptors is then considered and an informed judgement as to the duration, extent and magnitude of effect is made.
- 7.2.44 The scoping and baseline identification process will find that some of the effects upon receptors are unlikely to be significant and, therefore, they are given no further consideration.
- 7.2.45 The consideration and forecasting of the potential effects upon receptors is based upon an assessment of data relating to designated and non-designated heritage asset. The significance of the effect is primarily dependent on:
- The importance of the heritage asset or its setting;
 - The susceptibility to change; and
 - The magnitude of the effect.
- 7.2.46 The receptor's susceptibility to change stems from the contribution that the Site currently makes to its heritage value (Table 7.2). Distance, topography and intervening development is likely to play a role in this contribution and the degree to which the surroundings can change without impacting upon the legibility of the receptor's value.

Table 7.2 Receptor's susceptibility to change criteria

Susceptibility	Susceptibility to change criteria
High	The receptor has a low ability to accommodate the specific proposed change. The receptor's existing setting makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of the asset. The Site makes a positive contribution to the setting of the receptor. Distance, topography and/or intervening development may allow visual relationships between the Site and receptor.
Medium	The receptor has a medium ability to accommodate the specific proposed change. The Site may make a neutral contribution to the setting of the receptor. The receptor's existing setting may make a neutral contribution to its value. Distance, topography and/or intervening development may block any visual and legible historic relationship between the Site and receptor, and development may be unappreciable.
Low	The receptor has a high ability to accommodate specific proposed changes. The Site is likely to currently make a limited contribution to the value of the receptor, likely to form part of an urban context. The receptor's setting may currently make a negative contribution to the heritage value.



Susceptibility	Susceptibility to change criteria
	Distance, topography and/or intervening development may block any visual and legible historic relationship between the Site and receptor, and development may be unappreciable.

7.2.47 The receptor's value is assessed against its susceptibility to changes, which identifies its sensitivity. The sensitivity matrix identifies to what degree the receptor is sensitive to the change brought about by the Proposed Development (Table 7.3).

Table 7.3 Receptor's Sensitivity to Change

Sensitivity of receptor			
Receptor Value	Susceptibility of Receptor to Change		
	Low	Medium	High
Very Low	Low	Low	Low/Moderate
Low	Low	Low/ Moderate	Moderate
Medium	Low/ Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/ High
High	Moderate	Moderate/ High	High
Very High	Moderate/ High	High	High

Effect Magnitude

7.2.48 A professional judgement is made regarding the magnitude of likely effects (Table 7.4). The magnitude of effect is determined as the predicted change to the existing baseline environment during and following the construction of the Proposed Development. The magnitude primarily stems from whether the Proposed Development will:

- Conform with the pattern, scale, mass, grain and historic features of the receptor;
- create a loss or restoration of key features of the receptor;
- contribute to the identified receptor character; and
- accord with national, regional and local planning policy.

Table 7.4 Assessing Magnitude of Impact for Heritage

Magnitude of Impact	Typical Criteria Descriptors
Substantial	Negative: Impacts will damage or destroy cultural heritage assets; result in the loss of the asset and/or quality and integrity; cause severe damage to key characteristic features or elements; almost complete loss of setting and/or context of the asset. The

Magnitude of Impact	Typical Criteria Descriptors
	assets integrity or setting is almost wholly destroyed or is severely compromised, such that the resource can no longer be appreciated or understood. Positive: The proposals would remove or successfully mitigate existing damaging and discordant impacts on assets; allow for the restoration or enhancement of characteristic features; allow the substantial re-establishment of the integrity, understanding and setting for an area or group of features; halt rapid degradation and/or erosion of the heritage resource, safeguarding substantial elements of the heritage resource.
Moderate	Negative: Substantial impact on the asset, but only partially affecting the integrity; partial loss of, or damage to, key characteristics, features or elements; substantially intrusive into the setting and/or would adversely impact upon the context of the asset; loss of the asset for community appreciation. The assets integrity or setting is damaged but not destroyed so understanding and appreciation is compromised. Positive: Benefit to, or restoration of, key characteristics, features or elements; improvement of asset quality; degradation of the asset would be halted; the setting and/or context of the asset would be enhanced, and understanding and appreciation is substantially improved; the asset would be bought into community use.
Slight	Negative: Some measurable change in assets quality or vulnerability; minor loss of or alteration to, one (or maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements; change to the setting would not be overly intrusive or overly diminish the context; community use or understanding would be reduced. The assets integrity or setting is damaged but understanding and appreciation would only be diminished not compromised. Positive: Minor benefit to, or partial restoration of, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements; some beneficial impact on asset or a stabilisation of negative impacts; slight improvements to the context or setting of the Site; community use or understanding and appreciation would be enhanced.
Negligible/ No Change	Negative: Very minor loss or detrimental alteration to one or more characteristics, features or elements. Minor changes to the setting or context of the Site. No discernible change in baseline conditions. Positive: Very minor benefit to or positive addition of one or more characteristics, features or elements. Minor changes to the setting or context of the Site. No discernible change in baseline conditions.

Effect Significance

7.2.1 The level of significance of the environmental effect is determined by combining the impact risk with the sensitivity of the receptors which is commensurate with the standard WYG assessment method in Chapter 2. The matrix for assessing significance of effects has been modified for this ES chapter to account for the addition of a negligible category under value and to apply a finer degree of gradation to the effect categories to better reflect the heritage value of assets (Table 7.5). In this Chapter, any magnitude of effect that is defined as being intermediate adverse/beneficial or greater is defined as being significant (Table 7.6).

7.2.2 It should be noted that the terminology used in this assessment and the ES to assess the magnitude of effect does not equate with that used in the NPPF (2019). The points below are intended to avoid confusion between the use of the 'substantial harm' as used in the NPPF (2019) in relation to designated heritage assets and 'significant effects' as used in the ES. Under the NPPF (2019), development proposals should be assessed in terms of their impact on the heritage value of the heritage asset. It should be noted that the NPPF (2019) is concerned with impact (i.e. magnitude of change) not effect.

**Table 7.5 Assessing Effect Significance for Heritage**

Significance of Effects				
Cultural Heritage Value	Magnitude of Impact			
	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Negligible / no Change
Very High	Major	Major / Intermediate	Intermediate	Minor
High	Major / Intermediate	Intermediate	Intermediate / Minor	Neutral
Medium	Intermediate	Intermediate / Minor	Minor	Neutral
Low	Intermediate / Minor	Minor	Minor / Neutral	Neutral
Negligible	Minor / Neutral	Minor / Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Table 7.6 Likely Magnitude Effect on Receptor

Likely Magnitude Effects	
Beneficial	Major: The Proposed Development would be in keeping with, and would provide a major improvement to, or reinforce the value of the receptor.
	Moderate: The scheme would be in keeping with, and would provide a noticeable improvement to, or reinforce the value of the receptor.
	Minor: The scheme would be in keeping with, and would provide a slight improvement to, or reinforce the value of the receptor.
Negligible/ Neutral	The scheme would have no effect on the value of the receptor, or would be barely perceptible/ in keeping with, and would maintain the value of the receptor.
Adverse	Minor: The Proposed Development would have a minor negative effect to the value of the receptor.
	Moderate: The Proposed Development would cause a noticeable deterioration in the value of the receptor.
	Major: The Proposed Development would cause a major deterioration in the value of the receptor.

7.2.3 By combining the sensitivity and magnitude matrices an indication of the likely magnitude effects is achieved. It is considered that the moderate to major effects are considered 'significant' in the context of the EIA Regulations.

7.2.4 Effects may be considered to be 'direct', meaning to cause physical change (e.g. alteration, extension or demolition) to the receptor as a consequence of construction or operation. Effects may also be 'indirect', whereby impact arises from the effect of activities that do not explicitly form part of the Proposed Development.

7.2.5 Effects may also occur at different times. Construction phase impacts are considered to be those associated with the demolition and construction phase. Operational phase impacts are long-term effect which are associated with the completed and operational phase of the Proposed Development. Residual effects are those which persist after the Proposed Development has ceased to operate.

7.2.6 Cumulative effects are those where the additional effect of the Proposed Development is considered in conjunction with schemes subject to material consents surrounding the Site.

7.2.7 Mitigation measures are those elements of the scheme proposed to prevent, reduce and where possible, offset any significant adverse effects identified. These are built into the development as part of the design process and are identified within this Chapter.

Limitations of the Assessment

7.2.8 Due to the subterranean nature of previously unrecorded archaeology, the limitations of this Chapter are formed by the unknown level and nature of any potential archaeology within the Site. It is also noted that access to the interior of the heritage assets such as Fort Purbrook, the Towers, the site of Farlington Redoubt and Campdown Admiralty Semaphore Station and others was not gained during the assessment of this Chapter, however this is not necessary to consider or state the level of impact to the setting of the development upon the asset from within.

7.3 Baseline Environment

Existing baseline

7.3.1 A study area of 1km buffer from the Site boundary has been examined. This study has taken into consideration the historical and archaeological background of the Site and its surroundings. The sources consulted were:

- Hampshire Historic Environment Record (HER) and Historic Buildings Record data;
- National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE) (formerly the National Monuments Record (NMR));
- Historic England for designated sites;
- Local Planning Authority for designated and non-designated heritage assets;
- Historic mapping including tithe mapping and early Ordnance Survey, and
- Previously completed assessments and secondary research including, previously completed archaeological reports for the surrounding area, regional research frameworks and grey literature and journal articles, as appropriate.

7.3.2 There are no listed buildings, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within the Site. The Site contains one Scheduled Monument covering the archaeological site of Littlepark Wood Roman villa (NHLE: 1001859). Outside the Site, there are a number of individually designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings) located within c.500m of the Site with



settings that may be affected by the Proposed Development. Table 7.7 shows all heritage assets considered in this Chapter, their heritage value, susceptibility to change and their sensitivity.

Table 7.7 Table of Heritage Assets, their values, susceptibilities and sensitivities

Designation	Heritage Receptors	Value	Susceptibility to Change	Sensitivity	Distance to proposed development site
Scheduled Monument	Littlepark Wood Roman villa	High	High	High	Within the Site
Scheduled Monument	Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery	High	Medium	Moderate/High	c.300m south
Scheduled Monument	Fort Purbrook	High	Low	Moderate	c.800m south-west
Statutory Listed Building	Fort Purbrook	High	Low	Moderate	c.800m south-west
Statutory Listed Building	Fort Purbrook, that part in Portsmouth Church Parish	High	Low	Moderate	c.940m south-west
Statutorily Listed Building	The Towers	Medium	Low	Low/Moderate	c.280m south
NDHA	Undated Roman Enclosure (HER 17272)	Low	Low	Low	
NDHA	Roman Road (HER 23328)	Low	High	Moderate	
NDHA	Roman Trackway (HER 38682)	Low	High	Moderate	
NDHA	Site of Farlington Redoubt and Camp Down Admiralty Semaphore Station	Low	Low	Low	c.180m south

Littlepark Wood Roman villa

- 7.3.3 The Roman site SW of Littlepark Wood consists of the archaeological remains of a Roman villa. It is located within the northern part of the Site, to the west side of South Downs College. The Scheduled Area is defined by a rectangular area, the extent of which has recently been revised following intrusive fieldwork by the developer in order to confirm the results of the geophysical survey and establish the extent of the villa complex. The extent has been confirmed by the Secretary of State.
- 7.3.4 The villa complex has been subject to limited excavations in 1926 and 1973 and 2018. This identified two distinct phases of construction and interpreted the south-western part of the multi-roomed building as a bath house with furnaces and hypocaust. Geophysical survey of the Site as part of the Thames Valley Archaeology Service (TVAS) investigations revealed the principal ranges of a probable courtyard villa extending beyond the boundaries of the Scheduled Area. There are also further contemporary features, including trackways, enclosures and a further masonry building, located to the south of the main villa complex. The probable line of the Roman road between Chichester (*Noviomagus*) and Bitterne (*Clausentum*) runs through the Site to the south of South Downs College, with extant earthwork remains visible through part of the route that intersects the site in an east-west orientation. The main area of archaeological interest is focused on the villa that lies to its north side. The road and the archaeological features recorded through geophysical survey are viewed as non-designated heritage assets in their own right.
- 7.3.5 As a buried archaeological site, the villa's heritage value is primarily drawn from its high evidential value. It also has a small degree of illustrative historical value related to its siting and what that can tell us in terms of the distribution of villa sites in this part of England and therefore the extent of Romano-British settlement at this date, as well as the priorities behind the siting of villas more generally, which can be linked to the site's particular topographical features and the features of Roman settlement in its vicinity.
- 7.3.6 The features identified through geophysical survey in close proximity to the villa, and the buried and earthwork remains of the Roman road form part of its setting, contributing to both its evidential value and its illustrative historical value. The setting relationship is associative, rather than visual, except in the case of the surviving earthwork remains of the Roman road, which are visible from the Scheduled Area.
- 7.3.7 The setting of the Scheduled Monument is considered to make a moderate, positive contribution to its evidential value, since it has the potential to inform on the original setting of the villa and its relationship to existing settlement features and the influence it may have had on the development of further settlement features. The Roman road was probably a key existing feature of the landscape at the time the villa was constructed, contributing to the villa being positioned where it is in relation to the road. The line of the road is marked on Ordnance Survey mapping and the extant earthworks make a moderate contribution to the small degree of illustrative historical value of the Scheduled Monument.
- 7.3.8 The Littlepark Wood Roman villa scheduled monument has a **High heritage value**, the **Susceptibility to Change is High** and the **Sensitivity is High**.

Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery

- 7.3.9 Bevis's Grave long barrow and early medieval cemetery consists of the archaeological and earthwork remains of a Neolithic long barrow and the archaeological remains of an early medieval cemetery. It is located on the top of Portsdown Hill, c.300m south of the Site. Views into the field in which the long barrow is located are limited by the density and height of boundary planting, but an indicative view was taken as part of this assessment from the field's south-east corner next to Portsdown Hill Road.
- 7.3.10 The long barrow is believed to have been partially excavated in 1815, when three inhumations, possibly Saxon, were uncovered within 12 inches of the surface of the mound (HE Pastscape). Excavations between 1974 and 1976 recorded a total of 71 graves containing 88 individuals within and adjacent to the south ditch of the long barrow. Two of the graves were orientated south-north, the remaining graves



were oriented west-east. Twenty inhumations were accompanied by grave goods, mainly knives and buckles. Radiocarbon dating of five of the inhumations indicated the cemetery originated in the 7th century and continued in use into the 9th and 10th centuries.

- 7.3.11 As a mostly buried archaeological site, the long barrow and cemetery's heritage value is primarily drawn from its high evidential value.
- 7.3.12 As the long barrow also survives partially as an earthwork feature it also has a moderate degree of illustrative historical value related to its morphology and siting. It provides information on the distribution of barrow sites in this part of England where there is a notable concentration of c.180 long barrows. This indirectly, provides the extent of Neolithic occupation in this area, as well as the priorities behind the siting of barrows more generally, which can be linked to the site's particular topographical features, being located on the crest of the hill.
- 7.3.13 The evidential value of the later burials also contributes to the site's heritage value and the presence of grave goods in association with the burials enhances this evidential value further.
- 7.3.14 The setting of the long barrow is informed by its open location in a pasture field and its topographic location at the crest Portsdown Hill. The views from the monument in all directions were likely to be an important consideration in its siting, as well as its prominence in views of the monument within the landscape. The east-west alignment of Bevis's Grave mirrors the alignment of the Portsdown ridge on which it is located. Views along the ridge may be of added importance in this case and its placement at the far eastern end of the ridge may also form part of this setting relationship.
- 7.3.15 The long barrow's later use as a focus for early medieval burial suggests that it was still a prominent feature in the landscape in the 7th-9th centuries AD. It also indicates that there was an early medieval settlement nearby. No evidence of such a settlement was uncovered during research carried out as part of the baseline archaeological desk-based assessment (Appendix 7.2).
- 7.3.16 The prominence of the monument has been diminished by its truncation, as well as the establishment of field boundaries and other vegetation in the landscape around it. This is partially true of the boundary that bisects the monument from east to west. The barrow is no longer a prominent feature in the landscape. It does, however, benefit from expansive views across the landscape including views over the Site. These allow the topographical siting of the monument to be understood. The potentially important view along the Portsdown ridge from the monument is no longer extant as the mature trees lining the site of the former Farlington Redoubt block long views westward from the monument. The green aspect of the Site and its undulating topography therefore make a moderate contribution to one aspect of the barrow's setting, contribution to part of its illustrative historical value. It should be noted, however, that the barrow's evidential value is where it derives most its heritage value.
- 7.3.17 The Bevis' Grave Neolithic Long Barrow and Early Medieval Cemetery Scheduled Monument has a **High heritage value**, the **Susceptibility to Change is Medium** and the **Sensitivity is Moderate to High**.

Fort Purbrook

- 7.3.18 The Grade II* Listed and Scheduled Fort Purbrook consists of the brick-built and earthworks of a mid-19th century fort. It is located on the crest of Portsdown Hill, to the north side of Portsdown Hill Road. It comprises the fort, together with an irregular, linear, covered way leading from the fort's north-east angle eastwards to the site of the former Farlington Redoubt. At its closest, the covered way lies c.350m south of the Site, but the fort itself is located c.800m to the south-west of the Site.
- 7.3.19 Fort Purbrook is one of a series of forts built in the 1860s to protect Portsmouth Harbour. It is one of a group of forts known as the Portsdown Forts, whose purpose was to protect the harbour from a landward attack from the north. Other groups of fortifications were constructed to protect the harbour's east and west sides and a series of island forts were also constructed in the Spithead Strait to the south of the harbour and on the Isle of Wight. The Portsdown Forts were constructed specifically to fortify this

strategic ridge such that it could not be occupied by an invading French force and used a base from which to bombard the harbour. Fort Purbrook was the furthest east of the group and its eastern flank was further strengthened by the construction of two Redoubts; Farlington Redoubt, to its east side, and Crookhorn Redoubt, whose exact location is not known, but generally to its north-east side. The fort was linked to Farlington Redoubt with a covered way, a protected path, which forms part of the scheduling.

- 7.3.20 The forts, having been completed in the 1860s, remained unarmed until the 1880s, but by 1895 fixed landward defences were no longer in favour and in 1903 the forts were declared obsolete and disarmed. Whilst the forts were pressed into service as barracks and ammunition stores for nearby anti-aircraft batteries during the first half of the 20th century, they were never used for the purpose for which they built.
- 7.3.21 The fort's heritage value is primarily drawn from its high illustrative historic value and its high aesthetic value. The former is drawn from its being a very well-preserved example of a mid-19th century fortification, providing understanding of mid-19th century military technologies, strategies of national defence, construction techniques, military accommodation, weapons technology etc. The aesthetic value is perhaps fortuitous, rather than by design; the entrance to the fort being the only area furnished with architectural embellishment. Nevertheless, the foreboding brick walls of the southern elevation and the uniformity of materials and plan across the all of the forts in the group provide them with strong historic character. The association with Lord Palmerston and the fort's status as one of 'Palmerston's Follies' also provides it with a high degree of associative historical value, whilst its will also retain a moderate degree of evidential value in the form of archaeological deposits and evidence.
- 7.3.22 Fort Purbrook was designed to defend Portsdown Hill as one of a series of defensive forts along the ridge. The perceived attack was a landward advance from the north side. The design of the forts responded to this by being constructed partially within the slope of the hill, such that the forts were not a prominent upstanding structure when viewed from the north by a potential invading force. Whereas from the south side, the forts were clearly visible with their foreboding brick facades and each were accessed from Portsdown Hill Road, which was augmented into a military road as part of the defensive system. The construction of the forts involved the compulsory purchase of over 900 acres of land mostly from Mr Thomas Thistlethwaite of Southwick Park, together with another 1000 acres, over which clearance rights were obtained in order to improve fields of fire. The clearance rights meant that no buildings could be erected that might mask the field of fire from the guns, or to give shelter to an enemy force. This 'free-fire zone' extended to the base of Portsdown Hill on the northern side of the forts. The extent of the northern limits of the clearance rights is perhaps indicated by the retention of a large area of woodland within Purbrook Park, to the north side of Fort Purbrook, which appears not have been cleared throughout its operational life. The northern slope of Portsdown Hill is therefore an important element of the setting of the fort, contributing to its illustrative historical value.
- 7.3.23 Since the fort went out of use, inter-war and post-war housing has developed to its north, north-east, south and west sides. This development has for the most part respected the area covered by the clearance rights, leaving the northern slope of Portsdown Hill free of built development. A significant area of encroachment is located to the west of the fort around London Road which severs the fort from Fort Widley to its west side. The land to the immediate north side of Fort Purbrook is used as a golf course which still allows its field of fire to be appreciated and provides a green buffer between it and development to its north side.
- 7.3.24 Aside from the field of fire the fort's setting is also informed by its relationship with the other forts along the ridge. Any visual relationship that did exist between it and Fort Widley, to the west, has been blocked by built development to that side of the fort, but to its east side, the fort is physically linked to the site of the former Farlington Redoubt by means of an overgrown covered way within the golf course. This relationship contributes to the fort's illustrative historic value. Likewise, Portsdown Hill Road, linking all of the surviving forts on their rear, south side, and its group value with the forts along the ridge, as



appreciated when travelling along that road, is an important element of the fort's illustrative historical value and aesthetic value.

- 7.3.25 The fort could not be accessed internally during the preparation of the baseline assessment, however a circuit of the fort's exterior was made which showed the southern brick-built facade of the fort to be a prominent feature in the landscape when viewed from the south, and in views when travelling along Portsdown Hill road. The ditches around the fort and the upper level of the fort, however, are overgrown scrub and mature trees such that from the immediate north side no views into the fort are possible. The overgrown nature of the fort itself, therefore, detracts from an appreciation of its landscape setting and thus also of its illustrative historical value. No views over the Site are possible from the immediate vicinity of the fort, but they are possible from the north side of the covered way. A particularly open view across the Site is possible from the north side of the covered way adjacent to the north-west corner of the Farlington Redoubt.
- 7.3.26 Although the fort was not designed to be a prominent feature in views from the north, it would still have been discernible as a manicured earthwork, possibly with some brick-built elements on display. The current overgrown nature of the fort means that none of those features are visible, but it does mean that the monument is easy to pinpoint as a distinctive clump of trees on the crest of the hill. As there are no obvious indications that the clump of trees is a heritage asset, views of the asset in the landscape from its northern side do not contribute to the asset's heritage value. From the south and east sides, however, the southern brick-built facade of the fort and the artificial earthworks forming part of its construction are a prominent feature in the landscape and the fort is also prominent in views when travelling along Portsdown Hill road which allow it to be appreciated as one of a number of forts along the ridge. As the easternmost fort, Purbrook has added heritage value in this view as the first and last of the group when travelling east and west respectively.
- 7.3.27 The fort's landscape setting is informed, therefore, by its field of fire to the north, its relationship with the other forts in the group, its relationship with the Farlington Redoubt and its relationship to Portsdown Hill Road. All of these aspects of its setting contribute to its illustrative historical value to varying degrees, but as a fortress the landscape setting of the monument is clearly a key aspect of its importance. The Site lies to its north-east side, in the valley at the base of Portsdown Hill and rising up the opposing slope of Campdown Hill. The overgrown nature of the fort also lowers the degree to which the land to its north side can make a contribution to its heritage value. The overgrown fort, combined with the local topography, severely restricts views of the Site from the vicinity of the fort, although views are possible from the north side of the overgrown covered way forming part of the scheduled area. The Site is therefore assessed as making a negligible, positive contribution to the illustrative historic value and, hence, the heritage value of the fort.
- 7.3.28 The Fort Purbrook scheduled monument has a **High heritage value**, the **Susceptibility to Change is Medium** and the **Sensitivity is Moderate to High**.
- The Towers*
- 7.3.29 'The Towers' is an early 19th century house constructed in the style of a Tudor castle. It is brick-built and comprises a main block of 2 storeys, with an eastern extension, and a 3-storey west tower. The building has a crenellated parapet, pointed arches and heavy cusping to the windows and some stucco features to the ground floor. The tower has a mock-machicolated parapet. The house is now run as a residential Care Home.
- 7.3.30 The building appears to have been known as 'Belmont Castle' originally. A building is marked as such on Greenwood's map of Hampshire in 1826. It was partly built as a belvedere in the grounds of Belmont Park, a large estate that existed to its east side, focused on the now-demolished Belmont House. The 1826 map shows the building with a stand of woodland to its north side and a roadway (now Portsdown Hill Road) to its south side. This situation prevails through the Bedhampton Tithe map of 1842 and the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1866 which both provide further detail of the immediate and wider setting of the building. The 1st Edition Ordnance Survey shows Belmont House located c.800m to the east-north-east of Belmont Castle. The map shows Belmont House surrounded by its pleasure garden, with a probable walled garden to its west side. The walled garden gives access onto a tree-line avenue running further west towards woodland labelled as 'Belmont Coppice'. The Coppice and Belmont Castle appear to be the parkland features lying furthest to the west of the House, although a line of trees situated between Belmont House and Belmont Castle suggests that there was not a direct line of sight between the two. Belmont Castle is shown on the 1866 map as lying within a larger rectangular plot, possibly a paddock, with a more formal garden at its core, both containing tree planting. There is a possible lodge to the building's west side.
- 7.3.31 The building's heritage value is primarily drawn from its high aesthetic value, although it also retains illustrative historical value and associative historical value to a lesser degree. The house's illustrative historical value relates to its former use as a belvedere and parkland feature of the now-demolished Belmont House. This latter value contributes less to its heritage value than its aesthetic value due to Belmont House having been demolished and remainder of its parkland having been built over in the post-war period. The house's associative historical value is related to its former occupation by the Royal Navy as well as, perhaps, to its former owners and occupiers and the former owners and occupiers of the main Belmont House. These latter aspects of the building's value were not investigated further as they would be unaffected by development within the landscape adjacent to the building.
- 7.3.32 The wider parkland setting in which the building was constructed has been systematically built over in the post-war period and the main house to which it was subservient has been demolished. This aspect of the building's original setting has therefore been lost and cannot contribute to the building's illustrative historical value. The immediate setting of the building, comprising its garden and wider rectangular paddock has survived, however, and provides the building with a pleasant enclosed setting, still used by the residents of the care home. This contributes to its aesthetic value.
- 7.3.33 As a former belvedere, the building was designed to take advantage of a fine scenic view. Considering that the view to the north-east from The Towers would have overlooked the formal parkland associated with Belmont House and articulated the relationship between the two, although the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey map suggests that there may not have been a direct line of sight between the two by 1866. Likewise, the views to the south of the belvedere would be an expansive coastal view from the building's elevated position on Portsdown Hill and was probably more important to its position than the view back towards Belmont House. The views north now overlook the pasture fields interspersed with stands of mature trees, leading to the undulating fields comprising the Site. The mature trees within the garden and possible paddock area to the north of The Towers partially screen these views. The views to the south over the coast now overlook housing built to the south side of Portsdown Hill Road; however, it is likely the views from The Towers' upper levels will oversail the housing due to the local topography. These landscape views contribute to the building's aesthetic value, as well as contributing to its illustrative historical value, in giving an indication as to why the building was placed where it is, despite the loss of the former parkland. The views to the south are considered to contribute more to the asset's heritage value than those to the north, which are not only changed from their original form with the removal of Belmont House, but which are also not partially screened by mature trees within the building's garden and paddock area.
- 7.3.34 The building's immediate setting is informed by its relationship with Portsdown Road, its rendered enclosing wall and gate piers which appear later than the building, a gazebo to its east side, and its garden to the north containing mature trees and formal planting. All of these features contribute to the asset's aesthetic value and create a tranquil enclosed feel that suits its current use as a care home. Views of the Site are limited from within the immediate setting of the building by mature trees planted within the garden.



7.3.35 The setting of The Towers is therefore varied and complex in terms of the number of aspects of its setting that contribute to its heritage value and in terms of how they contributed originally how they contribute now. A minor contribution to one aspect of the building's setting, demonstrating its aesthetic and illustrative historical values, is made by the green aspect of the Site in views to the north and north-west of the building, although these views are partially screened by mature trees within the building's immediate setting.

7.3.36 The Grade II listed The Towers has a **Medium heritage value**, the **Susceptibility to Change is Low** and the **Sensitivity is Low to Moderate**.

Undated Roman Enclosure (HER 17272)

7.3.37 Lying outside the Site, and identified through historic aerial photographs, and through association with sherds of Roman pottery found in the vicinity, it is unclear what this enclosure is, what purpose it served, to what degree any archaeology has survived, and in what condition any archaeology is in.

7.3.38 However, considering the proximity of the Roman villa to the north, together with the Roman Road, it is considered that the potential Heritage Value of the undated Roman enclosure would be a **Medium heritage value**, with a **Medium Susceptibility to Change**, and a **Moderate Sensitivity**.

Roman Road (HER 23328)

7.3.39 A section of the road between Chichester and Bitterne intersects the Site in a north-west to south-east alignment to the south of the villa and its course appears to show as a slight earthwork, with part of the asset included under the revised scheduling for the Roman villa.

7.3.40 It is considered that the potential Heritage Value of the Roman Road is a **High heritage value**, with a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and a **High Sensitivity**.

Roman Trackway (HER 38682)

7.3.41 Another road has been excavated to the north-east of the villa and interpreted as a possible service road. However, as this has already been excavated, it is unlikely that further archaeological resource is present. As such, this Roman trackway is considered as having a **Low heritage value**, with a **Low Susceptibility to Change**, and a **Low Sensitivity**.

Site of Farlington Redoubt and Camp Down Admiralty Semaphore Station

7.3.42 The site of Farlington Redoubt comprises the quarried-out outline of the former Redoubt constructed in the 1860s. It is now in use as a waste transfer station. It is located on the crest of Portsdown Hill, to the north side of Portsdown Hill Road c.180m south of the Site. The former Redoubt has been entirely destroyed and the site is not designated. Forming part of the system of defences constructed along the Portsdown ridge in the 1860s to protect Portsmouth Harbour, its purpose was to protect the eastern flank of Fort Purbrook, working in tandem with Crookhorn Redoubt located somewhere to its north-west side. Farlington was linked to Fort Purbrook by means of a covered way which forms part of the Fort Purbrook Scheduled Monument. The Redoubt was eventually fitted with a compliment of seven guns and a main magazine, however, a barracks that was supposed to be constructed within the Redoubt was never built. After the Second World War the redoubt became little more than a quarry and it was finally demolished in the 1970s. All that remains of the Redoubt is the ghost of its outline plan marked by boundary planting screening the waste transfer station.

7.3.43 Farlington Redoubt is said to have occupied the site of a former Admiralty Semaphore Telegraph which had occupied the site between 1821 and 1860, replacing an earlier shutter-telegraph system. It was linked with Compton Telegraph station and Lumps Fort, conveying messages to Portsmouth harbour. However, the historic maps provided in the archaeological desk-based assessment indicate that the

semaphore was located on the south side of Portsdown Hill Road. A building marked 'Semaphore' is shown on Greenwood's map of 1826, the Bedhampton Tithe map on 1842 and the 1st Edition Ordnance Survey Map of 1866 on the south side of the road, not in the location later occupied by Farlington Redoubt. By the 2nd Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1895-6 the Semaphore is no longer depicted.

7.3.44 The heritage value of the site has been almost entirely destroyed by the systematic demolition of the Redoubt. The demolition and quarrying of the site has removed any evidential value that the site would have retained; however, the site is considered to retain a negligible level of illustrative historical value in so far as its outline is still present in the landscape, contributing to the understanding of Fort Purbrook to its west side. It also has associated historical value as part of Fort Purbrook.

7.3.45 Farlington Redoubt was designed to defend Fort Purbrook's eastern flank. Similar to the forts themselves, the perceived attack on the Redoubt was a landward advance from the north and east sides, and also similar to the forts, the creation of the Redoubt involved the compulsory purchase of land and clearance rights over other areas in order to improve fields of fire. The clearance rights extended to the base of Portsdown Hill on the north side. Some evidence perhaps related to the clearance of trees from the field of fire in the wider landscape around the Farlington Redoubt is provided by comparison of the 1st Edition Ordnance survey map of 1866 and the 2nd Edition map of 1895-6. The northern slope of Portsdown Hill is therefore an important element of the setting of the Redoubt, contributing to its illustrative historical value.

7.3.46 Since the Redoubt went out of use, the majority of its field of fire has remained free of built development; the only notable exception being the creation of the A3 to its east side. The view northwards towards the Site overlooks the golf course on the northern slope of Portsdown Hill, before the ground rises up the opposing slope where the Site is located.

7.3.47 Aside from the field of fire, the Redoubt's setting is also informed by its relationship with Fort Purbrook, westwards along the ridge and the physical link between the two provided by the covered way articulates this relationship. In the same way that the former Redoubt contributes to the setting of the fort, the fort therefore contributes to the setting of the Redoubt. As a largely destroyed feature, the Redoubt draws much of its illustrative historical value, and hence its heritage value, from this relationship and its wider landscape setting.

7.3.48 The non-designated site of Farlington Redoubt has a **Low heritage value**, the **Susceptibility to Change is Low** and the **Sensitivity is Low**.

Potential for unrecorded Archaeology

7.3.49 Given the proximity of the Neolithic long barrow, together with already known archaeological findspots both within and adjacent to the Site, the potential for unrecorded prehistoric heritage assets is **Moderate**. Without knowing what prehistoric assets may lie within the Site, no assessment of heritage value can be provided, although it is likely that they would have a **Low to Medium Heritage Value**. Any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Moderate to High Sensitivity to Change**.

7.3.50 With several Iron Age assets being identified within the proximity of the Site on the HER, there is a **High** potential for previously unrecorded Iron Age archaeology within the Site. Without knowing what Iron Age assets may lie within the Site, no assessment of heritage value can be provided, although it is likely that they would have a **Low to Medium Heritage Value**. Any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Moderate to High Sensitivity to Change**.

7.3.51 With the Roman villa sited within the northern part of the Site, together with various additional Roman assets, including the Roman Road, trackways and other associated features identified during geophysical survey, there is a **High** potential for previously unrecorded Roman archaeology within the Site. Without knowing what Roman assets may lie within the Site, although it is likely that they would have at least a



Medium Heritage Value. Any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Moderate to High Sensitivity to Change**.

- 7.3.52 Save for the military archaeology around the Site, there is a **Low** potential for Medieval, Post-Medieval or Modern archaeological assets within the Site. However, without knowing what such assets may lie within the Site, no assessment of heritage value can be provided, although any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Magnitude of Impact** would be **Substantial**.

7.4 Mitigation within the Submitted Design

- 7.4.1 As set out in Chapter 3 of this Statement, 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. A phased approach to construction will also limit the duration of effects within the immediate settings of heritage assets.
- 7.4.2 The Proposed Development has been off set from the Littlewood Park Roman Villa, thereby ensuring the physical preservation of this archaeological resource. Additional, archaeological design mitigation measures include the alignment of internal road to match the route of the Roman Road and fronting buildings towards the Schedule Monument.

7.5 Likely Significant Environmental Effects of the Scheme

Construction Phase Effects

- 7.5.1 During the Construction Phase, the potential for direct effects on the heritage value of heritage assets arises out of physical removal of heritage assets, in particular archaeological features. Such effects would be permanent. Indirect effects may affect the setting of 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

- 7.5.2 Littlepark Wood Roman villa scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **High**.
- 7.5.3 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with a **temporary Intermediate to Minor adverse significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Minor Adverse** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery

- 7.5.4 Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Medium** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate to High**.
- 7.5.5 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Fort Purbrook

- 7.5.6 Fort Purbrook scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **Medium** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate to High**.

- 7.5.7 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with a **temporary Intermediate to Minor adverse significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Minor Adverse** which is **not considered to be significant**.

The Towers

- 7.5.8 The Grade II listed The Towers has **Medium** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low to Moderate**.
- 7.5.9 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Undated Roman Enclosure (HER 17272)

- 7.5.10 The Undated Roman Enclosure has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.
- 7.5.11 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Roman Road (HER 23328)

- 7.5.12 The Roman Road has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate**. Design mitigation within the Proposed Development includes the alignment of the road echoing the axis of the Roman Road, thereby ensuring its route and alignment is retained within the scheme.
- 7.5.13 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with a **temporary Minor Adverse to Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Negligible/ Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Roman Trackway (HER 38682)

- 7.5.14 The Roman Trackway has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.
- 7.5.15 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **permanent Neutral significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Site of Farlington Redoubt and Camp Down Admiralty Semaphore Station

- 7.5.16 The site of Farlington Redoubt has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.
- 7.5.17 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **permanent Neutral significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Potential for unrecorded Archaeology

- 7.5.18 Potential unrecorded prehistoric heritage assets on the Site are likely to have a **Low to Medium Heritage Value**. Any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Moderate to High Sensitivity to Change**.
- 7.5.19 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Substantial**, with a **permanent Intermediate significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Major** which is **considered to be significant**.



- 7.5.20 Potential unrecorded Iron Age assets are likely to have a **Low to Medium Heritage Value**. Any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Moderate to High Sensitivity to Change**.
- 7.5.21 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Substantial**, with a **permanent Intermediate significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Major** which is **considered to be significant**.
- 7.5.22 The potential for additional previously unrecorded Roman assets are likely to have at least a **Medium Heritage Value**. Any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Moderate to High Sensitivity to Change**.
- 7.5.23 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Substantial**, with a **permanent Intermediate significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Major** which is **considered to be significant**.

Operational Phase Effects

- 7.5.24 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.
- 7.5.25 No additional effects are identified for potential previously unrecorded archaeological assets, as these will have been removed during the Construction Phase.

Littlepark Wood Roman villa

- 7.5.26 Littlepark Wood Roman villa scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **High**.
- 7.5.27 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with a **permanent Intermediate to Minor adverse significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Minor to Intermediate Adverse** which is **considered to be significant**.

Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery

- 7.5.28 Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Medium** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate to High**.
- 7.5.29 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **permanent Neutral significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Fort Purbrook

- 7.5.30 Fort Purbrook scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **Medium** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate to High**.
- 7.5.31 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with a **permanent Intermediate to Minor adverse significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Minor Adverse** which is **not considered to be significant**.

The Towers

- 7.5.32 The Grade II listed The Towers has **Medium** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low to Moderate**.
- 7.5.33 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **permanent Neutral significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Undated Roman Enclosure (HER 17272)

- 7.5.34 The Undated Roman Enclosure has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.
- 7.5.35 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **permanent Neutral significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Roman Road (HER 23328)

- 7.5.36 The Roman Road has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate**. Design mitigation within the Proposed Development includes the alignment of the road echoing the axis of the Roman Road, thereby ensuring its route and alignment is retained within the scheme.
- 7.5.37 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with a **permanent Minor Adverse to Neutral significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Negligible/ Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Roman Trackway (HER 38682)

- 7.5.38 The Roman Trackway has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.
- 7.5.39 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **permanent Neutral significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Site of Farlington Redoubt and Camp Down Admiralty Semaphore Station

- 7.5.40 The site of Farlington Redoubt has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.
- 7.5.41 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with a **permanent Neutral significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

7.6 Additional Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Measures

- 7.6.1 Significant adverse effects during the Construction Phase would result from the unmitigated loss of the archaeological assets identified or potentially present within the Site.
- 7.6.2 Specific mitigation measures are proposed for this effect only.
- 7.6.3 An unmitigated significant adverse effect on the setting and heritage value of the Littlepark Wood Roman villa through development within its setting has been identified. Specific mitigation measures are proposed for this effect only.

Construction Phase

- 7.6.4 The physical loss of archaeological assets during the construction phase will be offset by a phased programme of archaeological works focused on the southern area. This will comprise further evaluation work to verify and augment the results of the geophysical survey and inform the scope of subsequent archaeological mitigation, which is likely to comprise archaeological excavation, recording and analysis. In the unlikely event that archaeology meriting preservation *in situ* is identified, this may be achieved by amending the detailed design of the development.



- 7.6.5 Details of the scheme of archaeological recording can be agreed with the LPA's archaeological advisors. Given the results of the geophysical survey and archaeological evaluation undertaken, it is considered that such work could be undertaken post-consent, secured by planning condition.

Operational Phase

- 7.7.6 The archaeological investigations undertaken as mitigation for the Construction Phase will assist in further professional understanding of the context and heritage values of the villa, which will be further enhanced by the retention of open space within which the community can increase their understanding and awareness of the heritage asset.

7.7 Assessment Summary and Likely Significant Residual Environmental Effects

Construction Phase

Littlepark Wood Roman villa

- 7.7.1 Littlepark Wood Roman villa scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **High**.
- 7.7.2 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with and a **temporary Intermediate to Minor adverse significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Minor Adverse** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery

- 7.7.3 Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Medium** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate to High**.
- 7.7.4 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with and a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Fort Purbrook

- 7.7.5 Fort Purbrook scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **Medium** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate to High**.
- 7.7.6 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with and a **temporary Intermediate to Minor adverse significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Minor Adverse** which is **not considered to be significant**.

The Towers

- 7.7.7 The Grade II listed The Towers has **Medium** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low to Moderate**.
- 7.7.8 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with and a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Undated Roman Enclosure (HER 17272)

- 7.7.9 The Undated Roman Enclosure has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.
- 7.7.10 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with and a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Roman Road (HER 23328)

- 7.7.11 The Roman Road has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate**. Design mitigation within the Proposed Development includes the alignment of the road along the axis of the Roman Road, thereby ensuring its route and alignment is retained within the scheme.
- 7.7.12 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with and a **temporary Minor Adverse to Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Negligible/ Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Roman Trackway (HER 38682)

- 7.7.13 The Roman Trackway has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate**.
- 7.7.14 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with and a **temporary Minor Adverse to Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Negligible/ Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Site of Farlington Redoubt and Camp Down Admiralty Semaphore Station

- 7.7.15 The site of Farlington Redoubt has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.
- 7.7.16 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with and a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Potential for unrecorded Archaeology

- 7.7.17 Potential unrecorded prehistoric heritage assets on the Site are likely to have a **Low to Medium Heritage Value**. Any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Moderate to High Sensitivity to Change**.
- 7.7.18 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight to Moderate**, with a **permanent Minor significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Major** which is **considered to be significant**.
- 7.7.19 Potential unrecorded Iron Age assets are likely to have a **Low to Medium Heritage Value**. Any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Moderate to High Sensitivity to Change**.
- 7.7.20 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Substantial**, with a **permanent Intermediate significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Major** which is **considered to be significant**.
- 7.7.21 The potential for additional previously unrecorded Roman assets are likely to have at least a **Medium Heritage Value**. Any such archaeological assets would have a **High Susceptibility to Change**, and the **Moderate to High Sensitivity to Change**.
- 7.7.22 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Substantial**, with a **permanent Intermediate significance of effect**. The likely unmitigated **magnitude of effect** is **Major** which is **considered to be significant**.

Operational Phase

Littlepark Wood Roman villa

- 7.7.23 Littlepark Wood Roman villa scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **High**.



- 7.7.24 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with and a **temporary Intermediate to Minor adverse significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Minor Adverse** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery

- 7.7.25 Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Medium** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate to High**.

- 7.7.26 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with and a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Fort Purbrook

- 7.7.27 Fort Purbrook scheduled monument has **High** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **Medium** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate to High**.

- 7.7.28 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with and a **temporary Intermediate to Minor adverse significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Minor Adverse** which is **not considered to be significant**.

The Towers

- 7.7.29 The Grade II listed The Towers has **Medium** heritage value. Its **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low to Moderate**.

- 7.7.30 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with and a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Undated Roman Enclosure (HER 17272)

- 7.7.31 The Undated Roman Enclosure has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.

- 7.7.32 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with and a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Roman Road (HER 23328)

- 7.7.33 The Roman Road has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate**. Design mitigation within the Proposed Development includes the alignment of the road along the axis of the Roman Road, thereby ensuring its route and alignment is retained within the scheme.

- 7.7.34 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with and a **temporary Minor Adverse to Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Negligible/ Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Roman Trackway (HER 38682)

- 7.7.35 The Roman Trackway has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **High** and **Sensitivity** is **Moderate**.

- 7.7.36 The **magnitude of impact** would be **Slight Negative**, with and a **temporary Minor Adverse to Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Negligible/ Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Site of Farlington Redoubt and Camp Down Admiralty Semaphore Station

- 7.7.37 The site of Farlington Redoubt has **Low** heritage value. The **Susceptibility to Change** is **Low** and **Sensitivity** is **Low**.

- 7.7.38 The **magnitude of impact** would be **No Change**, with and a **temporary Neutral significance of effect**. The likely **magnitude of effect** is **Neutral** which is **not considered to be significant**.

Potential for unrecorded Archaeology

- 7.7.39 As the Construction Phase would see the removal of any potential previously unrecorded heritage assets within the Site, there will be no Operational effects on any previously undiscovered archaeological heritage assets.



Table 7.8 Assessment Summary and Residual Environmental Effects (Archaeology and Cultural Heritage)

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							
<i>Littlepark Wood Roman villa</i> Alteration to setting 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.	High	Slight Negative	Temporary Intermediate to Minor Adverse	Construction Management Plan	Slight Negative	Temporary Minor Adverse	High
<i>Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery</i> Alteration to setting 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.	Moderate	No Change	Temporary Neutral	Construction Management Plan	No Change	Temporary Neutral	High
<i>Fort Purbrook</i> Alteration to setting 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.	Moderate	Slight Negative	Temporary Intermediate to Minor Adverse	Construction Management Plan	Slight Negative	Temporary Minor Adverse	High



<i>The Towers</i> Alteration to setting 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.	Moderate	No Change	Temporary Neutral	Construction Management Plan	No Change	Temporary Neutral	High
<i>Undated Roman Enclosure (HER 17272)</i> Alteration to setting 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.	Low	No Change	Temporary Neutral	Construction Management Plan	No Change	Temporary Neutral	High
<i>Roman Road (HER 23328)</i> Alteration to setting 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.	Moderate	Slight Negative	Temporary Minor Adverse to Neutral	N/A	Slight Negative	Temporary Negligible/Neutral	High
<i>Roman Trackway (HER 38682)</i> Alteration to setting 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	Moderate	Slight Negative	Temporary Minor Adverse to Neutral	N/A	Slight Negative	Temporary Negligible/Neutral	High



associated structures and vehicles.							
<i>Site of Farlington Redoubt and Camp Down Admiralty Semaphore Station</i> Alteration to setting 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.	Low	No Change	Temporary Neutral	N/A	No Change	Temporary Neutral	High
<i>Potential for unrecorded Archaeology</i> Removal of archaeological resources	Medium to Low	Substantial	Permanent Major Adverse	Archaeological investigation	Substantial	Permanent Major	High
Operation							
<i>Littlepark Wood Roman villa</i> Alteration to setting through new development.	High	Slight Negative	Permanent Intermediate to Minor Adverse	Information and data from archaeological investigations made available to public	Slight Negative	Permanent Minor Adverse	High
<i>Bevis' Grave Neolithic long barrow and early medieval cemetery</i> Alteration to setting through new development.	Moderate	No Change	Permanent Neutral	N/A	No Change	Permanent Neutral	High



Fort Purbrook Alteration to setting through new development.	Moderate	Slight Negative	Permanent Intermediate to Minor Adverse	N/A	Slight Negative	Permanent Intermediate to Minor Adverse	High
The Towers Alteration to setting through new development.	Moderate	No Change	Permanent Neutral	N/A	No Change	Permanent Neutral	High
Undated Roman Enclosure (HER 17272) Alteration to setting through new development.	Low	No Change	Permanent Neutral	N/A	No Change	Permanent Neutral	High
Roman Road (HER 23328) Alteration to setting through new development.	Moderate	Slight Negative	Permanent Minor Adverse to Neutral	N/A	Slight Negative	Permanent Minor Adverse to Neutral	High
Roman Trackway (HER 38682) Alteration to setting through new development.	Moderate	Slight Negative	Permanent Minor Adverse to Neutral	N/A	Slight Negative	Permanent Minor Adverse to Neutral	High



Site of Farlington Redoubt and Camp Down Admiralty Semaphore Station Alteration to setting through new development.	Low	No Change	Permanent Neutral	N/A	No Change	Permanent Neutral	High
--	-----	-----------	-------------------	-----	-----------	-------------------	------



Table 7.9 Means by which Additional Mitigation Measure may be Secured (Archaeology and Cultural Heritage)

Identified Effect where additional mitigation (Not design mitigation) has been identified	Type of mitigation measures (avoidance, reduction, compensation, enhancement)	Means by which mitigation measure may be secured
Construction		
Loss of potential previously unknown archaeology	Archaeological investigation, the scope of which to be agreed with LPA and County Archaeologist	Archaeological excavation secured by condition
Negative effect of groundworks on identified heritage assets within site	Set piece archaeological excavation, strip, map and excavation, monitoring or preservation in situ as appropriate the scope of which to be agreed with LPA and County Archaeologist	Secured by condition
Operation		
Loss of open setting to Scheduled villa	Additional information and data from archaeological investigations made public to increase public awareness and understanding	Secured by condition

7.8 References

AOC Archaeology Group, 2019. Land at Campdown, Havant, Hampshire: An Archaeological Interim Evaluation Report

Department for Communities and Local Government (2014) Planning Practice Guidance (updated 2019).

Dicks, J., 2011. The Economic and Social Status of Romano-British Rural Villas in Southern England, University of Southampton, Faculty of Archaeology, PhD Thesis

English Heritage (2008) Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment.

Her Majesty’s Stationery Office (1990) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Historic England (2017) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets.

Historic England, 2019. Roman villa and section of Roman road south-west of Littlepark Wood [online] Available from: <<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001859>>

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2019) National Planning Policy Framework.

Thames Valley Archaeological Services (TVAS) Land at College Road, Campdown, Purbrook, Portsmouth, Hampshire Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, 2016

Thames Valley Archaeological Services, 2016. Land at College Road, Campdown, Purbrook, Portsmouth, Hampshire: Geophysical Survey (Magnetic).

WYG Heritage Statement - Land at College Road, Campdown, Purbrook, Portsmouth, Hampshire, 2019

7.9 Glossary

Term	Definition
Designated Heritage Asset	A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.
Heritage Asset	A building, monument, site, place or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified the by the local planning authority.
Significance (of a heritage asset)/heritage value	The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage value/interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage assets physical presence but also from its setting.
Setting	The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the heritage asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the heritage asset’s significance, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance, or may be neutral.
Archaeological Interest	There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially may hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source off evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them