



12.0 Cultural Heritage

12.1 Introduction

- 12.1.1 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. The chapter details the methodology followed, and provides a review of the baseline cultural heritage features and resources of the Site and study area, together with an assessment of their value.
- 12.1.2 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.
- 12.1.3 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 750m buffer radius from the edge of the Site boundary has been examined to assess the nature of the surrounding cultural heritage sites and place the recorded sites within their context. This study area was defined in consultation with the Senior Archaeologist from the Dorset Historic Environment Record.

12.2 Methodology and Scope

Policy Background

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

- 12.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's national planning policies including those on the conservation of the historic environment. The NPPF covers all aspects of the historic environment and heritage assets, including designated assets (World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields) and non-designated assets. The NPPF draws attention to the benefits that conserving the historic environment can bring to the wider objectives of the NPPF in relation to sustainability, economic benefits and place-making (para 126).
- 12.2.2 The NPPF states that the significance of heritage assets (including their settings) should be identified, described and the impact of the proposal on the significance of the asset should be assessed. The planning application should include sufficient information to enable the impact of proposals on significance to be assessed, and thus where desk-based research is insufficient to assess the interest, field evaluation may also be required. The NPPF identifies that the requirements for assessment and mitigation of impacts on heritage assets should be proportional to their significance and the potential impact (para 128).
- 12.2.3 The NPPF sets out the approach local authorities should adopt in assessing development proposals within the context of applications for development of both designated and non-designated assets. Great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and harm or loss to significance through alteration or destruction should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and

World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional (para 132). Additional guidance is given on the consideration of elements within World Heritage Sites and Conservation Areas (para 138).

- 12.2.4 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 (para 133). Where there is less than substantial harm the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development (para 134). Balanced judgements should be made when weighing applications that affect non-designated heritage assets (para 134). The NPPF also makes provision to allow enabling development (para 140) and allowing development which enhances World Heritage Sites and Conservation Areas (para 127).
- 12.2.5 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 (para 141).

Planning Practice Guidance (2014)

- 12.2.6 The NPPF is supported by Planning Practice Guidance on Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment (2014). This provides further information on how to interpret and apply the NPPF in practice and the relationship to the legislative framework for planning and the historic environment. Of relevance to the Proposed Development is the following guidance:
- Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals.
 - Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore, be more extensive than its curtilage. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not.
 - A thorough assessment on the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.
 - Views of and from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.
 - The implications for cumulative change to the setting of a heritage asset may need to be considered.
 - The assessment has considered the significance of heritage assets which may be affected by the Proposed Development and the potential effects upon that significance. Where the Proposed Development may affect heritage assets, mitigation measures have been proposed to record the asset and mitigate the effects on significance.

North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2016)

- 12.2.7 A new local plan was adopted by North Dorset District Council in January 2016, replacing a large number of policies in The North Dorset District-Wide Local Plan 2003. While a number of policies in the earlier



plan remain current, none pertain to heritage issues within or near the Proposed Development. Three policies in the revised Local Plan relate to heritage issues for the Proposed Development:

- Policy 5 – The Historic Environment
- Policy 21 – Gillingham Southern Extension

12.2.8 These policies support the appropriate assessment of remains leading to necessary protection of and mitigation of impact on heritage assets.

Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan Draft (2016)

12.2.9 A Neighbourhood Plan has been drafted by the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan Group, supported by Gillingham Town Council, the Three Rivers Partnership and North Dorset District Council. It covers Housing, Economy, Community Facilities, Retail and Town Centre Uses, Transport, Green and Urban Spaces, Design and Heritage. Once approved by referendum and adopted by North Dorset District Council it will be incorporated within the development plan for North Dorset. Two policies in the draft Neighbourhood Plan relate to heritage issues for the Proposed Development:

- Policy 24 – The pattern and shape of development
- Policy 28 – Protection of locally important heritage assets

12.2.10 These policies support the appropriate assessment of remains leading to necessary protection of and mitigation of impact on heritage assets.

Key Legislation

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979)

12.2.11 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.ⁱ

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990)

12.2.12 The Act outlines the provisions for designation, control of works and enforcement measures relating to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. Section 66 of the Act states that the planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of any Listed Building that may be affected by the grant of planning permission. Section 72 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.ⁱⁱ

Scoping Assessment Stage

12.2.13 A scoping response was received in relation to a proposed mixed-use sustainable urban extension on land south of Gillingham New Road from Robert Lennis, Major Projects Office at North Dorset District Council on 12th December 2014. It should be noted that Historic England have also provided an informal response, albeit one not directly related to the Proposed Development.

12.2.14 A full response to the consultee comments is included in the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Section of Chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment Approach.

12.2.15 The consultee response highlighted a high potential for unrecorded archaeological remains to be present on a site of such size, in proximity to a historic town, with known remains nearby. It also highlighted the range of designated built heritage in the surrounding area, noting King’s Court Palace moated site and Gillingham Deer Park Pale in particular, the settings of which could potentially be impacted upon by the Proposed Development. These points are addressed within this ES chapter and Technical Appendix 12.1.

12.2.16 Historic England have separately emphasised the need to assess the setting of Gillingham Deer Park Pale and other designated heritage assets within the wider historic landscape.

Assessment Methodology

12.2.17 Assessment of effects has been carried out through the consideration of baseline conditions in relation to the elements of the scheme that could cause cultural heritage effects. Baseline conditions are defined as the existing environmental conditions and in applicable cases, the conditions that would develop in the future without the scheme.

12.2.18 The assessment of effects has been carried out in accordance with the methodology outlined in Chapter 2. No standard method of evaluation and assessment is provided for the assessment of significance of effects upon cultural heritage, therefore a set of evaluation and assessment criteria have been developed using a combination of the Secretary of State’s criteria for Scheduling Monuments (Scheduled Monument Statement)ⁱⁱⁱ, Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB^{iv} and Transport Analysis Guidance^v. Guidance from the Historic Good Practice Advice Note in Planning No. 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets^{vi} has also been used to inform the consideration of attributes that may contribute to the setting and significance of an asset (step 2 considered in assessing heritage value, Table 12.1) and attributes of the development which may affect the setting (step 3 considered in assessing magnitude of impact, Table 12.2).

12.2.19 Professional judgement is used in conjunction with these criteria to undertake the assessment of effects. The criteria for assessing value and magnitude of change are outlined below.

Receptor Sensitivity

Table 12.1 Receptor Sensitivity: Assessing 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. Grade I Listed Buildings and built heritage of exceptional quality. Grade I 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).
High	Scheduled Monuments, or assets of national quality and importance or that can contribute to national research objectives. Grade II* and 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* and 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).



Value	Examples
Medium	Designated or undesignated assets of regional quality and importance that contribute to regional research objectives. Locally Listed Buildings, other Conservation Areas, historic buildings that can be shown to have good qualities in their fabric or historical association. Designated or undesignated 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	Undesignated 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. 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.

Table 12.2 Effect Magnitude: 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 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 brought into community use.

Magnitude of Impact	Typical Criteria Descriptors
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

- 12.2.20 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 the cultural heritage 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 significance of assets. In some cases in Table 12.3 the significance is shown as being one of two alternatives. In these cases a single description should be decided upon with reasoned judgement for that level of significance chosen. In this chapter, any significance of effect that is defined as being intermediate adverse/beneficial or greater is defined as being significant (Table 12.3).
- 12.2.21 It should be noted that the terminology used in this assessment and the ES to assess the significance of effect does not equate with that used in NPPF. The points below are intended to avoid confusion between the use of the 'substantial harm' as used in NPPF in relation to designated heritage assets and 'significant effects' as used in the ES. Under NPPF, development proposals should be assessed in terms of their impact on the heritage significance of the asset. It should be noted that NPPF is concerned with impact (i.e. magnitude of change) not effect. For the purposes of this assessment, a 'substantial negative' magnitude of change on a designated asset would equate to 'substantial harm' to a designated heritage asset. Moderate, slight and negligible negative magnitudes of change constitute 'less than substantial harm'.
- 12.2.22 For the assessment of the effects on the setting of designated sites within a 750m study area of the Proposed Development boundary, the Historic England good practice guidance, The Setting of Heritage Assets^{vii}, has been used. The guidance identifies a staged approach for the assessment of the impact of development upon the setting of heritage assets which includes: the identification of assets which having setting which could potentially be impacted upon by the Proposed Development, and therefore requiring evaluation under this methodology in accordance with Step 1; the contribution setting makes to the significance of the asset is described in Step 2 and the effect of the Proposed Development is outlined in Step 3; the consideration of maximising enhancement and minimising harm is considered in Step 4; and



Step 5 relates to the decision making, documentation and monitoring of the outcomes and will be secured through planning conditions.

12.2.23 In accordance with this guidance, 1 Scheduled Monument, 2 Grade II Listed Building and 2 groups of non-designated historic buildings Grade II Listed Buildings were identified in the Baseline Assessment as having settings which could potentially be impacted upon by the Proposed Development (Technical Appendix 12.1 Section 10.3). In each case, due to the varying sensitivity of their settings, the development proposals will result in some degree of negative impact upon the settings of these assets – these impacts are discussed in this chapter. The remaining designated sites were not considered to be adversely affected by the Proposed Development, and are therefore not discussed in this chapter (refer to Technical Appendix 12.1 Section 10.2).

Table 12.3 Significance of Effect Matrix: Assessing Effect Significance for Heritage

Significance of Effects	Magnitude of Impact			
	Cultural Heritage Value	Substantial	Moderate	Slight
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

Limitations of the Assessment

12.2.24 Not all Listed Buildings assessed as part of the Setting Assessment were publicly accessible during the walkover survey, and therefore the assessment was partially completed from public rights of way and highways. However, sufficient information is available to confidently assess the significance of the assets and this is not considered to be a significant limitation on assessing the potential impact of the Proposed Development upon these assets.

12.3 Baseline Environment

Existing baseline

12.3.1 A baseline assessment was completed by WYG in 2017 and is included as Technical Appendix 12.1^{viii}. The baseline assessment identified evidence for potential archaeological remains within the Site. The baseline assessment identified that the Proposed Development would be visible from a number of designated (Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments) and therefore, their settings may be affected.

12.3.2 The Park Farm area of the Site was also the subject of an earlier desk-based assessment by Context One Archaeological Services in 2010 (revised in 2014) in order to provide information on archaeological constraints to any future development proposals in this area. This report has been consulted in the course of compiling the 2017 desk-based assessment. However, an updated Historic Environment Record search, site walkover survey and setting assessment have been undertaken as part of the preparation for the 2017 WYG baseline assessment.

12.3.3 A geophysical survey was undertaken across the application site as part of a survey of the wider Gillingham southern extension in 2017 by Headland Archaeology and is included as Technical Appendix 12.2.

12.3.4 The results of all previous archaeological interventions within the Proposed Development boundary have informed the 2017 WYG baseline assessment.

Baseline data collection

12.3.5 A study area of 750m radius from the boundary of the Proposed Development area has been examined to assess the nature of the surrounding cultural heritage sites and place the recorded sites within their context. This study area was defined in consultation with Dorset Historic Environment Record Officer.

12.3.6 This study has taken into consideration the historical and archaeological background of the Proposed Development area. The sources consulted were:

- Dorset Historic Environment Record;
- National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE) (formerly the National Monuments Record (NMR));
- Dorset History Centre;
- Historic England and Local Planning Authority for designated sites;
- Aerial photographs – Historic England archives;
- Remote sensing data including LiDAR coverage;
- Historic mapping including early Ordnance Survey; and
- Secondary research including a previously completed desk-based assessment for a portion of the Site (Land at Park Farm: Context One 2014), previously completed archaeological reports for the surrounding area, regional research frameworks and grey literature and journal articles, as appropriate.

12.3.7 Consultation was undertaken with the Dorset Historic Environment Record, Historic England and the Dorset History Centre for the provision of data for this report.

12.3.8 Geophysical survey was undertaken by Headland Archaeology for WYG in February and March 2017. Survey included the 115 hectares within the boundary of the proposed masterplan for the Site, including land now outside the Site. The majority of anomalies identified were indicative of post-medieval agriculture and modern farming and other activity, but one area demonstrating clear archaeological potential was identified in the south-western corner of the Site. Linear anomalies forming enclosures, together with probable ditches have been identified, as has a linear anomaly that may represent a continuation of the park pale.



Designated Sites

- 12.3.9 Details of the designated sites can be seen in the table in Technical Appendix 12.1: Appendix E and their locations can be seen on Figure 2. Bracketed numbers within the text refer to the identifier in the Technical Appendix 12.1: Appendix E table and Figure 2. There are no World Heritage Sites, Registered Battlefields or Registered Parks and Gardens within the study area.
- 12.3.10 There is one designated heritage asset immediately adjacent to the Site: Park Farmhouse (List entry 1172639). Additionally, King's Court Palace moated site Scheduled Monument (1017276) is located to the north of the Site. There is one further Scheduled Monument, Gillingham Park boundary bank (1002382) within the 750m buffer study area. The King's Court Palace moated site was once a fortified royal hunting lodge, constructed in the late 12th century and demolished in the late 14th century. The boundary bank is associated with Gillingham Deer Park, first recorded in 1228 and disparted in 1628. The scheduled area includes the surviving earthwork on the eastern and southern limits of the former park.
- 12.3.11 The Gillingham Town Conservation Area is located on the northern edge of the study area, and takes in the historic centre of the settlement. The settlement of Gillingham was first mentioned in the 10th century, although evidence from archaeological works in Chantry Fields indicates occupation as far back as the 7th century (EDO5365 & MDO3891).
- 12.3.12 There is a total of 22 listed buildings, all Grade II, within the 750m study area, including one example, Park Farmhouse (List entry 1172639) within close proximity to the Site itself. This is a farmhouse dating to the early 19th century, constructed of rubble with a hipped slate roof. Madjeston Farmhouse is located only a short distance from the western corner of the Proposed Development boundary (List entry 1110299). This is also early 19th century in date, although it appears to represent a rebuild of an earlier structure extant in the 18th century. The remainder of the listed buildings within the study area are located in the historic core of Gillingham and along the main transport corridor leading south-east out of the town.

Archaeological and Historic Background and Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 12.3.13 The Historic Environment Record for Dorset holds details for 34 recorded archaeological monuments and findspots (excluding designated assets), as well as 32 archaeological events, within the 750m study area. Details of the non-designated sites can be seen in the table in Technical Appendix 12.1: Appendix E and their locations can be seen on Figures 3 and 4. Bracketed numbers within the text refer to the identifier in Technical Appendix 12.1: Appendix E table and Figures 3 and 4.
- 12.3.14 The only prominent non-designated heritage asset within the Site is the former extent of Gillingham Deer Park, which overlaps with the Park Farm and Kingsmead Business Park areas of the Proposed Development area (MDO27854). This was in use by 1228 until it was officially disafforested in 1628. A bank and ditch uncovered during archaeological trenching in Kingsmead Business Park is thought to be a continuation of the Park Pale (EDO5356).
- 12.3.15 The earliest known element of the archaeological record within the study area comprises a small number of poorly defined gullies and pits associated with worked flint on the western perimeter of Park Farm, identified in the course of trial trenching (MDO21929 and EDO5356); the remains are located immediate outside of the Site at Ham. This assemblage is tentatively suggestive of late prehistoric settlement.
- 12.3.16 The Park Farm area of the Site was also the subject of an earlier desk-based assessment by Context One Archaeological Services in 2010 (revised in 2014) in order to provide information on archaeological constraints to any future development proposals in this area.
- 12.3.17 A geophysical survey was undertaken across the Site by Headland Archaeology in 2017. Anomalies of probable and potential archaeological origin were identified within the southwest portion of the Site, close

to Newhouse Farm, including one sub-rectangular anomaly, itself adjacent to three sides of another sub-rectangular arrangement of linear features, which form a complex characteristic of an enclosure, often associated with settlement of a later prehistoric date. A further arcing anomaly was identified in the southeast of the Site close to Meadowbrook Farm, and may also be of archaeological potential. The anomaly could possibly locate the continuation of the deer park pale (Scheduled Monument 1002382) recorded approximately 0.5km from the southern boundary of the Site.

- 12.3.18 While no anomalies of potential archaeological origin were identified within the remainder of the Site, linear features characteristic of agricultural practice, field drains and potentially former field boundaries were located over much of the Site. The results of the geophysical survey are discussed in more detail below and are included as Technical Appendix 12.2.

Prehistoric (to 43 AD)

- 12.3.19 Material belonging to the Lower and Middle Palaeolithic period in the southwest of Britain is, as elsewhere, most frequently associated with fluvial deposits. There is no evidence for Palaeolithic activity within the study area or the wider local landscape.
- 12.3.20 Like the Palaeolithic period, the Mesolithic is characterised by the seasonal exploitation of resources, and sites are principally recognised from concentrations of lithics, as the temporary settlements used by these communities left little trace in the landscape. In Dorset the coastal sites of Hengistbury Head and Culverwell have produced significant amounts of lithic tool types, with evidence for a shell midden identified at the latter site. A small assemblage of Mesolithic flints have been recovered from archaeological works in the centre of Gillingham (EDO5348, EDO5360 & EDO5361).
- 12.3.21 Mortuary monuments, along with the introduction of pottery, domesticates and arable farming practices mark the beginning of the Neolithic period. Common Neolithic ceremonial monuments in the region include causewayed enclosures, barrows and cursuses. In Gillingham itself, a Group VI Langdale polished stone axe was found on Common Mead Lane in 1976 (MDO3878).
- 12.3.22 The Bronze Age period is characterised by significant changes in material culture, and domestic and ceremonial architecture. In South West England the Bronze Age is notable for large numbers of round barrows and round cairns, concentrated in Wiltshire and Dorset. An archaeological evaluation just south of the centre of Gillingham town centre identified Bronze Age pottery in the mid 1990s (MDO3909 and EDO5362). A more recent evaluation directly south of these earlier works also identified an arc of postholes, associated with Bronze Age pottery and a number of pits (EDO6007).
- 12.3.23 By the Iron Age period, the landscape saw increasing evidence for field systems and defended sites, and much stronger evidence for continental influences than earlier periods. Much archaeological fieldwork has focused on hillforts in the region, such as Maiden Castle, but evidence for Iron Age settlement has also been found at Gussage All Saints and Pimperne, both within Cranborne Chase. Rescue excavations on Common Mead Lane in Gillingham identified late Iron Age pottery as a potential precursor to the Romano-British settlement in that location (MDO3874 and EDO518). A few abraded sherds of potentially early Iron Age pottery were also identified during the cutting of a water main, again in Common Mead Lane (EDE0517).

Romano-British (AD43 to AD410)

- 12.3.24 The earliest evidence of Roman archaeology in the region comes from Hengistbury Head, where Roman imports have been found in late Iron Age contexts. In Dorset some of the earliest evidence for Roman occupation comes from Hamworthy and it would seem that there was a substantial Roman presence in the region from the 50s onwards with a civitas capital at Dorchester. Romanisation follows an apparently stiff resistance to the Roman invasion by the Durotriges.



- 12.3.25 Romano-British archaeological material had been reported from Common Mead Lane since the mid-19th century when Romano-British occupation material was identified during drainage operations at Morel Leas (EDO5367). More substantial rescue excavations in the same area in 1976 in response to a housing development revealed substantial evidence for Romano-British settlement, ranging from the 1st to the 4th centuries AD (EDO518, MDO3874 and MDO3875). Trial excavations over an area of c. 6 hectares identified masonry structures and several gravelled floors. Associated numismatic evidence spans the 2nd to 4th centuries AD alongside a wide variety of pottery fabrics, comprising both local and imported wares.
- 12.3.26 More ephemeral Romano-British material has been found more recently in the centre of Gillingham, on the location of the Waitrose car park extension (EDO5360 and EDO5361). Evaluation followed by excavation each identified Romano-British pottery on a predominantly later medieval site. The evaluation located it within alluvial layers, though the context of the pottery in the wider excavation is unclear. Further slight Romano-British ceramic evidence is reported from Chantry Fields (EDO610 and EDO3903). It appears that the focus of Romano-British activity in Gillingham was in the Common Mead Lane area.

Early medieval/Anglo-Saxon (AD410 to 1066)

- 12.3.27 Evidence for post-Roman activity in the region is scarce, though some does exist. Chalk floors appear to have been overlaid on mosaics at Greyhounds Yard, Dorchester and it has been suggested that the hillfort of Poundbury, near Dorchester, was refortified in the post-Roman period, as noted at Cadbury hillfort, Somerset. The name Gillingham first appears as 'Gillingaham' in 993 as the venue where Aethelred II confirmed the privileges of Abingdon Abbey. Some of the earliest evidence for early medieval activity in Gillingham comes from architectural fragments built into the north wall of the vicarage, of probable 9th-century date.
- 12.3.28 The main concentration of early medieval activity in Gillingham is firmly focused on Chantry Fields, directly south of the town centre on the opposite bank of the river Stour. The test pits in Chantry Fields identified an extensive range of early medieval wares alongside a smaller Romano-British assemblage (EDO610). Follow up excavation in Chantry Fields identified two shallow pits lined with fired clay and stone, with evidence of re-working (EDO5365 & MDO3891). Archaeomagnetic and radiocarbon dating provided dates of the late 7th and early 8th centuries.
- 12.3.29 Later Anglo-Saxon material has also been recovered on the east bank of the river Stour and Shreen Water where evaluation work at Gillingham School encountered a small assemblage of 10th- and 11th-century ceramics amid a larger later medieval assemblage (EDO5343 and MDO21908). The evidence attests to mid-Saxon activity around Chantry Fields, with less compelling evidence for later Saxon settlement to the north and east of the confluence of the rivers respectively.

Medieval (1066-1540 AD)

- 12.3.30 Gillingham appears in the Domesday survey as 'Gelingeham', among other variants. In 1066, possession was divided between the Crown and four other tenants. A royal presence is attested at Gillingham in 1132, in a charter of Henry I. A charter of his successor in 1152-1158 confirmed that Montacute Priory was in possession of "the land of Ghillingeham" which is called Hammé". This is the first mention of what is variously described as a manor and a tithing to the southeast of Gillingham, which encompasses the Site. The place name meaning either 'enclosure' or 'river meadow' survives in the name of Ham Common, Ham Farm, and the modern suburb of Ham.
- 12.3.31 The majority of evidence for later medieval settlement in Gillingham has been found in and around Chantry Fields, at the interface between Common Mead and the historic core of the town. Excavation on the path of the Gillingham Relief Road in 1990 exposed ditches and gullies associated with upstanding earthworks and a rubble spread, one that sealed the early medieval ovens, dating to the 12th and 13th

centuries (EDO5365). An evaluation immediately east of here for the site of a Waitrose supermarket identified further pits and post holes of the same date, indicating that later medieval deposits likely covered a large area (EDO5364). Further trial trenching and excavation demonstrated that this area was a significant focus of settlement and agricultural activity (EDO5361, EDO5360 and MDO21944). Stone buildings, surfaces and associated deposits appeared to represent a domestic structure with a garderobe and associated outbuildings, possibly part of a later medieval farm complex.

- 12.3.32 Less substantial archaeological evidence from the later medieval period has been identified in and around Gillingham. An archaeological evaluation on land at Ham Farm, now developed into residential buildings immediately north of the Site, discovered robbed out foundation trenches/beam slots for a later medieval building, associated with a hearth with inset pot designed for fermentation (EDO5352 and MDO21909). Further from the Proposed Development, later medieval pottery has been identified at Gillingham School (EDO5343, EDO5344, EDO5353, MDO21908 and MDO21910), Common Mead Lane (EDO5348 and EDO517) and Lodden Bridge Farm (EDO5358 and MDO21935). A later medieval drove road has also been identified south of Madjeston (MDO3887). It should be assumed that later medieval material is likely to be encountered in the vicinity of both longstanding settlement centres (Gillingham, Madjeston) and the modern settlement of Ham.

Post-medieval (1540-1750 AD), Industrial (1750-1900 AD) and Modern (1900-present)

- 12.3.33 A 1624 map of the forest of Gillingham was drawn up, just a few years before a licence was granted to enclose the forest. In broad summary, it shows that the study area was split between Gillingham Deer Park and the manors of Ham and Madjeston, with evidence of enclosures on the northwest side of the area. Enclosures progressively covered the study area, punctuated by widespread rioting in protest at forest enclosure in the 1620s. By the 18th century Gillingham was known as one of several clothmaking towns in Dorset. A number of brickworks were founded in the early to mid-19th century, an upsurge in industry accelerated by the introduction of the railway. While commercial and industrial interests grew after this time, the population did not, until after the Second World War.
- 12.3.34 There are several post-medieval assets and a large number of Industrial period remains within the study area which include built heritage, industrial and landscape features and reflect the various (mainly rural) industries of the local area. Rawson Court, on High Street is a former vicarage built in the Arts and Crafts style in 1883 to designs by Swinfen Harris (MDO22137). A number of road bridges were also constructed around the study area in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. These comprise Lodden Bridge, Kingscourt Bridge and Madjeston Bridge (MDO3856, MDO3857 and MDO3858). A footbridge of the early 19th century was formerly located immediately south of St Mary's Church, crossing the Stour (MDO21911). A number of demolished structures are also recorded as undesignated heritage assets. These include the early 19th-century Royal Hotel in Newbury (MDO3861), Ecccliffe Mill (MDO24062) and a former Baptist Chapel, again in Newbury (MDO27857). A brickworks was located immediately south of King's Court Palace moated site in the early 19th century (MDO27869) and a number of lime kilns are also recorded within the study area (MDO3907 and MDO24061).



12.4 Mitigation within the Submitted Design

Design

- 12.4.1 The existing landscape framework of mature hedgerows will be retained (where possible) and will help contain the Proposed Development from a landscape and visual point of view.
- 12.4.2 There are two Scheduled Monuments located within the 750m study area, King's Court Palace moated site (1017276) and Gillingham Park boundary bank (1002382). New tree planting in the northern limit of Park Farm will partially screen the King's Court Palace moated site Scheduled Monument from the new development, whilst preserving important views to and from the Scheduled Monument. This programme will continue existing tree-planting by the Royal Forest Project in the Park Farm area, reflecting the historic usage of this area as a deer park.

12.5 Likely Significant Environmental Effects of the Scheme

Unaffected Designated Assets

- 12.5.1 The Proposed Development will not physically impact upon any designated heritage assets. There are 2 Scheduled Monuments, 22 Grade II Listed Buildings and 1 Conservation Area within the setting study area. Two further Grade II Listed Buildings were considered in the course of the setting assessment – High Grove Farmhouse (1305738) and Waterloo Farmhouse (1110307) – each to the south of the Site and study area.
- 12.5.2 The majority of the Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area are located north-west of the Proposed Development area in the historic core of the town of Gillingham. 1 Listed Building is located within the Kingsmead Business Park area and immediately adjacent to the Site. The 2 Scheduled Monuments are located immediately north and south of the Park Farm area of the Site respectively. The locations of the designated heritage assets are displayed in Technical Appendix 12.1, Figure 2. Additionally, their locations have been cross-referenced with the available Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) as outlined in the LVIA chapter, and the majority of these assets are largely or completely screened from the Proposed Development by intervening settlement to the north, and by topography, mature hedges and tree lines to the south.
- 12.5.3 The following designated assets are not considered to be adversely affected by the Proposed Development and are not considered further:
- Gillingham Park boundary bank Scheduled Monument (1002382);
 - Grade II Listed Buildings at: Folly's End (1110310); Plank House and River Gate (1151937); Chantry Cottage (1172452); Little Chantry (1324576); The Cat Boutique (1110294); The Red Lion Two storey inn (1110295); Blackmore Vale House (1110304); Knapp House (1110311); Chantry Ford (1110332); Mill House (1110333); the Town Bridge (1110335); The Phoenix Hotel (1110337); Bridge carrying Wyke Street over the River Stour (1305014); the Premises of Senior and Goodwin (1305090); the Premises of Natural Harvest and Rutter and Rutter (1324569); Lodden Bridge Farmhouse (1324573); The Laurels (1324571); the Lock-up (1324574); Unidentified Table Tomb in St Mary's Churchyard (1261327); High Grove Farmhouse (1305738); Waterloo Farmhouse (1110307) and a War Memorial (1110296); and
 - Gillingham Town and The Wyke Conservation Areas.

- 12.5.4 The Proposed Development would not act to alter the outlook from, or setting of the Scheduled Monument or any of the 20 identified Listed Buildings in Section 10.2 of Technical Appendix 12.1 during the construction or operation phases, as the Site is physically separated from the assets and they are sufficiently distant from the Proposed Development for any impact to arise. Therefore, the scheme will result in no change to the setting or context of these assets, nor the assets' significance. As there are no affects, they will not be considered further.

Construction Phase Effects

Setting of Affected Designated Heritage Assets

- 12.5.5 A total of 3 designated heritage assets were identified as anticipating an adverse effect on their settings as a result of the construction phase of the Proposed Development.
- 12.5.6 These assets comprise the King's Court Palace moated site Scheduled Monument (1017276) and the Grade II listed Park Farmhouse (1172639) and Madjestone Farmhouse (1110299).
- 12.5.7 There will be a number of negative impacts arising from activities during the construction phase of the scheme, including demolition works, dust, noise, plant traffic and visibility of plant on and around the Site. The impact on the setting of the designated assets will be up to **moderate negative**. The value of the heritage assets is **high**, resulting in an unmitigated significance of effect of **intermediate adverse**. However, these are considered to be temporary construction impacts and will cease once construction is completed; additionally, the construction impacts on each of the three designated assets can be reduced by ensuring that heavy construction traffic is constrained per development phase in terms of the access routes used to the Site.

Unlisted Heritage Assets

- 12.5.8 Two groups of buildings were identified during the setting assessment as non-designated heritage assets of local (**low**) value with settings likely to be adversely affected by the current development proposals. These comprise Newhouse Farm and associated buildings and Cole Street Farmhouse.
- 12.5.9 There will be a number of negative impacts arising from activities during the construction phase of the scheme, including demolition works, dust, noise, plant traffic and visibility of plant on the Site. The impact on the setting of the unlisted built assets will be up to **moderate negative**. The value of the heritage assets is **low**, resulting in an unmitigated significance of effect of **minor adverse**. However, these are considered to be temporary construction impacts and will cease once construction is completed; additionally, the construction impacts on each of the unlisted built assets can be reduced by ensuring that heavy construction traffic is constrained per development phase in terms of the access routes used to the Site.

Recorded Heritage Assets

- 12.5.10 A number of undesignated heritage assets are recorded within the boundary of the Site. This includes part of the former extent of Gillingham Deer Park (MDO27854 & EO5356). While little remains of the former deer park with the Site, upstanding elements of the deer park are known to survive in the study area, including the designated section of the park pale and generally, the former deer park is considered to be of considerable historic value. As a historical asset in its own right, the deer park is considered to be of regional (**medium**) heritage value and potentially of evidential value where physical remains survive. The extent of the asset extends beyond the Site, and while the Proposed Development will impact upon the asset, much of the former deer park will also be retained. Therefore it is considered that the Proposed Scheme will result in an **unmitigated moderate negative impact** upon the deer park, as the asset will



only be partially lost, but not destroyed to the extent that understanding and appreciation is compromised. This would result in an **intermediate to minor adverse** significance of effect.

- 12.5.11 In addition, subsequent geophysical survey has identified undetermined anomalies of various complexity in the Newhouse Farm and Ham Farm areas within the Site^x. These could represent previously unrecorded archaeological remains including a small complex of sub-square and linear anomalies in the Newhouse Farm area, in addition to an arcing boundary that may reflect the former course of the Gillingham Deer Park pale.
- 12.5.12 The enclosure complex is characteristically later prehistoric in form, and is considered likely to be of regional (**medium**) heritage value, depending on the extent, preservation and character of the remains. If the arching boundary identified in F18 during the course of the geophysical survey does prove to be a continuation of the park pale, the feature would likely be of regional (**medium**) heritage value, and would contribute to the context and history of the wider deer park depending on the extent and character of the remains. The development proposals are likely to have a **substantial negative** magnitude of impact upon any remains present, resulting in up to an unmitigated **intermediate adverse** effect for remains of medium heritage value.

Previously unrecorded archaeological remains

- 12.5.13 Archaeological remains ranging in date from late prehistory to the Industrial period have been identified within and in close proximity to the Site. However, these remains have been few in number and generally only of local heritage value, with the exception of the potential continuation of the park boundary bank identified in the course of trial trenching in the Kingsmead Business Park area within the boundary of the Site (EDO5356). Given the size of the Proposed Development area, and its proximity to a historic town, there remains potential for encountering previously unrecorded archaeological remains and deposits during construction work. Additionally, there is some potential for more ephemeral remains associated with the evidence of later prehistoric settlement identified in the course of an earlier evaluation near the Park Farm area (HER MDO21919 & EDO5356) to be present within the Site.
- 12.5.14 In the locations where complex geophysical anomalies have been identified, there is a high potential for previously unrecorded archaeological remains of local to regional significance to be present (**low to medium** heritage value). In the remainder of the site, there is a low potential for previously recorded archaeological remains of local to regional significance to be present (**low to medium** heritage value), depending on their date, character and extent. The development proposals are likely to have an unmitigated **substantial negative** magnitude of impact on any remains present, resulting in up to an unmitigated **intermediate adverse** effect for remains of low heritage value.

Operational Phase Effects

Archaeological Assets

- 12.5.15 There will be no further impacts upon buried archaeological remains and deposits during the operational phase, as the principal impacts on archaeology are anticipated to take place during the construction period of the Proposed Development.

Setting of Affected Heritage Assets

- 12.5.16 At total of 3 designated heritage assets and 2 unlisted heritage assets were identified as anticipating an adverse effect on their settings as a result of the operational phase of the Proposed Development.
- 12.5.17 King's Court Palace moated site is a Scheduled Monument (1017276 and MDO4497) that comprises the earthwork remains of a fortified royal hunting lodge, established in the year 1199 and extensively altered

in 1249-50. The surviving remains are defined by an earthwork ditch, internal bank and partial external bank, and its setting has changed through time, from one associated with the royal forest, to the gradual deforestation and enclosure rural landscape, and finally the gradual expansion of Gillingham's urban fringes. The monument has a historic connection to Gillingham deer park, which is now characterised by enclosed pasture land and includes much of the eastern section of the Site, to the east of Shaftsbury Road.

- 12.5.18 The earthwork remains of the moated site are located in an area of grazed pasture land, which forms its immediate context and forms a continuation of the pasture fields to the south: the open space also allows the scale and form of the earthworks to be appreciated. The immediate setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of the moated site.
- 12.5.19 Views to the north of the monument are characterised by a tree line running along the southern edge of the train line and railway embankment, which help to screen views onwards the urban expanse of Gillingham further north. There are similar views to the west of the monument, with vegetation and green space helping to balance the detracting views towards modern development. Views to the north and west make a neutral contribution to the setting of the monument. The eastern part of the Site is located to the south of the asset. Open, uninterrupted views to the east towards Kingscourt Wood form an important positive and historic view from the moated site, as do views to the south over rolling pasture fields, including areas of the Site. Elements of the Site itself are visible to the south/ south-east of the monument, although larger parts of the Site are obscured from view. Generally, the Site makes a positive contribution to the setting of the asset, but is considered to be of lesser importance to the appreciation of the site than its immediate setting, or the long uninterrupted views to the east (Kingscourt Wood).
- 12.5.20 The larger portion of the Site is screened by tree lines to the south and encroaching development to the west/ south-west. However, the wider study area including the eastern part of the Site formed Gillingham deer park, and so there is an important functional and historic connection between the asset and the Site. King's Court Palace moated site is of considerable historic and evidential value, and is considered to be of **high** heritage value; the current, immediate setting of the monument, as well as long views to the east, make a high contribution to the heritage significance. The extensive area of the former deer park also contributes to the historic and evidential value of the asset.
- 12.5.21 The north-eastern corner of the Site falls to the immediate south of the scheduled monument. The masterplan has included opportunities to create an appropriate buffer to the Kings Court Palace scheduled monument: this is likely to include landscaped public open space and community space, such as allotments or orchards. Additionally, provision has been made to include new planting intended to complement the existing vegetation and historic field boundaries in recognition of the Sites location within the former deer park. The scheduled monument currently enjoys open views towards the northern extent of the Site, but views to the larger part of the Site are obscured by tree lines to the south and encroaching development to the west/ south-west. However, the development proposals across the Site may still result in negative changes to the setting of the asset, including visible urbanisation of presently open land which is likely to be discernible in both changes to the immediate skyline and increased light spill. Additionally, the proposed development scheme would result in the urbanisation of a large section of the former deer park, and loss of part of the historic context of the scheduled asset.
- 12.5.22 Therefore, the Proposed Development is considered likely to result in a discernible negative change to the wider setting and historic/ functional context of the Scheduled Monument, as well as the partial loss of open space forming the deer park, which strongly contributes to the context of the asset (functionally and historically). However, the proposals will not diminish the ability to appreciate the asset in its current immediate setting, and will not act to interfere or diminish important views towards Kings Court Wood to the east. The provision of open space within the northern part of the Site will also assist in reducing the visual impact of development to the south. Depending on the finalised design of development within the



northern part of the Site, including heights and densities, it is anticipated that the proposed development will result in a **slight negative** impact upon the setting and significance of the scheduled monument. This will result in an unmitigated **intermediate-minor adverse** significance of effect.

- 12.5.23 Park Farmhouse (1172639 and MDO22169) is an early 19th century farmhouse with rubble walls and a hipped, slated roof. The central and right hand rendered stacks with moulded caps. Historically, the farmhouse sat at the eastern edge of a large enclosed yard formed by long ranges, with further agricultural buildings to the rear (east) and south, a large orchard to the east, and pond and trees to the front (west) of the yard. The range was entered from the west, off the main road. The farm was historically associated with the eastern part of the Site, with early historic mapping indicating that much of the land forming this part of the Site was associated with Park Farm and the farmhouse. The historic elements of the farmyard are now largely lost, and the farmhouse and one remaining barn have been converted into office space, forming part of the Kingsmead Business Park. There is an attached L-shaped converted redbrick barn located to the southeast side of the farmhouse, with a further modern redbrick range on the northwest side, which has been designed to reflect the agricultural barn on the opposite side of the farmhouse. The industrial development has also acted to isolate the farmhouse from its historic farmland. The orchard and ancillary buildings to the east of the farmhouse have all been lost and are now occupied by industrial premises. Park Farmhouse and its associated barn building (presumed to be curtilage) are of some aesthetic, evidential and historic value. Overall, the asset is considered to be of **high** heritage value.
- 12.5.24 To the front of the farmhouse, there is a low redbrick wall which separates the small front yard from a surface carpark to the west. There are a number of pre-fabricated industrial units to the rear (east) of the farmhouse, including a number which surround a small open area of grass immediately behind the farmhouse, at its eastern/ rear elevation. The historic setting of the listed farmhouse has been lost, and the setting is now defined by elements of the business park, which make an overall negative contribution to the significance of the asset. The converted barn and redbrick wall make a positive contribution to the significance of the farmhouse as they contribute to its historic and evidential value, as well as providing some small historic context to the farmhouse. While the surface car park itself makes a negative contribution, it does afford some openness and allows the front elevation of the farmhouse and original barn to be viewed and appreciated from the northwest, west and southwest, which makes a positive contribution and therefore balances the negative elements of the car park. Intervening development make uninterrupted long views to the surrounding rural landscape near impossible; however, views from the upper level of the building are likely to include views towards the west and over the central part of the Site at Ham Farm, which is characterised by agricultural land and tree lines. The current, immediate setting of the monument, makes a low contribution to the heritage significance
- 12.5.25 The eastern part of the Site is located to the east and north of the listed building. There are no direct views towards the Site from the front elevation of the main building, and views east towards the Site from the upper levels of the farmhouse are hindered by the industrial development to the rear of the building. However, the Proposed Development will result in the loss of pasture land in the immediate vicinity of the listed farmhouse, including land historically associated with the farm: the urbanisation of the presently rural land forming the application site would act to diminish the remaining historic context between the farmhouse and its historic holdings. The scheme is therefore only considered to result in a minor change (**slight negative impact**) to the setting and heritage significance of the building, and this will result in an **unmitigated intermediate-minor** significance of effect.
- 12.5.26 Madjestone Farm House (1110299 and MDO22173) is an early 19th century farmhouse with a probable late 18th century rear wing, constructed of rubble and ashlar with a hipped slate roof. It is three storeys in height, and the porch is ashlar and rests on Roman Doric columns. To the east of the farmhouse is another building of Victorian appearance, which seems to have originated as a pair or more of cottages,

while there are a number of historic barns and other agricultural ranges to the east, north and west of the main building. Historic mapping indicates that the group of buildings formed a single ownership, and these buildings are considered to be curtilage listed. Now divided into separate residences, there are a number of enclosed private gardens to the rear (north) and a public byway runs along the eastern elevation of Madjestone Farmhouse and the length of its fenced garden, as far as the River Lodden, before crossing into the fields running to Brickfield Business Park. The group of buildings, as well as boundary walls, form a pleasant group of structures, several of which are of high quality design.

- 12.5.27 The principal setting of the buildings is formed by their grouping along the lane, and views to the south, which are primarily characterised by uninterrupted pasture land, and make a positive contribution to the significance of the assets. There are also historic ranges to the rear of the farmhouse, as well as its long private garden, which runs towards the river: these features provide historic context, reflecting the cottages and agricultural buildings historically associated with the property, as well as providing a grand, open outlook to the rear. Immediately to the south of the main farmhouse, a walled plot of land faced north onto the lane, and is accompanied by a stone lean-to; this feature appears on historic maps and provides further historic context, as it presumably functioned as a walled garden or orchard in the past. Again, these elements make a positive contribution to the significance of the assets.
- 12.5.28 The western portion of the Site is just visible from the front of the properties, in views along the lane to the east. The Site historically formed the much wider farmland setting surrounding Madjestone and provides undeveloped views to the east, further contributing to the sense of openness enjoyed at Madjestone; therefore, the Newhouse area of the Site in particular is considered to make a small positive contribution to the significance of the assets. However, the views into the Site are arguably incidental and views to the south are of key significance.
- 12.5.29 Madjestone Farm House and its associated curtilage buildings are of **high** heritage value and are certainly of a high degree of aesthetic, historic and evidential value; the current, immediate setting of the buildings, as well as long views to the south, make a **high** contribution to the heritage significance. There are views towards the Site from the front elevations of the main buildings, facing east, and generally the New House area of the Site contributes to the sense of open farmland in the wider surroundings. The development proposals may result in slight negative changes, in particular by introducing light spill and changes the skyline in views along the lane, to the east. However, views to the east are of lesser importance than views to the south, and the scheme is only considered to result in a minor change (**negligible negative impact**) to the wider setting of the buildings. This will result in an unmitigated **neutral** significance of effect.
- 12.5.30 Newhouse Farm is located along Cole Street Lane, close to its junction with the B3081. The farm is recorded on the East Stour tithe map (1841), with the main farmhouse located to the south of two longer ranges of buildings, presumably agricultural barns. The main farmhouse is of redbrick construction and of Victorian character, with a number of redbrick extensions to the rear (north), and sits in a private gated garden: the farmhouse faces to the south and away from the Site. There is a series of stone built barns backing onto Cole Street Lane, which are historic in appearance and form, corresponding with buildings visible on the Tithe map, and are roofed, in corrugated sheet metal. Newhouse farmhouse and the historic barns are considered to form a non-designated heritage asset.
- 12.5.31 The principal setting of the buildings is formed by their grouping, and views to the south, which are primarily characterised by uninterrupted pasture land, and make a positive contribution to the significance of the assets. The Site historically formed the wider farmland setting surrounding the farm and contributes to the sense of openness; therefore, the Newhouse area of the Site in particular is considered to make a positive contribution to the significance of the assets. However the views into the Site are arguably incidental and views to the south are of key significance.



- 12.5.32 As non-designated heritage assets, Newhouse Farm are of **low** heritage value and are of modest aesthetic, evidential and historic interest. The current, immediate setting of the monument, as well as views to the south, make a medium contribution to the heritage significance. Generally the New House area of the Site contributes to the sense of open farmland in the wider surroundings. The development proposals may result in negative changes, in particular by acting to overshadow and isolate the farm due to the potential proximity of development, and by introducing light spill and changes the skyline in views along the lane, and potentially from views out of the farmyard and garden. While views to the Site are of lesser importance than views to the south, the potential proximity of the scheme could be substantially intrusive into the setting and context of the asset; therefore the scheme is considered to result in up to a **moderate negative impact**, resulting in an unmitigated **minor adverse** significance of effect.
- 12.5.33 Cole Street Farmhouse and Farm is located along the northern side Cole Street Lane, and is separated from the Site by a small stream to the north, and a field and area of rough ground, seemingly used as a builder's yard, to the west. The farm is recorded on the East Stour tithe map (1841), with the main farmhouse located within the southwest of a triangular plot, accompanied by two rectangular buildings to the east and west. The principal setting of the buildings is formed by their grouping, which reflects the historic footprint of the farm and positively contributes to the significance of the farmhouse. Presently, the hedgerow along the lane disrupts views into the surrounding arable land to the south from the farmhouse, but higher ground further to the south can be seen forming the skyline. It is anticipated that from the upper level of the farmhouse, views to the south would be primarily characterised by rolling uninterrupted pasture land. Views to the south make a small positive contribution to the significance of the assets. The Site historically formed the wider farmland setting surrounding the farm and contributes to the sense of openness to the rear (north) of the farm; therefore, the Newhouse and Ham Farm areas of the Site in particular is considered to make a small positive contribution to the significance of the assets. However the views into the Site are only achieved from within the yard and between the extant buildings, and these views are arguably incidental.
- 12.5.34 As non-designated heritage assets, Cole Street Farmhouse is of **low** heritage value and moderate aesthetic, evidential and historic interest. The current, immediate setting of the buildings make a medium contribution to the heritage significance. Generally the New House and Ham Farm areas of the Site contribute to the sense of open farmland in the wider surroundings. The development proposals may result in negative changes, in particular by acting to overshadow the farm due to the potential proximity of development, and by introducing light spill and changes the skyline in views out of the farmyard. The potential proximity of the scheme could intrude into the setting and context of the asset; therefore the scheme is considered to result in up to a **moderate negative impact**, resulting in an unmitigated **minor adverse** significance of effect.

12.6 Additional Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Measures

Construction Phase

- 12.6.1 Temporary adverse effects on listed buildings, including from noise, dust, traffic and odour, as well as temporary structures associated with construction may be mitigated by use of Considerate Contractor Scheme rules, introduction of a CEMP and practical measures such as dust reduction.
- 12.6.2 Relatively few heritage assets have been recorded within the boundary of the Proposed Development. However, the overlapping position of the former deer park, the presence of the recently identified undetermined geophysical anomalies and the size of the development in such proximity to a historic settlement mean that there is certainly potential for previously unrecorded archaeological remains and deposits to be present within the Site. In addition, the 2017 geophysical survey has identified a number of potential archaeological sites within the Proposed Development.

- 12.6.3 Initial consultation has been undertaken with the Dorset County Council Senior Archaeologist, Steve Wallis, to determine the requirement for further investigations within the application site. Evaluation trenching will be required in parts of the Site where geophysical survey have identified archaeological potential, in order to better establish the character, extent and significance of the remains present. As the potential for previously unrecorded archaeological remains in the remainder of the Site cannot be entirely ruled out at this stage, a programme of archaeological evaluation trenching will be requested post-determination, in order to ascertain the presence and absence of archaeological remains within the Site.
- 12.6.4 Depending on the results of any programme of evaluation trenching, further archaeological mitigation may be required post-consent; further mitigation could range from preserving archaeological remains in situ, a targeted strip, map and record condition to, potentially, archaeological monitoring during construction groundworks. A range of mitigation options may be required across the Site.
- 12.6.5 Any further archaeological work should be undertaken in accordance with the standards and guidance from the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists and a Written Scheme of Investigation agreed in advance with the Dorset County Council. It is considered that a secured programme of archaeological investigation, recording and publication would satisfy the NPPF (2012) requirement for the significance of heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) to be recorded in a manner proportionate their importance and the impact, and to make this publicly accessible (para. 141). Assuming appropriate archaeological mitigation is secured, the proposal is also considered to comply with Policy 5 – The Historic Environment in the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2016).

Operational Phase

- 12.6.6 In each case, due to the varying sensitivity of their settings, the Proposed Development will result in some degree of negative impact upon the settings of the King's Court Palace moated site Scheduled Monument (1017276), the Grade II listed Park Farmhouse (1172639) and Madjestone Farm House (1110299). The Proposed Development will also have an impact on two groups of unlisted heritage assets as Newhouse Farm and Cole Street Farm.
- 12.6.7 At King's Court Palace, moated site (Scheduled Monument 1017276), the earthwork remains were found to have a historic connection to Gillingham deer park, now characterised by enclosed pasture, and includes much of the eastern section of the Site. While the Proposed Development would not impact upon the immediate setting of the moated site, or the important, open, uninterrupted views to the east towards Kingscourt Wood, the scheme does have the potential to impact upon views to the south over rolling pasture fields, which make a small positive contribution to the setting of the asset. The scheme would also result in the urbanisation of a portion of the deer park. It is noted that the larger portion of the Site is screened by tree lines to the south. However, the development proposals may still result in negative changes to the immediate skyline and cause increased light spill from the housing scheme.
- 12.6.8 Although good design is not considered to be mitigation (Historic England, 2008, p.47), this is considered the only means to minimise the negative impacts upon the setting of the heritage asset. It is expected that the impact of the proposed scheme upon the setting of King's Court Palace can be reduced from slight negative through design measures, including the development layout, development design and the provision of adequate planting/ screening. The commitment for provision of green open space within the northern portion of the application site would also act to reduce the negative impacts of the scheme.
- 12.6.9 At Park Farmhouse (1172639) little survives of the historic elements of the farmyard, with the farmhouse and one remaining barn converted into office space, forming part of the Kingsmead Business Park. The historic setting of the listed farmhouse has been lost. Overall, the development proposals may result in slight negative changes to the significance of the farmhouse, in particular by introducing light spill in views to the west from the upper levels of the building. No mitigation measures are considered necessary.



- 12.6.10 Madjestone Farm House (1110299) forms a group with the historic row of cottages, barns and other agricultural ranges to the east, north and west of the main building. The group of buildings, as well as boundary walls, form a pleasant group of structures, several of which are of high quality design. The scheme is only considered to result in a minor change (negligible negative impact) to the wider setting of the buildings. No mitigation measures are considered necessary.
- 12.6.11 Newhouse Farm and Cole Street Farmhouse are located along Cole Street Lane. Both farms appear on the East Stour tithe map (1841). The development proposals may result in negative changes, in particular by acting to overshadow the farms due to the potential proximity of development, and by introducing light spill and changes the skyline in views out of the farmyards. It is expected that the impact of the proposed scheme upon the setting of Newhouse and Cole Street Farms can be reduced from moderate negative through design measures, including the development layout, development design and the provision of adequate planting/ screening. Assuming that appropriate detailed development design and landscaping are secured, the overall magnitude of impacts could be reduced from moderate negative to slight negative.
- 12.6.12 No specific additional mitigation measures are proposed with respect to archaeology at the operation stage, as the principal impacts on archaeology are anticipated to take place during the construction period of the Proposed Development. There will be no further effects on buried archaeological remains during the operational stage of the scheme.
- 12.6.13 Archaeological recording affords an opportunity to enhance understanding of the archaeological heritage for residents within the new developments. Further, targeted information and interpretation of discoveries relating to the site will be considered and may be implemented, depending on the significance of any discoveries made.

12.7 Assessment Summary and Likely Significant Residual are presented in Table of Environmental Effects

Construction Phase

- 12.7.1 The construction phase effects upon designated and unlisted heritage assets relate to the temporary impact of construction works upon their settings. This will cease once the construction phase is completed. The disruption caused by the works will have a temporary mitigated **slight negative** magnitude of impact upon the assets. This will result in an **intermediate to minor adverse residual** setting effect on the designated (high value) assets, and a **minor adverse to neutral residual** effect on the unlisted built (low value) assets. These effects are **not considered significant** in EIA terms.
- 12.7.2 The implementation of a programme of archaeological mitigation and recording will reduce the magnitude of impact upon the archaeological record. For recorded and previously unrecorded archaeological remains within the Site, this is anticipated to reduce the impacts of the Proposed Development from a **substantial** to a **moderate negative** magnitude of impact upon any remains present. These works will improve understanding of the historic landscape within which the Proposed Development will be situated. This would result in a **residual intermediate to minor adverse** effect on remains of medium heritage value, and a **residual minor adverse** effect on low value heritage assets. These effects are **not considered significant** in EIA terms.
- 12.7.3 It is not anticipated that mitigation would be able to reduce the impact of the Proposed Development upon the Gillingham Forest deer park. Therefore, the residual impact upon the asset would remain a **moderate negative impact**, which would result in an **intermediate to minor adverse** significance of effect. These effects are **not considered significant** in EIA terms.

Operational Phase

- 12.7.4 Mitigation proposals for King's Court Palace moated site (1017276) comprise partial screening from the Proposed Development by way of the extension of an existing tree-planting scheme conducted under the auspices of the Royal Forest Project. It is anticipated that the mitigated impact can be reduced to the lower end of slight negative, resulting in a minor adverse residual effect upon the setting and significance of the Scheduled Monument. These effects are **not considered significant** in EIA terms. However, on balance, the proposed development is considered to result in '**less than substantial harm**' to the significance of King's Court Palace Moated Site Scheduled Monument in NPPF terms. The level of harm is considered to be in the low-range of 'less than substantial harm'.
- 12.7.5 No further mitigation measures have been considered necessary for the Grade II listed buildings Park Farmhouse (1172639) and Madjestone Farm House (1110299). For Park Farmhouse, the magnitude of impact would therefore remain **slight negative**, resulting in a **residual intermediate to minor adverse** significance of effect. This is not considered to be significant in EIA terms. On balance, the proposed development is considered to result in '**less than substantial harm**' to the significance of Park Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building in NPPF terms. The level of harm is considered to be in the low-range of 'less than substantial harm'. At Madjestone Farm House, the magnitude of impact would remain **negligible negative**, resulting in a **residual neutral** significance of effect. On balance, the proposals are not even considered to amount to less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of Madjestone Farm House in NPPF terms. These effects are **not considered significant** in EIA terms.
- 12.7.6 The mitigation measures proposed for the non-designated heritage assets at Newhouse Farm and Cole Street Farm comprise good design, layout and partial screening. It is anticipated that mitigation would allow the level of impact to be reduced during the operational phase from an unmitigated moderate negative to residual **slight negative** magnitude of impact upon these unlisted built heritage assets, with a corresponding residual **minor to neutral adverse** significance of effect. These effects are **not considered significant** in EIA terms.

12.8 Cumulative impacts

Construction

- 12.8.1 There is an increased potential that buried and unrecorded archaeological remains and deposits will be **adversely** impacted as a result of cumulative development. It is assumed that appropriate mitigation will be undertaken in regards to potential remains, therefore acting to reduce the cumulative impact.
- 12.8.2 There will be an increased **adverse** impact upon the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets as a result of additional construction activities from multiple developments. While cumulative development will result in an elevated impact overall, this cannot be quantified due to the uncertainty associated with when construction will occur for specific developments

Operation

- 12.8.3 There will be an increased **adverse** impact upon the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets, and upon the historic landscape of the wider area, as a result of cumulative development. While cumulative development will result in an elevated impact overall, this cannot be quantified due to the limited detail available for the outline applications.



Table 12.4 Assessment Summary and Residual Environmental Effects (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							
Impact upon the settings of Designated Heritage Assets: Kings Court Palace (1017276); Park Farmhouse (1172639); and Madjestone Farm House (1110299)	High	Moderate negative	Intermediate adverse (temporary)	Standard environmental mitigation to reduce/ control dust, noise, plant traffic etc. The construction impacts could be reduced by ensuring that heavy construction traffic does not pass in close proximity to the designated buildings, depending upon construction phase.	Slight negative (temporary)	Intermediate to minor adverse	High
Impact upon the settings of unlisted built assets: Newhouse Farm building group and Cole Street Farm building group	Low	Moderate negative	Minor adverse (temporary)	Standard environmental mitigation to reduce/ control dust, noise, plant traffic etc. The construction impacts could be reduced by ensuring that heavy construction traffic does not pass in close proximity to the designated buildings, depending upon construction phase.	Slight negative (temporary)	Minor adverse to neutral	High
Impact upon Gillingham Forest deer park MDO27854	Medium	Moderate negative	Intermediate to Minor adverse	No further mitigation measures are considered necessary.	Moderate negative	Intermediate to Minor adverse	High



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
Impact upon recorded heritage assets including: the enclosure complex in the Newhouse Farm area (potential later prehistoric enclosure), an arcing boundary thought to reflect the former course of the Gillingham Deer Park pale.	Medium	Substantial negative	Intermediate adverse	A programme of archaeological trial trenches is proposed across the Site to further explore the nature of the features identified through the geophysical survey, and to explore areas of the Site where potential anomalies have been masked by magnetic interference and modern agricultural activities. This will inform the requirement for further archaeological mitigation measures.	Moderate negative	Minor adverse	High
Impact upon potential heritage assets	Medium	Substantial negative	Intermediate adverse	A programme of archaeological trial trenches is proposed across the Site to identify the presence and absence of features and deposits of archaeological interest. This will inform the requirement for further archaeological mitigation measures.	Moderate negative	Intermediate to Minor adverse	High
	Low	Substantial negative	Intermediate-Minor adverse		Moderate negative	Minor adverse	High
Operation							
Impact on the setting of King's Court Palace (1017276)	High	Slight negative	Intermediate to Minor adverse	Mitigation through design at reserved matters: planting of additional vegetation to screen development and to reduce intrusive views. Development layout can be designed to provide appropriate building layouts and orientation to reduce major changes to the skyline. Reassessment of impacts to be completed.	Slight negative	Minor adverse	High



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
Impact on the settings of Park Farmhouse (1172639) and Madjestone Farm House (1110299)	High	Slight negative	Intermediate to Minor adverse	No further mitigation measures are considered necessary.	Slight negative	Intermediate to Minor adverse	High
Impact upon the settings of unlisted built assets: Newhouse Farm building group and Cole Street Farm building group	Low	Moderate negative	Minor adverse	Mitigation through design at reserved matters: planting of additional vegetation to screen development and to reduce intrusive views. Development layout can be designed to provide appropriate building layouts and orientation immediately adjacent to the buildings to reduce overshadowing and major changes to the skyline. Reassessment of impacts to be completed.	Slight negative	Minor to Neutral adverse	High



Table 12.5 Means by which Additional Mitigation Measure may be Secured (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		
Indirect effects on designated heritage assets	Good working practices, Considerate Contractor Scheme, CEMP or similar	Planning condition.
Adverse effect on previously unidentified archaeological remains	Archaeological evaluation post-determination.	Agreement of Written Schemes of Investigation with County Archaeological Advisers and CIfA Standards and Guidance.
Adverse effect on archaeological remains identified during evaluation	Preservation by record as Reserved Matters	Planning condition: Written Schemes of Investigation and CIfA Standards and Guidance.
Operation		
Adverse effect on archaeological remains identified during evaluation	Publication and interpretation of remains identified and investigated on the site.	Planning condition, CIL

12.9 Glossary

Term	Definition
Archaeological Evaluation	Archaeological trial trenching exercise to determine the presence/absence, nature, extent, date and significance of archaeological remains.
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)	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 assets physical presence but also from its setting.
Setting	The setting of a heritage asset is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Setting of an asset affects its understanding, appreciation and significance.

ⁱ HMSO (1979) Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act.
ⁱⁱ HMSO (1990) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act.
ⁱⁱⁱ DCMS (2010) Scheduled Monuments: Identifying, protecting, conserving and investigating nationally important archaeological sites under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.
^{iv} Highways Agency (2008) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3, part 2 HA 208/07 Cultural Heritage. Highways Agency.
^v Department for Transport (2003) Transport Analysis Guidance. The Heritage of Historic Resources Sub-Objective. TAG Unit 3.3.9.

^{vi} Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets
^{vii} Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets
^{viii} WYG, (2017) Gillingham Southern Extension, Dorset, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, Setting Assessment & Geophysical Survey
^{ix} Headland Archaeology (2017) Gillingham Southern Extension, Dorset: Geophysical Survey, GSEX/01