



# The Sizewell C Project

## 6.6 Volume 5 Two Village Bypass Chapter 9 Terrestrial Historic Environment

---

Revision: 1.0  
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(a)  
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

---

May 2020

Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



## Contents

|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| 9.  | Terrestrial Historic Environment .....   | 1  |
| 9.1 | Introduction.....                        | 1  |
| 9.2 | Legislation, policy and guidance.....    | 2  |
| 9.3 | Methodology .....                        | 4  |
| 9.4 | Baseline environment .....               | 12 |
| 9.5 | Environmental design and mitigation..... | 37 |
| 9.6 | Assessment.....                          | 38 |
| 9.7 | Mitigation and monitoring.....           | 57 |
| 9.8 | Residual effects .....                   | 58 |
|     | References .....                         | 65 |

## Tables

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 9.1: Requirements of the National Policy Statements.....   | 3  |
| Table 9.2: Assessment of the value or sensitivity of receptors for terrestrial historic environment..... | 7  |
| Table 9.3: Assessment of magnitude of impact for terrestrial historic environment. ....                  | 8  |
| Table 9.4: Classification of effects. ....   | 9  |
| Table 9.5: Summary of effects for the construction phase.....  | 59 |
| Table 9.6: Summary of effects for the operational phase. ....  | 62 |

## Figures

- Figure 9.1: Designated Heritage Assets
- Figure 9.2: Non-Designated Heritage Records
- Figure 9.3: Historic Landscape Character
- Figure 9.4: Fieldwork to date (Jan 2020)

## Plates

None provided.

## Appendices



Appendix 9A: Gazetteer of heritage assets

Appendix 9B: Sizewell C Two Village Bypass Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. November 2018

Appendix 9C: Geophysical Survey Report, June 2019

Appendix 9D: Interim Fieldwork Summary, December 2019

## 9. Terrestrial Historic Environment

### 9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 This chapter of **Volume 5** of the **Environmental Statement (ES)** presents an assessment of the potential effects on the terrestrial historic environment arising from the construction and operation phases of the two village bypass (referred to throughout this volume as the ‘proposed development’) of Farnham and Stratford St Andrew. This includes an assessment of potential impacts, the significance of effects, the requirements for mitigation and the residual effects.

9.1.2 Detailed descriptions of the two village bypass site (referred to throughout this volume as the ‘site’), the proposed development and the different phases of development are provided in **Chapters 1** and **2** of this volume of the **ES**. A glossary of terms and list of abbreviations used in this chapter is provided in **Volume 1, Appendix 1A** of the **ES** (Doc Ref. 6.2).

9.1.3 This assessment has been informed by data from other assessments as follows:

- **Chapter 4** of this volume: Noise and vibration.
- **Chapter 6** of this volume: Landscape and visual impact.

9.1.4 This assessment has also been informed by data presented in the following technical appendices:

- **Appendix 9A** of this volume: Gazetteer of heritage assets.
- **Appendix 9B** of this volume: Sizewell C Two Village Bypass Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
- **Appendix 9C** of this volume: Geophysical Survey Report
- **Appendix 9D** of this volume: Interim Fieldwork Summary.
- **Annex 6L.1** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**: UK EPR Sizewell C – Historic Environment – Settings Assessment Scoping Recommendations Update, 2019.

9.1.5 Please note that the red line boundary used in the figures within the appendices was amended after these documents were finalised, and therefore does not reflect the boundaries in respect of which development consent has been sought in this application. However, the amendment to

the red line boundary does not have any impact on the findings set out in this document and all other information remains correct.

## 9.2 Legislation, policy and guidance

9.2.1 **Appendix 6L of Volume 1** of the **ES**, identifies and describes legislation, policy and guidance of relevance to the assessment of the potential terrestrial historic environment impacts associated with the Sizewell C Project across all **ES** volumes.

9.2.2 This section provides an overview of the specific legislation, policy and guidance of relevance to the terrestrial historic environment assessment of the proposed development.

### a) International

9.2.3 There is no international legislation or policy that is relevant to the terrestrial historic environment assessment of the proposed development.

### b) National

#### i. Legislation

9.2.4 National legislation relating to the terrestrial historic environment assessment include:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (Ref. 9.1).
- The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Ref. 9.2).
- The Infrastructure (Decisions) Regulations 2010 (Ref. 9.3).
- The Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (Ref. 9.4).
- The Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Ref. 9.5).

9.2.5 The requirements of these, as relevant to the terrestrial historic environment assessment, are set out in **Appendix 6L of Volume 1** of the **ES**.

#### ii. Planning policies

9.2.6 The National Policy Statement (NPS) 2011 sets out the national policy for energy infrastructure. The overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) (Ref. 9.6), and NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) (Ref. 9.7)

provide the primary policy framework within which the development will be considered. A summary of the relevant planning policy and heritage legislation together with consideration of how the advice has been taken into account is provided in **Appendix 6L** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**, with requirements specific to this site set out in **Table 9.1**.

**Table 9.1: Requirements of the National Policy Statements.**

| Ref.            | NPS topic requirement.   | How the requirement has been addressed for the proposed development.  |
|-----------------|--|---|
| EN-1<br>p5.8.9. | <i>"Where proposed development will affect the setting of a heritage asset, representative visualisations may be necessary to explain the impact."</i> | No heritage specific visualisations were requested by consultees. The magnitude and nature of the change to setting of designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the proposed development site is not anticipated to give rise to significant adverse effects. Therefore, specific heritage visualisations would not be pertinent to the assessment. However, visualisations prepared for the landscape and visual impact assessment have been referred to where appropriate in this chapter to support the narrative assessment. <b>Figure 6.4</b> of this volume illustrates the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) viewpoint locations. |

c) **Regional**

9.2.7 There is no regional legislation or policy that is relevant to the terrestrial historic environment assessment of the proposed development.

d) **Local**

9.2.8 Local policies relating to the terrestrial historic environment assessment include:

- Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (Ref. 9.8):
  - Development Management Policy DM21.
  - Strategic Policy SP15.
- SCDC Final Draft Local Plan (Ref.9.9):
  - Policy SCLP11.3.
  - Policy SCLP11.4.
  - Policy SCLP11.5.
  - Policy SCLP11.6.

- Policy SCLP11.7.
- Policy SCLP11.8.
- Policy SCLP11.9.

- Supplementary Planning Guidance 6 Historic Parks and Gardens (Ref. 9.10).

9.2.9 The requirements of these, as relevant to the terrestrial historic environment assessment, are set out in **Appendix 6L** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**.

e) **Guidance**

9.2.10 This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the following guidance documents:

- Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in decision-taking in the Historic Environment. Historic England, 2015 (Ref. 9.11).
- Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance. Historic England (Ref. 9.12).
- Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic England, 2017 (Ref. 9.13).
- Research and Archaeology: Framework for the East of England (2000, 2011 and draft updates 2018–19) (Ref. 9.14 – 9.17).
- National and Local Archaeological Standards and Guidance (Ref. 9.18 – 9.25).

9.2.11 Further details on this guidance, as relevant to the terrestrial historic environment assessment, is set out in **Appendix 6L** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**.

## 9.3 **Methodology**

a) **Scope of the assessment**

9.3.1 The generic Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) methodology is detailed in **Volume 1, Chapter 6** of the **ES**.

9.3.2 The full method of assessment for the terrestrial historic environment that has been applied for the Sizewell C Project is included in **Appendix 6L** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**.

9.3.3 This section provides specific details of the terrestrial historic environment methodology applied to the assessment of the proposed development, and a summary of the general approach to provide appropriate context. The scope of assessment considers the impacts of the construction and operation phases of the proposed development.

9.3.4 The scope of this assessment has been established through a formal EIA scoping process undertaken with the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). A request for an EIA Scoping Opinion was initially issued to the PINS in 2014, with an updated request issued in 2019, as provided in **Appendix 6A** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**.

9.3.5 Comments raised in the EIA Scoping Opinion received in 2014 and 2019 have been taken into account in the development of the assessment methodology. These are detailed in **Appendices 6A** to **6C** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**.

b) Consultation

9.3.6 The scope of the assessment has also been informed by ongoing consultation and engagement with statutory consultees throughout the design and assessment process. A summary of the comments raised and SZC Co.'s responses are detailed in **Appendices 6A** to **6C** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**.

9.3.7 Consultation was undertaken with Historic England and Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) with regards to the suitability of the spatial scope and data search study area. Confirmation that the assessment and information was adequate was received from SCCAS, Historic England and East Suffolk Council (ESC) through the Stage 3 consultation and within the 2019 EIA Scoping Opinion.

9.3.8 The Settings Assessment Scoping report provided in **Annex 6L.1** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**, was also consulted on with SCCAS, Historic England and ESC, and the outcome of that consultation have been incorporated into this assessment.

c) Study areas

9.3.9 The site and study area are illustrated in **Figures 9.1** to **9.3**.

9.3.10 The geographical extent of the study area comprises:

- the site;



- a 750 metres (m) study area, the ‘data search study area’, agreed by SCCAS for gathering data on all recorded heritage assets, historic mapping and cartographic and documentary sources; and
- a second, wider study area, the ‘settings study area’, agreed with Historic England for the inclusion of six designated heritage assets associated with Glemham Hall, which may be subject to indirect effects.

9.3.11 To inform the development of the scope of assessment of effects arising through change to setting, heritage assets which could be subject to significant adverse effects were identified from the wider settings study area considered in the Settings Assessment Scoping report provided in **Annex 6L.1 of Volume 1 of the ES**, and agreed with Historic England, SCCAS and ESC.

d) **Assessment scenarios**

9.3.12 The terrestrial historic environment assessment comprises the assessment of the entire construction and operation phases of the proposed development, rather than specific assessment years. The assessment of construction effects presents the worst-case during construction of the proposed development. The assessment of effects during the operational phase has considered the proposed development during the peak construction of the Sizewell C main development site as well as once the power station is operational where relevant.

e) **Assessment criteria**

9.3.13 As described in **Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES**, the EIA methodology considers whether impacts of the proposed development would have an effect on any resources or receptors. Assessments broadly consider the magnitude of impacts and value/sensitivity of resources/receptors that could be affected in order to classify effects.

9.3.14 A detailed description of the assessment methodology used to assess the potential effects on the terrestrial historic environment arising from the proposed development is provided in **Appendix 6L of Volume 1 of the ES**. A summary of the assessment criteria used in this assessment is presented in the following sub-sections.

i. **Sensitivity (heritage significance)**

9.3.15 Heritage assets that may be affected by the proposed development have been assigned a level of heritage significance (value or sensitivity) in accordance with the definitions set out in **Appendix 6L of Volume 1 of the**

**ES.** Heritage significance is rated within the range of high-medium-low-very low.

9.3.16 The assessment of assigning the levels of sensitivity to receptors is set out in **Table 9.2**.

**Table 9.2: Assessment of the value or sensitivity of receptors for terrestrial historic environment.**

| Heritage significance (value or sensitivity). | Summary rationale.   | Example asset class.  |
|---|--|---|
| <b>High</b>                                   | Asset has significance for an outstanding level of archaeological, architectural, historic and/or artistic interest. | All designated heritage assets or non-designated assets of demonstrably schedulable quality.                    |
| <b>Medium</b>                                 | Asset has significance for a high level of archaeological, architectural, historic and/or artistic interest.         | Locally listed buildings and buildings of merit.<br>Regionally significant non-designated archaeological sites. |
| <b>Low</b>                                    | Asset has significance for elements of archaeological architectural, historic or artistic interest.                  | Locally-significant archaeological site.  |
| <b>Very low.</b>                              | Due to its nature, form/condition/survival, cannot be considered as an asset in its own right.                       | Non-extant historic environment record (HER).   |

ii. **Magnitude**

9.3.17 The magnitude of impact is based on the consequences that the proposed development would have on the heritage significance of the historic environment resource, and has been considered in terms of high-medium-low-very low, as set out in **Table 9.3** and detailed in **Appendix 6L** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**.

9.3.18 Potential changes have also been considered in terms of duration, whether the impact is permanent, temporary or reversible, adverse (negative) or beneficial (positive), and whether the change is likely to give rise to cumulative effects.

9.3.19 The criteria for the assessment of magnitude of impact are shown in **Table 9.3**.

**Table 9.3: Assessment of magnitude of impact for terrestrial historic environment.**

| Magnitude       | Summary rationale (Negative)   | Summary rationale (Positive)  |
|-----------------|--|---|
| <b>High</b>     | Loss of significance of an order of magnitude that would result from irreversible total, or substantial demolition/disturbance of a heritage asset, or from the disassociation of an asset from its setting. Impacts of this magnitude would generally be considered substantial harm on the heritage significance of an asset.  | Sympathetic restoration of an at-risk, or otherwise degraded heritage asset and/or its setting, and bringing into sustainable use with robust long-term management secured.                               |
| <b>Medium</b>   | Loss of significance arising from partial disturbance or inappropriate alteration of an asset which will adversely affect its importance. Change to the key characteristics of an asset’s setting, which gives rise to lasting harm to the significance of the asset, but which still allows its archaeological, architectural, or historic interest to be appreciated. Impacts of this magnitude would generally be considered less than substantial harm on the heritage significance of an asset. | Appropriate stabilisation and/or enhancement of a heritage asset, and/or its setting that better reveal the significance of the asset, or contribute to a long-term sustainable use or management regime. |
| <b>Low</b>      | Minor loss to or alteration of an asset which leaves its current significance largely intact. Minor and/or short-term <sup>1</sup> changes to setting which do not affect the key characteristics, and in which the historical context remains substantially intact. Impacts of this magnitude would generally be considered less than substantial harm on the heritage significance of an asset.  | Minor enhancements to a heritage asset, and/or its setting that better reveal its significance, or contribute to sustainable use and management.  |
| <b>Very low</b> | Minor alteration of an asset which does not affect its significance in any discernible way. Minor and/or short-term or reversible change to setting which does not affect the significance of the asset. Impacts of this magnitude would generally be considered of limited harm to heritage significance.   | Minor alteration of an asset which does not affect its significance in any discernible way. Minor and/or short-term or reversible change to setting which does not affect the significance of the asset.  |

iii. **Effect definitions**

9.3.20 The classification of the effect is judged on the basis of the magnitude of impact to the assessed heritage significance of the resource, and a narrative discussion is then given to support the conclusion. These effects may be adverse (negative) or beneficial (positive).

<sup>1</sup> Short-term is defined within this project and technical discipline as being of less than approximately 2 years’ duration, medium term of 2-10 years and long-term of 10-25 years duration. Any effects anticipated to persist for over 25 years would normally be considered permanent.

9.3.21 The definitions of effect for the terrestrial historic environment are shown in **Table 9.4**.

**Table 9.4: Classification of effects.**

|           |          | Heritage significance (sensitivity) |            |          |          |
|-----------|----------|-------------------------------------|------------|----------|----------|
|           |          | Very low                            | Low        | Medium   | High     |
| Magnitude | Very low | Negligible                          | Negligible | Minor    | Minor    |
|           | Low      | Negligible                          | Minor      | Minor    | Moderate |
|           | Medium   | Minor                               | Minor      | Moderate | Major    |
|           | High     | Minor                               | Moderate   | Major    | Major    |

9.3.22 Following the classification of an effect, as presented in **Table 9.4**, a clear statement and rationale is provided as to whether the effect is 'significant' or 'not significant'. As a general rule, major and moderate effects are considered to be significant, and minor and negligible effects are considered to be not significant. However, professional judgement is also applied where appropriate.

9.3.23 The assessment of the predicted significance of the effects is reported following incorporation of environmental measures embedded within design, as set out within **section 9.5**.

f) [Assessment methodology](#)

i. [Existing baseline](#)

9.3.24 Heritage assets were identified through:

- A search of the records held at the National Record of the Historic Environment (NHRE) and the Suffolk County Council HER. The data search also included Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) information; these are only referred to in broad terms given their sensitive nature. The searches were undertaken in April 2018.
- A search of the National Heritage List for England (NHLE), which contains data of designated assets was carried out in April 2018 and subsequently updated in January 2019.
- Analysis of the historic landscape characterisation (HLC) data for Suffolk, conducted in April 2018.

- A review of the two available Suffolk National Mapping Programme<sup>2</sup> project data sets (the study area is not within either, which was confirmed by the review in April 2018).
- A review of the available light detecting and ranging data from Environment Agency Geomatics in May 2018.
- A search of historical maps and documentation at the Ipswich branch of the Suffolk Record Office, conducted in 2014.
- A total of 36 vertical prints were reviewed from the National Record of the Historic Environment. A further search of the Cambridge University collection of aerial photography revealed no relevant aerial photographs.

9.3.25 In addition to the desk-based research that was undertaken, site investigations were carried out at the site in order to identify both known and previously unrecorded heritage assets (for example historic landscape features, extant earthworks). These surveys included:

- site visit (included within the desk based assessment (DBA) provided in **Appendix 9B** of this volume;
- detailed geophysical surveys provided in **Appendix 9C** of this volume; and
- evaluation trenching provided in **Appendix 9D** of this volume.

9.3.26 The full list of identified archaeological and historical sites, features and finds identified within the study area is presented in the gazetteer of heritage assets provided at **Appendix 9A** of this volume, and illustrated on **Figures 9.1** and **9.2**.

9.3.27 Direct effects on heritage assets are those which result from physical damage or disturbance which gives rise to a loss of heritage significance. Consequently, it is only those assets which might be physically disturbed by (i.e. within the site) the proposed development which are potentially subject to direct effects. As archaeological features are not always evident, a DBA, provided at **Appendix 9B** of this volume, was undertaken to examine archaeological heritage assets up to 750m from the site boundary to provide contextual information for understanding the potential locations of heritage assets within the site, and to ascertain the potential for heritage assets to be directly affected.

---

<sup>2</sup> Project comprising large area archaeological survey, which map and record archaeological features using aerial photographs and airborne laser scanning (lidar) as the main sources.

9.3.28 As conclusions from DBA are predictive, there are some cases where the potential presence of heritage assets, or their significance remains difficult to state with confidence, although professional experience and judgement can be applied. The results of further survey work, comprising geophysical survey, provided at **Appendix 9C** of this volume, and evaluation trenching of parts of the site, provided at **Appendix 9D** of this volume, in 2019 has also been incorporated into the assessment of effects for the proposed development.

9.3.29 Indirect effects on heritage assets have been defined as those which result in change to heritage significance, but do not give rise to physical damage or disturbance to the asset. In this context, these effects would generally arise through change to the settings of heritage assets. Historic England guidance sets out a methodology for considering any effects on the significance of heritage assets arising from change to setting. This is summarised in **Appendix 6L** of **Volume 1** of the **ES**.

9.3.30 The heritage assets identified within the settings search area through desk-based research comprise a number of different asset types with differing characteristics. The Settings Assessment Scoping report, provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**, has regard to the specific nature of the setting of each asset within the settings study area, and considers factors such as visibility of the proposed development in views of, and from, heritage assets, as well as other potential perceptual changes such as increased traffic movements and noise.

g) **Assumptions and limitations**

9.3.31 The following limitations have been identified:

- All assessment considers development within the site parameters as set out in the description of development at **section 2.3** of **Chapter 2** of this volume of the **ES** and illustrated on the **Work plans** reproduced in **Appendix 2A** of this volume.
- DBA is a predictive tool, and relies on a series of assumptions and extrapolations to develop an understanding of the potential extent and character of archaeological remains within the site.
- Geophysical survey is based on taking measurements of physical properties of the site that may have a number of causes. Conclusions from this type of survey remain predictive, but more refined inferences can be drawn on the basis of the nature and morphology of anomalies.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- Geophysical survey was carried out on approximately two thirds of the site as it was not possible to arrange access to the whole site at the time of writing.
- Evaluation trenching establishes the presence or absence of archaeological remains, and tests inferences made on the basis of desk-based and geophysical survey. While this approach considers a sample area of a site, it allows a clear understanding of the location, nature and significance of heritage assets which is considered robust. Evaluation trenching carried out to date (January 2020) is illustrated on **Figure 9.4**.
- Where assessment conclusions are based on desk-based or geophysical survey, a reasonable worst-case assessment is provided.

## 9.4 Baseline environment

9.4.1 This section presents a description of the baseline environmental characteristics within the site and in the surrounding area.

9.4.2 Further detail can be found in **Appendices 9A to 9D** of this volume.

### a) Current baseline

9.4.3 The baseline environmental information is drawn from the two village bypass DBA prepared in 2018, and subsequent geophysical survey and archaeological evaluation trenching (where undertaken).

9.4.4 The full list of identified archaeological and historical sites, features and finds identified within the data search study area is presented in **Appendix 9A** (gazetteer) of this volume. The gazetteer refers to heritage assets by their HER parish number or NHLE number.

9.4.5 Heritage records for the data search study area are illustrated on **Figure 9.1** and **9.2**.

### i. Site description and topography

9.4.6 The site comprises 54.8 hectares (ha) of primarily agricultural land as well as highway land. In a west to east direction, the site begins at the A12 to the west of Stratford St. Andrew, east of Parkgate Farm and Stratford Plantation. At the western end, the site occupies lower ground of the River Alde valley, and encompasses parts of the A12, Tinker Brook and another unnamed road. The land falls to the south-east from approximately 12m Above Ordnance Datum (AoD) at Stratford St. Andrew sloping to 3m AoD along the course of the river. Moving eastward, the ground level rises to

26m AoD as the site intersects two unnamed roads, and two areas of woodland, Whin Covert and Nuttery Belt. The site continues north-east across gently undulating agricultural fields, passing between Farnham Hall and Foxburrow Wood. The ground level gently falls again where the site encompasses a section of the A12 where it meets the A1094 Friday Street junction.

- 9.4.7 The majority of the site is within the parish of Farnham and Stratford St Andrew, while the north-east of the site is within the parish of Benhall. The parish boundary runs along the track from Friday Street, to the north of Mollett's Farm, crossing the site, and then running into Farnham and out to the west.
- 9.4.8 The superficial geology underlying the site comprises diamicton deposits (poorly-sorted matrix-supported deposits) of the Lowestoft Formation in the western and eastern sections of the site, in the vicinity of the junctions with the A12 (Ref 9.26). Alluvium is shown as present underlying the network of drains and River Alde crossing the west of the site. Superficial deposits are recorded absent in some areas in the east of the site. The soils comprise freely draining slightly acidic loamy soils (Ref. 9.27).
- 9.4.9 The site is underlain by three different bedrock strata. The majority of the site is underlain by Chillesford Church Sand Member, described as shallow-water marine and estuarine sands, gravels, silts and clays. There is a small area of Red Crag Formation in the west of the site, underlying the River Alde, described as 'coarse-grained, poorly sorted, cross-bedded, abundantly shelly sands'. The north-east of the site is underlain by the Crag Group, described as 'shallow-water marine and estuarine sands, gravels, silts and clays'.
- 9.4.10 A historical borehole log has been identified located 10m to the north-west of the site adjacent to the A12. The borehole encountered topsoil from ground level to 0.3m below ground level (bgl) underlain by possible head deposits (0.3m to 0.7m bgl) and the Chillesford Church Sand Member (0.7m–2.3m bgl).
- 9.4.11 The site is located primarily within a landscape area identified as rolling estate sandlands on the eastern edge of claylands (Ref. 9.28). These sandlands are characterised by rolling river terraces and coastal slopes, and their historical development has been conditioned by infertile soils, suited to grazing or rye cultivation, with the elevated land beside water courses attracting settlement from an early date. Woodland belts are a consistent feature reflecting the agricultural improvements of the 18th and 19th centuries.



**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 9.4.12 The south-western end of the site is dominated by the course of the River Alde. The landscape character here is identified as valley meadowlands, where flat valley floor grasslands are on silty and peat soils. The grassland is divided by a network of ditches which are commonly lined with trees.
- 9.4.13 Views across the landscape are often interrupted, relatively short and confined due to woodland, field boundary planting and topography.
- 9.4.14 A full description of the route may be found in **Chapter 2** of this volume.

**ii. Designated heritage assets**

- 9.4.15 One designated heritage asset, Glemham Hall Registered Park and Garden (Grade II 1001461), lies at the north-eastern edge of the site. The site extends into the park boundary for 50m along the existing A12. Although the part of the A12 which lies within the park boundary is included within the site, no intrusive works are proposed here and as a result it is scoped out of direct effects.
- 9.4.16 The settings study area contains 16 designated heritage assets. These include the Grade I Little Glemham Hall and associated listed buildings set within Glemham Hall Registered Park and Garden (Grade II 1001461). Two Grade II\* listed churches are the Church of St Mary (LB 1230211) at the southern edge of Farnham, and the Church of St Andrew (LB 1231407) within the village of Stratford St Andrew. All other buildings within the settings study area are listed at Grade II, the majority of which comprise houses and shops to either side of the A12 in Farnham and Stratford. Farnham Manor (LB 1230210) is located to the south-east of the village, and the site boundary abuts the east wall of its garden.
- 9.4.17 Designated heritage assets are presented at **Appendix 9A** of this volume and on **Figure 9.1**.

**iii. Non-designated heritage records**

- 9.4.18 Seven HER monument records are located within the site boundary.
- 9.4.19 There are a further 51 HER records located within the data search study area. The heritage records comprise a variety of heritage features ranging from prehistoric flint artefact scatters to Second World War (WWII) pillboxes and lookouts.
- 9.4.20 The HER includes 19 records of previous archaeological investigations undertaken across the data search study area including geophysical survey, evaluation trenching, and the archaeological monitoring of construction works.

9.4.21 There is one area of ancient woodland within the data search study area at Foxburrow Wood, located adjacent to the eastern half of the proposed route, approximately 250m to the east of Farnham Hall.

9.4.22 The non-designated heritage records within the site and data search study area are listed at **Appendix 9A** of this volume and shown in **Figure 9.2**.

#### iv. Historic landscape character

9.4.23 The Suffolk HLC project identifies the site as predominantly comprising “*random fields and irregular co-axial fields of pre-18th century enclosure.*” The central part of the site comprises “*post-1950 agricultural landscape*” representing boundary loss from the earlier random field systems.

9.4.24 The HLC defines pre-18th century enclosure as being common across Suffolk and refers to land that was enclosed before the 1700s, in contrast to other parts of the country where land was enclosed in the 18th and 19th centuries following common field farming in the medieval period. These earlier enclosed landscapes in Suffolk may date primarily to the late-medieval period, and can be of some historic significance (Ref. 9.29).

9.4.25 Hedgerows which are considered of historic interest are present within the site boundary. The tithe and Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping shows a strong continuity within the field systems recorded in the study area. Where change has occurred to field boundaries, this appears primarily as a result of loss of hedgerow through the amalgamation of smaller fields. These hedgerows are best considered of low heritage significance as relict elements of the historic landscape.

9.4.26 There are areas of woodland and shelter planting within and around the site, which coupled with the undulating terrain, restrict the number of long views and interrupt the horizon.

9.4.27 The River Alde valley context suggests a potential for deposits of geoarchaeological or palaeoenvironmental interest to be present.

9.4.28 The HLC areas are illustrated on **Figure 9.3**.

#### v. Archaeological and historical background

##### Prehistoric (Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age)

9.4.29 A small number of HER records within the site boundary date from the prehistoric period. These include widespread scatters of worked and heavily burnt flints (FNM 006, FNM 007, FNM 008, FNM 009), recorded during fieldwalking carried out in 1991 to assess proposed A12

improvement works, which were not carried out. Within an area of flint scatter in the west of the site (FNM 009), geophysical survey has identified three small discrete anomalies which are uncertain in origin, and may be indicative of archaeological features, natural geology or soil composition or ferrous objects, provided in **Appendix 9C** of this volume. Numerous weak linear anomalies also detected across this area are thought to be the result of ploughing. This interpretation could explain the scattered nature of prehistoric flint recovered. Where scatters of burnt and worked flint were recorded east of Pond Wood (FNM 008), geophysical survey recorded a weak linear anomaly indicating a former field boundary, as well as further linear anomalies probably resulting from ploughing.

- 9.4.30 The PAS has records of finds dating to the Bronze Age, including a site of metal working debris within the study area. These suggest a level of activity within the area during this period.
- 9.4.31 Within the study area, field systems, which include two main phases of prehistoric field boundaries dating from the Bronze Age and Iron Age period, were identified at Land off Hill Farm during geophysical survey and evaluation (FNM 021).
- 9.4.32 A small number of chance finds dating from the Iron Age have been found. These comprise pottery sherds (BNL 011; BNL 042), and two PAS finds of probable Iron Age date.
- 9.4.33 A particular feature of late Iron Age settlement in East Suffolk is the preference for relatively high ground overlooking the valleys (Ref. 9.30), similar to the topography to the eastern and western parts of the study area.
- 9.4.34 The site crosses the valley of the River Alde. This landscape context suggests an elevated potential for the presence of colluvial deposits on the side of the valley, which may have sealed archaeological remains or former land surfaces, and the low-lying land may afford opportunities for the preservation of organic materials in waterlogged deposits. While this context cannot be taken as an indication of the presence of prehistoric remains, it suggests that where remains are present, they may be particularly well-preserved.
- 9.4.35 Evaluation trenching, provided in **Appendix 9D** of this volume, towards the eastern half of the site, as illustrated in **Figure 9.4**, found remains, including ditches and pits, dating to between the Bronze Age and Middle Iron Age. The evidence is spread across the area excavated, suggesting settlement within the vicinity of the site.
- 9.4.36 The existing evidence would suggest that there is a high potential for further remains dating to prehistoric periods to be present within the site

boundary. Remains are likely to represent elements of settlement, and associated agricultural activity rather than just chance finds. They would potentially be of medium significance, supporting research agendas in understanding the understanding of settlement and changes, as well as the chronological development of prehistoric periods.

- 9.4.37 The absence of any stratified material of this date within the study area suggests that the potential for remains within the site boundary dating to the Iron Age period may be low. However, a particular feature of late Iron Age settlement in East Suffolk is the preference for relatively high ground, overlooking the valleys, similar to the topography of the eastern and western parts of the study area. There is a discernible promontory, on which Stratford St Andrew was sited, and another promontory to the south of Farnham, which is crossed by the site. The potential for the presence of remains of this date is considered to be medium. Where archaeological remains are located within the valley bottom, it is likely that remains would be well preserved, though remains on the higher promontories are likely to have been more significantly disturbed by ploughing, and are unlikely to have such favourable conditions for the preservation of organic material. Consequently, it is likely that any remains of this date could be of medium significance.

#### Romano-British

- 9.4.38 No records dating to the Romano-British period are known within the site boundary. However, there are records of Roman pottery and metal work found at various locations within the study area (e.g. SSA 002, GLL 002) and a Roman tile was reportedly used within the Norman fabric of the Church of St Mary (FNM 010). The name Stratford, of Stratford St Andrew, is believed to have come from the ford by which a Roman road crossed the River Alde. This road (possibly a predecessor of the A12 route) maybe that which ran from Combretovium (Baylham House), to the supposed town of Sitomagus. It has been suggested anecdotally that the Church of St Mary sits on the site of a Roman encampment, although there is no clear material or documentary evidence for this.
- 9.4.39 A number of PAS findspots dating to the Romano-British period including metal and pottery small finds suggestive of settlement have been also recorded within the study area. Several of these are located to the north-east part of the study area. Evaluation trenching, illustrated in **Appendix 9D** of this volume, also found a single sherd of Roman pottery within a ditch terminus.
- 9.4.40 The Romano-British finds recorded to date within the study area are largely chance finds. No definitive stratified evidence or features dating to the Romano-British period are known within the site boundary. The

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

potential for further Roman-British remains is medium, and the nature, and significance of these is at present uncertain, but there is no indication that remains of high heritage significance will be present.

#### Early-medieval and medieval

- 9.4.41 The settlements of Benhall, Stratford and Farnham, which have names of Old English origin, are identified at Domesday, and the basic medieval administrative geography of the area appears to have been well-established by the Norman Conquest.
- 9.4.42 The DBA did not identify any material evidence for activity dating from the early-medieval period within the site or study area, other than the surviving medieval fabric of the churches. There is a possible moat to the south of the site (GLL 011), and a scatter of medieval pottery was recovered from the fields west of Pond Barn (FNM 005), as well as chance finds of medieval metal objects and pottery. Evaluation trenching illustrated in **Appendix 9D** of this volume found ditches dating to the 13th to 14th centuries, most likely relating to land subdivision during this period.
- 9.4.43 It is likely that the modern settlement pattern around the churches, village cores and outlying farmsteads has medieval origins, and while it is possible that further outlying elements of medieval agricultural and industrial activity are present within or close to the site, it is unlikely that substantial settlement remains would be present.
- 9.4.44 While Glemham Park (GLL 003) is recorded as a medieval deerpark and may have its origins in the 13th century, its present layout is a product of later design and it is best understood as a post-medieval feature.
- 9.4.45 The general pattern of rural settlement in this area has been stable, and it can be expected that medieval settlements would have been largely focused on the existing settlement cores at halls, churches and greens within the present villages (Ref. 9.31). However, settlement has remained relatively dispersed and it is likely that outlying farmsteads or activity areas were present throughout the study area. The potential for archaeological remains dating to the medieval period is considered to be low. The significance of any remains will depend upon their nature and survival, but these remains are most likely to be of local archaeological and historic interest and of low significance for archaeological interest.

#### Post-medieval and modern

- 9.4.46 Records of remains of this date are focused on the existing farmsteads and settlements within the study area, such as the site of Mollett's Barn

(FNM 019), the early 19th-century buildings at Pond Barn (FNM 022) and outbuildings at Rosehill House (FNM 017).

- 9.4.47 The present layouts of designed landscape at Glemham Hall, which is designated as a Grade II Registered Park and Garden (1001461) at the western end of the route, and the non-designated Benhall Park (BNL 017) at the eastern end of the site date from the 17th and 18th centuries.
- 9.4.48 The modern A12 follows the line of the Ipswich – Lowestoft turnpike road which was established during the late-19th century, and the East Suffolk line passes through the eastern part of the study area.
- 9.4.49 It is not anticipated that there would be significant remains of this date present within the proposed site, although elements of dispersed farmsteads or industrial sites may be present.
- 9.4.50 The modern period experienced a general continuity of settlement and agricultural land use from the post-medieval period. HER records of modern features comprise anti-invasion defences, two WWII auxiliary hides (SSA 016; SSA 017) within Glemham Park, and a pillbox to the south of the A12 at the eastern edge of Stratford St Andrew (SSA 014).
- 9.4.51 Remains dating to this period have a degree of archaeological and historic interest but are likely to be of low significance.

#### vi. Previous impacts

- 9.4.52 There is little disturbance from modern construction activities; the majority of the site has been in agricultural use for some time, probably since the medieval period. Repeated ploughing in this area will have had an impact on the survival of the below ground archaeology, particularly of features or deposits predating the medieval period. This impact will have increased over time as the depth of ploughing gradually increased. Evidence from the geophysical survey and evaluation at land off Hill Farm (FNM 021), supports this assumption and suggests that, where intensive ploughing has happened, the features and deposits dating to the prehistoric period are likely to be poorly preserved, whereas later activity (e.g. early medieval or medieval) may be better preserved. This pattern of preservation has also been observed nearby at the Sizewell C main development site (Ref. 9.32), although where colluvial deposits survive it is possible that prehistoric remains would be protected from modern ploughing. While areas of permanent pasture would not have been affected in this way, agricultural change means that present land use is not necessarily a useful indicator of past cultivation.

#### vii. Potential archaeological heritage assets within the site

9.4.53 The areas of highest potential for survival of archaeological remains along the proposed road alignment can be summarised as:

- Prehistoric remains representing elements of settlement and associated agricultural activity.
- A particular feature of late Iron Age settlement in East Suffolk is the preference for relatively high ground overlooking the valleys. Stratford St Andrew is sited on a discernible promontory of higher ground above the valley floor, and there is another promontory within the site, located to the south of Farnham.
- Where archaeological remains are located within the valley bottom, it is likely that remains would be well preserved. Remains on the higher promontories are likely to have been subject to a greater degree of disturbance as a result of ploughing and are also unlikely to have such favourable (e.g. waterlogged) conditions for the preservation of organic material.
- Medieval remains of dispersed farmsteads or industrial sites may be present within the site.

9.4.54 Geophysical survey identified possible linear features of archaeological interest within fields in the west end of the site adjacent to Parkgate Farm, which correspond to field patterns evident on historic mapping. This area of the site is characterised as “*pre-18th century enclosure*” by the Suffolk HLC project indicating a post-medieval or earlier origin for these features of low heritage significance.

#### viii. Heritage assets subject to potential indirect effects

9.4.55 The following assets subject to potential indirect effects were scoped into the assessment and set out within the Settings Assessment Scoping report following discussion with consultees as provided in **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**:

- Farnham Manor (LB II 1230210).
- Church of St Mary (LB II\* 1230211).
- Elm Tree Farmhouse (LB II 1230213).
- Elm Tree Cottage (LB II 1230214).
- Post Office Stores (LB II 1230215).

- George and Dragon (LB II 1230216).
- Turret Cottage Turret House (LB II 1230217).
- Church of St Andrew (LB II\* 1231407).
- Four cottages 30m south of St Andrew's Church (LB II 1278123).
- Benhallstock Cottages (LB II 1377115).
- Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461).
- Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507).
- Retaining wall of ha-ha 30m west of Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1230629).
- Garden walling to south of Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1230800).
- Lodge at entrance to Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1278406).
- Little Glemham Hall Stables (LB II 1278438).
- Ponds Barn (FNM 022).

#### Farnham Manor (LB II 1230210)

9.4.56 Farnham Manor (LB 1230210), formerly listed as 'Farnham Hall' is a house dating to the early 17th century, timber framed and plastered with a brick gable to the south and a plaintile roof, and more recent 20th century modifications. It is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural, historic and archaeological interests:

- Large 17th century estate house.
- Surviving historic building fabric.
- Evidence of architectural development.
- Potential archaeological remains relating to the manor, associated non-designated buildings and gardens.
- Relationship with Foxburrow Wood (FNM 011).

9.4.57 Farnham Manor (LB 1230210) is set within private gardens, on the south side of an unnamed road opposite a group of non-designated 19th and 20th century buildings, some of which appear to have formed part of the historic core of the Farnham estate. The manor and garden are surrounded by



hedges which are higher to the west, north and east, but which appear to have been maintained to afford clear views into the field immediately to the south of the house. This setting provides a clear visual link between the farmhouse and the adjacent arable land, which also provides a regionally-distinctive rural context and contribute to the historic interest of the asset.

9.4.58 A particular feature of the wider landscape setting are the pockets of woodland, particularly that of Foxburrow Wood (FNM 011) (designated Ancient Woodland) which lies east of Farnham Manor (LB 1230210), opposite an arable field. The two are connected by a track. The view along this track is illustrated on **Figure 6.8**. This spatial relationship is evident on late 18th century historic mapping, and a study of the available evidence suggests that the woodland (now much reduced in size), and the track were laid out at the same time, rather than being a result of gradual landscape development. It is suggested that this was perhaps part of the wider activity of enclosure which involved woodland creation during the 16th or 17th century, which would make the woodland broadly contemporary with Farnham Manor (LB 1230210). The 1841 Farnham tithe map records Foxburrow Wood (FNM 011) within the Farnham Manor estate. This wider setting of Farnham Manor contributes to its historic interest.

9.4.59 The primary architectural interest is inherent in the standing building which is most clearly appreciated in relatively close views from within the hedges around the house and do not specifically relate to the wider landscape.

#### Church of St Mary (LB II\* 1230211)

9.4.60 This is a parish church comprising a nave, chancel and west tower primarily constructed in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries, but which retains 12th century features. The church underwent restoration in the 19th century when four heavy sloping brick buttresses were added. It is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural, historic and archaeological interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric of multiple phases, including medieval.
- Potential archaeological remains relating to the use and history of the church.
- Buried remains and gravestones within surrounding churchyard.
- Historic parish church still in current use.

9.4.61 The Church of St Mary (LB II\* 1230211) is located within a rectangular graveyard plot (FNM 010) within which are large trees, which obscure views eastward from the church, and to the church from the east, but interrupt

views to the west and south to a lesser degree. An illustrative view point is provided by the LVIA illustrative viewpoint 2 (I2) within **Appendix 6A** of this volume. This setting contributes to the architectural, archaeological and historic interest, where the consecrated ground defines a sacred, religious space serving as a final resting place, and within which its architecture can be appreciated.

**9.4.62** The church is sited at the southern edge of the village and near the access road to Farnham Manor (LB 1230210) upon a hill overlooking the River Alde and agricultural land to the south giving its wider rural setting. This elevation affords some longer views both to and from the church, and provides a sense of localised prominence in glimpsed views as the viewer enters Farnham along the A12. These aspects of setting contribute positively to the historic interest of the church, reflecting its role within the local agricultural life and economy.

**9.4.63** Whilst traffic noise is audible from the A12, which passes through the village to the north of the church, this noise is not a dominant element of the setting of the church, and makes a minor negative contribution to the perception of historic interest of the church.

#### Elm Tree Farmhouse (LB II 1230213)

**9.4.64** A farmhouse, possibly formerly two separate dwellings, dating to the late 16th or early 17th century. Timber-framed and plastered with a brick casing to the west side and a thatched roof. It is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural, historic and archaeological interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.
- Relatively rare example of substantially complete farm building dating to this period.
- Evidence of development of regional farm building traditions.
- Potential archaeological remains relating to the farmstead.
- Surviving element of the wider historic agricultural landscape.

**9.4.65** The farmhouse is located on the northern edge of Farnham village, on the east side of the A12. The building is currently in residential use, and is set back from the A12, to the rear of Elm Tree Cottage (LB 1230214) and surrounded by a group of non-designated outbuildings. There is very little planting around the farmhouse, and the farmstead is defined by low fencing. Whilst the large non-listed barn and Elm Tree Cottage (LB 1230214) between the farmhouse, and A12 interrupt views to and from the

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

property there are still westward views over the A12 toward the open countryside. Hedgerow planting and woodland plots restrict longer views from the farmhouse in this direction.

9.4.66 A low ridge which rises to the north and east of the farmhouse, together with existing plots of woodland, limits views to and from the asset in these directions.

9.4.67 The agricultural land to the east and north of the farmhouse is characterised by the HLC as “*pre-18th century enclosure*” with an irregular field pattern, whilst to the west is a large area of meadow; a seasonally wet grassland to the east of the River Alde where the field boundaries are ditched for drainage.

9.4.68 The principal contribution of the setting of the Elm Tree Farmhouse (LB II 1230213) is to the historic interest, placing it into a rural, agricultural context which preserves the historic functional relationship between the assets and surrounding agricultural land, which may have existed since the early post-medieval period. However, the proximity of the busy A12, and the audibility of traffic noise from the asset detract from this setting. The architectural interest is inherent in the standing building, though this can only be appreciated from within the immediate farmstead setting within a grouping of other non-listed historic outbuildings. The contribution of setting to archaeological interest is limited, and would primarily arise from the presence of related archaeological remains within the historic boundary of the farmstead, This would be of relatively limited contribution to the asset’s heritage significance.

#### Elm Tree Cottage (LB II 1230214)

9.4.69 This timber-framed and plastered house with a thatched roof, which dates to the late 16th or early 17th century is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural, historic and archaeological interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.
- Evidence of development of vernacular building traditions.
- Potential archaeological remains relating to the farmstead.

9.4.70 This asset is located adjacent to the A12 at the northern end of Farnham village. Its frontage faces north, and it is set within a rectangular plot, with a driveway and garages to the north and a garden to the south. The asset and plot are surrounded to the north and east by farm buildings including Elm Tree Farmhouse (LB II 1230213), and other non-designated

outbuildings. The A12 is a defining element of the asset's setting and influences visual and audible elements of setting. Additionally, the modern road signs and furniture along the A12 negatively affect views to and from the property.

- 9.4.71 A high fence to the garden boundary restricts southern views to and from the asset, whilst there are clear views of the asset from the northern approach along the A12, and partial views from the agricultural land to the west due to hedgerow and tree planting along field boundaries.
- 9.4.72 The wider landscape comprises agricultural land, which to the east and north is characterised as “*pre-18th century enclosure*” with an irregular field pattern, whilst to the west is a large area of meadow; a seasonally wet grassland to the east of the River Alde where the field boundaries are ditched for drainage.
- 9.4.73 Whilst the setting of the house can be said to contribute to its historic interest, in that the house, within its private garden, forms part the northern extent of a small historic roadside settlement set within a wider rural context, the busy A12 is a prominent and detracting element of its setting, and ultimately makes a negative contribution to the historic interest. The architectural interest is primarily inherent in the standing building, and the archaeological interest is expected to be within the historic boundary of the garden plot and would be of relatively limited contribution to the asset's heritage significance.

#### Post Office Stores (LB II 1230215)

- 9.4.74 This asset comprises a house and shop of painted brick with a pantile roof, which dates to the early 19th century. The 1883 OS mapping indicates that the Post Office was originally sited further north in the village and appears to have been re-sited before 1890. This suggests the building may not have been originally intended as a Post Office. It is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural and historic interests:
- Surviving historic building fabric.
  - Evidence of development of vernacular building traditions.
  - Link to social history.
  - Example of historic public building.
- 9.4.75 The building now functions as a residential property. It occupies a bend in the A12 at a junction with an unnamed road within the centre of Farnham village, known as ‘Farnham Bend’. The building fronts the A12 among a

group of roughly contemporary houses, and cottages which front directly onto the road, with some more recent houses in garden plots. The proximity of the George and Dragon (LB II 1230216), and the Turret Cottage and Turret House (LB II 1230217) to the asset provide an historical grouping of buildings within the late post-medieval core of Farnham, each contributing to the historical village setting of the others. The A12 is a defining element of the asset's setting and influences visual, and audible elements of setting. Additionally, the modern road signs and furniture along the A12 interrupt views to and from the property. Indivisibility between the asset, and the surrounding countryside is precluded by buildings, planting and topography.

- 9.4.76 The setting of the house contributes to its historic interest, whereby its central location within the village and its position adjacent to the main transport route reflects the importance of its historic function as a public service. The building can be clearly viewed on the approach along the road into the village from the north and west, and would have been easily identifiable to those passing into or through the village. The contribution of this village setting to the asset's significance is lessened by the change of function to a residential property, but primarily by the busy and prominent A12 and associated traffic noise, and visual intrusion, which make a negative contribution to the historic interest. The architectural interest is inherent in the standing building which can be appreciated from views within the village.

#### George and Dragon (LB II 1230216)

- 9.4.77 This asset comprises a former public house, now residential property, constructed of painted brick with a slate roof, which dates to the late 19th century. It is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural and historic interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.
- Evidence of development of vernacular building traditions.
- Link to social history.

- 9.4.78 The asset occupies a bend in the A12 at a junction with an unnamed road within the centre of Farnham village. The building fronts the unnamed road facing the Post Office Stores (LB II 1230215). Proximity of the Post Office Stores (LB II 1230215), and the Turret Cottage and Turret House (LB II 1230217) to the asset provide an historical grouping of buildings within the late post-medieval core of Farnham, each contributing to the historical village setting of the others. The A12 is a defining element of the asset's setting and influences visual and audible elements of setting. Additionally, the modern road signs and furniture along the A12 interrupt views to and

from the property. Indivisibility between the asset, and the surrounding countryside is precluded by buildings, planting and topography.

- 9.4.79 The setting of the asset contributes to its historic interest, whereby its central location adjacent to the main transport route through the centre of the village reflects its historical function as a public house. The building can be clearly viewed on the approach along the road into the village from the north and west, and would have been easily identifiable to those passing into or through the village. The contribution of this village setting to the asset's significance is lessened by the change of function to a residential property, and also by the busy and prominent A12 and associated traffic noise and visual intrusion, which makes a negative contribution to the historic interest. The architectural interest is inherent in the standing building which can be appreciated from views within the village.

#### Turret Cottage and Turret House (LB II 1230217)

- 9.4.80 This pair of houses are constructed of red brick with pantile roofs, date to the early 19th century and are covered by a single listing. They are of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural and historic interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.
- Evidence of development of vernacular building traditions.
- Potential archaeological remains relating to the development or activity of the houses.

- 9.4.81 The assets occupy the south side of a bend in the A12, within the centre of Farnham village. The houses front onto the road opposite the garden for the Post Office stores (LB II 1230215) and modern commercial properties. Gardens are to the rear and are bordered by tall trees and hedges. The proximity of the Post Office Stores (LB II 1230215), and the George and Dragon (LB II 1230216) (now both converted to residential properties) to the assets provide an historical grouping of buildings within the late post-medieval core of Farnham, each contributing to the historical village setting of the others, and therefore to their heritage significance.

- 9.4.82 The assets are largely enclosed by the built character of the village, and intervisibility between the assets, and the surrounding countryside is limited to the upper floors of the properties looking out to the west.

- 9.4.83 The A12 is a defining element of the asset's setting and influences visual and audible elements of setting. Additionally, the modern road signs and furniture along the A12 interrupt views to and from the properties, and detract

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

from historic interest. The architectural interest is inherent in the standing buildings which can only be appreciated from views within the village.

- 9.4.84 The architectural interest is primarily inherent in the standing buildings and the archaeological interest is expected to be within the historic boundary of the garden plots, and would be of relatively limited contribution to the assets' heritage significance.

#### Church of St Andrew (LB II\* 1231407)

- 9.4.85 This is a parish church comprising a possible 12th century nave and chancel, 15th century west tower, and a 16th century porch and other 13th century architectural elements. The church was restored in the 19th century which included a new set of nave benches, coloured floor tiles and the addition of the vestry. It is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural, historic and archaeological interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric of multiple phases, including medieval.
- Potential archaeological remains relating to the use and history of the church.
- Buried remains and gravestones within surrounding churchyard.
- Historic parish church still in current use.

- 9.4.86 The Church of St Andrew (LB II\* 1231407) is within a rectangular churchyard which is well defined by a dense border of tall trees and hedges, which screen views of and from the church. This setting contributes to the architectural, archaeological and historic interest, where the consecrated ground defines a sacred, religious space serving as a final resting place and within which its architecture can be appreciated.

- 9.4.87 The church is sited within the south-east of the village of Stratford St Andrew and occupies fairly level ground immediately west of the River Alde. There are glimpsed views of the church tower and roof rising above the trees in the churchyard from the various approaches to the village, and from within the surrounding low-lying fields to the east, west and south. The village setting and visual link with the wider rural setting contribute generally to the heritage significance of the church, reflecting its historic role within the local community, agricultural life and economy.

#### Four cottages 30 metres south of St Andrew's Church (LB II 1278123)

- 9.4.88 These four cottages were formerly a coaching inn dating to the 17th century, but which was converted in the 19th century, with extensions

added to the rear. The building is timber-framed with brick gable ends and pantile roofs. This asset is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural and historic interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.
- Evidence of development of vernacular building traditions.

**9.4.89** The asset occupies a bend in the A12 Main Road near the junction with Great Glemham Road at the southern end of Stratford St Andrew village. The building frontage faces south-east toward the road, but is set back behind gardens now divided for each property. Views in this direction are of agricultural fields with the horizon interrupted by planting along field boundaries, and housing on the opposite side of the road. To the west, views from the property are dominated by commercial properties, and the garage and to the north by modern houses.

**9.4.90** Whilst the asset's roadside location at the southern entrance to the village reflects its historical function as a coaching inn, only close views of the asset are possible on the approach along the A12 from either direction due to modern buildings and planting. The A12 itself is a busy main road and a prominent element of the asset's setting. The resulting traffic, air pollution and modern signage and verge treatment detract from the historic rural village setting. Prior to modern development and at the time when the asset was in use as a coaching inn, it would have been more visible to those passing by or through the village. The setting therefore makes a limited contribution to its historic interest. The architectural interest is inherent in the standing building which can only be appreciated from close roadside views, and the setting makes a very limited contribution to the heritage significance of the asset.

#### **Benhallstock Cottages (LB II 1377115)**

**9.4.91** This pair of cottages are on an L-shape plan with a gable facing forwards and are constructed of red brick with a roof of fish scale tiles. They date to the early-mid 19th century, and are identified as estate cottages, relating to the estate of Benhall Lodge (BNL 019) on the opposite side of the A12. A manor house is known to have existed on the estate since at least 1225 but was rebuilt various times in the subsequent centuries, most recently being restored after fires in 1885 and 1967. These cottages may have been constructed after the rebuild of Benhall Lodge in 1810 by Edward Hollond, Esq.

**9.4.92** Benhallstock Cottages (LB II 1377115) are of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural and historic interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.



- Evidence of development of vernacular building traditions.
- Association with Benhall Lodge estate.

9.4.93 The cottages are located on the south side of the A12 opposite the Park Road, the historic southern entrance to Benhall Lodge Park (BNL 017). The cottages are set within a triangular garden plot, but located relatively close to the road edge. The traffic on the A12, and the modern planting treatment means that any visual connection to the parkland on the north side of the A12 makes a minimal contribution to setting. Whilst planting along the south-east and west of the garden restricts views to and from the assets as the viewer approaches along the A12, views to the south from the asset of the flat agricultural landscape are clear. The 1845 Benhall tithe map identifies another cottage to the rear of the assets (no longer present) indicating that the original setting of the cottages did not include these southern views.

9.4.94 Due to dense woodland planting within Benhall Lodge Park (BNL 017), views northward from the assets beyond the A12 are very limited. Only close views of the assets are possible on the eastern and western approach along the A12 due to planting along the roadside, and the former police house immediately west of the asset.

9.4.95 The A12 itself, is a prominent element of the assets' setting. The busy traffic and noise result in a perceived separation between the cottages and Benhall Lodge Park (BNL 017), exacerbated by the dense screening planting to the southern boundary of the Park, and severing the historical connection between them.

9.4.96 The setting of the assets contributes to their historic interest, whereby their location opposite the southern entrance to Benhall Lodge Park (BNL 017) reflects their historical relationship with the estate, possibly to house estate staff. However, the ability to observe this historical function is reduced by the intensity of traffic on the A12. The cottages can be clearly viewed on the approach along the road into the village from the north and west, and would have been easily identifiable to those passing into or through the village. The architectural interest is inherent in the standing buildings which can only be appreciated close to the roadside. Overall the setting does not make a significant contribution to the heritage significance of the assets.

#### [Glemham Hall \(Park and Garden II 1001461\)](#)

9.4.97 Glemham Hall Park and Garden (1001461) is part of an early 18th century formal garden, associated with an Elizabethan hall remodelled as a Georgian mansion, Glemham Hall. The asset is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural, historic and archaeological interests:

- Eighteenth century designed parkland of country house, with 17 century late features.
- Former deer park.
- Association with the north family (later earls of Guilford).
- Described in the 1791 ‘Red Book’ by Humphry Repton.
- Early 19th century remodelling of the park.
- Landscape setting encompassing group of highly significant listed buildings.
- Remains of WWII operational base (SSA 016) and observation post (SSA 017).
- Potential archaeological remains relating to the design and use of the parkland and gardens.

**9.4.98** The park is located on the eastern side of the A12 between the villages of Stratford St Andrew and Little Glemham, both of which lie just beyond the park boundary. The park covers approximately 132ha, of which around 2ha are gardens divided by the A12. The park is surrounded by a gently rolling landscape comprising agricultural fields, and woodland on all sides and hemmed by Tinker Brook road along the eastern boundary and the A12 along the northern boundary. The topography of the park falls from south to the north until the A12 where it rises again toward the boundary.

**9.4.99** The main west drive into the park was in use from at least 1783 but was temporarily replaced in the 19th century by the approach from the north-east corner. The north-east route is now a farm track. The A12 passes through the north-west of the park, and it was at Repton’s suggestion within the Red Book that the public road should be kept so that the occasional passing carriage might add ‘to the character of cheerfulness’.

**9.4.100** There are a scatter of trees within the park, along with avenues of trees to the north and south. The avenue of limes to the south is of early 17th century date, and is aligned on the south front of the hall. The avenue of tree to the north dates to the 20th century and takes advantage of the outward northern views from Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507) toward the rolling agricultural fields, where this wider rural setting offers some visual continuity of the parkland. Views of this northern horizon are interrupted only by tree planting along field boundaries in the distance.

**9.4.101** The low hedges to the road side allow clear views from the A12 into the park and for views from within the park to the west and north-west.

Elsewhere the topography and existing planting largely precludes outward views from the park. This includes woodland belts along the eastern and southern boundaries, which date to the 19th century.

- 9.4.102 The setting contributes aesthetically to the designed view north from the hall, which is focused and emphasised by an avenue of trees to create an attractive vista which exploits and depends on the more open character of the parkland fringes to the north of the house. Elsewhere, the topography and planting scheme is designed to control the viewer's visual relationship with the wider rural landscape, and views beyond the parkland to the north-east, east and south-east are particularly restricted by topography and shelter planting. A representative viewpoint to the east from part way along the eastern edge of the park and garden can be found at **Figure 6.10**.

#### Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507)

- 9.4.103 This was originally a 16th century country house which was extensively remodelled in the early 18th century. It is constructed of red brick with an early Georgian façade but with a largely 16th century structure. The asset is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural, historic and archaeological interests:
- Surviving historic building fabric.
  - Within Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461), an 18th century designed parkland, with some late 17th century features.
  - Association with the north family (later earls of Guilford).
  - Potential archaeological remains relating to the design and use of the hall and gardens.
- 9.4.104 The hall is set within an extensive parkland (Glemham Hall Park and Garden II 1001461) located on the eastern side of the A12 between the villages of Stratford St Andrew and Little Glemham. It is centrally located with 18th century designed gardens to the south surrounded by a listed wall (LB II 1230800), and other listed structures. Planting to the east, west and south around the hall and gardens provides relative privacy, restricting views to and from the hall, whilst also providing a key garden vista southward, which is limited by the woodland along the southern boundary of the parkland. This is a designed setting which is laid out to give vistas from the house, in this case to the north, along an avenue of trees and open rolling agricultural land beyond.
- 9.4.105 The grounds still largely function as a parkland, though land north of the A12 is now arable fields and has suffered some boundary loss.

9.4.106 The primary architectural interest is inherent in the standing building. However, the garden and wider parkland setting of Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507) contributes to its architectural and historic interest, placing it into a designed landscape aimed at controlling close and long views, simultaneously creating privacy for the house whilst maintaining vistas. The contribution of setting to archaeological interest is limited and would primarily arise from the presence of related archaeological remains within the immediate environs of the hall and gardens, and surviving archaeological features relating to the parkland.

[Retaining Wall of ha-ha 30 metres west of Little Glemham Hall \(LB II 1230629\) and garden walling to south of Little Glemham Hall \(LB II 1230800\)](#)

9.4.107 The retaining wall is constructed of red brick and extends for approximately 200m, while the garden walling is constructed of red brick with several wrought iron gates and extends for approximately 200m enclosing the gardens to the south of Little Glemham Hall and a further uncultivated area to the south.

9.4.108 These assets are of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural, historic and archaeological interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.
- Eighteenth century parkland feature within Glemham Hall Park and Garden (1001461).
- Brick structure associated with ha-ha.
- Potential archaeological remains relating to the construction of the wall and ha-ha.

9.4.109 These walls are functional elements of the designed garden and parkland, which form an asset group which is integral to the setting of Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507), and therefore make a high contribution to its heritage significance.

[Lodge at entrance to Little Glemham Hall \(LB II 1278406\)](#)

*Heritage significance and contribution of setting*

9.4.110 This lodge is dated to the mid-19th century, and is constructed of red brick with stone dressings and plain tile roof. It is in picturesque style with a heavy timber porch. The asset is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural and historic interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.
- Evidence of development of vernacular building traditions.
- Association with Little Glemham estate.

9.4.111 The lodge is located on the east side of the A12 (Main Road) opposite Button's Lane, at the western entrance to Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461). It was possibly built when the main entrance to the park was reverted back to the western approach after temporary use of the north-east entrance.

9.4.112 The lodge is set within a small rectangular plot with a small garden to the north and is situated very close to the road edge behind a low brick garden wall. The lodge and garden are enclosed within a wood, and additional tall planting along both sides of the A12 and Button's Lane allows only close views of the asset along the northern, southern and western approach of this roads. Filtered outward views into the parkland are possible during Winter months, but there is no designed visual relationship between the asset and Little Glemham Hall. The woodland surrounding the asset to the south also contains a rectangular pond evident on 19th century historic mapping.

9.4.113 The immediate proximity of the A12 significantly affects the noise and air quality environment of the asset. Additionally, the modern road signs along the A12 negatively affect views to and from the property.

9.4.114 The principal contribution of the setting of the asset is to its historic interest, whereby its location at the western entrance to Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461) reflects its historic functional relationship with Glemham Hall estate. However, the intensity of traffic and associate modern roads signs detract from the setting, and make a negative contribution to the historic interest. The architectural interest is inherent in the standing building, which can be appreciated from within the garden and close roadside setting.

#### [Little Glemham Hall Stables \(LB II 1278438\)](#)

##### *Heritage significance and contribution of setting*

9.4.115 This former two-storey stable block to Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507) was built in the early 18th century, and is of red brick with plaintiled roof. It has a central bell turret on the hipped roof with a clock face and wrought-iron weathervane, and a 20th century rear extension. The asset is of high heritage significance for a combination of architectural and historic interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.

- Evidence of development of vernacular building traditions.
- Example of 18th century service building to country estate.
- Association with Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507).

9.4.116 The former stable, now garage, stands within a service area approximately 80m east of Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507). The asset is enclosed within a woodland which appears to have been designed to control its visual relationship with Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507). The asset is accessed either by the main western entrance, which continues past the Hall, or via two tracks leading to secondary entrances in the south and east of the park (Glemham Hall Park and Garden II 1001461). This setting is little changed since the 19th century, as evident on historic mapping.

9.4.117 The principal contribution of the setting of the asset is to its historic interest, deriving from its proximity to Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507) and reflecting the historic service function of the asset through the highly controlled intervisibility with Glemham Hall. While the purpose of the building required it to be closely sited to the Hall, it was enclosed within woodland to maintain the grand aesthetic effect of the hall and gardens. The architectural interest is inherent in the standing building, which can only be appreciated in close views.

#### Pond Barn (FNM 022)

##### *Heritage significance and contribution of setting*

9.4.118 This is a U-shaped group of three, single storey agricultural buildings recorded as possibly dating to the early 19th century, but which appear as a single occupied square building on a slightly different footprint on late 19th century OS mapping. They were modified and extended within the 20th century. The principal building on the site is a modest, three bay, red brick-built barn with timber bargeboards that is located at the head of the hard-surfaced courtyard, which is enclosed on each side by the other two outbuildings – a cart lodge and a former stable. The barn has a pitched, gabled roof clad with clay pantiles.

9.4.119 The outbuilding on the north side of the courtyard is an open-sided, six bay cart lodge, divided into two equal halves by a brick internal wall, although the rest of the structure is timber framed.

9.4.120 The outbuilding on the south side of the courtyard is of similar construction to the barn with red brick walls and weather boarded gable ends. The building was probably built as stables and the courtyard elevation contains vertical boarding interspersed with stable doors.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

9.4.121 This asset is of low heritage significance for a combination of architectural, historical and archaeological interests:

- Surviving historic building fabric.
- Evidence of development of regional farm building traditions.
- Potential archaeological remains relating to the farmstead.
- Surviving element of the wider historic agricultural landscape.

9.4.122 The modern extensions to the asset are considered to have no architectural or historic interest and detract from the significance of the earlier dated structure.

9.4.123 Pond Barn (FNM 022) fronts an unnamed road and is set within a square plot of land adjacent to an unlisted farmhouse, south of Farnham village. There is planting along the road opposite around a pond, to the west of the asset and additionally to the south and north-west. Beyond is open agricultural land with hedgerows and pockets of woodland restricting longer inward views of the asset. The agricultural land to the west and north of the asset is characterised by the HLC as “*pre-18th century enclosure*” with an irregular co-axial field pattern, whilst to the east is “*18th century and later enclosure*”, identified as former common arable or heathland.

9.4.124 The principal contribution of the setting of the Pond Barn (FNM 022) is to the historic interest, placing it into a rural, agricultural context which preserves the historic functional relationship between the asset, former farmstead and surrounding agricultural land. The architectural interest is inherent in the standing building, though this can be appreciated from within immediate isolated farmstead setting. The contribution of setting to archaeological interest is very limited, would primarily arise from the presence of related archaeological remains within the historic boundary of the farmstead, and would make a relatively limited contribution to the asset’s heritage significance.

b) **Future baseline**

9.4.125 In the absence of the proposed development, the baseline can be considered stable with no notable change anticipated. Other committed development in the wider area is unlikely to present any change to the baseline which would have a bearing on the assessment.

9.4.126 It is likely, however, that where intensive arable cultivation of parts of the site continues, this would result in the progressive disturbance of any archaeological remains which may be present.

## 9.5 Environmental design and mitigation

9.5.1 As detailed in **Volume 1, Chapter 6** of the **ES** a number of primary mitigation measures have been identified through the iterative EIA process and have been incorporated into the design and construction planning of the proposed development. Tertiary mitigation measures have also been identified and these comprise legal requirements or are standard practices that will be implemented as part of the proposed development.

9.5.2 The assessment of likely significant effects of the proposed development assumes that primary and tertiary mitigation measures are in place. These measures are identified later, with a summary provided on how the measures contribute to the mitigation and management of potentially significant environmental effects on the terrestrial historic environment.

### a) Primary mitigation

9.5.3 Primary mitigation is often referred to as ‘embedded mitigation’ and includes modifications to the location or design to mitigate impacts. These measures become an inherent part of the proposed development.

9.5.4 Change to setting arising from visibility of the proposed development can give rise to loss of or harm to historic and architectural interests, and perceptual change to existing field boundaries and land use can give rise to harm to historic landscape character. Therefore the landscape plan, as described in **Chapter 2** of this volume, would be designed specifically to minimise potential effects on the ecological and landscape and visual receptors and will follow the design principles set out in the **Associated Development Design Principles** (Doc Ref. 8.3).

9.5.5 The proposed measures include:

- Existing vegetation would be retained where possible, except where the route of the proposed two village bypass crosses field boundaries. Hedgerow planting is proposed along the route of the proposed two village bypass road to integrate the road with the surrounding landscape, compensating for the loss of hedgerow severed by the route. This would connect into the existing hedgerow network, where possible.
- Grass verges are proposed along sections of the proposed route of the two village bypass, including on the embankments of the River Alde overbridge, and on all sides of the proposed roundabout. Additional grassed areas are proposed around the infiltration basins as well as native tree and shrub planting to help them integrate into the surrounding landscape.



**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- Native tree and shrub planting is proposed along the western side of the cutting as the route of the proposed two village bypass road passes Farnham Hall and residential properties, as well as along the western side of the proposed embankment up to the overbridge, to provide visual screening.
- Native tree and shrub planting is also proposed on the east side of the overbridge, adjacent to Foxburrow Wood and Farnham Hall Farmhouse to provide visual screening and ecological connectivity. Grass verges are proposed along the length of the route on this section, including on the cuttings.

**b) Tertiary mitigation**

9.5.6 Tertiary mitigation will be required regardless of any EIA assessment, as it is imposed, for example, as a result of legislative requirements and/or standard sectoral practices.

9.5.7 The **Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)** (Doc Ref. 8.11) sets out best-practice measures for the reduction of potential impacts from construction activities on setting. These include measures identified in **Chapters 4 and 6** of this volume to minimise noise, lighting and visual impacts. These have been considered as tertiary mitigation where appropriate.

9.5.8 NPS EN-1 requires mitigation of any loss of archaeological interest through development. Consequently, archaeological mitigation may be required in cases where effects are assessed as less than significant. For the purposes of this assessment, all archaeological mitigation is considered as secondary mitigation, and discussed within **section 9.7** of this chapter. The effects of any loss of archaeological significance presented in **section 9.6** of this chapter are considered in the absence of mitigation.

**9.6 Assessment****a) Introduction**

9.6.1 This section presents the findings of the terrestrial historic environment assessment for the construction and operation of the proposed development.

9.6.2 This section identifies any likely significant effects that are predicted to occur, and **section 9.7** of this chapter then highlights any secondary mitigation and monitoring measures that are proposed to minimise any adverse significant effects (if required).

b) Construction

i. Direct effects on heritage assets

Archaeological heritage assets

9.6.3 Intrusive groundworks would take place across the site, including topsoil stripping and sub-soil disturbance during the construction of the proposed development. Invasive works of this nature would adversely affect any surviving sub-surface archaeological remains, reducing or removing their ability to be further interpreted, resulting in the loss of archaeological interest.

9.6.4 The DBA and evaluation trenching to date have indicated the presence of previously unrecorded archaeological remains that are likely to be of low to medium significance. There is no evidence to suggest the presence of as yet unknown high heritage significance remains within the site boundary.

9.6.5 Any archaeological remains within the proposed route would be substantially disturbed, if not removed entirely, by the proposed development. The total loss of archaeological remains would be an impact of high magnitude, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect which would be **significant** in the absence of further mitigation.

9.6.6 Where the removal of archaeological remains represents a partial loss of larger landscape scale heritage receptors, parts of which may survive outside the site boundary, the impact would be of medium magnitude, resulting in a moderate adverse effect, which would be **significant**.

9.6.7 Deposits of geoarchaeological or palaeoenvironmental interest, if present, are likely to be of low to medium heritage significance, and disturbance from construction is likely to affect a relatively small proportion of more extensive deposit sequences. This would likely represent a low magnitude of impact, resulting in a minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

ii. Effects arising through change to the setting of heritage assets

9.6.8 Change to setting is generally considered to be an operational phase effect. However, in this case, the construction works may be of sufficient duration and present a sufficient increase in magnitude of change over that occurring during the operation of the proposed development that these effects need to be considered separately.

## Farnham Manor (LB II 1230210)

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.9 Construction of the proposed development would take up to 24 months, and would introduce potential new visible and audible elements to the setting of Farnham Manor (LB II 1230210) as the construction progresses as a result of activities such as site clearance, earthworks, construction and vehicle movements. Visibility would be limited and partially screened by existing hedgerows and topography, with filtered views south and west more sensitive to visual change. Construction activities may be audible from the asset. This audibility will vary at certain times of day or at certain times within the construction programme, as set out within **Chapter 4** of this volume (Receptor 11), but this would likely represent an increase in existing noise levels. However, these audible effects do not contribute to the loss of historic interest of the asset and therefore would not impact upon heritage significance.
- 9.6.10 Construction of the proposed development would disrupt the existing and historical connection between the asset and Foxburrow Wood (FNM 011) while a temporary diversion is in place prior to completion of a proposed footbridge aimed at reconnecting the track at Farnham Manor (LB II 1230210) to that of Foxburrow Wood (FNM 011).
- 9.6.11 These changes would be experienced to varying degrees through the construction phase and any effects would be time-limited.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.12 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological interest would arise. The architectural interest would also remain unaffected. Whilst there would be limited perception of construction works to the south and east of the asset through minor changes to views, and noise environment, this is not expected to alter the understanding of the asset nor the ability to appreciate its historical function. The disruption of the historical relationship between Foxburrow Wood and the asset, and the urbanising effect of construction activities on its wider rural setting would be short-term temporary and represent an impact of very low magnitude, which would give rise to limited harm to heritage significance. This would give rise to a minor adverse effect which would be **not significant**.

### Church of St Mary (LB II\* 1230211)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.13 The site lies within the wider rural landscape which the Church of St Mary (LB II\* 1230211) overlooks. Construction of the proposed development would introduce new visible and audible elements to the setting of the asset as the construction progresses. Visibility of these works, though partially screened by existing planting, would be possible to the south and south-east of the asset.
- 9.6.14 Audibility is expected to be minimal due to the distance of the asset from the proposed development. However, it may increase at certain times of day or at certain times within the construction programme, as set out within **Chapter 4** of this volume, although no significant noise effects are anticipated during the construction phase.
- 9.6.15 These changes would be experienced to varying degrees through the construction phase and any effects would be time-limited.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.16 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological interest would arise, and its architectural and historic interest would also remain unaffected. Whilst construction works would be visible to the south of the church, this is not expected to alter the understanding of the asset nor the ability to appreciate its historical function. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

### Elm Tree Farmhouse (LB II 1230213)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.17 The asset lies approximately 300m north of the site, within Farnham village. The distance, and the intervening buildings, topography, landscape and existing planting means that construction activities within the site are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.18 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological or historic interest would arise, and its architectural interest would also remain unaffected. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

#### Elm Tree Cottage (LB II 1230214)

##### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.19 The asset lies approximately 300m north of the site, within Farnham village. The distance, and the intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that construction activities within the site are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

##### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.20 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological or historic interest would arise, and its architectural interest would also remain unaffected. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

#### Post Office Stores (LB II 1230215)

##### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.21 The asset lies within the centre of Farnham village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that construction activities are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

##### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.22 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological interest would arise, and its architectural and historic interest would also remain unaffected. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

#### George and Dragon (LB II 1230216)

##### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.23 The asset lies within the centre of Farnham village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that construction activities are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

##### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.24 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological interest would arise, and its architectural and historic interest would also remain unaffected. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

### Turret Cottage Turret House (LB II 1230217)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.25 The asset lies within the centre of Farnham village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that construction activities are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.26 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological interest would arise, and its architectural and historic interest would also remain unaffected. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

### Church of St Andrew (LB II\* 1231407)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.27 The asset lies within the south of Stratford St Andrew village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that construction activities are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.28 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological interest would arise, and its architectural and historic interest would also remain unaffected. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

### Four cottages 30 metres south of St Andrew's Church (LB II 1278123)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.29 The asset lies within the south of Stratford St Andrew village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that construction activities are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.30 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological interest would arise, and its architectural and historic interest would also remain unaffected. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

### Benhallstock Cottages (LB II 1377115)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.31 The asset lies adjacent to the site, next to a proposed temporary contactor compound and near a proposed roundabout on the A12 Main Road at Friday Street. Construction of the proposed development would introduce new visible and audible elements to the setting of Benhallstock Cottages (LB II 1377115) as a result of activities such as site clearance, earthworks and construction vehicle movements.
- 9.6.32 The temporary contactor compound would be used as the base to manage works on the site, and could include office and welfare facilities, up to 90 parking spaces, secure storage of construction plant, a laydown and storage facility for materials and components prior to installation and use, secure storage containers, safe turning space for vehicles and plant and temporary lighting.
- 9.6.33 Visibility would be partially screened by existing planting within the garden of the asset and along the site boundary, but views east and south from the asset would be possible. There would be increased visibility until landscape planting is implemented at the end of the construction phase.
- 9.6.34 The intensity and frequency of activity within the adjacent compound in combination with construction of the roundabout means that audibility may increase at certain times of day or at certain times within the construction programme, as set out within **Chapter 4** of this volume (receptor 16).
- 9.6.35 These noise effects may be viewed as an increase to the existing noise environment of the asset which is located to the busy A12.
- 9.6.36 These changes would be experienced to varying degrees through the construction phase and any effect would be time-limited (up to 24 months).

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.37 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological interest would arise, and its architectural interest would also remain unaffected. There would be a perception of construction works to the south and east of the asset through changes to views and noise environment, which although not expected to alter the understanding of the asset's historical function, would introduce new negative perceptible elements to the environment within which the asset may be appreciated. Change to this heritage asset, which is of high heritage significance would be short-term temporary, and of a very low magnitude of impact, which would give rise to limited harm to heritage significance. This would result in a minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

### Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.38 The asset lies at the western site boundary near a proposed new roundabout on the A12. Construction would introduce new perceptible elements to the setting of Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461).
- 9.6.39 Visibility from within the asset would be precluded by existing woodland belts and blocks along the east side of Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461), as well as topography and buildings. Whilst construction activity would visually affect the north-east approach to the park, there is a lack of any historical visual relationship between the asset and this eastern area of its setting, and the formal entrance to the park and Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507) is from the west some distance away.
- 9.6.40 Construction activities may be audible from the asset. This audibility would vary by location within the park, at certain times of day or at certain times within the construction programme, as set out within **Chapter 4** of this volume, but this is only likely to represent a small increase to existing noise levels experienced due to traffic along the busy A12 which passes through the asset.
- 9.6.41 These changes would be experienced to varying degrees through the construction period and any effect would be time-limited.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.42 The archaeological and architectural interests of the asset would remain unaffected by construction of the proposed development. Whilst there would be a perception of construction works and an increase in the scale of development to the north-east of the asset through changes to the noise environment this is not expected to alter the understanding of the asset nor the ability to appreciate its historical function. Any impact to this asset, which is of high heritage significance, would be of a very low magnitude, giving rise to limited harm to heritage significance. This would result in a minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

### Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.43 The asset lies within the core of the Glemham Hall Park and Garden (RPG II 1001461) approximately 830m west of the site. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that construction activities are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.



*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.44 There would be no change to heritage significance during the construction phase and no effect would arise.
- 9.6.45 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological interest would arise, and its architectural interest would also remain unaffected. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

Retaining wall of ha-ha 30 metres west of Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1230629) and garden walling to south of Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1230800)

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.46 These assets lie within the core of Glemham Hall Park and Garden (RPG II 1001461) approximately 820m west of the site. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting mean that construction activities are not anticipated to be perceptible from these assets.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.47 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the construction phase and no effect would arise.

Lodge at Entrance to Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1278406)

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.48 The asset lies on the western edge of Glemham Hall Park and Garden (RPG II 1001461) approximately 1.2 kilometres (km) west of the site. The distance, and the intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting mean that construction activities are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.49 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the construction phase and no effect would arise.

Little Glemham Hall Stables (LB II 1278438)

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.50 The asset lies within the core of Glemham Hall Park and Garden (RPG II 1001461) approximately 740m west of the site. The intervening buildings,

topography, landscape and planting mean that construction activities are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.51 There would be no impact on heritage significance during the construction phase and no effect would arise.

*Pond Barn (FNM 022)*

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.52 The proposed development lies within the wider rural landscape of the asset. Construction would introduce new visible and audible elements to the setting of the asset, although visibility would be heavily screened by existing planting and topography.
- 9.6.53 Construction activities may be audible from the asset. Audibility would increase at certain times of day or at certain times within the construction programme, as set out within **Volume 5, Chapter 4** of the **ES**.
- 9.6.54 These changes would be experienced to varying degrees through the construction phase, and any effect would be time-limited.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.55 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological or architectural interest would arise. Whilst there would be a perception of construction works through visual and audible changes this is not expected to alter the understanding of the asset nor the ability to appreciate its historical function. Any impact on this asset, which is of low heritage significance, would be short-term temporary and no effect would arise.

iii. *Effects arising through change to historic landscape character*

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.56 The historic and aesthetic interests of the historic landscape character of the study area would be eroded by the proposed development. Where existing woodland, scrub and hedgerows are crossed by the proposed development, sections would be removed. This would result in the truncation of boundaries within a landscape of pre-18th century enclosure, as well as the loss of The Belt, a narrow strip of woodland evident on 19th century mapping, and a 20th century section of woodland, Whin Covert. However, these are common elements of the wider landscape dominated by agricultural fields peppered with woodland pockets, and though the site

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

would bisect these historic boundaries, it would not eliminate the overall landscape pattern or the ability to understand it. Their loss therefore represents only a limited loss to historic interest.

- 9.6.57 Additional planting would be introduced along the proposed development, where it passes Farnham Hall and residential properties, along the two new roundabouts on the A12 and infiltration basins, and where sections of the proposed development would be on embankment or in cutting. The introduction of additional planting would be in keeping with the existing and historic character of the wider landscape that is already demonstrated to be dominated by agricultural fields with scattered pockets of woodland.
- 9.6.58 Construction activity would introduce new visual and audible elements to an otherwise agricultural landscape. This would affect historic and aesthetic interest within, and in, the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.
- 9.6.59 On completion of the construction programme, the temporary contractor compound would be removed, the land returned to agricultural use and hedgerows replanted to reflect the historic use and form of the landscape. While, in the long-term, this would partially mitigate loss of aesthetic and historic interest, any loss of archaeological interest would persist. This represents a minor reduction in the magnitude of change from the construction phase.

#### Significance of effect

- 9.6.60 Change to the historic boundaries would be permanent, though the visual changes resulting from construction activities would be short-term temporary. Consequently, this impact on heritage assets of low heritage significance would be permanent and of medium magnitude, giving rise to a minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

#### iv. Inter-relationship effects

- 9.6.61 The archaeological remains on the site are not sensitive to changes predicted other than direct disturbance and consequently no inter-relationship effects are anticipated.
- 9.6.62 Any visual effects would arise as a result of effects on valued views which represent a subset of the changes already considered within the assessments of effects arising as a result of change to setting and historic landscape character. Similarly changes in noise environment are already considered, insofar as these are appropriate, in the assessments of effects arising as a result of change to setting. Therefore, the consideration of inter-relationship effects forms an inherent part of the assessment presented within this chapter.

## c) Operation

## i. Direct effects on archaeological heritage assets

9.6.63 Any disturbance of archaeological heritage assets within the site would have occurred during the construction of the proposed development. No further effects are anticipated during the operation of the proposed development.

## ii. Effects arising through change to the setting of heritage assets

9.6.64 A list of scoped in heritage assets is provided in **section 9.4** and as set out within **Volume 1, Annex 6L.1** of the **ES**.

Farnham Manor (LB II 1230210)

*Predicted change*

9.6.65 The proposed development would move from south of the asset, passing eastwards between it and Foxburrow Wood. Its presence would be partially screened from the asset by existing vegetation and proposed planting along the west of the proposed development, which forms part of the landscape strategy. Visual effects would be largely mitigated by enhanced planting. The proposed development would sever to a degree the existing and historical connection between the asset and Foxburrow Wood (FNM 011), although the inclusion of a footbridge, would maintain to a degree the connection between the two. Operation of the proposed development would be audible from the asset causing an increase in existing noise levels currently experienced from traffic along the A12. Traffic levels along the two village bypass are predicted to be slightly above those which daily pass along the A12 through Farnham as provided in **Chapter 2** of this volume. These audible effects would not contribute to the loss of historic interest and therefore would not impact upon heritage significance.

*Significance of effect*

9.6.66 Operation of the proposed development would result in no discernible loss of the asset's architectural or archaeological interest. There would be limited perception of the proposed development to the south and east of the asset through changes to views and noise environment which are not expected to alter the understanding of the asset nor the ability to appreciate its historical function. However, these changes would alter the rural character of the asset's wider landscape and affect the historic relationship with Foxburrow Wood. Any impact would be permanent, and of very low magnitude, which

would give rise to limited harm to heritage significance. This would give rise to a minor adverse effect which would be **not significant**.

#### Church of St Mary (LB II\* 1230211)

##### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.67 The proposed development lies within the wider rural landscape which the Church of St Mary (LB II\* 1230211) overlooks. The proposed development would introduce new visible and audible elements to the setting of the asset. Visibility, though partially screened by planting and topography, would be possible with long views to the south and south-east of the asset. Noise from the operation of the proposed development would be audible from the churchyard, but would be perceived in the context of the occasional visibility of the road and would not affect the historic interests of the church. These changes would be permanent.

##### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.68 No discernible loss of the church's archaeological interest would arise. The architectural interest of the church would also remain unaffected. Whilst there would be visual changes to the wider rural setting, this would be limited to distant views which are interrupted by existing boundary vegetation and topography, as provided in Illustrative Viewpoint 2 in **Appendix 6A** of this volume, therefore making a limited contribution to significance. Consequently, there would be no discernible impact on heritage significance resulting in no effect.

#### Elm Tree Farmhouse (LB II 1230213)

##### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.69 The asset lies approximately 300m south of the site within the north of Farnham village. The distance, and the intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that the proposed development is not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.
- 9.6.70 Operation of the proposed development is expected to result in a diversion of traffic from the current A12 passing through Farnham village. Vehicle movements along this section of the A12 are expected to be reduced from approximately 18,900 per day to 250 per day as set out in **Chapter 2** of this volume. This would result in a substantial reduction in traffic noise within the vicinity of the asset. This change would be permanent.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.71 Operation of the proposed development would not affect the asset's architectural interest. The reduction in traffic noise as result of diverted traffic would improve how the asset is experienced and would help restore its village setting, therefore contributing its historic interest. This would represent a low magnitude of impact on heritage significance. This would give rise to a moderate beneficial effect which would be **significant**.

*Elm Tree Cottage (LB II 1230214)**Predicted change*

- 9.6.72 The asset lies approximately 300m south of the site within the north of Farnham village. The distance, and the intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that the proposed development is not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.
- 9.6.73 Operation of the proposed development is expected to result in a diversion of traffic from the current A12 passing through Farnham village. Vehicle movements along this section of the A12 are expected to be reduced from approximately 18,900 per day to 250 per day as set out in **Chapter 2** of this volume. This would result in a substantial reduction in traffic noise within the vicinity of the asset. This change would be permanent.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.74 Operation of the proposed development would not affect the asset's architectural or historic interest. The reduction in traffic noise as result of diverted traffic would help restore its village setting, therefore contributing its historic interest. This would represent a low magnitude of impact on heritage significance. This would give rise to a moderate beneficial effect which would be **significant**.

*Post Office Stores (LB II 1230215)**Predicted change*

- 9.6.75 The asset lies within the centre of Farnham village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that the proposed development is not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.
- 9.6.76 Operation of the proposed development is expected to result in a diversion of traffic from the current A12 passing through Farnham village. Vehicle movements along this section of the A12 are expected to be reduced from approximately 18,900 per day to 250 per day as set out in **Chapter 2** of this

volume. This would result in a substantial reduction in traffic noise within the vicinity of the asset. This change would be permanent.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.77 Operation of the proposed development would not affect the asset's architectural or historic interest. The reduction in traffic noise as result of diverted traffic would improve how the asset is experienced, and would help restore its village setting, therefore contributing its historic interest. This would represent a low magnitude of impact on heritage significance. This would give rise to a moderate beneficial effect which would be **significant**.

*George and Dragon (LB II 1230216)*

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.78 The asset lies within the centre of Farnham village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that the proposed development is not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.
- 9.6.79 Operation of the proposed development is expected to result in a diversion of traffic from the current A12 passing through Farnham village. Vehicle movements along this section of the A12 are expected to be reduced from approximately 18,900 per day to 250 per day as set out in **Chapter 2** of this volume. This would result in a substantial reduction in traffic noise within the vicinity of the asset. This change would be permanent.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.80 Operation of the proposed development would not affect the asset's architectural or historic interest. The reduction in traffic noise as result of diverted traffic would help restore its village setting, therefore contributing its historic interest. This would represent a low magnitude of impact on heritage significance. This would give rise to a moderate beneficial effect which would be **significant**.

*Turret Cottage Turret House (LB II 1230217)*

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.81 The asset lies within the centre of Farnham village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that the proposed development is not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.
- 9.6.82 Operation of the proposed development is expected to result in a diversion of traffic from the current A12 passing through Farnham village. Vehicle

movements along this section of the A12 are expected to be reduced from approximately 18,900 per day to 250 per day as set out in **Chapter 2** of this volume. This would result in a substantial reduction in traffic noise within the vicinity of the asset. This change would be permanent.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.83 Operation of the proposed development would not affect the asset's architectural or historic interest. The reduction in traffic noise as result of diverted traffic would help restore its village setting, therefore contributing its historic interest. This would represent a low magnitude of impact on heritage significance. This would give rise to a moderate beneficial effect which would be **significant**.

Church of St Andrew (LB II\* 1231407)

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.84 The asset lies within the south of Stratford St Andrew village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that the proposed development is not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.
- 9.6.85 Operation of the proposed development is expected to result in a diversion of traffic from the current A12 passing Stratford St Andrew village. Vehicle movements along this section of the A12 are expected to reduce from approximately 18,900 per day to 250 per day as set out in **Chapter 2** of this volume. This would result in a substantial reduction in traffic noise within the vicinity of the asset. This change would be permanent.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.86 Operation of the proposed development would not affect the asset's architectural or historic interest. The reduction in traffic noise as result of diverted traffic would help restore its village setting, therefore contributing its historic interest. This would represent a low magnitude of impact on heritage significance. This would give rise to a moderate beneficial effect which would be **significant**.

Four cottages 30 metres south of St Andrew's Church (LB II 1278123)

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.87 The asset lies within the south of Stratford St Andrew village. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting mean that the proposed development is not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.



**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 9.6.88 Operation of the proposed development is expected to result in a diversion of traffic from the current A12 passing along the south of Stratford St Andrew village. Vehicle movements along this section of the A12 are expected to be reduced from approximately 18,900 per day to 250 per day as set out in **Chapter 2** of this volume. This would result in a substantial reduction in traffic noise within the vicinity of the asset. This change would be permanent.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.89 Operation of the proposed development would not affect the asset's architectural or archaeological interest. The reduction in traffic noise as result of diverted traffic would help restore its village setting, therefore contributing to its historic interest. This would represent a low magnitude of impact on heritage significance. This would give rise to a moderate beneficial effect which would be **significant**.

*Benhallstock Cottages (LB II 1377115)**Predicted change*

- 9.6.90 The asset lies near a proposed new roundabout on the A12, where traffic would be diverted south along the new two village bypass. Visibility of the proposed development would be partially screened by existing planting within the garden of the asset, and along the site boundary, and proposed planting at the new roundabout east of the asset. Filtered views of the proposed development from the asset may be possible to the south or south-east.
- 9.6.91 Diverted traffic away from the current A12 which passes directly in front of the asset would result in a reduction in traffic noise within the vicinity of the asset, though this would be balanced by the close proximity of the roundabout approximately 230m to the east. The reduction in traffic movements along the A12 would reduce the perceived severance of historic connectivity to Benhall Park. Any change would be permanent.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.92 The architectural and primary historic interests of the asset would be enhanced by the significant reduction in traffic and the resulting increase connectivity between the cottages and Benhall Park, which would provide a better understanding of the asset's historical location and function at a roadside entrance to the Benhall estate. Any positive effect as result of diverted traffic is likely to be balanced against the negative effect of the proximity of the proposed roundabout. Consequently, there would be no impact on heritage significance therefore no effect would arise.

### Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.93 The asset lies adjacent to the western site boundary near a proposed new roundabout on the A12. Operation of the proposed development may introduce new perceptible elements to the setting of Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461).
- 9.6.94 Visibility of the proposed development from within the asset would be largely precluded by existing woodland belts and blocks along the east of Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461), as well as topography and buildings. Views of the proposed development may be possible from the north-east approach to the park. However, there is a lack of any historical visual relationship between the asset, and this eastern area of its setting; the western formal entrance to the park and Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507) as well as the prominent views north and south through the park would be unchanged. Any changes would be permanent.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.95 The archaeological, historic and architectural interest of the asset would remain unaffected by operation of the proposed development. Consequently, there would be no impact on heritage significance therefore no effect would arise.

### Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.96 The asset lies within the core of Glemham Hall Park and Garden (RPG II 1001461) approximately 830m west of the site. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting mean that operation of the proposed development would not be perceptible from the asset.
- 9.6.97 The proposed development is not expected to change any historic function or relationship of the asset with its wider setting.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.98 There would be no impact on heritage significance therefore no effect would arise.

Retaining wall of ha-ha 30 metres west of Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1230629) and garden walling to south of Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1230800)

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.99 These assets lie within the core of the Glemham Hall Park and Garden (RPG II 1001461) approximately 820m west of the site. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting mean that operation of the proposed development would not be perceptible from the assets.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.100 There would be no impact on heritage significance therefore no effect would arise.

Lodge at Entrance to Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1278406)

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.101 The asset lies on the western edge of the Glemham Hall Park and Garden (RPG II 1001461) approximately 1.2km west of the site. The distance, and the intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting means that operation of the proposed development would not be perceptible from the asset.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.102 There would be no impact on heritage significance therefore no effect would arise.

Little Glemham Hall Stables (LB II 1278438)

*Predicted change*

- 9.6.103 The asset lies within the core of the Glemham Hall Park and Garden (RPG II 1001461) approximately 740m west of the site. The intervening buildings, topography, landscape and planting mean that operation of the proposed development would not be perceptible from the asset.

*Significance of effect*

- 9.6.104 There would be no impact on heritage significance therefore no effect would arise.

### Pond Barn (FNM 022)

#### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.105 The proposed development lies within the wider rural landscape of the asset. Whilst its operation may introduce new visible and audible elements to the setting of the asset, any visibility would be heavily screened by intervening planting and topography.

#### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.106 No discernible loss of the asset's archaeological, historic or architectural interest would arise. Whilst there would be a perception of the proposed development through changes to the noise environment, this is not expected to alter the understanding of the asset nor the ability to appreciate its historical function. These changes to setting would not impact heritage significance therefore no effect would arise.

#### iii. Effects arising through change to historic landscape character

##### *Predicted change*

- 9.6.107 Overall, physical changes associated with the construction of the proposed development would persist and affect the legibility of the historic landscape, removing some elements and reorganising others.

##### *Significance of effect*

- 9.6.108 Impact to this asset of low heritage significance would be permanent, and of a moderate magnitude, resulting from diminution of historic interest, giving rise to a minor adverse effect which would be **not significant**.

#### iv. Inter-relationship effects

- 9.6.109 Effects including noise, and landscape and visual have been considered within the settings assessment. No further inter-relationship effects are anticipated to arise on any historic environment receptors as a result of the operation of the proposed development.

## 9.7 Mitigation and monitoring

### a) Introduction

- 9.7.1 Primary and tertiary mitigation measures, which have been accounted for as part of the assessment, are summarised in **section 9.5** of this chapter. Where required, secondary mitigation measures have been proposed.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

9.7.2 This section describes the proposed secondary mitigation measures for terrestrial historic environment as well as describes any monitoring required of specific receptors/resources or for the effectiveness of a mitigation measure.

**b) Mitigation**

9.7.3 It has been established that there is potential for remains dating to the prehistoric, Roman and medieval periods within the site as set out in **section 9.4** of this chapter. These would be of low to medium heritage significance if present. In the absence of further mitigation their removal would result in a **significant** adverse impact.

9.7.4 Secondary mitigation in this case would comprise the adoption of an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation to ensure that the archaeological interest of any significant deposits, and features within the site could be appropriately investigated, recorded and disseminated, preserving the archaeological interest of these remains. Following these mitigation measures would ensure that the magnitude of effect on buried archaeological remains from the proposed development would be reduced to low, resulting in a minor adverse effect, which would be **not significant**.

9.7.5 An overarching archaeological written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been produced for the Sizewell C Project, provided in **Appendix 16H** of **Volume 2** of the **ES** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and is secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Order** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This then requires that an individual site WSI would be produced to supplement this and agreed with SCCAS.

9.7.6 Publication and popular dissemination of any key results would allow any informative and historic value to be fully realised, and details of this will be set out within the WSIs.

**c) Monitoring**

9.7.7 Monitoring of the agreed programme of archaeological investigation would be carried out by SCCAS during the implementation of the scheme, the details of which would be set out within the individual site WSI.

**9.8 Residual effects**

9.8.1 **Table 9.5** and **9.6** present a summary of the terrestrial historic environment assessment. They identify the receptor/s likely to be impacted, the level of effect and, where the effect is deemed to be significant, the tables include the mitigation proposed and the resulting residual effect.

9.8.2 In general, mitigation through recording would be effective in retaining much of the archaeological interest of a heritage asset. However, to reflect the basic principle, acknowledged in NPS EN-1, that a retained record is not as valuable as archaeological interest retained in an asset which is actively conserved, this mitigation would serve as partial mitigation, reducing the magnitude of any adverse effect to low. In all cases identified in this assessment, this mitigation would be sufficient to ensure that no residual significant adverse effects would arise as a result of disturbance of archaeological remains.

**Table 9.5: Summary of effects for the construction phase.**

| Receptor   | Impact   | Primary or tertiary mitigation.  | Assessment of effects.                                   | Additional mitigation. | Residual effects.                                |
|--|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| Archaeological heritage assets within the site.                    | Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.      | None   | Moderate to Major adverse effect ( <b>significant</b> ). | Agreed WSI.            | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ). |
| Geoarchaeological or palaeoenvironmental deposits within the site. | Loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.      | None   | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).         | Agreed WSI.            | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ). |
| Farnham Manor Grade II (LB 1230210).                               | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting. | Standard <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) measures to limit noise disturbance.<br>Retention of existing vegetation where possible.<br>Woodland planting along the western side of the cutting as the route passes Farnham Hall to provide visual screening. | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ).         | None required.         | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ). |

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

| Receptor  | Impact  | Primary or tertiary mitigation.   | Assessment of effects. | Additional mitigation. | Residual effects. |
|---|---|---|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Church of St Mary Grade II* (LB 1230211)                      | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | Standard <b>CoCP</b> measures to limit noise disturbance. Landscaping of new road where it passes through the floodplain to the west of the church. | No effect              | None required          | No effect         |
| Elm Tree Farmhouse (LB II 1230213)                            | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | Standard <b>CoCP</b> measures to limit noise disturbance  | No effect              | None required          | No effect         |
| Elm Tree Cottage (LB I 1230214)                               | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | Standard <b>CoCP</b> measures to limit noise disturbance  | No effect              | None required          | No effect         |
| Post Office Stores (LB II 1230215)                            | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | None  | No effect              | None required          | No effect         |
| George and Dragon (LB II 1230216)                             | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | None  | No effect              | None required          | No effect         |
| Turret Cottage Turret House (LB II 1230217)                   | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | None  | No effect              | None required          | No effect         |
| Church of St Andrew (LB II* 1231407)                          | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | Standard <b>CoCP</b> measures to limit noise disturbance  | No effect              | None required          | No effect         |
| Four cottages 30m south of St Andrew's Church (LB II 1278123) | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | Standard <b>CoCP</b> measures to limit noise disturbance  | No effect              | None required          | No effect.        |

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

| Receptor  | Impact  | Primary or tertiary mitigation.  | Assessment of effects.                          | Additional mitigation. | Residual effects.                               |
|---|---|--|---|------------------------|---|
| Benhallstock Cottages (LB II 1377115)                                   | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | Standard <b>CoCP</b> measures to limit noise disturbance. Retention of existing screening. Planting at the proposed roundabout providing screening | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ) | None required          | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ) |
| Glemham Hall (Park and Garden II 1001461)                               | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | Standard <b>CoCP</b> measures to limit noise disturbance   | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ) | None required          | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ) |
| Little Glemham Hall (LB I 1278507)                                      | No impact   | None   | No effect                                       | None required          | No effect                                       |
| Retaining wall of ha-ha 30m west of Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1230629) | No impact   | None   | No effect                                       | None required          | No effect                                       |
| Garden walling to south of Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1230800)          | No impact   | None   | No effect                                       | None required          | No effect                                       |
| Lodge at Entrance to Little Glemham Hall (LB II 1278406)                | No impact   | None   | No effect                                       | None required          | No effect                                       |
| Little Glemham Hall Stables (LB II 1278438)                             | No impact   | None   | No effect                                       | None required          | No effect                                       |
| Ponds Barn (FNM 022)  | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting | Standard <b>CoCP</b> measures to limit noise disturbance   | No effect                                       | None required          | No effect                                       |



**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

| Receptor | Impact   | Primary or tertiary mitigation.   | Assessment of effects.                           | Additional mitigation. | Residual effects.                                |
|----------|--|---|--|------------------------|--|
| HLC.     | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to use of site and loss of hedgerows. | Existing vegetation retained where possible. Hedgerow planting along the route of the proposed development. | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ). | None required.         | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ). |

**Table 9.6: Summary of effects for the operational phase.**

| Receptor  | Impact   | Primary or tertiary mitigation.  | Assessment of effects.                           | Additional mitigation. | Residual effects.                                |
|---|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| Archaeological and geoarchaeological heritage assets within the site. | No impact.   | None   | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |
| Farnham Manor Grade II (LB 1230210).                                  | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting. | Woodland planting along the western side of the cutting as the route passes Farnham Hall.<br>A footbridge would be provided across the route to maintain connectivity with Foxburrow Wood. | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ). | None required.         | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ). |
| Church of St Mary Grade II* (LB 1230211).                             | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting. | Maturing of landscaping of new road.   | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |
| Elm Tree Farmhouse Grade II (LB 1230213).                             | Potential gain of heritage significance through change to setting. | None   | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). | None required.         | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). |

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

| Receptor   | Impact   | Primary or tertiary mitigation. | Assessment of effects.                           | Additional mitigation. | Residual effects.                                |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| Elm Tree Cottage Grade II (LB 1230214).                              | Potential gain of heritage significance through change to setting. | None                            | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). | None required.         | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). |
| Post Office Stores Grade II (LB 1230215).                            | Potential gain of heritage significance through change to setting. | None                            | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). | None required.         | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). |
| George and Dragon Grade II (LB 1230216).                             | Potential gain of heritage significance through change to setting. | None                            | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). | None required.         | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). |
| Turret Cottage Turret House Grade II (LB 1230217).                   | Potential gain of heritage significance through change to setting. | None                            | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). | None required.         | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). |
| Church of St Andrew Grade II* (LB 1231407).                          | Potential gain of heritage significance through change to setting. | None                            | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). | None required.         | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). |
| Four cottages 30m south of St Andrew's Church Grade II (LB 1278123). | Potential gain of heritage significance through change to setting. | None                            | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). | None required.         | Moderate positive effect ( <b>significant</b> ). |
| Benhallstock Cottages Grade II (LB 1377115).                         | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting. | None                            | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |
| Glemham Hall Grade II (Park and Garden 1001461).                     | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting. | None                            | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |
| Little Glemham Hall Grade I (LB 1278507).                            | No impact.   | None                            | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

| Receptor   | Impact   | Primary or tertiary mitigation.  | Assessment of effects.                           | Additional mitigation. | Residual effects.                                |
|--|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| Retaining wall of ha-ha 30m west of Little Glemham Hall Grade II (LB 1230629). | No impact.   | None   | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |
| Garden walling to south of Little Glemham Hall Grade II (LB 1230800).          | No impact.   | None   | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |
| Lodge at Entrance to Little Glemham Hall Grade II (LB 1278406).                | No impact.   | None   | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |
| Little Glemham Hall Stables Grade II (LB 1278438).                             | No impact.   | None   | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |
| Ponds Barn (FNM 022).  | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting.                           | None   | No effect.                                       | None required.         | No effect.                                       |
| HLC  | Potential loss of heritage significance through change to use of site and loss of hedgerows. | Maturing of hedgerow planting along the route of the proposed development. | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ). | None required.         | Minor adverse effect ( <b>not significant</b> ). |

## References

- 9.1 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.  
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46> [Accessed September 2019].
- 9.2 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.  
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents> [Accessed September 2019].
- 9.3 Infrastructure (Decisions) Regulations 2010.  
<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2010/9780111490266/contents>  
[Accessed September 2019].
- 9.4 The Hedgerow Regulations 1997.  
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1997/1160/contents/made> [Accessed September 2019].
- 9.5 The Protection of Military Remains Act 1986.  
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents> [Accessed September 2019].
- 9.6 DECC (2011) Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (NPS EN-1)  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/47854/1938-overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47854/1938-overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf)  
[Accessed July 2019].
- 9.7 DECC (2011) National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statements-for-energy-infrastructure> [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.8 ESC (2013) Suffolk Coastal District Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies  
<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/local-plans/suffolk-coastal-local-plan/existing-local-plan/core-strategy-and-development-management-policies/> [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.9 ESC (2019) Suffolk Coastal District Council Final Draft Local Plan  
<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/local-plans/suffolk-coastal-local-plan/local-plan-review/final-draft-local-plan/> [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.10 Suffolk Coastal District Council (1995) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 6 Historic Parks and Gardens  
<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Suffolk-Coastal-Local-Plan/Supplementary-Planning-Guidance/SPG6-Historic-parks-and-gardens.pdf>. [Accessed September 2019].

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 9.11 Historic England, (2015). Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in decision-taking in the Historic Environment. <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa2-managing-significance-in-decision-taking/gpa2/> [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.12 Historic England (2008) Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance. <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-principles-sustainable-management-historic-environment/conservationprinciplespoliciesandguidanceapril08web/>. [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.13 Historic England, (2017). Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets. <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/> [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.14 Jenny Glazebrook (ed.). (1997). Research and Archaeology: a Framework for The Eastern Counties 1. Resource assessment. East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 3. [http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap3/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap3/). [Accessed March 2019].
- 9.15 Nigel Brown, Jenny Glazebrook (eds). (2000). Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties 2. Research agenda and strategy. East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 8. [http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap8/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap8/). [Accessed March 2019].
- 9.16 Maria Medlycott (ed.). (2011). Research and Archaeology Revisited: a revised framework for the East of England, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Papers 24. [http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap24/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap24/). [Accessed March 2019].
- 9.17 East Anglian Archaeology (2019). Regional Research Framework Review. <http://eaareports.org.uk/algao-east/regional-research-framework-review/> [Accessed March 2019].
- 9.18 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). (2017). Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessment. [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA\\_3.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA_3.pdf) / [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.19 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). (2014). Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment. [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GCommissioning\\_1.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GCommissioning_1.pdf). [Accessed July 2019].

- 9.20 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). (2014). Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation. [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GFieldevaluation\\_1.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GFieldevaluation_1.pdf). [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.21 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). (2014). Standard and guidance for archaeological geophysical survey. [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics\\_2.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics_2.pdf). [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.22 Gurney, D. (2003). Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England. [http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ\\_pap14/](http://eaareports.org.uk/publication/occ_pap14/). [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.23 Schmidt et al. (2016). EAC Guidelines for the use of Geophysics in Archaeology [http://old.european-archaeological-council.org/files/eac\\_guidelines\\_2\\_final.pdf](http://old.european-archaeological-council.org/files/eac_guidelines_2_final.pdf). [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.24 Historic England (2011) Environmental Archaeology ([https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/environmental\\_archaeology/](https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/environmental_archaeology/)). [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.25 Historic England (2015) Geoarchaeology (<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geoarchaeology-earth-sciences-to-understand-archaeological-record/heag067-geoarchaeology/>). [Accessed July 2019].
- 9.26 British Geological Survey. 2019 (Online). Geology of Britain Viewer. Available from: <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>. (Accessed 04 March 2019).
- 9.27 Landis. 2018 (Online). Soilscales. Available from: <http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscales/index.cfm>. (Accessed 12 August 2019).
- 9.28 Suffolk County Council. 2011 (Online). Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment. Available from: [http://www.suffolklandscape.org.uk/landscape\\_map.aspx](http://www.suffolklandscape.org.uk/landscape_map.aspx). (Accessed 06 September 2019).
- 9.29 Suffolk County Council. 2017. The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation Map.
- 9.30 EAA. 2004. Excavations at a large Romano-British Settlement at Hacheston, Suffolk, 1973-74. East Anglian Archaeology Report No. 106. Suffolk County Council. Ipswich.
- 9.31 Martin, E. (n.d.) Medieval Rural (Regional Historic Environment Research Framework for the East of England period-based summary review) Available from:

[http://eaareports.org.uk/assets/uploads/RRF2017\\_Medieval\\_Rural\\_Draft.pdf](http://eaareports.org.uk/assets/uploads/RRF2017_Medieval_Rural_Draft.pdf)  
(Accessed 25 September 2019).

- 9.32 Cotswold Archaeology 2017. Main Development Site, Sizewell C, Suffolk.  
Interim Fieldwork Summary.