

**Archaeology**

**13**

## 13 Archaeology

---

### 13.1 Introduction

13.1.1 This chapter has been prepared by CGMS. The chapter evaluates the impacts of the proposed development on archaeological heritage assets.

13.1.2 The key objectives of the historic environment assessment are to:

- Assess the potential impact of the construction of the proposed development on known and potential archaeological heritage assets and to evaluate the significance of the impact;
- Assess the impacts of the operation of the proposed development on designated archaeological heritage assets within 500m, including consideration of their settings;
- Identify measures for avoiding or mitigating potential impacts; and detail any residual impacts that cannot be mitigated.

### 13.2 Legislation and Policy

#### National Context

13.2.1 The Ancient Monuments & Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended) protects the fabric of Scheduled Monuments, but does not afford statutory protection to their settings.

13.2.2 Government policy in relation to the historic environment is outlined in Section 12, entitled Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Section entitled 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment' provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking:

- Delivery of sustainable development;
- Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment;
- Conservation of England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; and
- Recognition of the contribution that heritage assets make to our knowledge and understanding of the past.

13.2.3 Section 12 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term.

13.2.4 Paragraph 128 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.

13.2.5 Heritage Assets are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as:

---

*“A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).”*

13.2.6 Archaeological Interest is defined as:

*“A heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.”*

13.2.7 Designated Heritage Assets comprise World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Park and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and Conservation Areas.

13.2.8 Significance is defined as:

*“The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.”*

13.2.9 Setting is defined as:

*“The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.”*

13.2.10 The NPPF is supported by the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). In relation to the historic environment, paragraph 18a-001 states that:

*“Protecting and enhancing the historic environment is an important component of the National Planning Policy Framework’s drive to achieve sustainable development (as defined in Paragraphs 6-10). The appropriate conservation of heritage assets forms one of the ‘Core Planning Principles.’”*

13.2.11 Paragraph 18a-002 makes a clear statement that any decisions relating to listed buildings and their settings and conservation areas must address the statutory considerations of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as well as satisfying the relevant policies within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan.

13.2.12 Paragraph 18a-013 outlines that the assessment of the impact of a proposed development on the setting of a heritage asset needs to take into account and be proportionate to the significance of the asset being considered and the degree to which the proposed development enhance or detract from the significance of the asset and the ability to appreciate the significance.

13.2.13 The NPPG outlines that although the extent and importance of setting is often expressed in visual terms, it can also be influenced by other factors such as noise, dust and vibration. Historic relationships between places can also be an important factor stressing ties between place that may have limited or no intervisibility with each other. This may be historic as well as aesthetic connections that contribute or enhance the significance of one or more of the heritage assets.

13.2.14 Paragraph 18a-013 concludes stating:

*“The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance. When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset’s significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation.”*

13.2.15 The key test in NPPF paragraphs 132-134 is whether a proposed development will result in substantial harm or less than substantial harm. However, substantial harm is not defined in the NPPF. Paragraph 18a-017 of the NPPG provides additional guidance on substantial harm. It states:

*“What matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed.”*

13.2.16 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF outlines that where a proposed development results in less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, the harm arising should be weighed against the public benefits accruing from the proposed development. Paragraph 18a-020 of the NPPG outlines what is meant by public benefits:

*“Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 7). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.”*

13.2.17 The National Planning Practice Guide (2014) acknowledges that the extent and importance of setting is often based on visual considerations, but that it can also be influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration; by spatial associations; and, by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.

### Local Context

13.2.18 The relevant replacement Local Plan 2016 is provided by St Edmundsbury Borough Council, adopted in June 2006:

*“Policy HC9 ‘Sites and Features of Archaeological Importance’*

*In considering proposals which affect sites of archaeological importance and their setting or sites of potential interest, the local planning authority will have regard to:*

- *the results of any archaeological evaluation required;*

- *the need to preserve archaeological remains in situ; and*
- *the need for adequate recording or excavation prior to development commencing."*

### Other Guidance

13.2.19 The Historic England 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment' (Historic England 2015) outlines a six stage process to the assembly and analysis of relevant information relating to heritage assets potentially affected by a proposed development. This is:

- Understand the significance of the affected assets;
- Understand the impact of the proposal on that significance;
- Avoid, minimise and mitigate impact in a way that meets the objectives of the NPPF;
- Look for opportunities to better reveal or enhance significance;
- Justify any harmful impacts in terms of the sustainable development objective of conserving significance and the need for change;
- Offset negative impacts on aspects of significance by enhancing others through recording, disseminating and archiving archaeological and historical interest of the important elements of the heritage assets affected.

13.2.20 The English Heritage 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets' (English Heritage, 2015) sets out guidance on the management of change within the settings of heritage assets. Key to this document is that the protection of the setting of heritage assets need not prevent change but the impact of change needs to be properly assessed. In summary, the key points from the guidance are:

- Setting is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Elements of the setting may make a positive, negative or neutral contribution to the significance of an asset.
- Setting is often described in visual terms but it can include other factors such as noise, smell, dust and historic associations between heritage assets.
- Setting is usually more extensive than curtilage, and is distinct from historic character and context.
- Setting exists irrespective of public access.

13.2.21 The setting of heritage assets change over time. Where the surroundings of a heritage asset are relatively unaltered from when the asset was first constructed/used, the contribution of the setting to the significance is likely to be higher than where the setting has been subject to high levels of change from its original state. However, the process of change can enhance the significance of a heritage asset.

13.2.22 The guidance sets out a 5 staged process for practical and proportionate assessment of potential impact of proposed development on the setting of heritage assets and the resultant decision making process. The assessment process adopted here is concordant with the guidance.

### 13.3 Methodology

13.3.1 13.3.1 The assessment involved the following key tasks:

- A 500m study area from the site boundary for non-designated and designated archaeological remains. Production of an archaeological desk-based assessment (Appendix 13.1) in accordance with the ClFA 'Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessments' (2014). Sources reviewed included: Suffolk Historic Environment Record (HER); National Monuments Record; historic cartographic and documentary sources at the Suffolk Record Office and the British Library; and unpublished material from recent nearby archaeological investigations.
- Archaeological geophysical survey of the site (Appendix 13.2).

#### Significance Criteria

13.3.2 13.3.2 Criteria for assessing the magnitude of predicted change are given in Table 13.1.

**Table 13.1: Criteria for assessing magnitude of change on historic environment receptors**

Magnitude	Impact
Major	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Total or substantial loss of the significance of a heritage asset.</li> <li>■ Substantial harm to a heritage asset's setting such that the significance of the asset would be totally lost or substantially reduced (e.g. the significance of a designated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its designation would be questionable; the significance of an undesignated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its categorisation as a heritage asset would be questionable).</li> </ul>
Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Partial loss or alteration of the significance of a heritage asset.</li> <li>■ Considerable harm to a heritage asset's setting, such that the asset's significance would be materially affected/considerably devalued, but not totally or substantially lost.</li> </ul>
Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Slight loss of the significance of a heritage asset. This can include the removal of fabric that forms part of the heritage asset, but that is not integral to its significance (e.g. the demolition of later extensions/additions of little intrinsic value).</li> <li>■ Some harm to the heritage asset's setting, but not to the degree that it would materially compromise the significance of the heritage asset.</li> <li>■ Level of harm perceivable, but insubstantial relative to the overall interest of the heritage asset.</li> </ul>
Negligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ A very slight change to a heritage asset. This can include a change to a part of a heritage asset that does not materially contribute to its significance.</li> <li>■ Very minor change to a heritage asset's setting such that there is a slight impact not materially affecting the heritage asset's significance.</li> </ul>
No impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ No change to a heritage asset or its setting.</li> </ul>

13.3.3 The sensitivity of the heritage asset will depend on factors such as the condition of the asset and its perceived heritage value and significance. The sensitivity of the heritage asset receptor is defined by its significance in terms of national, regional or local statutory or non-statutory protection and grading of the asset. Table 13.2 sets out the criteria for assessing sensitivity.

**Table 13.2: Criteria for assessing sensitivity of receptors**

Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>World Heritage Sites</li> </ul>
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheduled Monuments &amp; Areas of Archaeological Importance.</li> <li>Archaeological sites of schedulable quality &amp; significance.</li> </ul>
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undesignated sites of demonstrable regional importance</li> </ul>
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites with significance to local interest groups.</li> <li>Sites of which the significance is limited by poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations.</li> </ul>

13.3.4 The sensitivity of the receiving environment, together with the magnitude of change, defines the significance of the impact (Table 13.3). Impacts of ‘major’ or ‘moderate’ significance are considered by this chapter to equate to significant impacts highlighted in the context of the EIA Regulations.

**Table 13.3: Criteria for assessing significance of impact**

Sensitivity	Very High	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor
	High	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Medium	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	Negligible
	Low	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
	Magnitude of Change	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible

### 13.4 Baseline Conditions

13.4.1 The locations of sites/features mentioned in the text are shown in Appendix 13.1. References used are the Suffolk Historic Environment Record number.

#### Designated Archaeological Heritage Assets

13.4.2 There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Historic Battlefields or Registered Parks and Gardens within the site.

13.4.3 The Scheduled remains of a moated site at Great Wilsey Farm is located outside the red line area to the north of the central part of the site. The moat is thought to be the site of Wilsey Hall Manor which was owned by Gilbert de Clare in the first half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century the manor was held by amongst others, Robert Cornewall, Sir Giles Alington, Henry Turner and family and John Skinner, who in 1601 sold it to William Smythe. It is thought that a house on the island was replaced in the 17<sup>th</sup> century by a house immediately to the east of the moated site and this in turn was demolished in the 1960s and replaced by the present Great Wilsey Farmhouse. The moated site includes a roughly rectangular island measuring up to 46m north east-south west by 38m north west-south east which is raised up to 1m above the surrounding ground surface. The island is enclosed by a water-filled moat which measures up to 14m wide and is more than 1.5m deep. The island is approached by a modern footbridge across the south east arm of the moat.

- 13.4.4 The moated site is edged by tall trees, the south of which is a house, to east of which is Great Wilsey Farm which comprises a series of modern farm buildings and the north of which are two houses and to the west of which is a grass field across which the driveway the farm crosses. It is these elements that form the core of the moated site's setting and where the setting has a positive contribution to the significance of the monument. Beyond the immediate surroundings of the moated site are modern agricultural fields with the edge of the modern built area of Haverhill to the south which have a neutral contribution to the significance of the moated site.
- 13.4.5 The significance of the moated site is primarily its evidential archaeological and historical interest. The setting, while parts of it have a positive contribution to the significance of the monument, is a secondary element of the significance of the monument.

### Non-Designated Heritage Assets

#### Prehistoric

- 13.4.6 The only Palaeolithic remains recorded in the study area is a surface find of a Palaeolithic hand axe c. 750m south of the site (HVH013) and a second hand axe has been recorded c. 1km to the west of the site (HVH014).
- 13.4.7 Twenty one small flint blade flakes of Mesolithic date have been recorded c. 1km to the north east of the site (KDG007).
- 13.4.8 A Bronze Age thin-butted flat axe has been recorded in the north western corner of the site (WTL003) and a socketed bronze gouge has been recorded c. 1km to the north of the site (WTG007). A scheduled bowl barrow is located on the southern edge of Haverhill and is thought to be Bronze Age in date (DSF14960). An evaluation of Chalkstone Way sports field immediately to the south west of the study site recorded a small pit of Bronze Age date and two undated ditches (HVH068).
- 13.4.9 Archaeological investigations undertaken on the Westfield Primary School Replacement site immediately to the south west of the site revealed an iron Age settlement and funerary monuments (HVH072). An evaluation revealed part of an enclosure of Bronze Age/earlier Iron Age date that contained a small quantity of domestic refuse suggestive of occupation; a circular enclosure of earlier to middle Iron Age date; a double-ditched enclosure was interpreted as a barrow or a temple/shrine. A subsequent excavation of the site revealed slight evidence suggestive of later Neolithic/earlier Bronze Age date. Intensive occupation of the site began in the middle Iron Age and was represented mainly by a probable roundhouse and two substantial ring-ditch features that were possibly ritual/funerary monuments. There was no evidence for later occupation of the site.
- 13.4.10 An evaluation excavation of land off Chalkstone Way, immediately to the south of the site, revealed isolated pits and a system of parallel ditches dating to the late Bronze Age - Early Iron Age, and six pits and a ditch of Iron Age date (HVH059). An evaluation and excavation at Millfields Way c. 350m to the south east of the site has recorded a linear feature and a pit containing Iron Age pottery along with a further nine possible undated features (HVH019). Archaeological evaluation on land adjacent to the western boundary of the site, revealed small amounts of Iron Age and Roman pits along with localised scatters of Iron Age, Roman and Saxon finds.
- 13.4.11 A scatter of Iron Age pottery was discovered as was an inhumation c. 800m south of the site (MSF6037). An Iron Age coin hoard and a possible coin mould were recovered by labourers during land draining in the 18th century c. 150m south-west of the site (HVH001). A Greek silver Tetradrachm (coin) of the middle



---

Iron Age was found c. 150m north-east of the site (KDG010). A bun shaped rotary quern stone was found within a garden of Mount Road south of the site (HVH047).

#### **Roman**

13.4.12 Two Roman coins dated AD315-26 were found in the very south of the site on Chalkstone Hill (HVH002). An early Roman coin of Augustus was found at the cricket ground within the east of Haverhill (HVH003). A scatter of finds including pottery, tile, tessera, coins and a brooch were found without associated features during work at Coupals Road within the east of Haverhill to the south of the study site (HVH008). Further finds have been recovered including a miniature 'celtic' stone head, perhaps a portable amulet, found approximately 800m west of the study site (HVH015).

13.4.13 A scheduled Roman settlement lies the north west of Cotton Hall c. 1km to the east where evidence of stone buildings materials and large quantities of pottery and other contemporary artefacts have been recorded (KDG007). Ten ditches and an amphora have been recorded c. 1km to the north east (KDG004 & 019). A number of sherds of pottery and tile fragments have been recorded c. 600m to the south of the site (HVH020).

#### **Saxon**

13.4.14 The only Saxon remains recorded within the study area is fragments of architectural stone work contained within the Church of St Marys at Little Wratting (WTL002). The majority of the structure is medieval in date (HVH016). A large Saxon pin with ornate gilded bronze head & bronze shaft has been recorded c. 1km to the north of the study site (WTL004).

#### **Medieval**

13.4.15 The Scheduled Monument of the rectangular moat site at Great Wilsey Farm is located to the north of the central part of the study site (WTL001/DSF15473). Within the south-east of the site, a second moat (unscheduled) is present at Little Wilsey Farm, the earthwork is recorded as being infilled in 2001 (KDG012). The geophysical survey did not record any features in the area of this moat that could be interpreted as being associated with former medieval occupation. However, a sub-rectangular feature was recorded on the western bank of the stream toward the south eastern part of the site which could be interpreted as a former moated site. This feature is considered to be of local significance and low sensitivity.

13.4.16 Recent evaluation on land to the west of the study site revealed an area of medieval occupation activity on either side of the trackway leading to the area of Chapel Farm (HVH065). A chapel formerly occupied the site of the current Chapel Farm just east of the north-eastern boundary of the site. Flint and ashlar from the former Chapel are incorporated into the current 19th century Grade II Listed cottage and farm buildings (LB 466432). This site is marked as Haverhill Chapel on Hodgkinson's 1783 map of Suffolk. However it has been identified as possibly the Chapel of Alderton in 15th and 16th century wills (MSF19621).

13.4.17 Monitoring of area of stripped topsoil for Anglian Water pipeline located a large amount of medieval pottery and features to the N of road opposite Hill's Farm and Hilltop Farm c. 500m to the north of the site (WTL005).

13.4.18 The site lies outside the core of the Saxon and medieval settlement (HVH067), but it appears limited settlement activity was taking place around the current area of Boyton Hall (Chapel Farm) although the features look to fade out before reaching the study site. Further settlement activity could be expected in the areas of the moated sites although this would be of the nature of more isolated fortified houses with

maybe ancillary buildings. The remaining areas are most likely to be in agricultural land or woodland associated with such houses. Areas at the north-east of the site (close to Chapel Farm) and surrounding the moats of Great and Little Wilsey are considered to be of high potential for medieval archaeology, the potential for the remainder of the site is considered to be low to moderate.

#### **Post-Medieval & Modern**

13.4.19 There are no post-medieval remains recorded within the site.

13.4.20 The desk based assessment of the site includes a map regression exercise (Appendix 13.1). In summary, this demonstrates that the site has been agricultural fields since at least the earlier 19th century. With the exception of the loss of field boundaries, the site has remained essentially unchanged since the first edition OS map was published (1891).

#### **Geophysical Survey**

13.4.21 A geophysical survey has been undertaken of the site and the full details of the results of this survey are presented in Appendix 13.2. In summary, the survey revealed anomalies suggestive of up to three small late prehistoric/Roman settlements in the south eastern part of the site. Curved anomalies suggestive of a possible Bronze Age ring ditch (feature 5 Appendix 13.2, Figure 12) was recorded next to the area of possible settlement in the southern central area of the site. These remains are regarded as being of local significance and of low sensitivity. The survey also recorded a number of anomalies of possible archaeological origin which were primarily within the south eastern half of the site. A number of former field boundaries and tracks were also recorded. The north western half of the site appears to be largely devoid of anomalies that could be interpreted as being of archaeological significance.

#### **Historic Landscape Characterisation**

13.4.22 The site lies within an area of undulating estate farmlands as defined on the Suffolk Landscape Character mapping (which includes the results of the Suffolk HLC).

### **13.5 Predicted Effects**

13.5.1 The potential effects upon archaeological heritage assets have been considered from the outset.

#### **Construction**

13.5.2 The results of the geophysical survey indicate that there are possibly three areas of late prehistoric/Roman settlement and a possible medieval moated site within the south eastern half of the site. The results of nearby archaeological investigations such as at Westfield Primary School Replacement site, had indicated that the north western part of the site may also have potential for prehistoric remains. However, the geophysical survey does not support this. However, geophysical survey does not necessarily record all archaeological features and therefore, further remains in this part of the site cannot be ruled out entirely.

13.5.3 All three areas of probable late prehistoric/Roman settlement and the possible moated site are located within areas of proposed housing. Consequently, the construction of the proposed development will have a direct impact upon them. Should as yet unrecorded archaeological remains be present within the site, the construction of the proposed development will result in a major magnitude of change (i.e. damage or destruction) on such remains. As these potential remains will be of low sensitivity the construction phase

of the proposed development will have a minor impact upon such remains. There will be a negligible impact from the operational phase of the proposed development on such remains.

- 13.5.4 Construction impacts on designated archaeological heritage assets beyond the red line area will be of a comparable nature to those at the operational stage, albeit of a much shorter duration. The nature of the change in the views to or from the assessed assets will not be significantly different during construction when compared with operation. Therefore, the predicted effects of construction activities are broadly similar to those assessed in operational impacts and have not been repeated for construction impacts.

### Operational

- 13.5.5 All impacts on non-designated archaeological heritage assets will result from the construction stage of the project and suitable mitigation proposals in relation to this impact are set out below. Once these mitigation measures have been implemented ahead of construction, archaeological features within the site will have been fully excavated and recorded. Consequently, following the implementation of the proposed mitigation proposals, there will be a negligible impact from the operational phase of the project on non-designated archaeological heritage assets.
- 13.5.6 The proposed development will have no direct impacts on any designated archaeological heritage assets.
- 13.5.7 The moated site at Great Wilsey Farm lies in relative close proximity to the proposed development. The significance of the moated site resides primarily in its archaeological interest with some limited additional significance from its historic interest and aesthetic contribution to the local character. The current setting does not enhance significance of the moated site in itself but it does enable the moated site to be appreciated within a rural context.
- 13.5.8 The moated site is edged by tall trees, to the south of which is a house, to the east of which is Great Wilsey Farm which comprises of a series of modern farm buildings, to the north of which are two houses and to the west of which is a grass field across which the driveway the farm crosses. It is these elements that form the core of the moated site's setting and where the setting has a positive contribution to the significance of the monument. Beyond the immediate surroundings of the moated site are modern agricultural fields with the edge of the modern built area of Haverhill to the south, which have a mildly positive contribution to the significance of the moated site.
- 13.5.9 The proposed development will be within the wider setting of the moated site. However, the existing farm buildings, hedges and trees largely block or filter views across much of the site. Therefore, the core of the setting in its immediate surroundings will be unaffected. It is within the wider setting that the proposed development will have an effect on the setting of the moated site. The proposed development has been designed so as to enable the moated site to be screened from the development in the areas closest to the monument. Structural woodland planting is proposed on the eastern side of housing blocks on the west side of Great Wilsey Farm and on the western side of the housing block on the west side of the farm. This structural woodland planting will filter views of the housing to the west from the monument and the existing block of woodland to the west of the monument will still be visible and block views of the development beyond the woodland. The structural planting on the eastern side of Great Wilsey Farm, will, along with the existing farm buildings, block views of the proposed development to the east and south east from the monument. The field to the south of the scheduled monument and the house that is located on its southern side is not included within the redline boundary of the proposed development. The area to the south of that on both side of the stream will be retained as informal open space. There will consequently be a large buffer of open space to the south of the monument. The setting to the north of the monument

will be unchanged. Woodland belts will be no less than 40m in width in the vicinity of the moat and will be designed to contain a high percentage of evergreen species for all year round screening. The area immediately to the south of the moated site is to remain outside of the red line area of the site and therefore will not change, furthermore Great Wilsey farmhouse which lies in between the moated site and land to the south will be retained. Further to the south an extensive area of open space/country park is proposed in between the field to the south of the moated site and the development. The area to the north of the moated site will remain unchanged.

### **13.6 Mitigation, Monitoring and Residual Effects**

- 13.6.1 The following section outlines mitigation measures in addition to those incorporated into the design of the scheme assessed and specifies measures proposed to reduce impacts.
- 13.6.2 The archaeological potential of the site will be clarified and quantified by a programme of detailed evaluation trenching. The detail of the programme will be discussed and agreed with Suffolk County Council following the granting of planning permission. Should the evaluation have positive results, areas of archaeological significance that will be impacted by construction activities will be excavated and recorded in advance of construction commencing with the results being published following completion of the post-excavation analysis. Where appropriate and should remain merit it, consideration will be given to design solutions such as the allocation of open space to enable preservation.
- 13.6.3 The residual impact of the proposed development will be that the semi-rural setting of Wilsey moated site will be retained. Any archaeological remains present within the site that would have been impacted by the construction of infrastructure, buildings, green infrastructure and land forming, will have been fully excavated, recorded and published. There will be no long-term effects within the site itself once the process of excavation and recording of the archaeological remains have been completed. However, there will be a benefit accruing from the investigation into and the dissemination of the results of excavations of any remains that may be located within the site.

### **13.7 Non-Technical Summary**

- 13.7.1 The assessment of potential effects has included designated and non-designated archaeological heritage assets within and in the vicinity of the proposed development. It has taken into account scheduled monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, and registered historic parks and gardens as designated heritage assets within the landscape surrounding the site. The potential effects of the project on archaeological remains has been assessed, and has considered the direct physical impact of the proposed development on below ground archaeological remains that may be located within the site.
- 13.7.2 The assessment has established that the proposed development lies within an area that is considered to have potential for prehistoric/Roman remains. The construction of the proposed development will impact upon these remains. A geophysical survey of the site has already been completed. A programme of archaeological evaluation trenching is proposed to be undertaken. The results of the evaluation will also inform the scope of any archaeological mitigation measures required, such as archaeological excavation and/or watching brief which will be undertaken ahead of construction commencing. The scope of the mitigation measures will be agreed with the Suffolk County Council following completion of the archaeological evaluation.
- 13.7.3 The assessment has considered the effect on the scheduled medieval moated site at Great Wilsey Farm. The proposed development will have a minor impact on the setting of the moated site. This is considered

to result in a less than substantial harm to the monument, in accordance with Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Table 13.4: Summary of Potentially Significant Effects**

Predicted Effect	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Significance	Other Parameters	Mitigation, Monitoring & Controls	Magnitude	Significance	Other Parameters
Non-designated archaeological heritage assets	Low	Major	Minor		Programme of archaeological evaluation and further excavation and recording	Major	Minor	
Great Wilsey Farm moated site (designated heritage asset)	High	Minor	Minor		None	Minor	Minor	

1.0 Notes: Short term (0-5 years) = ST, medium term (5-10 years) = MT, long term (10+ years) = LT, permanent = P, temporary (construction) = T, intermittent = I, reversible = R, irreversible = Ir.