

# **M3 Junction 9 Improvement**

**Scheme Number: TR010055**

## **6.1 Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage**

**APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)**

**Planning Act 2008**

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

**Volume 6**

**November 2022**

## Infrastructure Planning

### Planning Act 2008

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

M3 Junction 9 Improvement  
Development Consent Order 202[x]

<b>6.1 ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT - CHAPTER 6: CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>
---

<b>Regulation Number:</b>	Regulation 5(2)(a)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:</b>	TR010055
<b>Application Document Reference:</b>	6.1
<b>BIM Document Reference:</b>	HE551511-VFK-EHR- X_XXXX_XX-RP-LE-0001
<b>Author:</b>	M3 Junction 9 Improvement Project Team, National Highways

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev 0	November 2022	Application Submission

## Contents

<b>6</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage</b> .....	<b>1</b>
6.1	Introduction .....	1
6.2	Consultation .....	1
6.3	Legislative, policy framework and guidance .....	5
6.4	Assessment methodology .....	7
6.5	Study area.....	13
6.6	Baseline conditions .....	14
6.7	Potential impacts.....	28
6.8	Design, mitigation and enhancement measures .....	30
6.9	Assessment of likely significant effects .....	32
6.10	Monitoring .....	55
6.11	Summary.....	55

## Tables

Table 6.1: Consultation undertaken relevant to Cultural Heritage .....	2
Table 6.2: Criteria for grading the value (or sensitivity) of cultural heritage assets .....	9
Table 6.3: Magnitude of impact and typical descriptions .....	9
Table 6.4: Significance of effect matrix.....	11
Table 6.5: Summary of receptors and their sensitivity .....	23
Table 6.6: Impacts upon designated archaeological remains during the construction phase .....	33
Table 6.7: Impacts upon non-designated archaeological remains during the construction phase .....	35
Table 6.8: Impacts upon designated built heritage assets during the construction phase .....	42
Table 6.9: Impacts upon non-designated historic landscapes during the construction phase .....	46
Table 6.10: Impacts upon designated archaeological remains during operation .....	49
Table 6.11: Impacts upon designated built heritage assets during operation .....	52

## Document Reference 6.2 – Environmental Statement

### Figures

- Figure 6.1: Site Location and Geology
- Figure 6.2: Designated Heritage Assets
- Figure 6.3: Previous Archaeological Investigations
- Figure 6.4: Prehistoric Heritage Assets
- Figure 6.5: Roman and Early Medieval Heritage Assets
- Figure 6.6: Medieval and Post-Medieval Heritage Assets
- Figure 6.7: Modern and Undated Heritage Assets
- Figure 6.8: National Mapping Programme

Figure 6.9: Historic Landscape Characterisation  
Figure 6.10: Eighteenth Century Kings Worthy  
Figure 6.11: Sir Charles Ogle Estate Map (1823)  
Figure 6.12: Important Hedgerows

## **Document Reference 6.3 – Environmental Statement Appendices**

Appendix 6.1: Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline  
Appendix 6.2: Geophysical Survey Summary Report  
Appendix 6.3: Archaeological Evaluation Report  
Appendix 6.4: Geophysical Survey Report (Sumo Survey, 2019)  
Appendix 6.5: Geophysical Survey Report (Headland Archaeology 2021a)  
Appendix 6.6: Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation Report (Headland Archaeology 2021b)  
Appendix 6.7: Archaeological Watching Brief (Wessex Archaeology 2021)  
Appendix 6.8: Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy

## 6 Cultural Heritage

### 6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of the construction and operation of the M3 Junction 9 Improvement Scheme (hereafter referred to as the Scheme) on cultural heritage. This chapter outlines legislative, policy framework and guidance, describes the assessment methodology, study area, baseline conditions, an overview of potential impacts, mitigation measures, likely residual effects, monitoring and a summary. This chapter has been prepared by a competent expert. Further details are provided in **Appendix 1.1 (Competent Expert Evidence)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**.

6.1.2 This chapter should be read in conjunction with **Environmental Statement (ES) Figures 6.1 – 6.12 (Document Reference 6.2)** and **Appendices 6.1 to 6.8** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** which comprise:

- ES Appendix 6.1: Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline
- ES Appendix 6.2: Geophysical Survey Summary Report (WSP, 2018)
- ES Appendix 6.3: Archaeological Evaluation Report (Wessex Archaeology, 2019)
- ES Appendix 6.4: Geophysical Survey Report (Sumo Survey, 2019)
- ES Appendix 6.5: Geophysical Survey Report (Headland Archaeology, 2021a)
- ES Appendix 6.6: Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation Report (Headland Archaeology, 2021b)
- ES Appendix 6.7: GI Watching Brief Report (Wessex Archaeology 2021)
- ES Appendix 6.8: Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy

6.1.3 This chapter should be read in parallel to **Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual)** and **Chapter 15 (Cumulative Effects)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**.

### 6.2 Consultation

6.2.1 Consultation and engagement have informed the cultural heritage assessment. Comments and responses to the Scoping Opinion received in November 2020 are provided in **Appendix 4.2 (Scoping Comments and Responses)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** and comments and responses received during statutory consultation between May and June 2021 are provided in **Appendix K of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1)**.

6.2.2 A consultation workshop between the applicant and key heritage stakeholders (Winchester City Council, Hampshire County Council, South Downs National

Park Authority and Historic England), was held on 25 November 2020 to discuss changes to the Scheme since the previously consulted design, see **Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**. Key comments raised during this workshop and responses to these comments are included in **Table 6.1**.

Table 6.1: Consultation undertaken relevant to Cultural Heritage

Reference	Comment	Response
Winchester City Council	Previous geophysical survey and trial trenching carried out as part of the previous design phase did not identify any archaeological remains that would prevent or significantly constrain the Proposed Scheme but further archaeological evaluative works particularly in the areas of temporary works and areas of uncertain potential will be required. This is likely to involve geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching.	A geophysical survey in <b>Appendix 6.5 (Geophysical Survey Report)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> and a trial trench evaluation in <b>Appendix 6.6 (Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation Report)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> were carried out as part of this assessment on suitable areas not covered during previous work. These have been used to formulate an Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy in consultation with the Winchester City Council Archaeologist in <b>Appendix 6.8</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .
Winchester City Council	A geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental review should be integrated into the archaeological desk-based assessment [detailed cultural heritage baseline for the ES] and outline mitigation strategy as planned, with special attention to deep sequences associated with the River Itchen floodplain to be impacted by piling	The results of historic boreholes are included within <b>Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> . The results of an archaeological watching brief during a recent phase of ground investigations are included within <b>Appendix 6.7 (Watching Brief Report)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> . The results of any further Ground Investigation work would be available during the detailed design phase and reviewed by the project archaeologist when available. A broad approach to geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental mitigation is included within <b>Appendix 6.8</b>

Reference	Comment	Response
		<b>(Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> which is secured by the draft <b>Development Consent Order (Document Reference 3.1)</b> .
Winchester City Council	<p>Mitigation should look to take a holistic landscape approach.</p> <p>Suggested revisiting the archive for previous fieldwork carried out during the construction of the M3 to analyse material not previously analysed.</p> <p>Community outreach should be included in the mitigation package.</p>	<p>An Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy in <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> has been prepared and reflects the views of the relevant stakeholders including Winchester City Council and includes reference to a holistic landscape approach, opportunities to examine archive material from previous investigations and community outreach.</p>
Hampshire County Council	<p>Raised issues about intrusive groundworks to create chalk grassland. Mentioned nitrate reduction methodology, with a preference for no soil strip.</p>	<p>Chalk grassland is proposed as part of the Scheme and is likely to involve a topsoil strip method. However alternative methods may be considered where possible and necessary. This is presented in <b>Figure 2.3 (Environmental Masterplan)</b> of the <b>ES (Document reference 6.2)</b>.</p>
Hampshire County Council	<p>Agreed it was appropriate to use the Winchester City Council Historic Environment Record (HER) dataset, but the Hampshire County Archaeologist will review the baseline during consultation to advise on any small updates needed based on the Hampshire Historic Environment Record (HHER)</p>	<p>An earlier draft version of the detailed cultural heritage baseline and the geophysical surveys carried out as part of an earlier phase of the Scheme were sent to the Hampshire County Council Archaeologist, the HER and Historic England for information.</p>
Hampshire County Council	<p>Adequate time must be allowed in the future construction programme for pre-construct mitigation measures (tbc) to be fully implemented without rushing</p>	<p>The Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy in <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document</b></p>



Reference	Comment	Response
		<p><b>Reference 6.3)</b> notes that sufficient time should be provided to allow pre-construction archaeological work to be carried out.</p>
Historic England	<p>Wish to be further consulted on any permanent elevated structures including gantries, signage and any long-term spoil retention areas in close proximity to scheduled monuments</p>	<p>Historic England have been updated on the Scheme and visited select designated heritage assets with the Applicant's Cultural Heritage Consultants in June 2022 to assess potential impacts from gantries and signage. Historic England will continue to be consulted during the detailed design phase.</p>
Historic England	<p>There will be a need for a settings assessment to be carried out to understand the impact of the proposals (both temporary and permanent elements). Any assessment should include winter foliage conditions.</p>	<p>Settings assessments for heritage assets considered likely to receive indirect effects from the Scheme are included within <b>Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> with assessment of potential affects, from temporary and permanent elements of the Scheme, considered in this chapter. The Applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) <b>Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.1)</b> considers both summer and winter conditions in accordance with DMRB LA 107 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Highways England, 2020).</p>
South Downs National Park Authority	<p>Scheme should include proposals for enhancement. Avoid intrusive public information boards but explore modern digital interpretation methods such as Quick Response (QR) codes which would enable the public to put the landscape into context.</p> <p>Issue raised about the lack of storage space for archaeological</p>	<p>Opportunities for enhancement and community outreach is provided within the <b>first iteration Environmental Management Plan (fiEMP) (Document Reference 7.3)</b>. The strategy also notes that archive storage needs consideration.</p>



Reference	Comment	Response
	archives and a number of large infrastructure projects in the same area will put increased pressure on storage space	
South Downs National Park Authority, Hampshire County Council, Historic England, Winchester City Council	Found the opportunity to come together useful. All wish to be kept informed as the evaluation package and outline mitigation packages evolve. A group meeting was proposed to finalise the outline mitigation package (agreement to be led by Winchester City Council)	All stakeholders, other than Hampshire County Council who formally stepped back from providing feedback on the Scheme and delegated full responsibility to Winchester City Council, were included within evaluation and outline mitigation discussions and would continue to be involved in detailed mitigation discussions during the detailed design stage.

6.2.3 In addition to the above consultation, the key heritage stakeholders were also contacted to discuss and agree investigations to inform the baseline, which comprised geophysical survey and trial trenching. Prior to these surveys starting, the Winchester City Council Archaeologist approved the written schemes of investigations (WSI) and then made two monitoring visits during the trial trenching. The results of the investigations and outline mitigation strategy were discussed with the Winchester City Council Archaeologist, South Downs National Park Authority and Historic England. The Winchester City Council Archaeologist confirmed the position stated in an earlier email (received 28 June 2020) that no further investigations were needed to inform the ES.

6.2.4 Select designated heritage assets were visited by Historic England and the Applicant's Cultural Heritage Consultants in June 2022 to assess the potential indirect effects from signs and gantries added to the Scheme following the government's announcement to pause all lane running (ALR) projects, including the M3 Junction 9 to Junction14 Scheme.

### 6.3 Legislative, policy framework and guidance

6.3.1 This assessment has been undertaken considering current legislation, together with national, regional and local plans and policies. A list is provided below and further detail regarding National Policy can be found in the **National Policy Statement Accordance Table (Document Reference 7.2)**:

- National Parks and Countryside Act 1949 (as amended in the Environment Act 1995)
- Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Hedgerow Regulations 1997
- National Policy Statement for National Networks (2014)
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (online resource)
- Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (2013)
- Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (2017)
- South Downs Local Plan (2019)
- Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013)
- Winchester District Draft Local Plan 2018 -2038 (emerging)

6.3.2 In addition to the legislation and national and local planning policies listed above, this assessment has also been carried out in accordance with the following professional standards and guidance:

- DMRB LA104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (Highways England, 2020a)
- DMRB LA106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (Highways England, 2020b)
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based assessment (as revised 2020)
- DEFRA The Hedgerow Regulations: A Guide to the Law and Good Practice (1997)
- Historic England's Managing the Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 2) (2015)
- Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3) (Second Edition) (2017)
- Historic England's Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets (Historic England Advice Note 12) (2019)
- Winchester City Council's Standards for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments (DBA) (n.d.)

## 6.4 Assessment methodology

### Scope of the assessment

- 6.4.1 This chapter presents an assessment of impacts upon designated and non-designated cultural heritage assets during both the construction and operation of the Scheme. The assessment is based on the DMRB LA 106 Cultural heritage assessment (Highways England, 2020b).
- 6.4.2 The cultural heritage assessment has been divided into the following three sub-topics:
- **Archaeological remains:** the material remains of human activity from the earliest periods of human evolution to the present. These could be buried traces of human activities, archaeological deposits, archaeological sites which are visible above ground, or moveable artefacts. Archaeological remains can encompass the remains of buildings, structures, earthworks and landscapes, human, animal, or plant remains, or other organic material produced by or affected by human activities
  - **Historic buildings:** architectural, designed or other structures with a significant historical value. These could include structures that have no aesthetic appeal or structures not usually thought of as 'buildings', such as milestones or bridges
  - **Historic landscapes:** the current landscape, whose character is the consequence of the action and interaction of natural and/ or human factors
- 6.4.3 The cultural heritage resource can be designated (heritage assets which are afforded statutory protection, such as listed buildings, scheduled monuments, and registered parks and gardens) or undesignated (heritage assets which have a degree of heritage value but do not meet the criteria for designation).
- 6.4.4 While this chapter assesses impacts upon individual and groups of cultural heritage assets within the South Downs National Park, impacts upon the National Park as a receptor are assessed in **Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**.

### Study area and baseline approach

- 6.4.5 The study area is defined within **Section 6.5** (Study area). Baseline data (and identification of cultural heritage assets) is outlined in **Section 6.6** and in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**. The baseline has been informed through gathering readily available desk-based information, data from stakeholders, site visits together with geophysics surveys and trial trenching.

### Approach to design, mitigation and enhancement measures

- 6.4.6 The Scheme has been designed to avoid or reduce effects on cultural heritage. Embedded mitigation is listed within **Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment)**

**Methodology** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**. Essential mitigation measures have been identified within this chapter and discussed with Historic England, South Downs National Park Authority and the Winchester City Council Archaeologist. This mitigation is also included within the **fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)**.

#### **Assessment approach - value (sensitivity) of resource**

- 6.4.7 The value (or sensitivity) of cultural heritage assets has been based mainly upon existing designations but allows for professional judgement where features are found which do not have any formal national or local designation. The value of cultural heritage assets is assessed on a five-point scale of, very high, high, medium, low and negligible. The criteria used to assess the value of cultural heritage assets is presented in **Table 6.2** and follows Table 3.2N in DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (Highways England, 2020). This approach differs from that presented in the October 2020 Scoping Report (National Highways, 2020) and at the cultural heritage consultation workshop (25 November 2020) which used the former version of DMRB for additional clarity on sensitivity and value. This change was requested by the National Highways Principal Cultural Heritage Advisor and has been discussed with the heritage stakeholders. The criteria used in this assessment for determining the value (or sensitivity) of cultural heritage assets is presented in **Table 6.2**.

Table 6.2: Criteria for grading the value (or sensitivity) of cultural heritage assets

Value (sensitivity) of receptor / resource	Typical description
Very high	Very high importance and rarity, international scale and very limited potential for substitution.
High	High importance and rarity, national scale, and limited potential for substitution.
Medium	Medium or high importance and rarity, regional scale, limited potential for substitution.
Low	Low or medium importance and rarity, local scale.
Negligible	Very low importance and rarity, local scale.

### Assessment approach - magnitude of impact

- 6.4.8 Magnitude of impact is the degree of change that would be experienced by a cultural heritage asset and its setting during the construction and operation of the Scheme, as compared with a 'do nothing' scenario. Magnitude of impact is assessed without reference to the value of the cultural heritage asset and could include physical impacts upon the cultural heritage asset or impacts on its setting. Effects may be temporary or permanent, direct or indirect and may be adverse, beneficial or may result in no change.
- 6.4.9 The magnitude of impact has been assessed using a five-point scale of, major, moderate, minor, negligible and no change. The assessment is based on professional judgement and follows criteria provided in DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (Highways England, 2020a). Factors in the assessment of the magnitude of impact for all cultural heritage assets are presented in **Table 6.3**.

Table 6.3: Magnitude of impact and typical descriptions

Magnitude of impact (change)		Typical description
Major	Adverse	Change to most or all key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; extreme visual effects; gross change of noise or change to sound quality; fundamental changes to use or access; resulting in total change to historic landscape character unit

Magnitude of impact (change)		Typical description
		<p>Change to most or all key archaeological materials, such that the resource is totally altered.</p> <p>Comprehensive changes to setting</p> <p>Change to key historic building elements, such that the resource is totally altered</p> <p>Comprehensive changes to the setting</p>
	Beneficial	Large scale or major improvement of resource quality; extensive restoration; major improvement of attribute quality
Moderate	Adverse	<p>Changes to many key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, visual change to many key aspects of the historic landscape, noticeable differences in noise or sound quality, considerable changes to use or access; resulting in moderate changes to historic landscape character</p> <p>Changes to many key archaeological materials, such that the resource is clearly modified.</p> <p>Considerable changes to setting that affect the character of the asset</p> <p>Change to many key historic building elements, such that the resource is significantly modified.</p> <p>Changes to the setting of an historic building, such that it is significantly modified</p>
	Beneficial	Benefit to, or addition of, key characteristics, features or elements; improvement of attribute quality
Minor	Adverse	<p>Changes to few key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, slight visual changes to few key aspects of historic landscape, limited changes to noise levels or sound quality; slight changes to use or access: resulting in limited changes to historic landscape character</p> <p>Changes to key archaeological materials, such that the asset is slightly altered. Slight changes to setting</p> <p>Change to key historic building elements, such that the asset is slightly different. Change to setting of an historic building, such that it is noticeably changed</p>
	Beneficial	Minor benefit to, or addition of, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements; some

Magnitude of impact (change)		Typical description
		beneficial impact on attribute or a reduced risk of negative impact occurring
Negligible	Adverse	Very minor changes to key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, virtually unchanged visual effects, very slight changes in noise levels or sound quality; very slight changes to use or access; resulting in a very small change to historic landscape character  Very minor changes to archaeological materials or setting  Slight changes to historic buildings elements or setting that hardly affect it
	Beneficial	Very minor benefit to or positive addition of one or more characteristics, features or elements
No change		No loss or alteration of characteristics, features or elements; no observable impact in either direction

### Assessment approach - significance of effect

6.4.10 For all three sub-topics assessed in this chapter the significance of effect has been determined as a combination of the assessment of the value of the cultural heritage asset and the magnitude of impact. This is achieved using professional judgement informed by the matrix (taken from DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (Highways England, 2020a)) illustrated below in **Table 6.4**. Five levels of significance (very large, large, moderate, slight or neutral) are defined which apply equally to adverse and beneficial impacts. Where two significances of impacts are given in the table (for example neutral or slight) professional judgement is used in the text to suggest the most likely significance of effect in addition to the reasonable worst-case scenario.

Table 6.4: Significance of effect matrix

	Magnitude of impact (degree of change)					
		No change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
Environmental value (sensitivity)	Very High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate or large	Large or very large	Very large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Slight or moderate	Moderate or large	Large or very large



	Magnitude of impact (degree of change)					
		No change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
Medium	Neutral	Neutral or slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate or large	
Low	Neutral	Neutral or slight	Neutral or slight	Slight	Slight or moderate	
Negligible	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral or slight	Neutral or slight	Slight	

6.4.11 A significance of effect of moderate or above is taken to be significant in EIA terms.

#### Reasonable worse case parameters for assessment

6.4.12 An assessment has been conducted within the Limits of Deviation (LoD) outlined within **Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**. The vertical and lateral LoD for the Scheme have been reviewed with respect to sensitive receptors identified within this chapter. The vertical and lateral LoD would not affect the conclusions of the assessment reported in this chapter.

6.4.13 Where a cultural heritage receptor has an unknown sensitivity, due to a lack of available information through the Winchester Historic Environment Record, or where investigation works has not identified features recorded within the Winchester Historic Environment Record, professional judgement has been used to assign a potential value of high to each receptor, which is considered reasonable to fully assess the worst-case effect and provide a robust assessment.

#### Assessment assumptions and limitations

6.4.14 Data used to compile this chapter consists of secondary information derived from a variety of sources. The assumption is made that this data, as well as that derived from other secondary sources, is suitably accurate.

6.4.15 The records held by the Winchester Historic Environment Record are not a record of all surviving heritage assets, but a record of the discovery of a wide range of archaeological and historical components of the historic environment, usually driven by development in a particular area. The information held within it is not complete and does not preclude the subsequent discovery of further heritage assets that are, at present, unknown, notably buried archaeological remains.

6.4.16 It should be noted that a programme of archaeological evaluation including geophysical survey and trial trenching, see **Appendix 6.2 – 6.6** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** has tested the archaeological potential of the accessible parts of land within the Application Boundary. These surveys have reduced the risk that previously unidentified archaeological remains may be present within the Application Boundary. There is still the potential for known and previously unknown archaeological remains to be present in those areas not previously surveyed such as areas of existing highway/ vegetation and a narrow (approximately 15m) strip of land adjacent to the Spitfire Link which was included in the Scheme design following completion of the geophysical survey. However, a sufficient percentage of land within the Application Boundary has been surveyed as part of this assessment, or historically, to inform the likely potential and allow for an assessment of likely effects. It is therefore considered that the baseline assessment is robust and suitable to inform the cultural heritage assessment. This has been confirmed by the Winchester City Council Archaeologist and no further baseline information has been requested to be obtained.

## 6.5 Study area

- 6.5.1 The study area comprises 1km around the Application Boundary for designated cultural heritage assets and a 300m study area around the Application Boundary for non-designated cultural heritage assets – study areas are presented in **Figure 6.1 (Site Location and Geology)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** and all other relevant figures. These study areas have been used to identify cultural heritage assets that might be impacted upon, directly or indirectly, by the Scheme. These study areas were presented in the *M3 Junction 9 Improvement Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report (2020)* and at the cultural heritage consultation workshop held in November 2020. They were deemed acceptable by the Winchester City Council Archaeologist, the South Downs National Park Authority and Historic England, the key heritage stakeholders.
- 6.5.2 In paragraph 3.6.1 of DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (Highways England, 2020b) it is stated that a “*study area should include the settings of any designated or other cultural heritage resource in the footprint of the scheme or within the zone of visual influence or potentially affected by noise*”. Preliminary versions of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and final ZTVs **Figures 7.5 – 7.11 (Document Reference 6.2)** produced as part of **Chapter 7 (Landscape and Visual Assessment)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)** consider a 3km buffer around the Application Boundary and take into account the 3D model of the Scheme (including earthworks, gantries and planting) and consider the visibility of heavy goods vehicles. These demonstrate that the Scheme has a relatively limited visual envelope focused around the existing M3, A34 and A33 transport corridors. This was confirmed during the subsequent walkover surveys. Visibility of the Scheme and potential receptors that could receive indirect effects from the Scheme were discussed with heritage stakeholders at the consultation workshop. It was agreed that given the distance and lack of historical or functional association, the setting of cultural heritage assets beyond the 1km study area are unlikely to be affected. This has been confirmed in

subsequent correspondence and consultation responses from Historic England who confirmed the receptors they felt were most likely to receive significant effects. These all fall within the agreed 1km study area.

- 6.5.3 The study areas used for the noise assessment in **Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)** are 300m for construction effects and 600m for operation effects. No significant noise effects are anticipated beyond these and therefore the 1km study area used for this assessment sufficiently covers any designated heritage asset that might be affected by noise.

## 6.6 Baseline conditions

### Land use, topography and geology

- 6.6.1 A description of the land within the Application Boundary and the surrounding land use is provided in **Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)** and **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**. A description of topography and geology is provided in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** and **Chapter 9 (Geology and Soils)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**. In summary, the Application Boundary contains Junction 9 of the M3 along with sections of the M3 to the north and south of the junction and sections of the A33, A34, A272 and Easton Lane. The Application Boundary includes a narrow buffer around the carriageways and several fields to the east of the M3. The Application Boundary also includes several fields located between the A34 and M3.
- 6.6.2 The River Itchen flows through the northern part of the Application Boundary. Within the base of the valley, the ground level is at approximately 40m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) rising to between 80m and 90m AOD on the valley sides. The carriageway at the M3 Junction 9 is approximately 59m AOD and 66m AOD at roundabout level.
- 6.6.3 The geology within the Application Boundary, as recorded by the British Geological Survey (BGS) is shown on **Figure 6.1 (Site Location and Geology)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**. The underlying bedrock geology is recorded as chalk across the whole of the Application Boundary. In the central and northern parts of the Application Boundary, Seaford Chalk is recorded whilst in the southern part, either side of Petersfield Road bands of Lewes Nodular Chalk, New Pit Chalk and Holywell Nodular Chalk are recorded (BGS 2020). Superficial (Quaternary age) deposits, where recorded, consist of alluvium within the river valley comprising clay, silt, sand and gravel. Elsewhere, head deposits are recorded on the subaerial slopes formed by soil creep, solifluction and hill wash. These deposits also comprise clay, silt, sand and gravel.

## Archaeological remains

### *Scheduled monuments*

6.6.4 Whilst there are no designated archaeological remains (scheduled monuments) within the Application Boundary there are nine within the 1km study area which are of national interest and therefore of high value shown on **Figure 6.2 (Designated Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**. These are:

- The late Iron Age settlement site to the north of Grace's Farm (National Heritage list for England (NHLE): 1001825) which is located 40m west of the Application Boundary
- The site of St Gertrude's Chapel (NHLE: 1005518) which is approximately 185m west of the Application Boundary
- A round barrow cemetery of Magdalen Hill Down (NHLE: 1016746) which is 300m east of the Application Boundary
- St. Catherine's Hillfort (NHLE: 1016489) which is 660m southwest of the Application Boundary
- The remains of a Roman road to the east of St Catherine's Hill (NHLE: 1001798) which is 410m south of the Application Boundary
- An Anglo-Saxon Cemetery (NHLE: 1001817) in Worthy Park which is approximately 450m from the Application Boundary
- An Iron Age field system, banjo enclosure and Romano-British villa (NHLE: 1013269) which is 940m north-west from the Application Boundary
- Wolvesey Palace (NHLE: 1005535) located approximately 970m to the west of the Application Boundary within the Winchester Conservation Area
- The City Bridge (NHLE: 1021112) located approximately 960m to the west of the Application Boundary within the Winchester Conservation Area

6.6.5 Land within the Application Boundary is currently considered to make a neutral contribution towards the setting and value of the late Iron Age settlement site to the north of Grace's Farm (NHLE: 1001825) and the site of St Gertrude's Chapel (NHLE: 1005518). It is not considered to contribute towards the setting of the other scheduled monuments within the 1km study area and the Scheme is not considered to change this. Further detail on the assessment of the setting of these scheduled monuments and the contribution of land within the Application Boundary to this setting is provided in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**.

### ***Known non-designated archaeological remains***

- 6.6.6 The WHER records archaeological investigations at 46 locations within the 300m study area including 14 within the Application Boundary shown on **Figure 6.3 (Previous Archaeological Investigations)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**. The majority of these investigations are associated with survey work, preliminary excavations and rescue excavations and watching briefs carried out during the construction and development of the M3. The remains of Neolithic and Bronze Age funerary monuments, two small early Bronze Age cemeteries, middle and late Bronze Age settlements, 'Celtic' field systems, an early Iron Age settlement, a late Iron Age/ Romano-British settlement and evidence of early medieval occupation have all been found within the Application Boundary shown on **Figure 6.4 (Prehistoric Heritage Assets)** and **6.5 (Roman and Early Medieval Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**. The archaeological remains excavated during previous archaeological investigations within the Application Boundary have largely been removed during construction of the M3 although two areas to the east of the M3 were not removed and do survive. Those remains removed have no value/ sensitivity but are indicative of wider archaeological potential and provide valuable context for known and currently unknown archaeological remains. The surviving remains which were previously investigated do retain archaeological interest/value.
- 6.6.7 Other known archaeological remains identified within the Application Boundary from the *Winchester Historic Environment Record*, other sources consulted during preparation of **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** and archaeological investigations carried out as part of the previous design of the Scheme include:
- The surviving remains of the Neolithic/ Bronze Age ring ditch (SRN<sup>1</sup> 71, see **Figure 6.4 (Prehistoric Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**, originally excavated during the construction of the M3, and recently investigated as part of the archaeological investigations carried out previously, see **Appendix 6.2 (Geophysical Survey Summary Report)** and **Appendix 6.3 (Archaeological Evaluation Report)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** along with several discrete prehistoric pits, post-medieval field boundaries and parish boundary
  - An undated ring ditch (SRN 75), see **Figure 6.4 (Prehistoric Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**, likely dating to the prehistoric period, and an undated east to west aligned feature (SRN 215), see **Figure 6.7 (Modern and Undated Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** identified as a cropmark at Manor Farm
  - Two Roman roads, one along the course of the A33 and another along the course of Petersfield Road, and an aqueduct (SRN 123), see **Figure 6.5**

---

<sup>1</sup> For ease of reference the *Winchester Historic Environment Record* data has been rationalised and records assigned a Stantec Reference Number (SRN). This is referred to in the text and figures provided in Appendix 6.1 (Document Reference 6.3) and in this chapter were relevant.



**(Roman and Early Medieval Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** which crosses the Application Boundary. The section of aqueduct within the Application Boundary was removed during the construction of the existing M3 and it is therefore not considered to be a receptor

- Geophysical anomalies which were identified to the west of Manor Farm and are thought to represent a possible Anglo-Saxon settlement (SRN 214), see **Figure 6.7 (Modern and Undated Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**
- Water meadows (SRN 186,187, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196), see **Figure 6.6 (Medieval and Post-Medieval Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** which survive as earthworks along the River Itchen
- Watermill and pond visible on historic maps, see **Figures 6.10 (Eighteenth Century Kings Worthy)** and **6.11 (Sir Charles Ogle Estate Map (1823))** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** to the south of Kings Worthy
- The former Didcot, Newbury and Southampton Railway line (SRN 160, 161, 163), see **Figure 6.7 (Modern and Undated Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**, which survives as an embankment on which the A34 was built
- Area of flint and dark clay (SRN 213), see **Figure 6.7 (Modern and Undated Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** which suggests the possible presence of archaeological deposits in the White Hall Cottage area. This was recorded during surveys prior to the construction of the M3 but no further details are provided by the *Winchester Historic Environment Record*
- Additional features identified as cropmarks and earthworks identified by the NMP, see **Figure 6.8 (National Mapping Programme)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**
- Features of uncertain origin identified during the second phase of geophysical survey carried out previously, see **Appendix 6.4 (Geophysical Survey Report)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**

**[Geophysical survey 2021 Appendix 6.5 of the ES \(Document Reference 6.3\)](#)**

- 6.6.8 A geophysical (magnetometer) survey was carried out across land within the Application Boundary suitable for the technique and not previously surveyed. Most of the survey areas were on the eastern side of the M3 with one area on the western side (see **Appendix 6.5 (Geophysical Survey Report)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** for final report and figures). In summary, the survey identified ditch and pit like anomalies associated with a settlement site dating from the Bronze Age to the Romano-British period. This was archaeologically

excavated in the 1970s and partially removed during construction of the M3. Other features identified include linear anomalies associated with an extensive prehistoric field system (across all surveyed areas), former field boundaries, extractive pits and cultivation marks. The undated ring ditch (SRN 75) recorded during surveys during the construction of the M3 coincided with an area of magnetic disturbance and is likely to relate to an area of quarrying. The results of the geophysical survey suggest there is generally a low potential for occurrence of significant archaeological remains although remains of higher significance were recorded (Headland Archaeology, 2021a).

#### ***Trial trenching 2021 Appendix 6.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)***

6.6.9 A trial trench evaluation, consisting of 59 trenches, was carried out to the east and west of the M3 which had been subject to the 2019 geophysical survey. Features identified include several undated linear features and pits on either side of the M3, some of which were sealed beneath colluvium, a palaeochannel, the foundations of a post-medieval building and a circular pit containing 183 pieces of flint. The trenching exercise demonstrated that modern ploughing had impacted some archaeological remains with only fragments surviving (Headland Archaeology 2021b). Many of the cropmarks recorded by NMP were not identifiable through trenching and no remains were present associated with a possible Anglo-Saxon settlement (SRN 214) or area of flint and dark clay (SRN 213), both recorded by the *Winchester Historic Environment Record*. The archaeological remains identified were in poor condition and are all of low value and of local importance only.

#### ***Watching Brief 2021 Appendix 6.7 of the ES (Document Reference 6.3)***

6.6.10 Wessex Archaeology (2021) carried out a watching brief during ground investigation (GI) works. During the watching brief a total of 19 mechanically excavated trial pits to the north of junction 9 were monitored and recorded. No archaeological features were recorded, and no finds recovered. The observed stratigraphy was similar to that recorded during earlier phases of archaeological investigation and consisted of topsoil and subsoil overlying the natural chalk geology. In places the subsoil may have formed within colluvium (hillwash) and colluvial deposits were also recorded in trial pit 5 (Wessex Archaeology 2021).

#### ***As yet unidentified archaeological remains***

6.6.11 The archaeological fieldwork described above has reduced the risk of previously unknown archaeological remains being present. However, there is still considered to be the potential, albeit low, for further as yet unidentified archaeological remains to be present. Any further remains identified would most likely be of a similar character and value (low) to remains so far identified.

6.6.12 In addition, there is also the potential for undiscovered Palaeolithic and Mesolithic or later deposits and sites to be present within and under the alluvial deposits associated with the River Itchen, as has proved to be the case in other local river valleys. The presence and value of such deposits is currently unknown, but it is considered that unstratified finds of early prehistoric date



would be of low value and any in situ finds or features have the potential to be well preserved and of medium or high value. Alluvial deposits also have the potential to contain well preserved finds, such as textiles, and organic material from later periods. The presence and value of which is presently unknown. Any unstratified finds would be of no more than low value but in situ finds could be of higher value.

- 6.6.13 Further details about the known and as yet unknown archaeological resource within the Application Boundary and the likely value of receptors is provided in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** and is summarised in **Table 6.6** below.

#### *Previous disturbance and survival*

- 6.6.14 Intrusive groundworks associated with the construction of the M3, A33 and the A34 and any associated services, drainage ditches and attenuation features would have significantly impacted buried archaeological deposits, although a programme of archaeological investigation was carried out during these construction works to mitigate the impact. Intrusive groundworks associated with the construction of these roads and the associated services would have resulted in the damage or destruction of buried archaeological deposits. Where the roads are in deep cuttings, for example at the Junction 9 roundabout, there is likely to have been the complete removal of archaeological deposits within the footprint of the carriageway. There are also likely to have been significant impacts on archaeological remains where the roads are at grade. It is anticipated that where the roads are located on embankments, archaeological deposits are likely to have survived below the embankment.
- 6.6.15 The majority of the land within the Scheme's Application Boundary, beyond the carriageways appears to have remained relatively undeveloped and, as such, archaeological remains are likely to have survived, albeit it with a degree of truncation from historic episodes of cultivation, as demonstrated by the recent trial trench evaluation. It is also anticipated that waterlogged archaeological remains and deposits are likely to survive within the River Itchen flood plain where deep layers of made ground, alluvium and peat are recorded by BGS and in recent geotechnical borehole surveys.

#### **Historic buildings**

##### *Designated built heritage assets*

- 6.6.16 There are no listed buildings within the Application Boundary. However, the Application Boundary covers small parts of the Abbots Worthy and Kings Worthy Conservation Areas. There are a further 120 designated built heritage assets within 1km of the Application Boundary including 117 Listed Buildings and three further Conservation Areas, see **Figure 6.2 (Designated Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**.
- 6.6.17 The following designated built heritage assets are of high value:

- Four Grade I Listed Buildings (Church of St Mary NHLE: 1095898, City Bridge NHLE: 1167781, Church of St John the Baptist NHLE: 1296158, Church of St Swithin NHLE: 1350461).
- 11 Grade II\* Listed Buildings (Church of St Mary NHLE: 1156360, Dymoke House NHLE: 1095857, Church of St Swithun NHLE: 1350471, 1 Water Lane NHLE: 1095347, 24 and 25 St John's Street NHLE: 1095386, St John's Croft NHLE: 1095387, Peter's Theatre NHLE: 1095502, 42 Chisel Street NHLE: 1271527, 1 Chisel Street NHLE: 1350648, 12 Chisel Street NHLE: 1350651, Worthy Park House NHLE: 1095892).
- 102 Grade II listed buildings, which are mainly located within conservation areas.
- The Abbots Worthy (partially within the Application Boundary), Easton, Kings Worthy (partially within the Application Boundary), Martyr Worthy and Winchester Conservation Areas which contain a number of designated and non-designated historic buildings that contribute significantly to their historic character.

6.6.18 Further details of the value of designated built heritage assets considered likely to receive effects from the Scheme, including an assessment of their setting and the contribution that the land within the Scheme's Application Boundary makes towards that setting, is provided in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**.

#### *Non designated built heritage assets*

6.6.19 In addition to the designated built heritage assets the following non-designated built heritage assets are considered to have the potential to receive effects from the Scheme:

- Abbotsworthy House (SRN 168) which is located within Abbotsworthy House Historic Park and Garden (HPG) (SRN 200). The HPG is located adjacent to the Application Boundary
- Fulling Mill Cottage which is 60m from the Application Boundary

6.6.20 Neither building is nationally or locally listed but are considered to retain some historic value. An assessment of the value and the setting of both buildings is provided in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**.

6.6.21 No additional non-designated built heritage assets were raised as a concern at the consultation workshop held on 25 November 2020 or in subsequent consultation with key heritage stakeholders.

## Historic Landscape

### *Designated historic landscapes*

6.6.22 There are no designated historic landscapes recorded by Historic England within the Application Boundary or the 1km study area. In addition, no designated historic landscapes beyond the 1km study area were identified, through desk-based research or walkover surveys, as having the potential to receive impacts from the construction or operation of the Scheme. None were identified by Historic England as being sensitive to the Scheme.

### *Non-designated historic landscapes*

6.6.23 Within Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy there are eight historic park and gardens (HPG) in **Figure 6.6 (Medieval and Post-Medieval Heritage Assets)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**, some of which are on the local register. In accordance with **Table 6.3** these are most likely to be of low value/ sensitivity. There are no HPGs within the Application Boundary however, the Abbotsworthy House HPG (SRN 200), which is on the local register, is adjacent to the Application Boundary. Worthy Park HPG (SRN 204) is located outside of the Application Boundary on the northern side of the Itchen Valley with extensive views across the river valley and is likely to have developed originally as a deer park (SRN 183). Both of these are of low value/ sensitivity.

### *Historic landscape character*

6.6.24 The historic landscape character within the Application Boundary is recorded by the Hampshire Historic Landscape Characterisation project as predominately parliamentary enclosure with areas of recent settlement, old settlement, downland and valley floor, see **Figure 6.9 (Historic Landscape Characterisation)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**. These broad types are further subdivided into historic landscape types. These are described in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** and summarised below.

6.6.25 The downland historic landscape character type is of late medieval date and generally consists of unimproved chalk grazing land. Within the Application Boundary there is an area of downland to the north of Winnall between the M3 and A33 and another area to the east of St Giles Hill.

6.6.26 Within the study area the parliamentary fields historic landscape character type is subdivided into medium regular fields with straight boundaries, large fields with straight boundaries and prairie fields. Medium and large fields derive mostly from late eighteenth and nineteenth century Parliamentary Enclosure Acts. Medium fields form the majority of the historic landscape character types within the Application Boundary. Large fields are present in the north-western and southern parts of the Application boundary. Prairie fields are large and have been created by boundary loss during the twentieth century. This historic landscape character type is present in the north-eastern corner of the Application Boundary.

- 6.6.27 The old settlement historic landscape character type covers the historic parts of Kings Worthy, Abbots Worthy and Headbourne Worthy. Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy are both designated conservation areas, but Headbourne Worthy is not. A small part of the 'Old Settlement' at Kings Worthy is within the Scheme's Application Boundary. The post-1810 settlement historic landscape character type covers the later expansion of these settlements. This historic landscape character type is recorded within the southern part of the Application Boundary to the north of Alresford Road, at Winnall (to the east of the existing junction) and at Headbourne Worthy, Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy.
- 6.6.28 The valley floor historic landscape character type within the study area is subdivided into water meadows, marsh and rough grazing and miscellaneous valley bottom paddocks and pastures. Water meadows were created between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. Hampshire contains nearly half of the surviving water meadows in England. There are areas of water meadow either side of the River Itchen. Those parts within the Application Boundary have largely been damaged/ removed during the construction of existing infrastructure. Marsh and rough grazing historic landscape character type is located next to the river courses and has usually never been used for agriculture. A small area of this historic landscape character type is within the Application Boundary to the north of Winnall. Miscellaneous valley bottom and paddocks and pastures resulted from the enclosure of meadows. There is a small area of this historic landscape character within the Application Boundary to the south-east of Abbots Worthy.
- 6.6.29 The majority of these historic landscape character types are common and are considered to be of low value/ sensitivity although the old settlement areas and the water meadows are likely to be of higher sensitivity. The old settlements are designated as conservation areas for their special character and appearance and are of medium value. The water meadows which are situated within the valley floor are likely to be of medium value/ sensitivity. The valley floor and large parts of the study area to the east of the M3 are part of the South Downs National Park.

#### *Important hedgerows*

- 6.6.30 Hedgerows which meet the criteria for 'important hedgerows' under the Hedgerow Regulations (1997) are present either side of Easton Lane and Long Walk and partially fall within the Application Boundary, see **Figure 6.12 (Important Hedgerows)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**. These are not designated but do constitute non-designated heritage assets as they preserve part of the historic landscape. Overall, they are considered to be of medium value.

Table 6.5: Summary of receptors and their sensitivity

Receptor	Value/sensitivity	Qualifying comment
<b>Archaeological remains</b>		
Roman road east of St Catherine's Hill (NHLE: 1001798)	High	Scheduled monuments are of national importance
Anglo-Saxon cemetery in Worthy Park (NHLE: 1001817)	High	Scheduled monuments are of national importance
The late Iron Age settlement site north of Grace's Farm (NHLE: 1001825)	High	Scheduled monuments are of national importance
The site of St Gertrude's Chapel (NHLE: 1005518)	High	Scheduled monuments are of national importance
Wolvesey Palace (NHLE: 1005535)	High	Scheduled monuments are of national importance
The Iron Age field system, banjo enclosure and Romano-British villa, 500m east of Woodham Farm (NHLE: 1013269)	High	Scheduled monuments are of national importance
St Catherine's Hill hillfort (NHLE: 1016489)	High	Scheduled monuments are of national importance
The round barrow cemetery on Magdalen Hill Down (NHLE: 1016746)	High	Scheduled monuments are of national importance
City Bridge at the junction of High Street and Bridge Street (NHLE: 1021112)	High	Scheduled monuments are of national importance
Surviving remains of the Neolithic/ Bronze Age ring ditch (SRN 71) several discrete and possible prehistoric pits found during recent evaluation (SRN 55)	Medium	Ring ditch compromised by construction of the M3. Surviving part retains cultural heritage value and is likely to be of regional importance  The discrete possibly prehistoric pits are likely to be of at least local interest but could be higher and of similar value to the ring ditch
Post-medieval field boundaries and parish	Low	Local interest

Receptor	Value/sensitivity	Qualifying comment
boundary found during recent evaluation (SRN 55)		
An undated ring ditch (SRN 75) thought to date to the prehistoric period	High	The value of this feature is currently unknown. It appears to relate to an area of magnetic enhancement identified during the 2021 geophysical survey and likely to relate to quarrying. This is of little archaeological interest. If this does relate to a ring ditch it could be of higher value. A value/ sensitivity of high has been used for this receptor within the assessment as the reasonable worst-case scenario.
Two Roman roads, the projected routes of which cross the Application Boundary	Medium	Archaeological remains likely to be of regional importance.
Geophysical anomalies - possible Anglo-Saxon settlement (SRN 214)	High	The value of this feature is currently unknown. It was identified during geophysical survey prior to the construction of the M3. It is located within trees directly adjacent to the motorway and not feasible to evaluate as part of this assessment. No associated remains present in nearby trenches recently excavated. If remains of an Anglo-Saxon settlement are present, they would be of at least regional importance. A value/ sensitivity of high has been used for this receptor within the assessment as the reasonable worst-case scenario.
Water meadows (SRN 186,187, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196)	Medium	Surviving original features which are of regional importance. Those parts



Receptor	Value/sensitivity	Qualifying comment
		within the Application Boundary have been previously damaged/ removed during the construction of existing infrastructure.
Watermill and pond to the south of Kings Worthy	Low	Condition of receptor likely to be compromised by the construction of the A33 but still of local interest
The former Didcot, Newbury and Southampton Railway line (SRN 160, 161, 163)	Negligible	Little or no surviving archaeological interest
Area of flint and dark clay (SRN 213)	High	No features revealed near this area during the 2021 trial trenching. The presence and value of archaeological remains at this location is unknown. A value/ sensitivity of high has been used for this receptor within the assessment as the reasonable worst-case scenario.
Previously excavated remains directly adjacent to the M3 and detected during the 2021 geophysical survey	Medium	Remains previously excavated and truncated by construction of M3. Still retain archaeological interest and considered to be of regional interest.
Other archaeological features identified during geophysical survey and trial trenching in 2021	Low	Majority of archaeological remains identified during geophysical survey likely to be of local interest. Surviving remains identified during trial trenching compromised by poor preservation and are of local interest.
As yet unidentified archaeological remains	High	There is still the potential for as yet unidentified archaeological remains to be present although the risk has been reduced by carrying out a programme of geophysical survey and trial trenching.



Receptor	Value/sensitivity	Qualifying comment
		Any further remains identified would most likely be of a similar character and value to remains so far identified. A value/ sensitivity of high has been used for such receptors within the assessment as the reasonable worst-case scenario.
<b>Built heritage assets</b>		
Winchester Conservation Area	High	Conservation areas are of national importance.
Church of St Mary NHLE: 1095898, City Bridge NHLE: 1167781, Church of St John the Baptist NHLE: 1296158, Church of St Swithun NHLE: 1350461	High	Grade I listed buildings are of national importance
Church of St Mary NHLE: 1156360, Dymoke House NHLE: 1095857, Church of St Swithun NHLE: 1350471, 1 Water Lane NHLE: 1095347, 24 and 25 St John's Street NHLE: 1095386, St John's Croft NHLE: 1095387, Peter's Theatre NHLE: 1095502, 42 Chisel Street NHLE: 1271527, 1 Chisel Street NHLE: 1350648, 12 Chisel Street NHLE: 1350651, Worthy Park House NHLE: 1095892	High	Grade II* listed buildings are of national importance
Kings Worthy Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	Grade II listed buildings and conservation areas are of national importance.
Abbots Worthy Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	Grade II listed buildings and conservation areas are of national importance.
Easton Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	Grade II listed buildings and conservation areas are of national importance.

Receptor	Value/sensitivity	Qualifying comment
Martyr Worthy Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	Grade II listed buildings and conservation areas are of national importance.
Other Grade II listed buildings located beyond the conservation areas	High	Grade II listed building are of national importance
Abbotsworthy House (SRN 168)	Low	Building with local historic environment interest
Fulling Mill Cottage	Negligible	Building significantly altered but still of local historic environment interest
<b>Historic landscapes</b>		
Historic Park and Gardens – Abbotsworthy House and Hinton House	Low	Locally listed HPG's of local interest
Historic Park and Gardens – Kings Worthy Court, Kings Worthy House, Kings Worthy Grove, Northleigh, Worthy Park, Morton House	Low	HPG's with little historical interest or value limited by poor preservation
River Valley – water meadows	Medium	An undesignated historic landscape type which are of regional value. The parts which fall within the Application Boundary have been damaged/ removed by the construction of existing infrastructure.
Old settlement – village/ hamlet 1810 extent	Medium	The areas of old settlement are designated conservation areas and are of regional value
Downland	Low	Robust landscape of local interest
Parliamentary fields – medium regular fields with straight boundaries, large regular fields with straight boundaries and prairie fields	Low	Robust landscape of local interest
Recent settlement – post 1810 settlement	Low	Robust landscape of local interest

Receptor	Value/sensitivity	Qualifying comment
Valley Floor – Miscellaneous valley bottom paddocks and pastures and marsh and rough grazing	Low	Robust landscape of local interest
Important hedgerows along Easton Lane and Long Walk	Medium	Preserve part of the historic landscape and are of regional importance

### Baseline evolution

6.6.31 In the absence of the Scheme (no development scenario), the land uses within the Application Boundary would be retained and there would be no impacts upon built heritage or the historic landscape. Those areas within the Application Boundary currently in agricultural use would be retained in their current use. Any shallow archaeological remains could be disturbed by the existing regular ploughing regime or any alterations to the existing ploughing regime. The depth of this disturbance could increase the longer these areas are under the plough. This could result in a gradual negligible impact upon any known or as yet unidentified archaeological remains present.

6.6.32 Developments which have been identified as being likely to be in operation prior to the construction of the Scheme form part of the future baseline scenario and have been taken into account in the assessment of likely significant effects from the Scheme (construction and operation) presented in this chapter.

## 6.7 Potential impacts

6.7.1 The Scheme has the potential to impact upon cultural heritage receptors. Impacts may be direct (physical) or indirect (changes to setting). The effects during construction are anticipated to be short to medium term duration (temporary) while post-construction (operation) effects are anticipated to be of long-term duration (permanent) unless otherwise stated. The exceptions to this are (direct) construction effects upon archaeological sites and features, which would be permanent due to loss / removal.

### Construction (including site preparation)

6.7.2 Construction of the Scheme has the potential to adversely impact cultural heritage resources both directly and indirectly. Direct physical impacts could result from intrusive groundworks which would damage or remove heritage resources, including archaeological remains. Impacts could arise from the following activities:

- Geotechnical and ground investigation works
- Removal of hardstanding, buried underground obstacles and potentially contaminated ground within the footprint of the existing carriageways

- Demolition of existing gyratory road structures
- Removal of topsoil, subsoil and the grading of existing ground levels within the Application Boundary for permanent works areas as well as the areas of temporary works such as the working easement, construction access and compounds
- Excavation for new subways, underpasses, retaining walls, trenches and pits for new gantries, new and diverted utility services, soakaways, culverts or other drainage features
- Excavation and drilling for piles for the new bridge crossing and other new structures
- Landscaping and planting
- Compression of superficial deposits in areas of fill

6.7.3 Indirect impacts from the construction of the Scheme could result in impacts to the setting of cultural heritage assets. This could arise from:

- Views of site clearance such as topsoil removal and vegetation clearance within the setting of heritage assets
- The introduction of construction machinery, construction compounds and lay down areas within the setting of the heritage assets
- An increase in dust, noise, light, construction vehicle movement and vibration within the setting of cultural heritage assets

6.7.4 During the construction phase there would be construction traffic and temporary road diversions, which would be restricted to motorways and A roads where possible, including the A303, A34, A33, A31 and A3404, see **Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)** and **Figure 2.5** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**. Also see **Traffic Management Plan (Document Reference 7.8)**. Where this is not possible, smaller B-roads may need to be used which could result in increased traffic levels through conservation areas or adjacent to listed buildings. These would be temporary, of limited duration and reversible.

### Operation

6.7.5 There would be no physical impacts upon below ground archaeological remains within the Application Boundary during operation of the Scheme. These would have occurred during the construction phase.

6.7.6 The operation and permanent features of the Scheme have the potential to impact (beneficial and adverse) upon the setting of cultural heritage assets. Impacts could include:

- The introduction or removal of roads and related infrastructure such as gantries and signage within the setting of heritage assets or within key views from, towards, through and across cultural heritage assets
- Increase or decrease in lighting, traffic and noise within the setting of cultural heritage assets
- The alteration to the historic landscape (i.e. setting) of cultural heritage assets, for example, new lengths of road causing a physical division between previously related heritage assets causing a loss of the identifiable relationship or where there are substantial changes to key features of an assets setting
- The loss of land historically associated with cultural heritage assets

## 6.8 Design, mitigation and enhancement measures

6.8.1 Mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the Scheme are reported as embedded mitigation in **Chapter 4 (Environmental Assessment Methodology)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**. This section outlines essential mitigation required. Essential mitigation is outlined within the **fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)** and **Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**. Prior to the implementation of mitigation, the Scheme has the potential to have cultural heritage impacts during construction and operation.

### Essential mitigation

6.8.2 The Scheme has been designed to limit or avoid, as far as possible, adverse impacts upon environmental receptors including cultural heritage assets, through minimisation of intrusive footprints, depths and method of intrusive ground investigation and construction works to reduce impact on known and unknown archaeological remains, as well as careful consideration of the location of gantries and signage to limit indirect impacts upon cultural heritage assets. This has been achieved through the design development phase and through ongoing consultation between environmental specialists, the design team and key stakeholders.

6.8.3 **Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** sets out the broad approach to avoid/ limit harm and mitigate impacts upon cultural heritage assets. This has been prepared following consultation with key heritage stakeholders. In addition, generic cultural heritage mitigation measures are also outlined within the **fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)**.

6.8.4 Where mitigation of impacts upon archaeological remains through design (preservation in situ) is unavoidable then a programme of archaeological works (preservation by record) would be put in place. No archaeological remains have been identified that are of such high value that they warrant preservation in situ. The broad mitigation strategy is summarised below.

### *Construction (including site preparation)*

6.8.5 The programme of archaeological mitigation required to reduce or offset adverse effects upon archaeological remains would include:

- Pre-construction archaeological strip, map and sample beyond the existing highway in areas of permanent highways work, compounds, landscaping (both cut and fill where existing overburden is to be removed) and for attenuation features
- Watching brief on GI/ site investigation (SI) works; on intrusive groundworks associated with ground levelling during construction of the new foot and cycle bridge; on intrusive groundworks within existing highways where previous disturbance has not completely removed archaeological remains; and on other intrusive groundworks associated with new pedestrian routes, infiltration and attenuation features (between the A34 and the Winnall industrial estate) and utility diversions
- A programme of palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological work which would consist of specialist boreholes

6.8.6 As well as on site excavation and recording, preservation by record would also involve a detailed post-excavation programme which would consist of specialist assessment and analysis of finds and environmental samples and dating with appropriate reporting and publication. Further details of the outline mitigation strategy, which is based upon discussions with key heritage stakeholders are provided in **Appendix 6.8** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**.

6.8.7 The scope and scale of archaeological mitigation, and post-excavation work, would be based on the **Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**. Prior to construction the outline strategy would be developed into the Detailed Mitigation Strategy (based on the outline strategy) which is secured through the DCO requirements and would be further discussed with the Winchester City Council Archaeologist. All mitigation would be carried out in accordance with agreed WSIs (which are required within the outline strategy).

### *Operation*

6.8.8 All archaeological mitigation would have occurred prior to, or during construction, and as such none would be required during operation.

### *Enhancements*

6.8.9 The findings of the archaeological mitigation would result in knowledge gain, providing a better understanding of the historic environment within Winchester's hinterland and provide further context for known archaeological remains previously investigated. The information would enhance the existing Winchester Historic Environment Record data set for the area providing further knowledge to the public of past human activity within the surrounding area. However, it is



noted that the ability to record archaeological remains is not a factor when deciding if the loss of remains should be permitted.

6.8.10 In addition, several other enhancement opportunities are noted in the **fiEMP (Document Reference 7.3)** including public art, QR codes, push notification and interpretation boards which could form part of trails highlighting the nature of archaeology within the Itchen Valley and area surrounding Winchester. These enhancement measures have not formed part of this assessment and would be developed during detailed design.

## 6.9 Assessment of likely significant effects

6.9.1 This section presents the assessment of likely significant effects for construction and operation on cultural heritage receptors. The assessment of effects takes into account the impacts to each receptor following the implementation of embedded and essential mitigation measures to determine the significance of the residual effects.

### Construction (including site preparation)

#### *Archaeological remains*

##### *Designated archaeological remains*

6.9.2 Construction of the Scheme would not result in direct impacts to any scheduled monuments; all of those identified within the 1km study area are located outside of the Application Boundary. As noted in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** land within the Application Boundary does not currently contribute towards the setting of the majority of scheduled monuments within the 1km study area and the construction of the Scheme would not change this. However, a review of the ZTVs, see **Figures 7.5 – 7.11** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)**, setting walkover survey and baseline assessment determined that St Gertrude's Chapel (NHLE: 1005518) and the Iron Age settlement site to the north of Grace's Farm (NHLE: 1001825) has the potential to be impacted from the Scheme construction. This reflected the position of Historic England who identified that these two receptors were the most likely designated archaeological remains to be impacted by the Scheme.

6.9.3 St Gertrude's Chapel (NHLE: 1005518) is largely screened from land within the Application Boundary. The trees along the western edge of the A34 which screen views of the carriageway, a small part of water meadow which is within the Application Boundary and higher ground beyond the A34 (which is within the Application Boundary) are visible from the scheduled monument. These elements are considered to be part of the wider setting of the scheduled monument and make a neutral contribution to its overall value. The majority of the construction works would be screened from the scheduled monument by existing vegetation, topography and the Winnall Industrial Estate although works along the A34 and on the higher ground between the A34 and M3 are likely to be visible, particularly during any works undertaken during winter



months when there are less leaves on the intervening trees. Traffic from the A34 and M3 is already audible from the scheduled monument however there would be an increase in noise during construction although this would be temporary and not significant, see **Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**. Construction of the Scheme would slightly change a small part of the wider setting of the scheduled monument but would not alter the overall character of the monument. It is therefore considered that construction of the Scheme would have a minor magnitude of impact to this receptor of high sensitivity resulting in a temporary slight or moderate adverse effect. Given that these effects would be temporary and only affect a small part of the wider setting it is considered that the effect would be temporary slight adverse and not significant.

6.9.4 Whist the Iron Age settlement close to Grace’s Farm (NHLE: 1001825) is approximately 40m from the Application Boundary there are no construction works proposed in this area. The closest construction works proposed are the installation of new variable message signs (VMS) along the M3 approximately 1km to the south. The main works area is approximately 1.5km to the south of the scheduled monument. Given the long distance from these works it is unlikely that construction activities would be perceptible either visually or audibly from the scheduled monument. Construction would not result in the loss of archaeological remains which are considered to contribute towards the setting of the scheduled monument and overall, it is considered that the construction phase of the Scheme would result in no change to this receptor of high sensitivity, resulting in a temporary neutral effect which is not significant.

6.9.5 The construction phase of the Scheme would result in no change to the remaining high value scheduled monuments within the 1km study area which would result in a neutral and not significant effect. The effect of the construction of the Scheme upon designated archaeological remains is summarised in **Table 6.6**.

Table 6.6: Impacts upon designated archaeological remains during the construction phase

Receptor	Value/sensitivity	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
Roman road east of St Catherine’s Hill (NHLE: 1001798)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
Anglo-Saxon cemetery in Worthy Park (NHLE: 1001817)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
The late Iron Age settlement	High	No direct or in direct impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)

Receptor	Value/ sensitivity	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
site north of Grace's Farm (NHLE: 1001825)				
The site of St Gertrude's Chapel (NHLE: 1005518)	High	Some construction activities likely to be partially visible and audible from the scheduled monument, affecting a small part of the wider setting but would not alter the overall character	Minor	Temporary slight adverse (not significant)
Wolvesey Palace (NHLE: 1005535)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
The Iron Age field system, banjo enclosure and Romano- British villa, 500m east of Woodham Farm (NHLE: 1013269)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
St Catherine's Hill hillfort (NHLE: 1016489)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
The round barrow cemetery on Magdalen Hill Down (NHLE: 1016746)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No Change	Neutral (not significant)
City Bridge at the junction of High Street and Bridge Street (NHLE: 1021112)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)

*Non-designated archaeological remains*

- 6.9.6 Whilst historical investigations demonstrated that the Scheme is within an archaeologically sensitive area, trial trenching carried out as part of this assessment and a previous design has shown that archaeological remains within the main works area are of no more than medium value. A geophysical survey carried out also identified remains of similar value within the fields to the east of the M3 although two areas of potentially higher value were identified. One of these areas relates to a known area of prehistoric and Roman settlement activity adjacent to the existing roundabout and within the Application Boundary. This was impacted upon by the construction of the M3 and likely to be of medium value. Another relates to a previously unknown ring ditch which is now outside of the Application Boundary
- 6.9.7 Intrusive groundworks during the construction of the Scheme are likely to have a direct adverse effect resulting in the damage or removal of known and any as yet unknown archaeological remains within the Application Boundary and within the footprint of intrusive groundworks. Where archaeological remains are wholly within the footprint of intrusive ground works, these construction activities would likely result in the complete removal of archaeological remains. This would represent a major adverse magnitude of impact. Where archaeological remains extend outside the footprint of intrusive groundworks for example straddling the Application Boundary, the magnitude of impact is likely to be moderate or lower because the assets would not be completely destroyed and those parts of the features that extend beyond intrusive groundworks would not be impacted upon.
- 6.9.8 Construction of two new outfalls and the cleaning of one existing outfall into the River Itchen would require temporary and localised dewatering of isolated areas of the river adjacent to the outfalls. These works would last up to one week after which the areas would be reflooded. This work would not have a long-term impact on waterlogged deposits within the vicinity of the outfall works. The temporary dewatering would have a negligible impact upon any waterlogged deposits; the value of which is currently unknown. In a worst-case scenario this would have a temporary slight adverse effect upon high value remains which is not significant.
- 6.9.9 The effect following appropriate mitigation, as set out in **Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**, would reduce or offset any significant effects. The effect upon non-designated archaeological remains is summarised in **Table 6.7**.

Table 6.7: Impacts upon non-designated archaeological remains during the construction phase

Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Description of impact and mitigation	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
Surviving remains of the Neolithic/ Bronze Age ring ditch (SRN 71) several	Medium	Although the receptor would be completely removed (major impact) it would be mitigated through a programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)

Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Description of impact and mitigation	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
discrete and possible prehistoric pits found during recent evaluation (SRN 55)		accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8(Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .		
Post-medieval field boundaries and parish boundary found during recent evaluation (SRN 55)	Low	Receptors would be partially (minor or moderate impact) or completely removed (major impact) during construction of the Scheme. This would be mitigated through a programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8(Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
An undated ring ditch (SRN 75) thought to date to the prehistoric period but most likely relates to an area of quarrying.	Unknown likely to be negligible but high if feature does relate to a ring ditch	Receptor would be completely removed during construction of the Scheme. This would be mitigated through a programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
Two Roman roads, the projected routes of which cross the	Medium	Construction activities adjacent to Kings Worthy could result in damage to a very small part of the projected road which follows the A33 and extends beyond	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse upon the northern of the two

Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Description of impact and mitigation	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
Application Boundary		the Application Boundary (minor impact). This would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> . No works are proposed in the area of the road which follows the B3404 and therefore there would be no impact upon this receptor.		roads (not significant). Neutral for the southern of the two roads.
Geophysical anomalies - possible Anglo-Saxon settlement (SRN 214)	Unknown likely to be medium (reasonable worst-case scenario high)	Exact location and extent of receptor currently unknown. In a worst-case scenario, the receptor would be completely removed (major impact). This would be mitigated by a suitable programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
Water meadows (SRN 186, 187, 188, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196)	Medium	Whilst the small parts of the water meadows within the Application Boundary have largely been damaged or removed during the construction of existing infrastructure construction activities could further damage or remove surviving remains. The majority of the water meadows extend beyond the Application	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)

Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Description of impact and mitigation	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
		Boundary and only a small area would be impacted. This would be mitigated by a suitable programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .		
Watermill and pond to the south of Kings Worthy	Low	Presence of receptor within the Application Boundary is currently unknown. If remains are present they are likely to have been significantly impacted upon by the construction of A33. Minor works in this area could damage or remove any surviving remains which might present. This impact would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
The former Didcot, Newbury and Southampton Railway line (SRN 160, 161, 163)	Negligible	Construction activities would damage a small part of the receptor which extends beyond the Application Boundary (minor impact). This would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage	Negligible	Permanent neutral (not significant)



Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Description of impact and mitigation	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
		Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .		
Area of flint and dark clay (SRN 213)	Unknown (worst-case high)	Presence and extent of feature within the Application Boundary is currently unknown. In a worst-case the receptor would be completely removed (major impact). This would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
Previously excavated remains directly adjacent to the M3 and detected during the 2021 geophysical survey	Medium	Archaeological remains would be completely removed during construction of the Scheme (major impact). This would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
Other archaeological features identified during geophysical survey and trial	Low	Archaeological remains would be completely or partially removed during construction of the Scheme (minor to major impact). This would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological recording	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)



Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Description of impact and mitigation	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
trenching in 2021		(preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .		
As yet unidentified archaeological remains (including palaeoenvironmental and waterlogged deposits)	Unknown (reasonable worst-case scenario high)	Archaeological remains completely within the Application Boundary would be removed during construction (major impact) whilst those extending beyond the Application Boundary would be partially removed during the construction of the Scheme (minor to moderate impact). This would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological recording (preservation by record) in accordance with the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy <b>Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)</b> of the <b>ES (Document Reference 6.3)</b> .	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)

### **Built heritage**

#### *Designated built heritage assets*

6.9.10 The construction of the Scheme would not result in direct physical impacts to any listed building or un-listed historic building within the 1km study area; all of those identified within the 1km study area are located outside of the Application Boundary.

6.9.11 Land within the Application Boundary is screened in views to and from the majority of the listed buildings within the Abbots Worthy and Kings Worthy Conservation Areas and impacts upon these are considered in relation to the effects upon the conservation areas as a whole.

- 6.9.12 The majority of construction works associated with the Scheme would be separated from the Kings Worthy Conservation Area by intervening buildings and vegetation. However, there would be some construction activities associated with minor works carried out along the A33 in close proximity to (within the setting of), and partially within, the conservation area. This includes the installation of new signage, creation of a new cycle and pedestrian route and new access to the business units to the southwest of the conservation area and resurfacing works. The construction of the short length of new pedestrian and cycleway within the eastern end of the conservation area would not impact upon any key elements of the conservation area, as identified in the Kings Worthy Conservation Area Technical Assessment (Winchester City Council, 1997), and would therefore, not impact upon the special character and appearance of the conservation area. The A33 is a busy road visible from parts of the conservation area and audible throughout the conservation area. There would be an increase in noise across the conservation area during construction with those areas' closer to the Scheme receiving a higher increase. The increase in noise would only be temporary. Overall, there would be a negligible magnitude of impact to this receptor of high value, resulting in a temporary slight adverse effect upon the Kings Worthy Conservation Area which is not significant.
- 6.9.13 Similarly, the installation of new signage, creation of a new cycle and pedestrian route and resurfacing works along the A33 are unlikely to affect the setting of the Abbots Worthy Conservation Area. These construction works would be visible in a key view between Abbots Worthy and Kings Worthy, as identified in the Abbots Worthy Conservation Area Technical Assessment (Winchester City Council, 1997), but this view between the two is across the existing busy junction. The southern end of the conservation area is in close proximity to the Application Boundary. While separated by a band of trees, the ground affected by Scheme rises higher than the conservation area and, as such, construction activities in this area may be visible from some parts of the southern end of the conservation area. There would be an increase in noise across the conservation area during construction with those areas' closer to the Scheme receiving a higher increase. The increase in noise would only be temporary. These works within the setting of the Abbots Worthy Conservation Area would have a minor magnitude of impact to this receptor of high value. This would only be experienced from a small part of the conservation area closest to the works and overall it is considered that the impact would result in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.
- 6.9.14 Worthy Park House is located to the north of the Application Boundary. Due to its elevated position, it has extensive views across the surrounding landscape. These views of the River Itchen and the surrounding area, which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, these elements are largely screened from the listed building and the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped, retaining views of the Downs as described in the nineteenth century (see detailed setting assessment of Worthy Park House in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document**

**Reference 6.3).** A very small part of the area between the A34 and M3 is visible in long distance views from the listed building and overall, it is considered that construction activities are unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable from the listed building and the current character experienced from the listed building would be retained. Therefore, the impact of magnitude would be negligible to this receptor of high value, resulting in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.

6.9.15 The construction phase of the Scheme would largely be screened in views from the Winchester Conservation Area, Easton Conservation Area, Martyr Worthy Conservation Area, their associated listed buildings and the remaining listed buildings within the 1km study area (which are located outside of the conservation areas) and is unlikely to impact upon elements of their setting or how their value is experienced and appreciated. The impact and significance of effect upon designated built heritage assets is summarised in **Table 6.8**.

Table 6.8: Impacts upon designated built heritage assets during the construction phase

Receptor	Value/ Significance	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
Winchester Conservation Area	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No Change	Neutral (not significant)
Grade I Listed Buildings - Church of St Mary NHLE: 1095898, City Bridge NHLE: 1167781, Church of St John the Baptist NHLE: 1296158, Church of St Swithun NHLE: 1350461	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No Change	Neutral (not significant)
Grade II* Listed Worthy Park House NHLE: 1095892	High	Long distance views of a small part of the main works between the A34 and M3 but in general construction activities unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable	Negligible	Temporary slight adverse (not significant)

Receptor	Value/ Significance	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
Other grade II* listed buildings - Church of St Mary NHLE: 1156360, Dymoke House NHLE: 1095857, Church of St Swithun NHLE: 1350471, 1 Water Lane NHLE: 1095347, 24 and 25 St John's Street NHLE: 1095386, St John's Croft NHLE: 1095387, Peter's Theatre NHLE: 1095502, 42 Chisel Street NHLE: 1271527, 1 Chisel Street NHLE: 1350648, 12 Chisel Street NHLE: 1350651	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No Change	Neutral (not significant)
Kings Worthy Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	Construction works within the eastern end of the conservation area would not impact upon key elements of the conservation area. The A33 is a busy road within the setting of the conservation area and construction activities would not significantly alter this.	Negligible	Temporary slight adverse (not significant)
Abbots Worthy Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	Works along the A33 would not affect the setting of the conservation area. Construction activities within the conservation areas setting would be	Minor	Temporary slight adverse (not significant)

Receptor	Value/ Significance	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
		visible and audible from the southern part of the conservation area		
Easton Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	No direct or indirect effects	No Change	Neutral (not significant)
Martyr Worthy Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	No direct or indirect effects	No Change	Neutral (not significant)
Other Grade II listed buildings located beyond the conservation areas	High	No direct or indirect effects	No Change	Neutral (not significant)

### ***Non-designated built heritage assets***

6.9.16 The Abbots Worthy Conservation Area Technical Note states that Abbotsworthy House (SRN 168) is visible as a landmark feature within views from Long Walk however these are long distance and largely screened by trees and hedgerows. The construction of the Scheme is likely to be largely screened in views from the house and would not be experienced in relation to it. Therefore, the construction phase of the Scheme would not impact the setting of the listed building. No change to this receptor of low sensitivity would result in a neutral effect which is not significant.

6.9.17 Fulling Mill Cottage is approximately 60m from the Application Boundary. Construction traffic is likely to access the main works area between the A34 and M3 via Long Walk and construction activities in this area which is considered to be part of the buildings wider setting are likely to be partially visible and audible resulting in a temporary increase in noise. A minor magnitude of change upon the negligible value receptor would result in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.

## *Historic landscapes*

### *Non-designated historic landscapes*

- 6.9.18 Abbotsworthy House HPG (SRN 200) is located in close proximity to the minor works proposed along the A33. The A33 is a busy road visible and audible from the western part of the HPG and whilst construction works within this area would result in a temporary increase in noise this is not considered to affect the setting of this asset. Overall, there would be a negligible magnitude of impact to this receptor of low value resulting in a temporary slight adverse effect upon the HPG which is not significant.
- 6.9.19 Worthy Park HPG is located to the north of the Application Boundary. As described above the house and the garden have extensive views across the surrounding landscape. Modern development has encroached the HPG but is mostly screened by the topography and intervening vegetation. The motorway and moving vehicles are largely screened by intervening vegetation although vehicle movements and motorway furniture are more visible in the winter months. The main works area is largely screened from the gardens although a small part of the main works area between the A34 and M3 may be visible in glimpsed long-distance views from some part of the HPG. There would be an increase in noise during construction although this would be temporary and not significant. Overall, it is considered that construction activities are unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable from the HPG and the current character experienced from the HPG would be retained. Therefore, a negligible magnitude of impact to the low value receptor would result in a temporary slight adverse effect which is not significant.
- 6.9.20 The construction of the Scheme would result in direct physical impacts upon the HLC types within the footprint of intrusive groundworks within the Application Boundary. This includes river valley (water meadows) and village/ hamlet (1810 extent) which are of medium value and downland, parliamentary enclosure (medium regular fields), river valley (marsh and rough grazing) and post 1810 settlement which are of low value. It is anticipated that the construction of the Scheme would only impact a very small part of the water meadows, which have been previously impacted, and old settlement HLC types which are within the Application Boundary. A direct impact of minor magnitude upon the medium value HLC types would result in a permanent slight adverse effect which is not significant. Construction activities, particularly those associated with areas of permanent works, potential construction compound areas and areas proposed for environmental mitigation would have a direct impact of moderate magnitude upon the parliamentary type enclosure (medium fields) HLC type which is of low value. This would result in a permanent slight adverse effect which is not significant. The new A33 roundabout, link road and attenuation ponds would have a direct adverse impact upon the area of downland between the A34 and M3. However, beyond these areas, chalk grassland would be created retaining the character and ability to appreciate the area of downland. Overall, it is considered that a moderate magnitude of impact upon the low value receptor



would result in a permanent slight adverse effect which is not significant. Direct impacts would only affect a small part of the other HLC types within the Application Boundary (river valley (marsh and rough grazing) and post 1810 settlement) but would not alter the existing character. Minor changes to these low value receptors would result in a permanent slight adverse effect which is not significant. There would be no change to other HLC types within the 300m study area and which would have a neutral effect which is not significant.

6.9.21 A small section of the historic hedgerows along Easton Lane would be removed during construction of the Scheme. The loss of a small section of these hedgerows would result in a minor magnitude of impact to this receptor of medium value, resulting in a permanent slight adverse effect which is not significant.

6.9.22 A summary of the impacts upon non-designated historic landscapes and the significance of effects is summarised in **Table 6.9**.

Table 6.9: Impacts upon non-designated historic landscapes during the construction phase

Receptor	Value/ sensitivity	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
Abbotsworthy House HPG	Low	Minor construction works along the A33 would be visible and audible, but the setting would not be significantly altered	Negligible	Temporary slight adverse (not significant)
Worthy Park HPG	Low	Long distance views of a small part of the main works between the A34 and M3 but in general construction activities unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable	Negligible	Temporary slight adverse (not significant)
Kings Worthy Court HPG, Kings Worthy House HPG, Kings Worthy Grove HPG, Northleigh HPG, Hinton House HPG, Morton House HPG	Low	No direct or indirect effects	No change	Neutral
River Valley – water meadows	Medium	Change to a very small part of the receptors which extend beyond the	Minor	Permanent slight adverse

Receptor	Value/ sensitivity	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
		Application Boundary and would not alter the overall character		effect (not significant)
Valley Floor - marsh and rough grazing	Low	Change to a very small part of the receptors which extend beyond the Application Boundary and would not alter the overall character	Minor	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
Old settlement – village/ hamlet 1810 extent	Medium	Change to a very small part of the receptors which extend beyond the Application Boundary and would not alter the overall character	Minor	Permanent slight adverse effect (not significant)
Downland	Low	Direct impacts and soil stripping in this area to create new infrastructure and chalk grassland. Would still be appreciable as an area of downland	Moderate	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
Parliamentary fields – medium regular fields with straight boundaries	Low	Direct impact and change of character to a large area of the much larger receptor which extends beyond the Application Boundary	Moderate	Permanent slight adverse effect
Parliamentary fields – large regular fields with straight boundaries and prairie fields	Low	No impact	No change	Neutral
Recent settlement – post 1810 settlement	Low	Change to a very small part of the receptors which extend beyond the Application Boundary and would not alter the overall character	Minor	Permanent slight adverse
Valley Floor – Miscellaneous	Low	No Impact	No change	Neutral

Receptor	Value/ sensitivity	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
valley bottom paddocks and pastures				
Important hedgerows along Easton Lane Long Walk	Medium	A small section of the receptors, which extend beyond the Application Boundary, would be removed.	Minor	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)

## Operation

### Archaeological remains

#### *Designated archaeological remains*

6.9.23 The setting of St Gertrude’s Chapel is principally defined by its isolated position on the flood plain of the River Itchen. Despite the construction of modern infrastructure and the expansion of Winchester and Winnall the scheduled monument has retained its sense of isolation. The motorway and Winnall Industrial Estate are largely screened by existing vegetation but are partially visible in the winter months when there are less leaves on the vegetation. The new A33 roundabout will not be lit so there will no increase in the light from the Scheme (see **Chapter 2 (The Scheme and its Surroundings)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**). Noise models indicate there will be no noise increase at St Gertrude’s Chapel during operation (see **Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**). Several of the VMS signs between the A34 and M3 may be partially visible just above the tree line in summer with slightly more visibility in winter. However, this would be seen in the context of existing infrastructure and the landscaping and planting, once established would ensure the Scheme would be largely screened with no visual impacts (see **Figure 7.14** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** for visualisations). Therefore, the current character of the surroundings as experienced from the scheduled monument would be retained during operation. A slight change to the wider setting of the scheduled monument would result in a negligible magnitude of impact to the high value receptor which would have a permanent slight adverse and not significant effect.

6.9.24 The main area of works is approximately 1.5km from the Iron Age settlement close to Grace’s Farm (NHLE: 1001825) and is unlikely to be visible from the scheduled monument. The closest new elements of the Scheme would be new VMS signs along the M3, the closest of which is approximately 1km to the south. While the ZTV, see **Figure 7.10** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** suggests that there would be some visibility of several signs, in reality these would be very long-distance views and seen in the context of the existing road and signage. There would be no increase in noise or light experienced from the

monument during operation and the existing character of the surrounding landscape as experienced from the monument would be retained. No change to the high value receptor would result in a permanent neutral effect which is not significant.

6.9.25 The land within the Scheme's Application Boundary is not considered to contribute towards the setting of any other high value scheduled monument within the 1km study area and introduction of the Scheme would not alter this. There would be no direct or indirect effects upon these receptors during operation. Therefore, the Scheme would have a neutral effect which is not significant. The effect of the operation of the Scheme upon designated archaeological remains is summarised in **Table 6.10**.

Table 6.10: Impacts upon designated archaeological remains during operation

Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
Roman road east of St Catherine's Hill (NHLE: 1001798)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
Anglo-Saxon cemetery in Worthy Park (NHLE: 1001817)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
The late Iron Age settlement site north of Grace's Farm (NHLE: 1001825)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
The site of St Gertrude's Chapel (NHLE: 1005518)	High	Scheme largely screened although possible glimpsed views of several new signs. General character of the surroundings would be retained but change to a small part of the wider setting.	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
Wolvesey Palace (NHLE: 1005535)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
The Iron Age field system, banjo enclosure and Romano-British	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)

Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
villa, 500m east of Woodham Farm (NHLE: 1013269)				
St Catherine's Hill hillfort (NHLE: 1016489)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
The round barrow cemetery on Magdalen Hill Down (NHLE: 1016746)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No Change	Neutral (not significant)
City Bridge at the junction of High Street and Bridge Street (NHLE: 1021112)	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)

#### *Non-designated archaeological remains*

6.9.26 Archaeological work carried out as part of this assessment and a previous design have not identified any remains of such high value that warrant preservation in situ. Where the impact upon archaeological remains is suitably mitigated prior to or during the construction of the Scheme, there would be no direct impacts during the operation phase as remains would have been damaged or removed during the construction phase.

6.9.27 **Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)** has concluded that the Scheme would not change the floodplain storage, overland flow routes or groundwater level or quality. Therefore, the operation of the Scheme would not adversely affect waterlogged deposits and the effect upon palaeoenvironmental remains beyond the impact footprint of the Scheme would be neutral which is not significant.

#### **Built heritage**

##### *Designated built heritage assets*

6.9.28 The operation of the Scheme would not directly affect any listed or unlisted historic building within the 1km study area, although there is the potential for indirect effects from changes to the setting of Worthy Park House and the Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Conservation Areas.

6.9.29 To the north of the Application Boundary Worthy Park House (Grade II\* listed, NHLE: 1095892) has extensive views across the surrounding landscape. As previously mentioned, these views of the River Itchen and the surrounding area,

which are recorded in nineteenth century descriptions, have been significantly altered by the construction of the M3, the existing junction and the modern encroachment of Winchester from the west. Despite this, these elements are largely screened from the listed building and the landscape on the eastern side of the M3 has remained undeveloped, retaining views of the Downs as described in the nineteenth century (see detailed setting assessment of Worthy Park House in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**). A very small part of the area between the A34 and M3 is visible in long distance views from the listed building and the ZTV, see **Figure 7.10** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** suggests that several VMS signs may be visible. Any visibility would be partial, largely screened by vegetation, particularly in summer months, and where visible seen in the context of existing infrastructure. Overall, it is considered that the operation of the Scheme is unlikely to be visually or audibly noticeable from the listed building and the current character experienced from the listed building would be retained. However, alteration to the wider landscape is likely to have a negligible impact of magnitude upon the high value receptor resulting in a permanent slight adverse effect which is not significant.

6.9.30 There would be no direct changes to the Kings Worthy Conservation Area during the operation of the Scheme. The construction of the short length of new pedestrian and cycleway within the eastern end of the conservation area would not impact upon any key elements of the conservation area, as identified in the *Kings Worthy Conservation Area Technical Assessment* (Winchester City Council, 1997), and would not impact upon the special character and appearance of the conservation area. The A33 is already a busy road that passes adjacent to Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy. Indicative traffic flows suggest a possible increase in traffic along the A33 but this would not result in a significant increase in noise, see **Chapter 11 (Noise and Vibration)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.1)**. The slight changes to the alignment of the A33 adjacent to the Kings Worthy Conservation Area, addition of the walking and cycling route and creation of new access from the A33 to businesses at the western end of the conservation area represent minor changes to the setting of the Kings Worthy Conservation Area, although resurfacing in this area would result in a slight reduction of noise in the southern part of the conservation area. These minor changes to the largely modern setting to of the conservation area represent a negligible magnitude of impact to the high value receptor. This would result in a permanent slight adverse effect upon the conservation area which is not significant.

6.9.31 Similarly, there would be no direct impacts upon the Abbots Worthy Conservation Area during the operation of the Scheme. The resurfaced carriageway and new pedestrian and cycle route on the northern side of the A33 would be visible in a key view between Abbots Worthy and Kings Worthy, as identified in the *Abbots Worthy Conservation Area Technical Assessment* (Winchester City Council, 1997), but would not significantly alter this view across the existing busy junction. The southern end of the conservation area is in close proximity to the Application Boundary and approximately 180m from where the new M3 northbound on-slip ties into the existing M3 carriageway. This area acts a green buffer between the conservation area and the M3. The



M3 is mostly screened visually from the conservation area although it is audible from the southern end. An existing band of trees alongside the water meadow would be retained which would largely screen the Scheme in views from the conservation area although the ZTV, see **Figure 7.10** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.2)** indicates that several VMS signs might be partially visible from some parts of the conservation area. These views in general would be longer distance and partial and where visible would be seen in the context modern infrastructure. Beyond the new highways an area of chalk grassland, characteristic of downland (the current historic landscape type), would be created retaining some of the existing character in the area between the A34 and M3 and the green buffer between conservation area and modern infrastructure. The operation of the Scheme would also not result in an increase in noise across the conservation area. Overall, the minor changes to the setting would have a negligible magnitude of impact upon the high value conservation area. This would result in a permanent slight adverse effect which is not significant.

6.9.32 The operation of the Scheme would largely be screened in views from all other conservation areas and listed buildings within the 1km study area and would not impact upon elements of their setting or how their value is experienced and appreciated. The impact and significance of effect upon designated built heritage assets is summarised in **Table 6.11**.

Table 6.11: Impacts upon designated built heritage assets during operation

Receptor	Value/ Significance	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
Winchester Conservation Area	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No change	Neutral (not significant)
Grade I Listed Buildings - Church of St Mary NHLE: 1095898, City Bridge NHLE: 1167781, Church of St John the Baptist NHLE: 1296158, Church of St Swithin NHLE: 1350461	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No Change	Neutral (not significant)
Grade II* Listed Worthy Park House NHLE: 1095892	High	Scheme would be largely screened although there may be some glimpsed views of new signage seen in the context of existing infrastructure.	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)

Receptor	Value/ Significance	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
		Change to the wider setting but no alteration to the existing character experienced from the listed building.		
Other grade II* listed buildings - Church of St Mary NHLE: 1156360, Dymoke House NHLE: 1095857, Church of St Swithun NHLE: 1350471, 1 Water Lane NHLE: 1095347, 24 and 25 St John's Street NHLE: 1095386, St John's Croft NHLE: 1095387, Peter's Theatre NHLE: 1095502, 42 Chisel Street NHLE: 1271527, 1 Chisel Street NHLE: 1350648, 12 Chisel Street NHLE: 1350651	High	No direct or indirect impacts	No Change	Neutral (not significant)
Kings Worthy Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	Operation of the Scheme would not impact upon key elements of the conservation area. The A33 is a busy road within the setting of the conservation area and whilst the operation would result in increase in traffic there would not be an increase in noise. Minor changes to the largely modern setting	Negligible	Temporary slight adverse (not significant)

Receptor	Value/ Significance	Description of impact	Magnitude of impact	Effect and significance
Abbots Worthy Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	No direct impacts during operation. Once completed the works along the A33 would not affect the setting of the conservation area. Green buffer between conservation area and infrastructure maintained by minor change to the setting.	Negligible	Permanent slight adverse (not significant)
Easton Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	No direct or indirect effects	Neutral	No Change
Martyr Worthy Conservation Area and associated Grade II listed buildings	High	No direct or indirect effects	Neutral	No Change
Other Grade II listed buildings located beyond the conservation areas	High	No direct or indirect effects	Neutral	No change

*Non-designated built heritage assets*

6.9.33 As stated previously the *Abbots Worthy Conservation Area Technical Note* states that Abbotsworthy House (SRN 168) is visible as a landmark feature within views from Long Walk however these are long distance and largely screened by trees and hedgerows. The Scheme is likely to be largely screened in views from the house and would not be readily experienced in relation to it. In addition, there would be no increase in noise at the building or its immediate setting during the operation phase of the Scheme. Therefore, the Scheme would not impact the setting of the listed building. No change to the low value receptor would result in a neutral effect which is not significant.

6.9.34 Fulling Mill Cottage is not nationally or locally listed and despite significant alterations it retains some historic value. As outlined in **Appendix 6.1 (Detailed Cultural Heritage Baseline)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)** its setting is defined by the surrounding waterways and garden which would not be impacted upon by the Scheme. The Scheme would not be perceptible either

visually or audibly from the non-designated built heritage asset. The alteration to the adjacent area of download in the wider setting would hardly affect the building. The negligible magnitude of impact upon the negligible value receptor would result in a permanent neutral effect not considered to be significant.

### *Historic landscape*

#### *Non-designated historic landscapes*

6.9.35 There would be no direct impacts upon the historic landscape character types or HPGs during the operation of the Scheme. The alteration to the historic landscape character would have occurred during the construction phase. The operation of the Scheme would be largely screened in views from HPGs within the 300m study area and is unlikely to affect the setting of the low value receptors. As such there is likely to be a magnitude of impact of no change and a permanent neutral effect which is not significant.

6.9.36 There would be no impacts upon historic hedgerows during the operation of the Scheme, impacts would have occurred during the construction phase.

## **6.10 Monitoring**

6.10.1 The assessment of effects from the Scheme has not identified effects which are considered likely to be significant. No monitoring is therefore required in relation to cultural heritage.

## **6.11 Summary**

6.11.1 This chapter presents an assessment of the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme upon the historic environment (archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment was carried out in accordance with professional standards and guidance and methodologies outlined within the DMRB LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring (Highways England, 2020) and the DMRB LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (Highways England, 2020) and agreed with key heritage stakeholders.

6.11.2 A programme of archaeological investigation to inform the baseline consisting of geophysical surveys and trial trenching was carried out to inform the assessment. No remains were identified that were of such high value that would warrant preservation in-situ. However, prehistoric, Roman and post-medieval features were identified which would be damaged or removed, during construction.

6.11.3 A programme of archaeological mitigation is required which would preserve by record any archaeological remains that would be impacted upon and would reduce or offset any significant adverse effects. The scope and scale of archaeological mitigation, and post-excavation work, would be based on the Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy, **Appendix 6.8 (Archaeology and Heritage Outline Mitigation Strategy)** of the **ES (Document Reference 6.3)**. Prior to construction the outline strategy would be

developed into the Detailed Mitigation Strategy (based on the outline strategy) which is secured through the DCO Requirements and would be further discussed with the Winchester City Council Archaeologist. All mitigation would be carried out in accordance with agreed WSIs (which are required within the outline strategy).

- 6.11.4 A number of designated heritage assets were identified as having the potential to be impacted upon by the Scheme (impacts to their setting). In addition, a number of non-designated heritage assets were also considered to have the potential to receive effects. This assessment has found that there would be no or limited temporary impacts upon these assets during the construction of the Scheme. A small section of construction works adjacent to the A33 fall within the Kings Worthy Conservation Area but the works would not affect any of its key attributes. There would be some minor alterations to some historic landscape parcels within the Application Boundary during construction. An area of downland between the M3 and A34 would receive the biggest impact but much of this would be returned to chalk grassland following construction and would still be legible as an area of download. Construction of the Scheme would result in the loss of a small part of the historic hedgerows along Easton Lane, refer to **Drawing 2.13 (Protected Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed)** of the **ES** to be removed (**Document Reference 2.13**).
- 6.11.5 The operation of the Scheme would not impact upon any archaeological remains which would have been sufficiently investigated (mitigated) during construction. There would not be any significant impacts upon the setting of any built heritage receptors or historic park and gardens during the operation. Impacts upon the historic landscape would have occurred during the construction phase and as such no further impacts would occur during operation.
- 6.11.6 Overall, this assessment has concluded that following mitigation there would not be any significant residual effects upon the historic environment (archaeology, built heritage or historic landscape) from the construction or operation of the Scheme.