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Summary
Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by David Wilson Homes, BDW Eastern Counties to prepare an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of land to the east of Holt Road, Horsford, Norfolk, centred on National Grid Reference 618879, 317348. This study is intended to support a planning application for a proposed residential development within the Site.

The aims of this study were to assess the known and potential heritage resource within the Site and the surrounding area, and to assess the likely impacts of the development proposals on this resource.

The effect of the development proposals on the historic environment resource will be a material consideration in the determination of the planning application. This study has identified no overriding heritage constraints which are likely to prohibit development.

This assessment has established that there is an archaeological interest within the Site. This is defined as the potential for the presence of buried archaeological remains, in particular relating to the Late Iron Age and Romano-British periods. This is based on the presence of archaeological features of possible Late Iron Age and Romano-British date found in the adjacent field to the south that are likely to extend into the proposed development Site.

The potential for Bronze Age, medieval and post-medieval archaeology to be present on the Site is deemed moderate, while that of a Saxon presence is thought to be low. There is an unknown potential for early prehistoric periods and the Early Iron Age.

Due to the presence of significant archaeological remains within such proximity to the site, it is likely that additional archaeological investigations will be required by the archaeological advisor to Broadland District Council. In the first instance, this may take the form of a detailed geophysical survey followed by a targeted trial trench evaluation.

The proposed development is unlikely to result in any adverse impacts to the settings of any designated or non-designated heritage assets within the wider landscape surrounding the Site.

The Historic Landscape Character of the proposed development site is of limited significance. Although development of the Site would fundamentally change its character, this would not constitute an appreciable loss to the wider historic environment resource.

The need for, scale, scope and nature of any further assessment and/or archaeological works should be agreed through consultation with the statutory authorities.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project background

1.1.1 Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by David Wilson Homes, BDW Eastern Counties (the Client), to prepare an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of land to the East of Holt Road, Horsford, Norfolk (hereafter ‘the Site’, Figure 1), centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) 618879, 317348.

1.1.2 This study will support a planning application for a proposed residential development within the Site, to be submitted to Broadland District Council.

1.2 The Site

1.2.1 The Site comprises an irregular parcel of land of approximately 10.7 hectares (ha) located to the north of Horsford and to the southwest of Horsford Woods. The Site lies 6.3 km to the north of Norwich, 3.7 km to the south east of Haveringland and 2 km to the north east of Thorpe Marriot.

1.2.2 The Site is made up of two large rectangular fields under arable cultivation (Plates 1 & 2) plus a smaller sub-triangular pasture field at the northern boundary (Plate 3). The present internal field boundary between the two larger fields is a sparse/intermittent hedge with a barbed wire fence (Plate 4). The small northern field is separated from the other two by mature hedgerows and trees and wire fencing (Plate 5). The rear gardens of residential properties bound the southwest side of the Site (Plates 6 & 7). Green Lane, two residential properties and three small grass fields lie to the north of the Site with Horsford Woods beyond. Mature trees and hedgerows line the boundary of the Site with Green Lane. Here a substantial bank survives within the hedgerow along with the shallow remains of a ditch (Plate 8). A large arable field bounds the Site to the east while a newly constructed residential development is located to the southeast (Plate 9).

1.2.3 The Site is situated on a ridge with a gentle incline from c. 35 m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) in the southeast to c. 39 m (aOD) northwest.

1.2.4 The British Geological Survey (BGS) have mapped the underlying bedrock geology throughout the Site as the Wroxham Crag Formation of sand and gravel. This is overlain by superficial Glaciofluvial Deposits of sand and gravel (BGS Online).

1.3 Development proposals

1.3.1 The layout plan for the proposed development indicates that the development will comprise the erection of 259 new dwellings, together with associated public open space, landscaping, highways and drainage infrastructure works.
1.4 Scope of document

1.4.1 This assessment was requested by the Client in order to determine, as far as is possible from existing information, the nature, extent and significance of the historic environment resource within the Site and its environs, and to provide an initial assessment of the potential impact of development on the heritage assets that embody that significance.

1.4.2 The Historic Environment, as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012): Annex 2, comprises:

‘all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.’

1.4.3 NPPF Annex 2 defines a Heritage Asset as:

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

1.5 Aims

1.5.1 The specific aims of this assessment are to:

• outline the known and potential heritage assets within the Site based on a review of existing information within a defined study area;
• assess the significance of known and potential heritage assets through weighted consideration of their valued components;
• assess the impact of potential development or other land changes on the significance of the heritage assets and their setting; and
• make recommendations for strategies to mitigate potential adverse impacts arising from the proposed development.

2 PLANNING BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 There is national legislation and guidance relating to the protection of, and proposed development on or near, important archaeological sites or historical buildings within planning regulations as defined under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. In addition, local authorities are responsible for the protection of the historic environment within the planning system.

2.1.2 The following section summarises the main components of the national and local planning and legislative framework governing the treatment of the historic environment within the planning process. Further detail is presented in Appendix 2.

2.2 Designated heritage assets

2.2.1 Designated heritage assets are defined in NPPF Annex 2 as:

‘World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Park and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and Conservation Areas designated under the relevant legislation.’
2.2.2 Designation can be defined as:

‘The recognition of particular heritage value(s) of a significant place by giving it formal status under law or policy intended to sustain those values’ (English Heritage 2008, p.71).

2.2.3 Statutory protection is provided to certain classes of designated heritage asset under the following legislation:

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990;
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979; and
- Protection of Wrecks Act 1973

2.2.4 Further information regarding heritage designations is provided in Appendix 2.

2.3 National Planning Policy Framework

2.3.1 NPPF Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment sets out the principal national guidance on the importance, management and safeguarding of heritage assets within the planning process.

2.3.2 The aim of NPPF Section 12 is to ensure that Local Planning Authorities, developers and owners of heritage assets adopt a consistent and holistic approach to their conservation and to reduce complexity in planning policy relating to proposals that affect them.

2.3.3 To summarise, government guidance provides a framework which:

- recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource;
- requires applicants to provide proportionate information on the significance of heritage assets affected by the proposals and an impact assessment of the proposed development on that significance;
- takes into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and their setting;
- places weight on the conservation of designated heritage assets, in line with their significance; and
- requires developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible.

2.3.4 A selection of excerpts from NPPF Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment is presented in Appendix 2.

2.4 Planning Practice Guidance

2.4.1 On 6 March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) web-based resource (Available at: http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/ Accessed on 30/03/2016). The resource provides additional guidance intended to accompany the NPPF. It includes a section entitled Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (ID: 18a), which expands upon NPPF Section 12.
2.5 **Local planning policy**

2.5.1 The Site is situated within the administrative boundaries of Broadland District Council, which is currently in the process of preparing its local plan. Until its finalisation policies from the adopted 2006 Local Plan remain in force as ‘saved policies’. As part of the emerging Local Plan Development Management Documents are being produced to replace the 2006 Local Plan and the saved policies will gradually be replaced by the policies within the Development Management Document. Policies relating to heritage have been replaced within the Development Management Document adopted on 3rd August 2015.

2.5.2 In March 2011 a Joint Core Strategy was prepared the Greater Norwich Development Partnership, which Broadland District is a member of. This document sets out the overarching strategy for the Norwich, Broadland and South Norfolk area.

2.5.3 Local planning policies, contained within the aforementioned documents that relate to the historic environment and may be relevant to the proposed development are presented in Appendix 2.

2.6 **Supplementary planning guidance**

2.6.1 Broadland District Council has prepared a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) adopted by the Council in 2013 as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Broadland District Council, 2013). The LCA SPD is supplementary to Policy 1 Addressing Climate Change and Protecting Environmental Assets in the Joint Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD).

3 **METHODOLOGY**

3.1 **Introduction**

3.1.1 The methodology employed during this assessment has been based upon relevant professional guidance including the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists’ *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment* (ClfA, 2014).

3.2 **Study Area**

3.2.1 A Study Area was established within a 1 km radius of the Site boundary. The recorded historic environment resource within the Study Area was considered in order to provide a context for the discussion and interpretation of the known and potential resource within the Site.

3.3 **Sources**

3.3.1 A number of publicly accessible sources of primary and synthesised information were consulted. These comprised:

- The National Heritage List for England (NHLE), which is the only official and up to date database of all nationally designated heritage assets;
- The Norfolk Historic Environment Record (NHER), comprising a database of recorded archaeological sites, find spots, and archaeological events within the county;
- National heritage datasets including the Archaeological Data Service (ADS), Heritage Gateway, OASIS, PastScape, the National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE) Excavation Index and the National Mapping Project (NMP);
3.3.2 A bibliography of documentary, archive and cartographic sources is included in the References section of this report (Section 8).

3.4 Site visit

3.4.1 The Site was visited on the 11th April 2016. Weather conditions were dry and clear. A fieldwork record comprising digital photography is held in the project archive.

3.4.2 The aim of the Site visit was to assess the general aspect, character, condition and setting of the Site and to identify any prior impacts not evident from secondary sources. The Site visit also sought to ascertain if the Site contained any previously unidentified features of archaeological, architectural or historic interest.

3.4.3 A key objective of the Site visit was the gathering of observations upon which to assess the potential for the development proposals to affect the settings of heritage assets (see Section 3.6).

3.5 Assessment criteria- Significance

3.5.1 Significance (for heritage policy) is defined in NPPF Annex 2 as:

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

3.5.2 Current national guidance for the assessment of the significance of heritage assets is based on criteria provided by English Heritage (now Historic England) in the document Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (2008). Within this document, significance is weighed by consideration of the potential for the asset to demonstrate the following value criteria:

- **Evidential value** Deriving from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity;
- **Historical value** Deriving from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. It tends to be illustrative or associative;
- **Aesthetic value** Deriving from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place; and
- **Communal value** Deriving from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory. Communal values are closely bound up with historical (particularly associative) and aesthetic values, but tend to have additional and specific aspects.

3.5.3 The relative significance of heritage assets has been determined in accordance with the categories laid out below in Table 1 (after Highways Agency, 2007; Table 5.1, 6.1 and 7.1).
Table 1: Categories of heritage assets classified according to significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very High    | World Heritage Sites (including nominated sites)  
|              | Assets of recognised international importance  
|              | Assets that contribute to international research objectives |
| High         | Scheduled Monuments  
|              | Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings  
|              | Grade II Listed Buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations  
|              | Grade I and Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens  
|              | Registered Battlefields  
|              | Non-designated assets of national importance  
|              | Assets that contribute to national research agendas |
| Moderate     | Grade II Listed Buildings  
|              | Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens  
|              | Conservation Areas  
|              | Assets that contribute to regional research objectives |
| Low          | Locally listed buildings  
|              | Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor contextual associations  
|              | Assets with importance to local interest groups  
|              | Assets that contribute to local research objectives |
| Negligible   | Assets with little or no archaeological, architectural or historical interest |
| Unknown      | The importance of the asset has not been ascertained from available evidence |

3.6 Setting assessment

3.6.1 Annex 2 of the NPPF defines the setting of a heritage asset 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.’

3.6.2 The aim of the setting assessment, presented in Section 6, was to explore the potential effects of the proposed development on the settings of designated and non-designated heritage assets situated within the wider context of the Site.

3.6.3 The manner in which the setting assessment was undertaken was guided by the recommendations outlined in Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning. Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2015).

3.6.4 The aforementioned guidance issued by Historic England advocates a systematic and staged approach to the assessment of the implications of development in terms of their effects on the settings of heritage assets.

3.6.5 Step 1 of the approach is ‘identifying the heritage assets affected and their settings’.

3.6.6 This initial step of the setting assessment has been carried out by undertaking a Scoping Exercise, the results of which are presented in Section 6.2.
3.6.7 The Scoping Exercise employed a GIS-based viewshed analysis in order to aid the identification of those heritage assets and their settings that might be affected by the development proposals. The methodology employed in this regard is set out in Appendix 4.

3.6.8 The Scoping Exercise also aimed to identify any additional designated and/or non-designated heritage assets that were not highlighted by the viewshed analysis, which nevertheless share intervisibility with the Site, or that may be affected by non-visual effects resulting from the development proposals.

3.6.9 The potential for the proposed development to effect change upon the settings of the heritage assets included in the Scoping Exercise was then assessed via the application of professional judgement, informed by observations made during the Site visit.

3.6.10 Where it could be confidently determined that a heritage asset and its setting would not be affected by the development proposals, no further assessment was undertaken.

3.6.11 In cases where it could be anticipated that the development proposals may have the potential to alter the setting of a heritage asset, these assets were scoped in for further detailed assessment. These heritage assets were assessed on a case by case basis, in accordance with Steps 2 and 3 of the process outlined below.

3.6.12 **Step 2** requires consideration of ‘whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s)’. This stage of the assessment should first address the key attributes of the heritage asset itself and then consider:

- the physical surroundings of the asset, including its relationship with other heritage assets;
- the way the asset is appreciated; and
- the asset’s associations and patterns of use.

3.6.13 **Step 3** is ‘Assessing the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the asset(s)’. This stage of the assessment addresses the key attributes of the proposed development, such as its:

- Location and siting;
- Form and appearance;
- Additional effects; and
- Permanence.

3.6.14 **Step 4** of the guidance issued by Historic England is to explore opportunities for ‘maximising enhancement and minimising harm’, while **Step 5** is to ‘make and document the decision and monitor outcomes’. For the purposes of this assessment, only Steps 1-3 of the process have been followed.

3.7 **Assumptions and limitations**

3.7.1 Data used to compile this report consists of secondary information derived from a variety of sources, only some of which have been directly examined for the purposes of this Study. The assumption is made that this data, as well as that derived from other secondary sources, is reasonably accurate.
3.7.2 The records held by the NHER 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. The information held within it is not complete and does not preclude the subsequent discovery of further elements of the historic environment that are, at present, unknown.

3.8 Copyright

3.8.1 This report may contain material that is non-Wessex Archaeology copyright (e.g. Ordnance Survey, British Geological Survey, Crown Copyright), or the intellectual property of third parties, which Wessex Archaeology are able to provide for limited reproduction under the terms of our own copyright licences, but for which copyright itself is non-transferable by Wessex Archaeology. Users remain bound by the conditions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 with regard to multiple copying and electronic dissemination of the report.

4 BASELINE RESOURCE

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The following section provides a brief summary of the archaeological and historical development of the Site and the Study Area, compiled from the sources summarised above and detailed in the references section of this report (Section 8). The aim is to establish the known and potential historic environment resource that could be affected by the development proposals.

4.1.2 All heritage assets identified within the Study Area are listed in Appendix 3. The NHLE and NHER entries are assigned a unique number within the text and given a WA/LB prefix for ease of reference.

4.2 Designated heritage assets

Site

4.2.1 There are no designated heritage assets within the Site.

Study Area

4.2.2 Designated heritage assets within the Study Area comprise:

One Scheduled Monument:

- **WA03 & WA04**: two Bronze Age round barrows on Horsford Heath.

One Grade II Listed Building:

- **LB01**: St Helena’s Mill - a tower windmill built in 1858.

4.2.3 There are no World Heritage Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, Archaeology Priority Areas, Conservation Areas or Locally Listed Buildings within the Study Area.

4.2.4 Designated heritage assets located within the Study Area are depicted in Figure 1.

4.3 Previous studies

Site

4.3.1 No record of any previous intrusive archaeological investigation within the Site has been identified during the preparation of this assessment.
4.3.2 The NHER contains entries pertaining to two intrusive investigations which have been carried out within the Study Area. These comprise:

- **WA 14**: two phases of evaluation, three small excavation areas and a watching brief were undertaken on land off Mill Lane to the immediate south of the Site. Here a number of Late Iron Age to Romano-British fire pits and other discrete features were found.
- **WA47**: an 11 trench evaluation at Pinelands Industrial Estate to the south of the Site found no archaeological features.

4.3.3 The NHER contains entries pertaining to a large number of non-intrusive investigations which have been carried out within the Study Area. These comprise:

- **The Norfolk National Mapping Project** is one of 64 Historic England National Mapping Projects, which aim to identify, map and interpret all archaeological sites throughout England visible on aerial photographs. The aim of the programme is to gain an understanding and to provide a synthesis of past human settlement and activity from the Neolithic period to the 20th century. The Norfolk NMP uses a variety of aerial photographs, including the approximately 86,000 aerial photographs in the Norfolk Air Photograph Library. The National Monuments Record collection (held at Swindon), Cambridge University aerial photographs from the Unit for Landscape Modelling and vertical photography from Norfolk County Council are amongst the other sources consulted.
- **Earthwork Surveys**: two earthwork surveys have been undertaken by B. Cushion within the Study Area that have identified a number of surviving archaeological features. In 2003 an investigation of earthworks north of Horsford Castle was carried out, which lies to the south-east of the Study Area while in 2011 a rapid earthwork identification survey was done of the Houghen Plantation, which is located across the western side of the Study Area.
- **Metal Detecting Surveys**: two metal detecting surveys WA34 and WA35 have been undertaken of fields at the far western edge of the Study Area.

4.3.4 Where relevant, the results of these investigations are discussed in further detail in Section 4.5.

4.3.5 Results from the National Mapping Project carried out within the Study Area are illustrated in Figure 2.

4.4 Archaeological and historical context

4.4.1 The following section provides a brief summary of the archaeological and historical development of the Site and the Study Area, compiled from the sources listed above. The likelihood of as yet unrecorded archaeological remains within the Site is informed by the consideration of the known heritage assets within the Study Area, in conjunction with the geology and topography of the area.

4.4.2 Records obtained from the NHLE, NHER, Norfolk NMP and other sources are listed in Appendix 3 and illustrated in Figures 1 & 2.

**Neolithic (4000 – 2400 BC)**

4.4.3 A single Neolithic record is located within the Study Area. Situated 983 m to the south of the Site, (WA01) a part-polished Neolithic handaxe of grey marbled flint was found in an
4.4.4 A number of Bronze Age records are located within the Study Area. **WA02** represents an identified Bronze Age barrow cemetery located within Horsford Woods 179 m to the north of the Site. This dispersed cemetery covers approximately 1.1 km² of heathland and plantation and extends northeast out of the Study Area. It is thought to contain ten or more possible Bronze Age barrows some of which have been previously identified on the ground; however, the majority have been observed as cropmarks or earthworks through the systematic study of aerial photographs as part of the Norfolk NMP.

4.4.5 The earliest identified barrows in the cemetery are two oval barrows which were recorded in 1936. These two barrows have since been classed as a single Scheduled Monument, which is represented by **WA03**. The eastern barrow of this schedule corresponds with HER entry 7773 (**Plate 10**). However, the western barrow of the schedule does not align with any given HER data. To the immediate southwest of the western scheduled area is **WA04** (HER entry 7772) which the supplied HER data suggests is the other barrow pertaining to this schedule. The discrepancy in the data is the reason this barrow has not been incorporated into **WA03** although it is almost certain this area should be part of the Scheduled Monument. Both barrows are of substantial size, measuring 35 m x 21 m and 42 m x 25 m and appear to respect the 35m contour line, sitting on the edge of a ridge of high ground that slopes away to the northeast into the Bure Valley.

4.4.6 **WA05** is the Site of a possible round barrow. There are records of Site visits in 1976 and 2012, which could not identify any surviving earthworks however the record from the 2009 NMP survey suggests a possible feature could be seen measuring 8.4m diameter albeit this is a tentative record that may relate to change in vegetation cover and should be treated with caution. Situated within the area of **WA05** is a possible ring ditch **WA06** that has been identified by the NMP. Similarly this record is based on tentative cropmark and has only been recorded due to its proximity to other barrows.

4.4.7 **WA07** is the location of a double concentric ring ditch of a barrow. The barrow was surveyed in 1973 with an inner bank 3 m wide and 0.3 m deep, a 6 m wide berm and a ditch around the central earthwork. The barrow was also observed as part of the NMP which recorded a central mound of 15 m diameter with a 1.8 m wide inner ditch, and 2.7 m outer ditch separated by a bank between 2 and 7.4 m wide. The record does say that this feature was adjusted 80 m northwest from its original proposed location. Another double concentric ring ditch barrow is located at **WA08** that was first reported by the Forestry Commission in 1982.

4.4.8 There are two further records of barrows at **WA09** and **WA10** seen as cropmarks, although both entries acknowledge that they may be referring to the same feature, which is more likely to be located at **WA09**. The final barrow record within the cemetery is at **WA11**, which was first recorded by the Forestry Commission. As part of the Norfolk NMP the interpretation of this record is that it may be a natural topographic feature that may have been augmented by human activity.

4.4.9 Beyond the extents of the Bronze Age cemetery a further potential barrow has been identified at **WA12**, 547 m west of the Site. This was found during an earthwork identification survey in 2011. Located 105 m to the east of the Site at **WA13** a Bronze Age copper alloy socketed axehead was recovered in 1976 from the field to the northeast of Sharp’s Hall Farm. A number of prehistoric worked flint implements were found during
metal detecting of a field to the west of the Study Area at **WA34**, although no date for the tools is given.

*Iron Age (700 BC – AD 43) and Romano-British (AD 43 – 410)*

4.4.10 The fields to the immediate south of the Site and to the southwest of Sharp’s Hall Farm **WA14** have undergone extensive archaeological investigations prior to the construction of a residential development. In 2013 Wessex Archaeology undertook a geophysical survey which was subsequently followed in 2014 by two phases of evaluation, three small areas of strip, map and sample excavation and a watching brief. The investigation works identified and recorded a number of fire pits, some of which contained fragments of slag and hammerscale recovered from the charcoal rich deposits found sealed within the pits. Based on the morphology of the recovered slag a possible Late Iron Age to Romano-British date has been given to the features. A number of other discrete features were recorded across the site and it was noted that there appeared to be a greater concentration of features towards the north of the Site. This would potentially mean that similar features could be expected within the Site boundaries of the current proposed development.

4.4.11 Located 238 m east of the Site **WA15** is a record for the discovery for a Roman coin of Antoninus Pius which gives the minting of the coin a mid-2nd Century AD date. A Romano-British quern stone was recovered after ploughing at **WA16**, 868 m to the west of the Site. The find is the upper part of a quern made from puddingstone and iron spindle fragments were still present in the central hole.

4.4.12 Romano-British finds have been recovered during metal detecting across the western edge of the Study Area. A Roman stud was found at **WA34** while a brooch was found at **WA35**.

*Saxon (AD 410 – 1066)*

4.4.13 There are no specific Saxon record points within the Study Area. A metal detecting survey at the western edge of the Study Area at **WA35** has produced two Middle Saxon brooches, a Middle Saxon pin and a Late Saxon bridle cheek piece.

4.4.14 The village of Horsford is recorded in the Doomsday Book and so is likely to have had Saxon origins. The village would have lain to the south of the Study Area possibly at the fording point of the Hor Beck, from where the settlement gets its name. In 1066 the village was one of many holdings belonging to Edric of Laxfield who held lands across Norfolk. By 1086 the village had been given to Robert Malet the son of Norman Lord William Malet.

*Medieval (AD 1066 – 1500) and Post-medieval (AD 1500 – 1800)*

4.4.15 The Barony of ‘Horseford’ was given to Walter de Cadomo, a knight of Robert Malet. He built Horsford motte and bailey castle, now a Scheduled Monument (List Entry 1003998) which lies c. 1 km southeast of the Study Area. Two parks were formed around the castle. Little Park lay to the south and is likely to have functioned as the deer park. Great Park lay to the north of the castle and extends into the southeast corner of the Study Area **WA17**. The parkland was first documented in 1302 and an earthwork survey undertaken in 2003 to the north of the castle identified surviving elements of the park which were mapped on post-medieval and later cartographic sources.

4.4.16 As part of the Norfolk NMP two broad linear of cropmarks have been identified at **WA18** as medieval ditches forming a rectilinear enclosure 800 m west of the Site. These features appear to be on a similar alignment to the earliest phase of a series of features identified
at WA19 on the northwestern edge of the Study Area. Here two phases of bank and ditch cropmarks have been observed on aerial photographs on slightly different alignments. The earlier, fainter linear features have been given a tentative medieval date while the more substantial features, some of which potentially correspond with boundary alignments on early historic mapping, have been given a post-medieval date.

4.4.17 The rapid earthwork identification survey of the Houghen Plantation undertaken in 2011 recorded two extraction pits 689 m northwest of the Site (WA20). It is possible these pre-date the 1780 enclosure of the area although without further investigation only a medieval to post-medieval date range can be given. Also during the same survey, a possible medieval to post-medieval pillow mound was identified at WA21 689m west of the Site. This comprises two linear mounds 10 m long by 4 m wide, with relatively smooth profiles and has been interpreted as former rabbit warrens.

4.4.18 The Norfolk NMP has identified a number of locations of linear cropmarks pertaining to medieval or post-medieval field boundaries. WA22 is immediately to the east of the Site and represents a linear ditch seen on the 1841 Tithe Map. An earlier, fainter phase of this cropmark ditch is visible on the north side of Green Lane. WA23 to the northeast of the Site is a cropmark observed on the same alignment of boundary depicted on the Tithe Map.

4.4.19 A large area to the southeast of the Site (WA24), located within Horsford Castle Park (WA17) has been identified as having a number of medieval or post-medieval field boundaries and trackways visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. It is possible that there is more than one phase of activity within the area. A similar series of linear ditches and trackways are recorded at WA25, 574 m southwest of the Site. WA26 represents further fragmentary linear features observed on aerial photographs. They lie within an area of World War II activity around a searchlight battery (WA37). However, these features do not align with any activity seen of photographs of this time therefore given their proximity immediately to the north of WA24 and similar alignment, they have been given and earlier date of medieval or post-medieval.

4.4.20 During the earthwork survey to the north of Horsford Castle a substantial and well-defined bank and ditch were identified at WA27, 700 m southeast of the Site. These have been given a tentative post-medieval date as they do not align with any features seen on historic mapping. The 2011 earthwork survey found two post-medieval boundary banks at WA28 and WA29 to the west of the Site. It is thought that WA29 may date to the enclosure of the area in 1780, as it is seen on the Enclosure Map defining the edge of common land, while WA28 may be a pre-enclosure field boundary.

4.4.21 During metal detecting surveys at WA34 and WA35 at the far west of the Study Area, numerous medieval and post-medieval coins and pieces of metalwork have been recovered.

4.4.22 Faden’s Map of 1797 depicts the broad area of the Site (Figure 4: A). The triangle of land formed by Holt Road, Mill Lane and Green Lane can be seen. A fourth trackway is shown cutting north-northeast across the area and directly across Horsford Heath. It is likely that the present development site lies to the northwest of this trackway. The alignment of the track may correspond with cropmarks WA22 seen to the east of the Site.

19th Century (AD 1800 – 1900)

4.4.23 Located 1 km south of the Site is the former site of a Wesleyan Chapel built in 1862 by Mr Philip Blyth (WA30). The chapel was later bought and in 1865 and a National School for
100 children with a teachers house was constructed in a Gothic style on the site. A new chapel for the Free Methodists was built at WA31 in 1866.

4.4.24 Two 19th Century milestones with OS benchmarks WA32 and WA33 survive on Holt Road to the southwest and northwest of the Site.

4.4.25 The 1802 Horsford Enclosure Map (Figure 4: B) shows the eastern half of the Site being part of a large triangular enclosure awarded to Matthew Catchpole. The northwestern corner of the Site lies within a much smaller trapezium apportionment awarded to John Wade although the copyhold of the Site remained with Horsford Manor. Further smaller rectangular enclosures border between the Site and Holt Road. The 1817 Ordnance Survey Drawing of the area (not reproduced here) shows less detail suggesting the site lies wholly within an irregular shaped parcel of land at the junction of Holt Road and Green Lane.

4.4.26 The 1841 Horsford Tithe Map (Figure 4: C) shows a number of subdivisions within the Site; these are all parallel or perpendicular to Holt Road. The eastern part of the Site is now defined by a boundary and is formed of four separate plots each of which extend beyond the present Site boundary. These four plots are owned by Thomas Osborne Springfield, former Mayor of Norwich in 1829 & 1836, and occupied by Thomas Watts. Plot 460 is recorded as pastureland, plots 461 and 462 are plantation woodland and plot 463 is arable land. The western part of the Site has been divided into two rectangular plots and a triangular plot fronting onto Holt Road. These three plots are all owned by John Wade (likely to be the same John Wade awarded the land in 1802 or his son). The northern plot 426 is recorded as a cottage and garden although no building is shown on the land. The other two plots 427 and 428 are arable land.

4.4.27 The 1882 Ordnance Survey Map (Figure 4: D) shows the eastern half of the Site has been divided on a northwest to southeast alignment into three long plots, the northwestern of which is the only area that remains as sparse coniferous plantation. Furze or gores is shown along the western and southern extents of this area and deciduous trees are depicted along the far eastern and western field boundaries. By this time, a number of structures with outbuildings have been constructed fronting directly onto Holt Road including the Flag Cutters Arms at the junction of Holt Road and Green Lane. All of these buildings are just outside the proposed Site boundary.

Modern (AD 1900 – present day)

4.4.28 By the time of the 1907 Ordnance Survey Map (Figure 5: A) the internal boundaries within the eastern half of the Site have been removed and the plot appears to have been entirely converted to farmland. A trackway is now located along the eastern boundary. The buildings along Holt Road have been enclosed suggesting the lands to the rear of the properties may have been sold off.

4.4.29 A number of Second World War features have been identified by the Norfolk NMP across the Study Area. WA36 to the immediate north and west of the Site is an area that was used for military practise excavation of hand-dug trenches. It is associated with a larger military practise area to the northwest of the Study Area and the present Rifle Range located 220 m north of the Site that was in use during the Second World War. WA37 to the southeast of the Site is location of a Second World War searchlight battery with a row of five huts. To the south of the battery is WA38, which has been interpreted as a bomb crater. The 2011 earthwork identification survey found a number of depressions at WA39 that have been interpreted as further Second World War military activity associated with WA36.
4.4.30 The only change shown on the 1957 Provisional Ordnance Survey Map (Figure 5: B) is that a small rectangular structure has been constructed just within the western boundary of the Site. The later 1971 Ordnance Survey Map shows (Figure 5: C) the eastern boundary of the Site has been removed incorporating it into a large L shaped field that extends from Green Lane to Mill Lane. Further properties have been constructed along Holt Road to the west along with the beginnings of the small residential estate to the southwest of Oliver Crescent and Barrett Lennard Road. The two residential houses to the north have been built and enclosed along with the area of the adjacent grassed fields. One of the field boundaries within the western half of the Site has been removed. There is no change shown on the 1996 Ordnance Survey Map (Figure 5: D).

4.4.31 The Site visit confirmed that the building within the western boundary of the Site on the 1957-1996 Ordnance Survey Maps no longer exists. Also, the rear gardens of two of the properties that back onto the large western field have been extended creating the dog leg in the present Site boundary.

Undated

4.4.32 There are a number of undated records within the Study Area. The Norfolk NMP has identified a linear ditch cropmark within the western extent of the Site (WA40). It is on a north to south alignment and approximately 3.9 m wide.

4.4.33 An undated square enclosure located on Horsford Heath to the north of the Site was first recorded in the 1930s (WA41). It has been suggested that this is the ‘Warren House’ marked on Fadens Map on of 1797 (Figure 4: A), although the drawn location is potentially 1.5 km southeast of the known earthwork. The Norfolk NMP measured the enclosure as 52 m by 57 m and identified a small internal bank feature 18 m by 19 m.

4.4.34 The 2011 earthwork survey identified an enclosure boundary bank at WA42, to the west of the Site. The bank appears to act as a flood defence separating dryland from wetter areas either side of a watercourse. WA46 is the location of a raised triangular area identified by the earthwork survey. It is possible it is associated with a house and garden seen on the 1841 Tithe Map.

4.4.35 In 2009, a field visit identified an area of quarrying at WA43 to the north of the Site. This record lies within the area of identified Second World War military activity therefore it is possible that these shallow hollows relate to same period. WA45 to the northwest of the Site is recorded as a 2 m diameter steep sided hole identified in 1986. The entry suggests it may have been used for charcoal burning, although with its location within an area of known military activity (WA36) it is possible this too is of modern date.

4.4.36 Situated 670 m southwest of the Site, WA44 is an area where iron working waste and fragments of furnace were found after the field was converted to arable and was ploughed for the first time in 1971.

Negative

4.4.37 Located to the south of the Site on the south side of Holt Road WA47, Oxford Archaeology East undertook an evaluation in 2010. No archaeological finds or features predating the 20th century were found.

4.5 Historic Landscape Character

4.5.1 The general Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) (Broadland District Council, 2013) for the area is that of Woodland Heath Mosaic classed as ‘generally flat, plateau landscape, covered with a pattern of large-scale woodland and plantations’. A mixture of
old deciduous woodland and more recent coniferous plantations are peppered with small areas of remnant heathland contained within the woodland. The woodland is interspersed with relatively large arable fields.

4.5.2 The LCA gives a Historic Environment Character for the area: ‘Although there is little evidence of early settlement within the Woodland Heath Mosaic Type, remains of several prehistoric barrows exist; two being found on Horsford Common. Neolithic, Bronze and Iron Age occupation is also represented by recorded findspots of items such as Neolithic flint axes and flint extractions or later Bronze Age metalwork.

4.5.3 Evidence of Roman occupation is again limited to findspots however, Early Medieval presence is reflected in upstanding earthworks such as the Norman motte and bailey of Horsford Castle.

4.5.4 By the Iron Age, open agricultural landscapes were widespread in this Character Type and by 1750 a mixture of open fields and enclosures, with some woods and heath occurred. Parliamentary enclosure was to change the pattern of fields when in was introduced; the earliest example of which was around Felthorpe prior to 1793. Today’s landscape pattern is influenced by its agricultural history with a mixture of 18th – 19th century enclosures, 20th century agriculture, heath and large patches of woodland. Ancient replanted woodlands, which are defined as having pre 1650s origins, are scattered across this Character Type.

4.5.5 More recently the landscape has been influenced by World War I and World War II activity with some new build, such as pillboxes and some temporary conversions such as Felthorpe Hall, which was converted into a Red Cross Hospital during World War I.

4.5.6 The settlement pattern [is] generally scattered and consists of linear villages that line straight roads, which cut across the landscape. Farms are dotted about the villages that have retained some of their character with a mix of old and new houses. Vernacular dwellings are mostly constructed of red or colourwashed brick, or a mixture of brick and flint or brick and timber frame. Small manor houses, many with moats suggest a medieval origin, highlighting the settled nature of the landscape’ (Broadland District Council 2013).

4.6 Assessment of survival and previous impacts

4.6.1 It is anticipated that, as the Site has not been previously developed, any disturbance to buried archaeological remains that may be present would be largely restricted to truncation caused by ploughing and tree planting. The installation of land drainage systems may also have caused localised disturbance, although this is unlikely to have significantly diminished the archaeological potential of the Site.

5 POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS- PHYSICAL IMPACTS

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This section provides an initial assessment of the potential effects of the proposed development in relation to elements of the historic environment resource that may be subject to physical impacts. The following predictions as to the potential effects of the proposed development are based upon draft design proposals. As a result, the statements presented below should be regarded as provisional.
5.2 Summary of known and potential historic environment resource

5.2.1 The following table (Table 2) presents a summary of the known and potential elements of the historic environment resource within the Site and its vicinity, which could be physically affected by the development proposals, based on the information presented in Section 4.

5.2.2 Entries in the table are assigned a ‘Potential’ rating, which represents a measure of probability. This has been determined via the application of professional judgement, informed by the evidence presented in the preceding sections of this assessment. ‘Potential’ is expressed on a four point scale, assigned in accordance with the following criteria:

- **High** Situations where heritage assets are known or strongly suspected to be present within the Site or its vicinity and which are likely to be well preserved.
- **Moderate** Includes cases where there are grounds for believing that heritage assets may be present, but for which conclusive evidence is not currently available. This category is also applied in situations in which heritage assets are likely to be present, but also where their state of preservation may have been compromised.
- **Low** Circumstances where the available information indicates that heritage assets are unlikely to be present, or that their state of preservation is liable to be severely compromised.
- **Unknown** Cases where currently available information does not provide sufficient evidence on which to provide an informed assessment with regard to the potential for heritage assets to be present.

5.2.3 The relative ‘Significance’ of known and potential heritage assets included in Table 2 has been determined in accordance with the criteria set out in Section 3.5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Period and Description</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Previous impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Late Iron Age to Romano-British</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Limited disturbance from 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Century and Modern farming practices and the formation and removal of field boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; century &amp; Modern</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>Limited disturbance from 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Century and Modern farming practices and the formation and removal of field boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval to Post-medieval</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Limited disturbance from 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Century and Modern farming practices and the formation and removal of field boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Limited disturbance from 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Century and Modern farming practices and the formation and removal of field boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Summary of known and potential historic environment resource within the Site**

Late Iron Age and Romano-British activity has been identified in the adjacent field to the south of the Site WA14. The apparent concentration of archaeological features to the north of this area would suggest that this activity is likely to extend into the Site boundary.

Cartographic sources suggest that there have been a number of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century field boundaries that have cut across the Site. The boundaries that would have been formed of ditches and treelines were located on northwest to southeast and northeast to southwest alignments.

There is extensive evidence for Bronze Age burial activity to the north of the Site WA02-WA11. However, the Barrow cemetery is not thought to extend as far south as the proposed development. A single Bronze Age axehead was found in a field to the east of the Site WA13 suggesting the potential for activity from this period to be Moderate.

A medieval to post-medieval cropmark has been observed close to the Site WA22, coupled with an undated cropmark located within the Site WA40, the potential for medieval to post-medieval features within the Site is classed as Moderate.

The only evidence of Saxon activity within the Study Area is from metal detecting finds at the far western edge of this assessment WA35 leading to a low potential rating.
| Unknown       | Palaeolithic to Neolithic and Early Iron Age | There is little evidence within the Study Area records pertaining to these periods. There is a single Neolithic find spot recorded at the southern edge of the Study Area **WA01**. This may, in part, be due to the limited number and small-scale nature of any recent archaeological investigations within the area. | Limited disturbance from 19th Century and Modern farming practices and the formation and removal of field boundaries | Moderate |
5.3 Statement of potential impact

Designated heritage assets

5.3.1 The implementation of the development proposals would result in no physical impacts to any designated heritage assets. The potential for the development proposals to affect the settings of designated heritage assets is explored in Section 6.

Archaeological remains

5.3.2 The implementation of the Proposed Development is anticipated to entail the following sources of ground disturbance and excavations:

- Preliminary site investigation works;
- Setting up a secure construction compound within the Site;
- Plant movement;
- Topsoil stripping;
- Piling and/or excavation of new foundation trenches;
- Installation of services, drainage and other infrastructure;
- Establishment of new car parking areas, estate roads and access points;
- Hard and soft landscaping works (levelling, remodelling); and
- Environmental enhancement works, including planting.

5.3.3 The aforementioned works have the potential to result in the damage to or loss of any buried archaeological features which may be present within their footprint. This could in turn result in a total or partial loss of significance of these heritage assets.

5.3.4 Any adverse impact to buried archaeological features would be permanent and irreversible in nature. This potential adverse effect could be reduced through the implementation of an appropriate scheme of archaeological mitigation.

5.3.5 The most destructive elements of the development proposals in terms of below ground archaeology (should any such remains be present within the Site) would be likely to be associated with the main construction areas.

Historic Landscape Character

5.3.6 The plots of land that make up the Site have never conformed directly with the general landscape characterisation of the area of 'generally flat, plateau landscape, covered with a pattern of large-scale woodland and plantations'. The majority of the Site has been farmland since the earliest cartographic sources. The former areas of woodland within the Site have been sparse and appear not to have been part of the major managed plantations to the north. The conversion of the Site to a residential development would alter the immediate landscape character although this would have no effect on the surrounding woodland plantations.

6 POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS- SETTINGS OF HERITAGE ASSETS

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This section presents an assessment of the potential effects of the development proposals in relation to the settings of heritage assets, in accordance with the methodology set out in Section 3.6.
6.1.2 It should be noted that the assessment of the potential effects of the proposed development presented in this section are based upon draft design proposals. Consequently, the following statements should be regarded as provisional.

6.2 Scoping exercise

6.2.1 The viewshed analysis determined that, outside of the limit of the 1 km Study Area, visibility beyond the Site is, theoretically, quite extensive within a 5 km radius.

6.2.2 The following designated heritage assets were identified within the ZTV:

- Five Scheduled Monuments;
- Three Grade I Listed Buildings
- Four Grade II* Listed Buildings; and
- One Grade II Listed Building.

6.2.3 No World Heritage Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens or Registered Battlefields were identified within the ZTV.

6.2.4 Designated heritage assets identified within the ZTV are illustrated in Figure 3 and listed in Appendix 5.

6.2.5 Given the distance at which all of the designated heritage assets within the Study Area are located from the Site, it is anticipated that non-visual effects arising from the proposed development would not result in any adverse impacts to the settings of these assets.

6.2.6 The Site is surrounded in close proximity by 20th and 21st century residential developments to the west and south. The presence of these buildings, which are predominantly of at least two storeys, effectively block any views beyond the immediate surroundings of the Site. Views to the east are slightly more extensive over the arable fields adjacent to the Site, however these are then restricted by further woodland beyond. Views from the Site to the north are blocked by the Horsford Wood coniferous plantation.

6.2.7 A single designated heritage asset, the Grade II Listed St Helena’s Mill (LB01) (NHLE no. 1051547) was confirmed to be visible from the northeastern corner of the Site. Only the wooden reconstructed cap of the windmill is visible from the furthest edge of the Site (Plates 11 & 12), the main tower of the windmill is effectively screened by residential housing and to an extent, mature trees situated along the southeastern Site boundary. Due to the presence of modern intervening residential developments and the limited area of visibility at the northeastern corner of the Site it is considered that the proposed development would result in no adverse harm upon the setting of this heritage asset therefore it has not been scoped into a detailed assessment.

6.2.8 The closest Scheduled Monument to the Site are the round barrows WA03/WA04 that lie 0.27 km to the north, within the Bronze Age barrow cemetery WA02. It was established that due to the barrows location within the Horsford Wood coniferous planation they do not share any intervisibility with the Site (Plate 13), however due to their proximity to the Site and that of the funerary landscape in which they are located, the barrows were scoped in for further detailed assessment in the following section.

6.2.9 Due to the screening effect of surrounding topography, intervening development, and woodland plantations the Site does not share intervisibility with any of the remaining designated heritage assets identified within the ZTV. Therefore, the Site is not considered to constitute, or contribute to the settings of these heritage assets and, as such, the visual
effects associated with the development proposals would not result in any adverse impacts to them. As the development proposals are considered to entail no risk of affecting the settings of these heritage assets, no further assessment has been undertaken in relation to them.

6.2.10 The results of the Scoping Exercise are summarised in Appendix 5.

6.3 Two round barrows on Horsford Heath

The asset and its setting

6.3.1 The scheduled round barrows on Horsford Heath (NHLE No. 1003164) comprise two oval prehistoric funerary monuments that are part of a wider Bronze Age funerary landscape. The eastern barrow measures 35 m by 21 m and is aligned northeast to southwest. The western barrow is up to 1.5 m high and measures 41 m by 25 m and is aligned northwest to southeast. Both barrows are located in clearings within mature coniferous plantations and appear to be located on the 35m aOD contour line.

Contribution of the setting to the significance of the asset

6.3.2 The monuments derive their significance from their evidential value. Both the mounds and potential encircling ditches will contain archaeological and palaeoenvironmental evidence relating to their construction, longevity, relative chronologies, territorial significance, social organisation and overall landscape context.

6.3.3 Further significance is derived from the feature’s historical value as surviving examples of oval barrows, being two of a number of potential funerary monuments in the wider landscape indicating that, during Bronze Age period, the area was populated and subject to a degree of social organisation.

6.3.4 The monument’s broader landscape context is also of significance. In antiquity, i.e. when the monument served its original function, the open views of the heath land afforded by the site’s wider visibility would have been important across the surrounding landscape, helping to maintain a link between the funerary monument and local settlements.

6.3.5 It is often observed that prehistoric funerary monuments, such as the barrows in question, appear to have been deliberately sited in order to maintain lines of sight with other contemporary monuments, settlements and/or landscape features. These two barrows lie on northeastern edge of a northwest to southeast ridge of higher ground overlooking gently sloping lands into the Bure Valley. The majority of the recorded barrows located within this funerary landscape are located on the northeast facing slope of this ridge dropping away from the development Site. This may suggest that any former intervisibility connection the monuments may have had with other contemporary monuments, settlements and/or landscape features was orientated to the northeast.

6.3.6 Almost all of the views from the barrows are now severely restricted due to the surrounding 19th Century/modern woodland plantations. Any key views the monuments may have had with the surrounding landscape to the northeast over the valley or to the south across the Site has since been lost. Despite this, the location of the barrows within the woodland has enabled the monuments to retain a quiet tranquillity and contemplative aspect to their setting within an ever-changing landscape beyond.

Potential effects of the proposed development

6.3.7 The scheduled round barrows on Horsford Heath are situated 270 m north of the Site. Neither of the barrows shares intervisibility with the Site due to the intervening woodland plantations (Plate 13). The development does not intrude into the woodland plantation
surrounding the barrows. It is proposed that Green Lane will be widened to allow access to the new development although current plans do not show how this will affect upon the woodland. It is unlikely that increased traffic use at the west end of Green Lane would alter the tranquil nature of the woodland around the barrows.

6.3.8 Accordingly, it is considered that the development proposals would result in no discernible alteration of the monument’s setting.

7 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 General

7.1.1 The effect of the development proposals on the known and potential heritage resource will be a material consideration in determination of the planning application. This study has identified no overriding cultural heritage constraints which are likely to prohibit development.

Designated heritage assets- physical impacts

7.1.2 There will be no physical impact on designated heritage assets as part of the proposed development.

Archaeological remains

7.1.3 This assessment has established that there is an archaeological interest within the Site. This is defined as the potential for the presence of buried archaeological remains, in particular relating to Late Iron Age and Romano-British periods. However, due to a lack of previous archaeological investigation within the Site, the potential for and significance of any such remains could not be accurately assessed on the basis of the available evidence.

7.1.4 Any adverse impact to buried archaeological features as a result of the implementation of the development proposals would be permanent and irreversible in nature. This potential adverse effect could be reduced through the implementation of an appropriate scheme of archaeological mitigation, in accordance with national and local planning policy.

Historic Landscape Character

7.1.5 The proposed development will not fundamentally change the general landscape characterisation for the area as it does not impinge upon the woodland plantations to the north.

Settings of heritage assets

7.1.6 It is considered there will be no impact upon the setting of any of the surrounding designated heritage assets as a result of the proposed development.

7.2 Recommendations

Archaeological remains

7.2.1 The presence, location and significance of any buried archaeological remains within the Site cannot currently be confirmed on the basis of the available information, although significant archaeological remains have been found within close proximity to the Site. As such it is likely that additional investigations may be required by the planning archaeologist for Broadland District Council.

7.2.2 In the first instance this may take the form of a detailed geophysical survey followed by a targeted trial trench evaluation.
7.2.3 The need for, scale, scope and nature of any further archaeological works should be agreed through consultation with the statutory authorities.
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9 APPENDICES

9.1 Appendix 1: Terminology

Glossary
The terminology used in this assessment follows definitions contained within Annex 2 of NPPF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological interest</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially may hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation (for heritage policy)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated heritage assets</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Park and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and Conservation Areas designated under the relevant legislation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage asset</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic environment</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic environment record</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information services that seek to provide access to comprehensive and dynamic resources relating to the historic environment of a defined geographic area for public benefit and use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting of a heritage asset</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance (for heritage policy)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An aspect of worth or importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chronology
Where referred to in the text, the main archaeological periods are broadly defined by the following date ranges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prehistoric</th>
<th>Historic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>970,000 – 9500 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Post-glacial</td>
<td>9500 – 8500 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>8500 – 4000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>4000 – 2400 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>2400 – 700 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>700 BC – AD 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 Appendix 2: Legislative and planning framework

Designated Heritage Assets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Associated Legislation</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Sites</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) World Heritage Committee inscribes World Heritage Sites for their Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) – cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. England protects its World Heritage Sites and their settings, including any buffer zones or equivalent, through the statutory designation process and through the planning system. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out detailed policies for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, including World Heritage Sites, through both plan-making and decision-taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Monuments and Areas of Archaeological Importance</td>
<td>Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</td>
<td>Under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, the Secretary of State (DCMS) can schedule any site which appears to be of national importance because of its historic, architectural, traditional, artistic or archaeological interest. The historic town centres of Canterbury, Chester, Exeter, Hereford and York have been designated as Archaeological Areas of Importance under Part II of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Additional controls are placed upon works affecting Scheduled Monuments and Areas of Archaeological Importance under the Act. The consent of the Secretary of State (DCMS), as advised by Historic England, is required for certain works affecting Scheduled Monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
<td>In England, under Section 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Secretary of State is required to compile lists of buildings of special architectural or historic interest, on advice from English Heritage/Historic England. Works affecting Listed Buildings are subject to additional planning controls administered by Local Planning Authorities. Historic England is a statutory consultee in certain works affecting Listed Buildings. Under certain circumstances, Listed Building Consent is required for works affecting Listed Buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
<td>A Conservation Area is an area which has been designated because of its special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. In most cases, Conservation Areas are designated by Local Planning Authorities. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires authorities to have regard to the fact that there is a Conservation Area when exercising any of their functions under the Planning Acts and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Although a locally administered designation, Conservation Areas may nevertheless be of national importance and significant developments within a Conservation Area are referred to Historic England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields</td>
<td>National Heritage Act 1983</td>
<td>The Register of Parks and Gardens was established under the National Heritage Act 1983. The Battlefields Register was established in 1995. Both Registers are administered by Historic England. These designations are non-statutory but are, nevertheless, material considerations in the planning process. Historic England and the Garden History Society are statutory consultees in works affecting Registered Parks and Gardens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Designation | Associated Legislation | Overview
--- | --- | ---
Protected Wreck Sites | Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 | The Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 allows the Secretary of State to designate a restricted area around a wreck to prevent uncontrolled interference. These statutorily protected areas are likely to contain the remains of a vessel, or its contents, which are of historical, artistic or archaeological importance.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

**NPPF Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment**


**Para. 128** In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

**Para.129** Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

**Para. 132** When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

**Para. 135** The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

**Para. 137** Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

**Para. 139** Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

**Para. 141** Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.
Local Planning Policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy ref.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN2</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>In order to protect the character of the area, development proposals should have regard to the landscape character assessment SPD and, in particular, consider any impact upon as well as seek to protect and enhance where appropriate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Gaps between settlements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Visually sensitive skylines, hillsides, valley sides and important views including the setting of the Broads Area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Nocturnal Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Conservation Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Scheduled Ancient Monuments; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Historic Parks and Gardens; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Green spaces including natural and semi-natural features as well as geological/geomorphological features which make a significant contribution towards defining the character of an area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (Adoption March 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy ref.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1</td>
<td>Addressing Climate Change and Protecting Environmental Assets</td>
<td>To address climate change and promote sustainability, all development will be located and designed to use resources efficiently, minimise greenhouse gas emissions and be adapted to a changing climate and more extreme weather. Development will therefore:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• be energy efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• provide for recycling of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• use locally sourced materials wherever possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• be located to minimise flood risk, mitigating any such risk through design and implementing sustainable drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• minimise water use and protect groundwater sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• make the most efficient appropriate use of land, with the density of development varying according to the characteristics of the area, with the highest densities in centres and on public transport routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• minimise the need to travel and give priority to low impact modes of travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• be designed to mitigate and be adapted to the urban heat island effect in Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• improve the resilience of ecosystems to environmental change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            |                                                                      | The environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained, restored and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved. Development and investment will seek to expand and link valuable open space and areas of biodiversity importance to create green networks. Where there is no conflict with biodiversity objectives, the quiet enjoyment and use of the natural environment will be encouraged and all proposals should seek to increase public access to the countryside. All new developments will ensure that there will be no adverse impacts on European and Ramsar designated sites and no adverse impacts on European protected species in the area and beyond including by storm water runoff, water abstraction, or sewage discharge. They will provide for sufficient and appropriate...
Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (Adoption March 2011)
Available at: URL http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/planning/joint-core-strategy/ (Accessed on 30/03/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy ref.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local green infrastructure to minimise visitor pressures. Development likely to have any adverse affect on nationally designated sites and species will be assessed in accordance with national policy and legislation. In areas not protected through international or national designations, development will: • minimise fragmentation of habitats and seek to conserve and enhance existing environmental assets of acknowledged regional or local importance. Where harm is unavoidable, it will provide for appropriate mitigation or replacement with the objective of achieving a long term maintenance or enhancement of the local biodiversity baseline • contribute to providing a multifunctional green infrastructure network, including provision of areas of open space, wildlife resources and links between them, both off site and as an integral part of the development • help to make provision for the long term maintenance of the green infrastructure network • protect mineral and other natural resources identified through the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework The built environment, heritage assets, and the wider historic environment will be conserved and enhanced through the protection of buildings and structures which contribute to their surroundings, the protection of their settings, the encouragement of high-quality maintenance and repair and the enhancement of public spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: Gazetteer of heritage assets within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA No</th>
<th>NHER No/ NHLE No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA01</td>
<td>15183- MNF15183</td>
<td>Neolithic axehead</td>
<td>A Neolithic partially polished flint axehead was found. There were many flint ‘chippings’ in the soil around it.</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>618695</td>
<td>316185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA02</td>
<td>52449- MNF58420</td>
<td>Barrow Cemetery</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. The barrow cemetery at Horsford Woods, centred on TG 1923 1832, represents a group of ten or more possible Bronze Age barrows, some of which are unconfirmed despite systematic study of the available aerial photographs. The dispersed cemetery covers approximately 2.2km by 0.5km of heathland and plantation. The cemetery includes two large embanked barrows with double concentric ring ditches (NHER 7779: WA07 and 18491: WA08), although the latter is no longer visible as an earthwork. Two oval barrows (NHER 7772: WA04 and 7773: WA03) and three round barrows (NHER 7774: WA05, 7777: not in the Study Area and 52450: WA06) are also visible as earthworks. Two possible ring ditches are visible as vegetation marks (NHER 52450: WA06 and 52426: WA09). Also, two previously reported round barrows (NHER 7775: WA10 and 52451: WA11) could not be confirmed from the study of the aerial photographs.</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>619179</td>
<td>318589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA03</td>
<td>7773- MNF7773; 1003164</td>
<td>Two round barrows on Horsford Heath</td>
<td>MNF7773: Eastern part of Scheduled Monument 1003164. November 2009. Norfolk NMP. An oval barrow is visible as an earthwork on aerial photographs (S3)-(S9), centred on TG 1895 1778, within Horsford dispersed barrow cemetery (NHER 52449: WA02). The barrow measures 35m by 21m The barrow is aligned northeast-southwest, and appears to respect the 35m contour line, measuring 35m by 21m. The western barrow is likely to be WA04 (see below).</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>618788</td>
<td>317815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA No</td>
<td>NHER No/ NHLE No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA04</td>
<td>7772-MNF7772; 1003164</td>
<td>Bronze Age round barrow on Horsford Heath</td>
<td>MNF7772: Western part of Scheduled Monument 1003164. The polygon for the Scheduled Monument and the HER are not in the same location so this record has been kept separate. This Bronze Age round barrow stands 1.5m high and measures 41m by 25m. It is surrounded by a birch plantation. It is visible as an earthwork on aerial photographs. November 2009. Norfolk NMP. An oval barrow is visible as an earthwork on aerial photographs (S1)-(S7), centred on TG 1858 1779, within Horsford dispersed barrow cemetery (NHER 52449). The barrow measures 42m by 25m. The barrow is aligned northwest-southeast, and appears to respect the 35m contour line.</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>618584</td>
<td>317794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA05</td>
<td>7774-MNF7774</td>
<td>Site of possible Bronze Age round barrow</td>
<td>Two Bronze Age barrows are recorded in this pine plantation. These could not be found when the site was visited in 1976. However, it was possible to distinguish one possible round barrow earthwork on aerial photographs, and a possible ring ditch, visible as a vegetation mark and recorded separately as NHER 52450: WA06. Could not be found in plantation of young pines. A. J. Lawson (NAU), 7 January 1976. January 2009. Field visit. About two thirds of the HER mapped area/polygon was explored. No barrow earthworks were identified in this area. D. Robertson (HES), 28 August 2012. November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A possible round barrow is visible as an earthwork on aerial photographs (S2), centred on TG 1840 1778, within Horsford Heath plantation area and the dispersed barrow cemetery (NHER 52449: WA02). The barrow measures up to 8.4m in diameter. The earthwork itself is not entirely convincing, and may not be archaeological in nature, but due to the fact that there are several other Bronze Age barrows in the vicinity, and that two possible round barrows were recorded, but never confirmed, in this area (NHER 7774), this feature has been mapped and recorded, albeit with a note of caution, as it is only visible on one set of photographs, and may relate merely to a change in vegetation cover.</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>618405</td>
<td>317782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Land to the East of Holt Road, Horsford, Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA No</th>
<th>NHER No/ NHLE No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA06</td>
<td>52450-MNF58422</td>
<td>Site of possible Bronze Age round barrow</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A possible ring ditch is visible as a vegetation mark on aerial photographs within Horsford Heath plantation area and the dispersed barrow cemetery (NHER 52449: WA02). The vegetation marks themselves are not entirely convincing, and may not be archaeological in nature, but due to the fact that there are several other Bronze Age barrows in the vicinity, and that two possible round barrows were recorded, but never confirmed, in this area (NHER 7774: WA05), this feature has been tentatively dated to the Bronze Age period.</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>618408</td>
<td>317809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA07</td>
<td>7779-MNF7779</td>
<td>Site of Bronze Age round barrow</td>
<td>A Bronze Age round barrow with double concentric ring ditches is visible as earthworks on aerial photographs, on land within Horsford Woods plantation, within a dispersed barrow cemetery (NHER 52449: WA02). 1973. Surveyed by A.J. Lawson (NAU). Circular double bank and ditch. Doubtfully destroyed barrow. Inner bank 3m wide. 0.3m deep, berm 6m wide, ditch round central earthwork. November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A Bronze Age round barrow with double concentric ring ditches is visible as earthworks on aerial photographs (S3-S8), on land within Horsford Woods plantation, within a dispersed barrow cemetery (NHER 52449: WA02). The round barrow has a central mound, measuring approximately 15m in diameter, surrounded by a 1.8m wide inner ditch. This is surrounded by a bank which measures between 2m and 7.4m, but is not evident for the entire width between the two ditches, perhaps due to degradation. The outer ditch is up to 2.7m in width, and the overall external diameter measures 43m. Outside the outer ditch a fragmentary bank is evident to the south east measuring up to 5.2m in width. The site of this barrow has been moved approximately 80m to the northwest of the original site, from TG 1936 1818 to TG 1933 1825.</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>619330</td>
<td>318256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA No</td>
<td>NHER No/ NHLE No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA08</td>
<td>18491-MNF18491</td>
<td>Site of embanked Bronze Age barrow with double concentric ring ditches</td>
<td>On former heath, now Forestry Commission plantation. Small feature cut by track on southeast, resembles a ploughed barrow. Information from letter from Head Forester, Wensum, 1982. November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A large embanked barrow with double concentric ring ditches is visible as an earthwork on aerial photographs on the southern edge of the Horsford Woods plantation and the dispersed barrow cemetery (NHER 52449: WA02).</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>619534</td>
<td>318200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA09</td>
<td>52426-MNF58418</td>
<td>Site of possible Bronze Age round barrow</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A possible ring ditch is visible as a vegetation mark and possibly as a slight earthwork on aerial photographs within Horsford Heath plantation area, and the dispersed barrow cemetery (NHER 52449: WA02). The vegetation marks are not entirely convincing, and may not be archaeological in nature, but due to the fact that there are several other Bronze Age barrows in the vicinity, and that a possible round barrow was recorded, but never confirmed, 20m to the north east (NHER 7775: WA10), this feature has been mapped and recorded, albeit with a note of caution, as it is only visible on two sets of photographs, and rather differently on each one.</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>619184</td>
<td>317998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA10</td>
<td>7775-MNF7775</td>
<td>Possible Bronze Age round barrow</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A Bronze Age barrow is recorded in this plantation. It could not be found when the site was visited in 1976. It was not possible to confirm its existence from a systematic search of the available aerial photographs, however a possible round barrow was recorded 20m to the southwest (NHER 52426: WA09) which may in fact represent this possible barrow.</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>619191</td>
<td>318049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA11</td>
<td>52451-MNF58423</td>
<td>Site of possible Bronze Age round barrow</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A small feature resembling a ploughed out Bronze Age barrow was recorded by the Forestry Commission within a plantation. This feature has been examined on aerial photographs and considered to be a natural topographic feature, possibly augmented by human activity, and it was not possible to confirm that it represents a Bronze Age barrow, despite its location within the Horsford dispersed barrow cemetery (NHER 52449: WA02).</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>618765</td>
<td>318144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA No</td>
<td>NHER No/ NHLE No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA12</td>
<td>55537-MNF61857</td>
<td>Possible Bronze Age barrow</td>
<td>In March 2011 an earthwork survey identified a possible Bronze Age barrow in Whinny Hills coppice woodland.</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>618085</td>
<td>317134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA13</td>
<td>11393-MNF11393</td>
<td>Bronze Age axehead</td>
<td>A Bronze Age copper alloy socketed axehead was found. The cutting edge of the axehead had been damaged in the Bronze Age.</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>619367</td>
<td>317235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA14</td>
<td></td>
<td>MILL LANE, HORSFORD, NORFOLK</td>
<td>In 2013 Wessex Archaeology undertook a geophysical survey of land off Mill Lane. A number of probable and possible archaeological anomalies were identified. These were targeted in two phases of archaeological evaluation works followed by three small areas of excavation and a watching brief in 2014. The works revealed a number of fire pits containing charcoal rich deposits, some of which also produced slag and hammerscale. Wood radiocarbon dates and analysis of the slag suggests a late Iron Age to Romano-British date for the features. A number of other discrete features were recorded. There appeared to be a greater concentration of features to the north of the site.</td>
<td>Late Iron Age to Romano-British</td>
<td>619098</td>
<td>317111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA15</td>
<td>12305-MNF12305</td>
<td>Roman coin</td>
<td>Hoeing around rose bushes led to the discovery of a Roman coin of Antonius Pius.</td>
<td>Romano-British</td>
<td>619356</td>
<td>317185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA16</td>
<td>7790-MNF7790</td>
<td>Roman quern</td>
<td>Part of a Roman quern, which was ploughed up before 1975. Upper stone of puddingstone quern with iron spindle fragments in central hole.</td>
<td>Romano-British</td>
<td>617614</td>
<td>317716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA17</td>
<td>40139-MNF43979</td>
<td>Horsford Castle Park</td>
<td>Late 2003. Documentary Research and Earthwork Survey. The park mentioned in a document dating to 1302 and is shown on a 1773 map. It may be of medieval origins. The park as in two sections. Great Park to the north, Little Park to the south. Little Park is likely to have been a medieval deer park with Lodge Farm as its management centre. The boundary of the park is marked on old maps and in some areas original banks, ditches and hedges may mark the line of the boundary. The castle had one of only three medieval chases in Norfolk. The chase referred to hunting rights over people's land.</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>619945</td>
<td>316537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA No</th>
<th>NHER No</th>
<th>Cropmark Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA18</td>
<td>52366- 617600</td>
<td>Cropmarks of possible medieval rectilinear enclosure</td>
<td>Two broad and blurred linear ditches form a possible rectilinear enclosure and have been tentatively assigned a medieval date on the basis of alignment with linear features recorded 200m to the west as part of NHER 52365: WA19.</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA19</td>
<td>52365- 617411</td>
<td>Cropmarks of post-medieval banks and undated linear ditches</td>
<td>October 2009, Norfolk NMP. Two broad and blurred linear ditches are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. They appear to be medieval in date, but at least some of the linear ditches may relate to an earlier phase of the site. There appear to be two linear banks, at 206m to the south west from the point at which they meet. The south western arm is depicted as a tree line on the Feltorpe Tithe Map (S7), but is not visible on the Ordnance Survey 1st edition map (S6). It is therefore possible that both these features are post-medieval in date. Some of the faint linear ditches appear to be earlier than these two banks, such as those in the north and running from TG 1753 1798 to TG 1733 1760. However, at least one of the linear ditches, running from TG 1753 1798 to TG 1733 1760, does appear to share an alignment with Roman period field system, although at least some of the Cropmark sherds are aligned to the north and may therefore represent a fragment of Roman period field system.</td>
<td>Medieval-Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 2009, Norfolk NMP. A linear bank feature is visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs, together with a number of linear ditch features. Several of these linear ditch features are rather faint and ephemeral, and may actually relate to geological, rather than archaeological features. The banks appear to be post-medieval in date, but at least some of the linear ditches may relate to an earlier phase of the site. The south western arm is depicted as a tree line on the Feltorpe Tithe Map (S7), but is not visible on the Ordnance Survey 1st edition map (S6). It is therefore possible that both these features are post-medieval in date. Some of the faint linear ditches appear to be earlier than these two banks, such as those running from TG 1753 1798 to TG 1733 1760. However, at least one of the linear ditches, running from TG 1753 1798 to TG 1733 1760, does appear to share an alignment with Roman period field system, although at least some of the Cropmark sherds are aligned to the north and may therefore represent a fragment of Roman period field system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA No</th>
<th>NHER No/ NHLE No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA20</td>
<td>55538-MNF61858</td>
<td>Possible pre-enclosure extraction pits</td>
<td>In March 2011 a rapid earthwork survey identified two extraction pits possibly pre-dating enclosure of this area (before 1780). Two extraction pits one approximately 22m in diameter and up to 2m deep and the other 27m in diameter and up to 3m deep with an access ramp to the north-west. It is possible that these pits pre-date the enclosure of this area (before 1780).</td>
<td>Medieval to Post-medieval</td>
<td>617832</td>
<td>317910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA21</td>
<td>55547-MNF61877</td>
<td>Possible medieval or post-medieval pillow mounds</td>
<td>In March 2011 a rapid earthwork survey identified a possible medieval or post-medieval pillow mound. A possible medieval or post-medieval pillow mound comprising two linear mounds 10m in length in a line with a gap of 7m between, both 4m wide and 0.6m high with a relatively smooth profile.</td>
<td>Medieval to Post-medieval</td>
<td>617960</td>
<td>317061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA22</td>
<td>52452-MNF58424</td>
<td>Cropmarks of medieval to post medieval field boundary ditches</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. Linear ditches, partly corresponding to field boundaries, are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. They are aligned roughly south southeast-north northwest, and are bisected by the east-west road, Green Lane, Horsford. The northern-most linear feature is clearly visible on the Tithe Map of 1841, and there appears to be more than one phase of this ditch, as a fainter one is visible for at least half the length of the more defined ditch feature. Both these ditches have been dated to the medieval to post medieval period.</td>
<td>Medieval to Post-medieval</td>
<td>619099</td>
<td>317526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA23</td>
<td>52453-MNF58425</td>
<td>Cropmarks of medieval to post medieval field boundary</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A linear ditch feature, probably a medieval to post medieval field boundary, is visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs to the north east of Green Lane Farm, Horsford. Although this feature is not depicted directly on the Tithe Map of 1841 it is on the same alignment as, and appears to be a continuation of, a linear ditch to the south east which is shown on the Tithe Map, which has survived as the edge of a modern plantation. It has therefore been dated to the medieval or post medieval period.</td>
<td>Medieval to Post-medieval</td>
<td>619301</td>
<td>317762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA No</td>
<td>NHER No/ NHLE No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA24</td>
<td>53205-MNF58432</td>
<td>Site of medieval to post medieval field boundary ditches and possible trackways</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A system of field boundary ditches and trackways, partly depicted on the Tithe Map of 1841, are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs on land to the southeast of Mill Lane Farm, Horsford. Although the majority of features are likely to be medieval to post medieval in date, it is possible that more than one phase of activity is visible on this site, and at least one earlier linear feature may be discernible. It is not quite on the same alignment, but may be similar enough to the ditch features 2.3km to the northwest, NHER 52364: not in the Study Area, and 52365: <strong>WA19</strong>, to suggest that it represents Roman period activity.</td>
<td>Medieval to Post-medieval</td>
<td>619698</td>
<td>316656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA25</td>
<td>52455-MNF58428</td>
<td>Cropmarks of undated fragmentary linear features and possible trackways</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. Several fragmentary linear features are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs on land to the southeast of Felthorpe Common, Horsford. A possible trackway is visible, consisting of two parallel ditches, 5.3m apart, which may represent a continuation of a trackway visible within the plantation to the north. It is likely that all these features represent medieval to post medieval trackways or possible field boundaries, although they may also relate to modern drainage channels.</td>
<td>Medieval to Post-medieval</td>
<td>618132</td>
<td>316757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA26</td>
<td>53209-MNF58436</td>
<td>Site of undated fragmentary linear and possible pit features</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. Two faint fragmentary linear ditches and several possible pit features are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs (S1), to the south of Mill Lane Farm, Horsford. The features are situated within the area of the World War Two searchlight battery (NHER 53203: <strong>WA37</strong>). It is therefore possible that these features are related to World War Two activity on the site, although they do not appear to correspond with any of the features or trackways visible on the wartime photographs. It is also possible that the linear features may be contemporary with the field boundary ditches recorded 350m to the east (NHER 53205: <strong>WA24</strong>), as the western one at least appears to be on a similar, roughly north-south alignment, but it is difficult to be sure.</td>
<td>Medieval to Post-medieval</td>
<td>619428</td>
<td>316874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WA Project No. 101672

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA No</th>
<th>NHER No/ NHLE No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA27</td>
<td>40146-MNF43993</td>
<td>Undated bank and ditch</td>
<td>Late 2003. Earthwork Survey. An undated bank and ditch were identified during a walkover survey of this area in 2003. Substantial and well-defined bank and ditch which links to a scarp forming the south-western edge of the farm buildings of Mill Lane Farm. Significant form suggests a feature of some age, along it does not correspond with anything mark on early cartographic sources.</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>619474</td>
<td>316648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA28</td>
<td>55541-MNF61865</td>
<td>Post-medieval common-edge boundary bank</td>
<td>In March 2011 a rapid earthwork survey observed this boundary is shown on the Enclosure Award map (1780) which would have marked the edge of common land. The longest straight section in the north is the best preserved with banks still extant up to 0.5m high.</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>617640</td>
<td>317435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA29</td>
<td>55542-MNF61872</td>
<td>Post-medieval pre-enclosure field boundary bank</td>
<td>In March 2011 a rapid earthwork survey identified a possible pre-enclosure (1780) field boundary bank. A well-defined possible pre-enclosure (1780) field boundary bank 4m in length and up to 1.2m high.</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>617516</td>
<td>317300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA30</td>
<td>55337-MNF62031</td>
<td>Horsford Church of England Infants School</td>
<td>The first building on this site was a Wesleyan Chapel built in 1862 by Mr Philip Blyth. The chapel was later purchased in 1865 by J. Day and converted into a National School. A new school and teacher's house was built on the site in 1865 for 100 children. The school is constructed from white brick with a red brick string course above window arches and also four courses of red brick plus dentil course under the eaves and on the gable with a slate roof in a Gothic style.</td>
<td>19th Century</td>
<td>619245</td>
<td>316181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA31</td>
<td>58151-MNF64172</td>
<td>Horsford United Free Methodist Chapel</td>
<td>Free Methodist Chapel dated 1866. The chapel has rendered walls and a hipped and pantiled roof. Above the plain entrance are two gallery windows.</td>
<td>19th Century</td>
<td>619194</td>
<td>316273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA No</td>
<td>NHER No/ NHLE No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA32</td>
<td>56447- MNF62855</td>
<td>19th century milestone marking Norwich 5 miles, Holt 16 miles and Cawston 6 miles</td>
<td>One of 14 surviving milestones along the Norwich to Holt road, marking Norwich 5 miles and Holt 16 miles and also incorporating an OS benchmark. This road ran from St Augustine's Gate in Norwich to Holt, and apart from the first few miles of the road forming part of the Norwich to Cromer turnpike, this road, although well-travelled, was not a turnpike. The milestones along this road are primarily comprised of one of two types of milestone. This type of milestone dates from the 19th Century and is part of the Norfolk County Council series.</td>
<td>19th Century</td>
<td>618980</td>
<td>316725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA33</td>
<td>56448- MNF62856</td>
<td>Late 19th century milestone marking Norwich 6 miles and Holt 15 miles</td>
<td>One of 14 surviving milestones along the Norwich to Holt road, marking Norwich 6 miles and Holt 15 miles and also incorporating an OS benchmark. This road ran from St Augustine's Gate in Norwich to Holt, and apart from the first few miles of the road forming part of the Norwich to Cromer turnpike, this road, although well-travelled, was not a turnpike. The milestones along this road are primarily comprised of one of two types of milestone. This type of milestone dates from the late 19th Century and is part of the Norfolk County Council series.</td>
<td>19th Century</td>
<td>618192</td>
<td>317963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA34</td>
<td>33502- MNF33502</td>
<td>Multi-period finds scatter</td>
<td>Prehistoric flint implements, a possible Roman stud, and medieval and post medieval coins and metalwork, found by metal detecting.</td>
<td>Multi-period</td>
<td>617464</td>
<td>317941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA35</td>
<td>35253- MNF39369</td>
<td>Multi-period finds scatter</td>
<td>Metal detecting has revealed a range of finds dating from the Roman to the post medieval periods. These include a Roman brooch, two Middle Saxon brooches, a Middle Saxon pin, a Late Saxon bridle cheek piece, and medieval and post medieval coins and metalwork.</td>
<td>Multi-period</td>
<td>617374</td>
<td>317544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Archaeological Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA No</th>
<th>NHER No/ NHLE No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA36</td>
<td>52438-MNF58419</td>
<td>Earthworks of World War Two slit or practice trenches</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. Two areas of World War Two practice trenches are visible as earthworks on aerial photographs (S1)-(S2), to the east and west of Holt Road, Horsford. There are a great number of these small, hand-dug trenches, scattered over the two areas, centred on TG 1871 1787 and TG 1821 1740, and they have been mapped as two extents of area. They may be related to a group of larger possible practice trenches to the north-west (NHER 52425: not in the Study Area), and may also have been sited here due to the proximity of the rifle range, at TG 1938 1802, which was clearly in use during World War Two (S3).</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>618187</td>
<td>317534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA37</td>
<td>53203-MNF58430</td>
<td>Site of World War Two searchlight battery and associated structures</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. The site appears to change between 1942 (S1)-(S2) and 1944 (S3), and perhaps reflects changing technology of the time, as there appear to be less raised circular areas by 1944, perhaps indicating that it became similar to a site identified by Roger Thomas (English Heritage) as a late form of searchlight site, which utilised a radar controlled 150mm projector mounted on a wheeled trailer (NHER 42471: not in the Study Area). To the west of the searchlight emplacements (between TG 1943 1695 and TG 1939 1689) was a row of five huts, probably operational buildings and accommodation for the crew. By 1944, an extra hut has been added to the south west, and one of the original huts is missing. To the south of the searchlight is a circular feature (NHER 53204: WA38) which may also be related to World War Two activity as it appears to be reasonably fresh on the 1944 photographs. Whether any traces of the structures still survive at the site is not known.</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>619468</td>
<td>316908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA38</td>
<td>53204-MNF58431</td>
<td>Site of possible World War Two bomb crater</td>
<td>November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A possible World War Two bomb crater is visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs from 1944, but is ploughed out by 1946. It is possible that this feature represents a post medieval extraction pit or other agricultural feature, but given its proximity to the searchlight battery described in NHER 53203: WA37, and its fresh appearance on the wartime aerial photographs, it was considered to be a possible bomb crater.</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>619506</td>
<td>316422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In March 2011 a number of depressions were observed in this area that might be part of the World War Two practice trench system to the east (NHER 52438: WA36). An oval depression aligned north to south measuring 10 x 5m and up to 1.5m deep is located in the western area of the site with a series of smaller sharp edged depressions being located 30m to the north-east of this feature and a further two rectangular depressions measuring 2 x 2m and 0.4m deep to the south-east. It is possible that these depressions are of a military origin and may be degraded slit trenches.

November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A possible undated linear ditch feature is visible as a cropmark on an aerial photograph, stretching 60m north-south from TG 1867 1744 to TG 1867 1738. The cropmark itself is rather faint and ephemeral, although is quite broad (up to 3.9m in width) and, due to the fact that there are many geological features visible in the field, it is possible that this feature is not archaeological in nature. The fact that it is only visible on one photographic frame means that it has been recorded with a note of caution.
An undated square enclosure was recorded on Horsford Heath in the 1930s. Each side was about 50m long. It is possible that it could be related to warren activity on the heath, and may in fact represent the 'Warren House' marked on Faden's Map of 1797. This feature was also mistakenly recorded as NHER 11828. A square banked enclosure surrounded by a ditch, situated 206m (225 yards) distant from 'B' Tumulus shown on previous form, the direction being 5 degrees east of north from that tumulus. Enclosure is practically a perfect square and also stands practically north, south, east and west each side being some 55 to 60 paces. The north side has however been broken through and a shallow hollow about 12 paces excavated on the west side of which there is a small bank and a small mound is opposite the entrance. The bank of the enclosure is of an average height of 90cm to 1.05m (3 to 3 1/2 feet) and the whole is covered with dense bracken as is the rest of the heath. There is no sign of the heath having ever been cultivated or of the hollow mentioned being used for getting gravel.

November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A rectangular enclosure is visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs, centred on TG 1897 1802. It is situated approximately 35m to the northeast of the previously reported location for this feature (TG 1895 1796). It is possible that it could be related to warren activity on the heath, and may in fact represent the ‘Warren House’ marked on Faden’s Map of 1797, which has also been suggested as relating to a rectangular cropmark 860m to the north-east (NHER 52423: not in the Study Area). The enclosure measures 52m by 57m externally, and 47m by 39m internally. There is a small square internal bank feature attached to the northern side at TG 1896 1804, which measures 18m by 19m, surrounded by a ditch on its southern and

In March 2011 a rapid earthwork survey identified an enclosure boundary bank subdividing dry land from a wetter area on either side of a watercourse. The bank is up to 1m high with a flanking ditch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA No</th>
<th>NHER No/ NHLE No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA41</td>
<td>7783-MNF7783; 11828-MNF11828</td>
<td>Undated square enclosure on Horsford Heath</td>
<td>An undated square enclosure was recorded on Horsford Heath in the 1930s. Each side was about 50m long. It is possible that it could be related to warren activity on the heath, and may in fact represent the 'Warren House' marked on Faden's Map of 1797. This feature was also mistakenly recorded as NHER 11828. A square banked enclosure surrounded by a ditch, situated 206m (225 yards) distant from 'B' Tumulus shown on previous form, the direction being 5 degrees east of north from that tumulus. Enclosure is practically a perfect square and also stands practically north, south, east and west each side being some 55 to 60 paces. The north side has however been broken through and a shallow hollow about 12 paces excavated on the west side of which there is a small bank and a small mound is opposite the entrance. The bank of the enclosure is of an average height of 90cm to 1.05m (3 to 3 1/2 feet) and the whole is covered with dense bracken as is the rest of the heath. There is no sign of the heath having ever been cultivated or of the hollow mentioned being used for getting gravel. November 2009. Norfolk NMP. A rectangular enclosure is visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs, centred on TG 1897 1802. It is situated approximately 35m to the northeast of the previously reported location for this feature (TG 1895 1796). It is possible that it could be related to warren activity on the heath, and may in fact represent the ‘Warren House’ marked on Faden's Map of 1797, which has also been suggested as relating to a rectangular cropmark 860m to the north-east (NHER 52423: not in the Study Area). The enclosure measures 52m by 57m externally, and 47m by 39m internally. There is a small square internal bank feature attached to the northern side at TG 1896 1804, which measures 18m by 19m, surrounded by a ditch on its southern and</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>618979</td>
<td>318029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA42</td>
<td>55546-MNF61876</td>
<td>Enclosure boundary bank of unknown date</td>
<td>In March 2011 a rapid earthwork survey identified an enclosure boundary bank subdividing dry land from a wetter area on either side of a watercourse. The bank is up to 1m high with a flanking ditch.</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>617930</td>
<td>317389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA No</td>
<td>NHER No/ NHLE No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA43</td>
<td>52602-MNF57695</td>
<td>Area of quarrying, Horsford Heath</td>
<td>January 2009. Field visit. Area of quarrying measuring about 60m by 30m, which includes a number of irregular shallow hollows and low mounds. Although the hollows and earthworks do not look like barrows, it is possible two of the low mounds could have been mistakenly recorded as barrows (see NHER 7774: WA05).</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>618528</td>
<td>317699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA44</td>
<td>7782-MNF7782</td>
<td>Undated iron working site</td>
<td>Iron working waste and bits of furnace were found after the field had been ploughed for the first time in 1971. These come from an undated iron working site.</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>618146</td>
<td>316734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA45</td>
<td>22631-MNF22631</td>
<td>Possible undated charcoal burning site</td>
<td>22 May 1986. Visit. Hole in ground. Circular, about 2m across and 1m deep, steep sided, surrounded by earth bank around 0.7m across and 0.5m high. To one side, semi-circular ditch cut in ground around 0.75m wide and 0.25m deep. Much overgrown and silted by dead leaves. No masonry apparent. Note - ditch does not surround hole but is separate. Use and origin unknown. Land shown as part of heathland on (S1) and (S2) since afforested. Quite probably industrial structure but not limekiln despite vague similarity. Or wartime feature? These features may well derive from charcoal burning. Compare similar arrangement at Museum of Welsh Life, National Museum of Wales, St Fagan's, Mid Glamorgan.</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>618200</td>
<td>317909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA46</td>
<td>55536-MNF61856</td>
<td>Features possibly associated with a post-medieval house and garden</td>
<td>In March 2011 features possibly associated with a nearby house and garden shown on the 1841 tithe map were observed during an earthwork survey. A roughly triangular raised area up to 0.5m high, 40m in length and between 2m and 8m wide could be associated with a house and garden shown on the 1841 tithe map a few meters to the south-east.</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>618059</td>
<td>317639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In July 2010 an archaeological desk-based assessment was undertaken for the Pinelands Industrial Estate. In December 2010 an archaeological evaluation revealed no archaeological finds or features. A total of 465m of linear trenches was excavated. No archaeological features or finds were recovered from any of the trenches, or during a metal detector survey of the site. This was in spite of the proximity of the study area to the known barrow cemetery in Horsford Woods. However, two modern pits and several cultivation trenches were noted. Tree root disturbance was related to the previous use of the site as a pine plantation.

### Listed Heritage Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LBNo.</th>
<th>NHLE No.</th>
<th>NHER No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB01</td>
<td>1051547</td>
<td>7792-MNF7792</td>
<td>St Helena’s Mill, Corn mill, 32m north of Mill House</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>This tower windmill, also known as St Helena or St Helen’s Mill, was probably built in 1858 and replaced an earlier smock mill on the same site. It was last used in 1912 or 1920. The mill originally had five storeys. Some of the machinery is still inside although the iron wind shaft was removed for safety reasons in 1982. Derelict corn wind mill, built 1860, of red brick with internal lead flat roof. Circular tapering brick tower, originally of 5 storeys. Ground floor entrance to west with segmental brick arch and stable door. Entrance to first floor above with segmental brick arch and door frame. First, second and third floor windows to north, the lower window with cast iron casement. First, second, third and fourth floor windows to south, the lower 2 retaining cast iron casements. All windows, single light with segmental brick arches. Tall blocked opening to east on ground and first floor level now containing inserted opening at first floor level with segmental brick arch. Remains of shot curb on parapet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.4 Appendix 4: Viewshed analysis methodology

9.4.1 Viewshed analysis is a type of visibility analysis, a commonly applied GIS technique where the output produces a mathematical model of the area which theoretically shares intervisibility with a target point. This model is referred to as a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV).

9.4.2 This method provides a means of modelling where in the landscape a proposed development is likely to be visible from, thereby helping to identify those heritage assets which could be affected by the proposals.

9.4.3 A viewshed analysis was carried out within a 5 km radius of the Site for the purposes of this assessment. The ZTV was calculated using:

- The Landform Panorama DTM, a ‘bare earth’ terrain model of 50 m horizontal resolution provided by Landform Panorama;
- An array of target points located within the Site boundary and set to correspond with the approximate height of the proposed development, as indicated by the draft proposals. The maximum height of the target points was set at 10 m;
- Observer heights were set to 1.6 m representing the eye height of an average person.

9.4.4 Designated heritage assets of the highest significance (comprising World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings, Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields) which lay within the 5 km limit of the ZTV were identified. All Conservation Areas, Grade II Listed Buildings, and Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens located within the 1 km Study Area were also included in the viewshed analysis.

9.4.5 It should be noted that, in itself, the inclusion of a heritage asset within the ZTV does not indicate that the Site constitutes part of its setting, or that the development proposals would necessarily affect the asset.

9.4.6 The viewshed analysis is based on a ‘bare-earth’ model, which takes no account of surface forms and features including trees, vegetation, buildings and other structures. Therefore, the inclusion of a heritage asset within the ZTV should not be conflated with ‘real-world’ intervisibility.
## Appendix 5: Designated heritage assets within the ZTV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA No.</th>
<th>NHLE No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Distance from Site (km)</th>
<th>Direction from Site</th>
<th>Scoped in to detailed assessment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA03/</td>
<td>1003164</td>
<td>Two round barrows on Horsford Heath</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>618788</td>
<td>317815</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Due to the proximity of the barrows to the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB01</td>
<td>1051547</td>
<td>St Helena’s Mill, Corn mill, 32m north of Mill House</td>
<td>Grade II Listed Building</td>
<td>619038</td>
<td>316711</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Only the very top of the windmill is visible from the northeast corner of the Site (Plates 11 &amp; 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1051539</td>
<td>Parish church of St Margaret</td>
<td>Grade II* Listed Building</td>
<td>616980</td>
<td>317318</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this building does not share intervisibliity with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1170781</td>
<td>Parish church of All Saints</td>
<td>Grade II* Listed Building</td>
<td>619684</td>
<td>315379</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this building does not share intervisibliity with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1003998</td>
<td>Horsford Castle</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>620540</td>
<td>315668</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this Scheduled Monument does not share intervisibliity with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1003933</td>
<td>St Faith Priory</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>621623</td>
<td>315170</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this Scheduled Monument does not share intervisibliity with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1003960</td>
<td>Round barrow north of Sandy Lane</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>615190</td>
<td>317608</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this Scheduled Monument does not share intervisibliity with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA No.</td>
<td>NHLE No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>Distance from Site (km)</td>
<td>Direction from Site</td>
<td>Scoped in to detailed assessment Y/N</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1372959</td>
<td>Church of the Blessed Virgin and St Andrew</td>
<td>Grade I Listed Building</td>
<td>621602</td>
<td>315089</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this building does not share intervisibility with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1003999</td>
<td>Drayton Lodge</td>
<td>Scheduled Monument</td>
<td>618643</td>
<td>313151</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this Scheduled Monument does not share intervisibility with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1306023</td>
<td>Drayton Lodge</td>
<td>Grade II* Listed Building</td>
<td>618643</td>
<td>313154</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this building does not share intervisibility with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1372972</td>
<td>Church of St Margaret</td>
<td>Grade I Listed Building</td>
<td>622158</td>
<td>320767</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this building does not share intervisibility with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1372948</td>
<td>Parish church of St Peter</td>
<td>Grade II* Listed Building</td>
<td>615149</td>
<td>320902</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this building does not share intervisibility with the Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1250099</td>
<td>Parish church of St Mary the Virgin and St Botolph</td>
<td>Grade I Listed Building</td>
<td>620131</td>
<td>322319</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>NNE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Due to intervening topography, woodland and residential properties this building does not share intervisibility with the Site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>