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Non-Technical Summary

Lanpro was commissioned by Grand Vision Developments Ltd to produce an archaeological desk-based assessment to inform a planning application for residential development of land off Norwich Road, Salhouse, Norfolk.

This assessment considers approximately 11 hectares of land north of Norwich Road, between Salhouse and New Rackheath.

The assessment identifies and provides a description of archaeological assets potentially affected by the development of the study site and addresses the information requirements of Government’s National Planning Policy Framework, particularly paragraph 128.

The assessment establishes that there are no designated heritage assets within the study site and that development within the study site will have no impact upon any designated heritage assets in the vicinity.

Whilst there is evidence of reasonably extensive exploitation of the surrounding landscape from prehistory onwards the bulk of that evidence is located on the better drained and more fertile soils to the north and west of the study site. Cropmark evidence from within the study site itself would appear to be of relatively recent origin and a rapid assessment of the artefact content of the topsoil has only recovered a single artefact. This study has, therefore, concluded that the site has a low potential to contain significant archaeological remains of any period and that should any archaeological remains be present that they are likely to be of very limited potential to add to national or regional research objectives. As such any impact could be mitigated through investigation and recording.

It is considered likely that Norfolk Historic Environment Service, acting as advisors to Broadland District Council, will look for further archaeological assessment to allow the formulation of a mitigation strategy (if required). However, given the relatively low potential and significance of the site it would be appropriate for any such works to be secured by condition attached to any grant of planning consent.
1 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

1.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment of land north of Norwich Road, Salhouse, Norfolk (henceforth referred to as the study site) has been prepared by Lanpro Services Limited on behalf of Grand Vision Developments Ltd.

1.2 This assessment has been undertaken to inform a planning application for residential development within the study site.

1.3 This document provides an assessment of the potential for the survival of archaeological remains within the study site and assesses the potential impacts that the proposed development could have on these heritage assets.

1.4 The assessment has been undertaken to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; Chapter 12: ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’, paragraph 128) and is in line with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) guidelines Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (CIfA 2014).

2 LEGISLATION, POLICY AND GUIDANCE

2.1 In considering any planning application for development, the local planning authority will be guided by current legislation, the policy framework set by government planning policy, by current Local Plan policy and by other material considerations.

Current Legislation

2.2 The applicable legislative framework is summarised as follows:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (AMAAA) 1979;
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (P(LBCA)) Act 1990

2.3 The AMAAA largely relates to Scheduled Monuments (SMs) and designated archaeological areas, detailing in particular what can and cannot be undertaken on archaeological grounds. Part III of the Act also details the financial implications arising specifically from archaeological investigations.

2.4 The P(LBCA) Act provides for the protection of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, and is largely expressed in the planning process through policies in regional and local planning guidance, as outlined above.

2.5 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act of 1990 is the primary legislative instrument addressing the treatment of listed buildings and conservation areas through the planning process.

2.6 Section 66 of the 1990 Act states that “...in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of
preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.

**National Planning Policy Framework**

2.7 Section 12 of the NPPF, entitled *Conserving and enhancing the historic environment* provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:

- Delivery of sustainable development
- Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment, and
- Conservation of England’s heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

2.8 Section 12 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 128 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that the level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.

2.9 Heritage Assets are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: ‘a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process.’.

2.10 Annex 2 also defines ‘Archaeological Interest’ as a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage Assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.

2.11 A Designated Heritage Asset comprises a World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.

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

2.13 In short, government policy provides a framework which:

- Protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets (which include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or Conservation Areas)
- Protects the settings of such designations
• In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions
• Provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not significant enough to merit in situ preservation.

Planning Practice Guide

2.14 The NPPG is a web-based resource which is to be used in conjunction with the NPPF. It is aimed at planning professionals and prescribes best practice within the planning sector. The relevant section is entitled ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’. The guidance given in this section is effectively a condensed version of the PPS5 Practice Guide and sets out the best practice to applying government policy in the NPPF.

Local Planning Policy

2.15 Broadland’s Local Plan comprises the following documents:

• The Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (adopted 2011, amendments adopted 2014)
• Broadland Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (adopted August 2015)

2.16 The Joint Core Strategy 2008-2026 currently provides the local development policy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (adopted 2011, amendments adopted 2014). Policy 1, addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets, seeks to conserve and enhance the built environment, heritage assets and the wider historic environment 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.’

2.17 The Broadland District Council’s Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) outlines the council’s planning policies in relation to the historic environment under the section on ‘Environmental Assets’ (paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5) reproduced below:

‘The National Planning Policy Framework and Joint Core Strategy place considerable emphasis on the need to safeguard and enhance the environmental assets of the district for the benefit of current and future generations. These assets include...built heritage and the wider historic environment (paragraphs 126-141 of the NPPF) e.g. listed buildings, ancient monuments and archaeological assets, geodiversity (geological features), landscape and historic landscape character; as well as more general aspects such as the countryside and rural character, the setting of conservation areas and the Broads.'
Policy 1 of the JCS states that 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 setting, the encouragement of high-quality maintenance and repair and the enhancement of public spaces. Policy 8 of the JCS states that cultural heritage will be enriched through use of innovative design and art in the public realm.’

Professional Guidance


2.19 The English Heritage (now Historic England) publication The Setting of Heritage Assets (2011a) details guidance on managing change in the settings of heritage assets, including archaeological remains and historic buildings, sites, areas, and landscapes. This is supported and updated by the English Heritage Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets Setting (2014).

2.20 The English Heritage guidance publication Seeing the History in the View (2011b) explains how the heritage significance of views can be assessed in a systematic and consistent way. Understanding Place (English Heritage 2010) provides guidelines on undertaking Historical Area Assessments, and includes guidance on defining the character and evaluating the significance of heritage assets.

3 METHODOLOGY

Information Sources

3.1 A gazetteer of all records held on the Norfolk Historic Environment Record (HER) and the Historic England National Heritage List for England (NHLE) is provided in Appendix 1, and their locations marked on a plan in Figure 1.

3.2 The following sources of information have been consulted in order to meet the requirements of the assessment, and are in line with the guidelines laid down by the CIfA (2014).

Archaeological records

3.3 Information on heritage assets and archaeological investigations for within the search area was obtained from the Norfolk HER and the NHLE, as well as the English Heritage National Mapping Programme (NMP). The NMP data is shown in Figure 2.
Historical documentary and cartographic sources

3.4 The holdings of the Norfolk Record Office and other on-line repositories were consulted for historical maps and plans, and other relevant documentary sources.

Designated heritage assets

3.5 Information on designated heritage assets was obtained from the Norfolk HER and the NHLE.

Published and unpublished documentary sources

3.6 A range of published and unpublished material has been consulted, including the regional archaeological research framework, 'Research and Archaeology: A Framework for the Eastern Counties' (EAA 2000), and sources on the wider archaeological and historical background.

Site walkover survey

3.7 A walkover survey was undertaken of the study site on 10th January 2017, in dry, sunny conditions, to provide a further assessment of the character of the site and to appraise the potential impact of the proposed development on any archaeological heritage assets (Plates 1-4).

3.8 At the time of the site visit approximately two-thirds of the site had been ploughed and so the opportunity was taken to assess the artefactual content of the topsoil in more detail than is usual for a desk based assessment. Transects, approximately 20m apart, were walked across ploughed areas. A single flint scraper, of probable Neolithic to Bronze Age date, was recovered (Plate 5). No other worked flint (waste flakes or tools) or pre-modern pottery was noted.

3.9 The plough soil appeared to be relatively thin with subsoil deposits being turned over by the plough at a depth of c.20cm below ground level.

Assessment Criteria

Setting

3.10 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’

3.11 English Heritage’s The Setting of Heritage Assets (2011a) was used to inform the methodology for this assessment, supported by the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England 2015) and Understanding Place (English Heritage 2010).
**Significance**

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

3.13 It is recognised that not all parts of a heritage asset will necessarily be of equal significance. In some cases, certain elements could accommodate change without affecting the significance of the asset. Change is only considered harmful if it erodes an asset’s significance. Understanding the significance of any heritage assets affected and any contribution made by their setting (paragraph 128, NPPF 2012) is therefore fundamental to understanding the scope for and acceptability of change.

**SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION**

4.1 The study site is situated approximately 7km to the north-east of Norwich city centre (centred at NGR TG 29330 13422; Figure 1). The study site covers 11.3 hectares of arable farmland. The site is bounded to the southeast by the Norwich Road and the rear gardens of properties along Norwich Road, residential properties to the northeast and northwest, and by the Norwich to Sheringham railway line and to the west.

4.2 The ground within the study site is broadly level although there is a gradually slope down towards the north-east from a height of approximately 31m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) at its southwestern edge to about 27m aOD at the northeast.

4.3 The bedrock geology within the study site consists of the Crag Group sand and gravel. Superficial deposits are recorded as Happisburgh Glacigenic Formation diamicton (BGS 2016).

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

**Introduction**

5.1 This chapter reviews existing archaeological evidence for the study site and the archaeological and historical background of the general area, based on a consideration of evidence in the Norfolk HER, the NHLE and the Norfolk Record Office for the study site and the surrounding 1km search area. It is not the purpose of this document to create a detailed archaeological or historical narrative of the area, but to provide an assessment of the study site’s historical development and archaeological potential in accordance with the NPPF.

**Designated Heritage Assets**

5.2 The study site contains no designated heritage assets.

5.3 The Salhouse Conservation Area (located c.600m to the northeast at its closest point) is the only designated heritage asset within 1km of the study site.
Non-designated heritage assets

5.4 The Norfolk HER contains 59 records of heritage assets, archaeological investigations or archaeological find spots within the search area, including four within the study site.

5.5 The HER records relating to archaeological remains or finds within the search area breakdown as follows. Some individual HER records cover more than one period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Within Study Site</th>
<th>Within Search Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early medieval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Details of all HER records are listed in a gazetteer in Appendix 1 and their positions marked on Figure 1.

5.7 There are many entries on the HER, both within and surrounding the study site, that are currently classified as undated. Most these entries relate to cropmark evidence that has not been tested by intrusive archaeological investigation. In some cases, the features have been tentatively dated on morphological grounds and where this is the case they are discussed in the relevant period sections below.

Early prehistoric Period (c.9500 BC – c.700 BC)

5.8 The earliest evidence of human activity from within the search area is represented by a Palaeolithic handaxe found in a field c.800m to the south of the study site (MNF8151).

5.9 Mesolithic activity in the vicinity of the study site is only a little better represented with two Mesolithic tranchet axe heads recorded within the search area (MNF8147 & 43963). No other pieces of Mesolithic flint are recorded from within the search area, either singularly or forming parts of larger scatters.

5.10 Whilst there are a number of records of Neolithic finds, these again primarily comprise single objects not found in association with any wider flint scatters (flint axe heads, MNF8168, 8467 & 8468, and flint scraper MNF57768). As stated in section 3.8 above a single flint scraper was recovered from the topsoil during the site visit, however, no other pieces of worked flint were seen.

5.11 A cropmark feature that would appear to be a Neolithic oval barrow or mortuary enclosure (MNF18875) is located c.900m to the west of the study site. The feature comprises a rather irregular oval ring ditch, with a possible causeway at its eastern end. Whilst it has not been tested by intrusive evaluation it is similar in both its size and shape to other examples of
Neolithic funerary monuments identified in Norfolk and elsewhere and does not correspond to any known later features (particularly anything related to the former airfield) and so there is a reasonably high confidence in its interpretation.

5.12 Confirmed Bronze Age evidence from the search area is limited to MNF40476 which records the find spots of two Bronze Age flint arrowheads (although the HER does not provide a detailed location for these finds).

5.13 The HER records four potential Bronze Age ring ditches to the south-east and south of the study site (MNF54052, 57608 & 57609). However, none of these features have been subject to any detailed investigation and so the validity of their interpretation remains unknown.

5.14 The evidence held by the HER indicates that the area surrounding the study site has been exploited throughout prehistory. The evidence does not suggest particularly intensive exploitation/occupation but the presence of funerary monuments in the landscape does suggest some degree of organisation. The lack of cropmark evidence for the study site combined with the apparently low artefact content of the topsoil would suggest the potential for the presence of as yet unidentified prehistoric remains within the study site is low.

Iron Age (c.700 BC – c.AD 43) and Roman Period (c.AD 43 – c. AD 410)

5.15 There are relatively few Iron Age and/or Roman finds recorded from the search area, and the majority of those that are recorded have come from metal detecting finds, which are not given precise locations in the HER data. The only recorded Roman pottery within the search area comes from unstratified finds made during a watching brief on a pipeline approximately 950m to the west of the study site (MNF33750).

5.16 Despite the relatively low level of Iron Age and Roman finds from the search area there are a number of cropmarks which share their orientation and general character with an extensive group of coaxial field systems of probable Iron Age and/or Roman date identified over large areas of the wider locality.

5.17 MNF56224 covers a large area to the north of the study site, extending from Muck Lane to north of Stonehouse Road. The record covers fragmentary cropmarks of unknown date visible on aerial photographs which may represent remnants of a field system of possible Iron Age to Roman date. These cropmarks appear to form part of an area of complex multi-period features, the orientation of which do not respect that of the modern field pattern, or of cropmarks dating to later phases of activity with which they overlap.

5.18 The HER records four other areas of cropmarks to the north and west of the study site (MNF56006, MNF56007, MNF56008 and MNF56019) which are believed to date to the medieval or early post-medieval periods, but for which an Iron Age and/or Roman date cannot be ruled out.

5.19 The archaeological evidence for the Iron Age and Roman periods within the search area, particularly from the extensive cropmark evidence, shows a high level of exploitation of the
landscape in the period. However, the lack of cropmark evidence from within the study site, combined with the poorer soils than that to the north and west, suggests a comparatively low potential for previously unrecorded Iron Age and/or Roman remains to be present.

**Medieval Period (c.AD 410 – c. AD 1540)**

5.20 There is limited Saxon evidence recorded on the HER within the search area and nothing from within the study site itself. A sherd of 11th or 12th century pottery was found in a pit during an evaluation adjacent to the western edge of the study site (MNF63206). The report for the evaluation (Allen Archaeology 2012) states that only a single sherd of possible Saxon pottery was recovered and that its abraded state may suggest that it is residual. The pit from which the pottery was recovered was the only feature of archaeological interest identified by the evaluation which concluded that the site was peripheral to any associated settlement.

5.21 The only other record of early medieval activity from the search area is a Late Saxon stirrup, recorded as being found by metal detecting (MNF57567) although the exact location of the find is not given by the HER.

5.22 Salhouse is not recorded in the Domesday survey of 1086 with the nearest recorded settlements being Little Plumstead (c.2.3km to the south-east) and Rackheath (c.2.5km to the north-west). It would seem that the area, later to be known as Mousehold Heath, remained sparsely populated in the early medieval period.

5.23 A number of medieval tracks and hollow ways are known to have run from Norwich through Sprowston and onto Rackheath. One of these, Ravengate Way (MNF8127), is recorded by the HER as passing through the southern corner of the study site, although the earliest map to show the route (the Mousehold Map of 1585, not reproduced) is only schematic and does not allow for an accurate determination of the road’s location. Furthermore, no traces of the postulated line of this track were identified by geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching to the immediate west of the study site (Allen Archaeology 2012). It is reasonable to assume that the route shown on the 1585 map actually followed the former trackway along the northern edge of the study site as shown on Fadden’s map of 1797 (Fig 3) rather than that postulated by the HER.

5.24 Whist the former road itself is not visible in any of the cropmark data for the area MNF56008 (c.100m west of the study site) is evident as a linear arrangement of rectilinear enclosures ranged along what is now a field boundary but is likely to have been (at least in part) the route of Ravensgate Way. What may be further elements of this settlement have been identified immediately to the west of the study site (MNF56007). Although these are separated by some 570m, the cropmarks further to the north (MNF56006) are similar enough in alignment and character to suggest that they formed part of the same probable settlement, ranged along a trackway or road, now followed for some of its length by the parish boundary. As stated above, it is possible that these cropmarks relate (at least in part) to Iron Age and/or Roman settlement, however, if the settlement and trackway was arranged along Ravensgate Way, before turning
away north towards Wroxham, a late medieval or early post-medieval date seems most likely, with the sites occupying a former common-edge position in relation to Mousehold Heath.

5.25 The areas of cropmarks described above combined with slightly more ephemeral areas of probable medieval or early post-medieval settlement, enclosures and field systems (MNF55996, 57603, 57604, 57605) suggest that throughout the medieval and early post-medieval periods the area to the west and north-west of study site was extensively exploited for both settlement and agriculture. However, the cropmark evidence for the study site itself, and the area to its south and south-east, is scarce, suggesting that settlement was confined to the north-western edge of Mousehold Heath. It is possible that the lack of cropmarks is due to changes in the underlying superficial geology making cropmarks less obvious (sand and gravel to the north-west, diamicton to the south-east), however, it is more likely that the better drained sand and gravel geology was more favoured for settlement and agriculture than the heavier, less fertile diamicton.

5.26 Available evidence would suggest that the site has a low potential to contain significant remains of a medieval date, and that the site was situated on marginal land at this time beyond the extent of any possible settlement or, at the very most, on its extreme periphery.

Post-Medieval Period (c.1540 – 1799)

5.27 As stated above, the HER has interpreted much of the intensive cropmark evidence from the vicinity of the study site as settlement and associated activity of medieval to early post-medieval date. The accuracy of this interpretation has, however, not yet been tested by intrusive archaeological works.

5.28 The point at which these settlements fell out of use is not known, however, even the earliest mapping of the site (map of Mousehold Heath 1585), whilst showing the approximate line of Ravensgate Way does not depict any settlement in the location of these cropmarks, although it should be noted that the map does not contain a great amount of detail.

5.29 The study site lies within the former extent of Mousehold Heath, as identified by the HER (MNF58282). The origins of the heath are unknown, but it appears to have remained little altered between the 16th century and the end of the 18th century, following which Enclosure Acts for various parishes (including Rackheath in 1801 and Salhouse in 1802) rapidly eroded the extent of the heath.

5.30 Faden’s Map of Norfolk 1797 (Figure 3) is the earliest relatively detailed mapping for the area. The map shows the area of the study site lying within the heath with the track forming the northern edge of the heath possibly lying just within the western extremity of the study site.

5.31 Available evidence would suggest that the site has a low potential to contain significant remains of post-medieval date. The study site would appear to be in a location beyond the
extent of recorded or inferred settlement, or at the very most on the extreme peripheries of any such settlement.

**Modern Period (1800 – Present)**

5.32 Rackheath parish was enclosed by Act of Parliament in 1801 with Salhouse following shortly after in 1802. The respective enclosure maps (Figure 4) are the first to show the area in real detail, including field boundaries, buildings etc. The study site falls within Rackheath parish and can be seen to form part of unenclosed land between Norwich Road to the south and various enclosed fields to the north.

5.33 By 1834 the study site had been divided into two fields as shown by the Rackheath tithe map (Figure 5). No development is shown within the study site although by this date Mousehold Farm had been constructed just beyond the southern boundary.

5.34 The East Norfolk Railway, which now forms the western boundary of the study site, was constructed between 1867 and 1877 (MNF13586). The construction of the railway seems to have facilitated the amalgamation of the study site into a single field as shown on the 1887 edition of the Ordnance Survey map (Figure 6). There is little change in the depiction of the study site on the subsequent Ordnance Survey mapping of 1908 and 1938 (Figures 7 & 8), although the 1938 map does show a boundary corresponding with cropmark MNF57604. The other cropmark recorded within the study site (MNF57605) is not shown on any historic mapping but does share a similar alignment to modern field boundaries.

5.35 Rackheath Airfield, located to the north-west of the study site, was constructed during the Second World War (MNF8170). The airfield opened in 1943 to accommodate the USA 8th Air Force Bomb Group, the ‘Rackheath Aggies’, flying B24 Liberators. Various HER records refer to the airfield and its outlying areas, although there are no records of any associated features within the study site.

**Historic Landscape Characterisation**

5.36 The study site is classed by the HLC as 20th century enclosure. The various classifications are shown in Figure 12.
6 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Designated heritage assets
6.1 The study site contains no designated heritage assets.

Potential sub-surface archaeological remains
6.2 The significance of sub-surface archaeological remains in the study site will be largely vested in their evidential value (i.e. what the physical remains can reveal about past human activity). The level of significance will be dependent upon several factors including the date of the remains, whether they represent a single or multiple periods, the nature of the remains, the state of their preservation and their potential to add to national and regional research objectives.

6.3 The only recorded archaeological evidence within the study site comprises two linear cropmarks. HER MNF57604 can clearly be seen to correspond with a 20th century field boundary and is, therefore, of no archaeological interest. Whist there is no corresponding cartographic depiction of cropmark MNF57605 the alignment of the feature is consistent with 19th and 20th century field boundaries and as such is not considered to be of any potential archaeological interest.

6.4 Whilst the presence of Prehistoric/Roman activity within the study site cannot be entirely discounted, archaeological works undertaken to the immediate west of the study site, together with cropmark evidence from the wider vicinity, as well as the nature of the superficial geology, suggests a very low potential for significant archaeological remains of these periods to be present. Should any such remains be present they are likely to comprise former field boundaries and/or more ephemeral activity of relatively low significance.

6.5 Available evidence would suggest that the study site remained part of Mousehold Heath throughout the medieval and post-medieval periods and there is considered to be negligible potential for the study site to contain any common edge settlement of these periods, such as that possibly represented by cropmarks recorded to the north and west.
7 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 It is recognised that not all parts of a heritage asset will necessarily be of equal significance. In some cases, certain elements could accommodate change without affecting the significance of the asset. Change is only considered harmful if it erodes an asset’s significance.

Proposed development

7.2 The overall study site extends to 11.3ha, however, approximately 5ha of that area is proposed for open space.

Designated heritage assets

7.3 The proposed development will have no impact upon any designated heritage assets.

Historic Landscape

7.4 The study site currently comprises a single, 20th century, arable field of negligible historic interest.

Potential sub-surface remains

7.5 The construction techniques employed in modern development are such that it is improbable that any archaeological remains now present on the study site would survive the development process, unless they coincide with areas of public open space.

7.6 Available evidence would suggest that the study site has a low potential to contain significant archaeological remains of any period and that should any archaeological remains be present that they are likely to be of very limited potential to add to national or regional research objectives and as such any impact could be mitigated through investigation and recording.

7.7 It is considered likely that Norfolk Historic Environment Service, acting as advisors to Broadland District Council, will look for further archaeological assessment in order to allow the formulation of a mitigation strategy (if required). However, given the relatively low potential and significance of the site it would be appropriate for any such works to be secured by condition attached to any grant of planning consent.
8 CONCLUSIONS

8.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment draws together the available archaeological, historical, topographic and land-use information in order to clarify the heritage significance and archaeological potential of land proposed for development off Norwich Road, Salhouse. It addresses the information requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and provides the proportionate response sought by the NPPF.

8.2 The assessment establishes that there are no designated heritage assets within the study site and that development within the study site will have no impact upon any designated heritage assets in the vicinity.

8.3 Whilst there is evidence of reasonably extensive exploitation of the surrounding landscape from prehistory onwards the bulk of that evidence is located on the better drained and more fertile soils to the north and west of the study site. Cropmark evidence from within the study site itself would appear to be of relatively recent origin and a rapid assessment of the artefact content of the topsoil has only recovered a single artefact. This study has therefore concluded that the site has a low potential to contain significant archaeological remains of any period and that should any archaeological remains be present these are likely to have very limited potential to add to national or regional research objectives. As such, any impact could be mitigated through investigation and recording.

8.4 It is considered likely that Norfolk Historic Environment Service, acting as advisors to Broadland District Council, will look for further archaeological assessment in order to allow the formulation of a mitigation strategy (if required). However, given the relatively low potential and significance of the site it would be appropriate for any such works to be secured by condition attached to any grant of planning consent.
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## Appendix 1: Gazetteer of heritage assets

The following table provides details of heritage assets recorded on the Norfolk HER and on the Historic England National Heritage List for England within 1km of the study site. These have been listed in order of their HER and NHLE references, and their locations are marked on Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER Ref.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NGR</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MNF8127</td>
<td>Ravensgate Way, medieval road</td>
<td>This medieval road is marked on maps in 1585 and 1906. The exact line is hard to judge but the road ran from Norwich through Sprowston to Rackheath. Although no traces of the road have been found, a short section of a post medieval hollow way has been identified here.</td>
<td>TG 2635 1175</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF8147</td>
<td>Mesolithic flint tranchet axehead</td>
<td>In 1941 a Mesolithic flint tranchet axehead was found in the garden of a property in Rackheath.</td>
<td>TG 2861 1256</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF8151</td>
<td>Palaeolithic flint handaxe</td>
<td>A Palaeolithic flint handaxe was found in a potato harvester here in 1974. It had probably originally lain in one of the nearby fields.</td>
<td>TG 295 123</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF8166</td>
<td>Ranworth Way, medieval road</td>
<td>This is the course of a medieval road, shown on a map of 1585. The course of the road forms the parish boundary between Great and Little Plumstead, Rackheath, Sprowston and Thorpe St Andrew. A parish boundary ditch, or roadside ditch, was observed in a gas pipe trench in 1979.</td>
<td>TG 2685 1096</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF8168</td>
<td>Neolithic chipped and polished flint axe</td>
<td>Sometime around 1969 a Neolithic chipped and polished flint axe was retrieved from this location.</td>
<td>TG 2895 1297</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF8170</td>
<td>Site of World War Two airfield at Rackheath</td>
<td>A World War Two airfield occupied this site, some elements of which still survive today. The airfield opened in 1943. The airfield was closed in 1945 and was used as a private airfield from 1960, although this too has now closed. Parts of the runways and tracks, together with the control tower, still survive.</td>
<td>TG 2871 1398</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF8171</td>
<td>Prehistoric stone implement</td>
<td>A prehistoric stone axehammer has been recorded at this location.</td>
<td>TG 2837 1303</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF8467</td>
<td>Neolithic stone axe</td>
<td>Sometime prior to 1928 a Neolithic stone axe with slightly squared sides was recovered from this location.</td>
<td>TG 300 140</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF8468</td>
<td>Neolithic polished flint axehead</td>
<td>Ploughing of parkland near to Salhouse Hall in 1973 unearthed a Neolithic polished flint axe. This example showed slight damage around the cutting edge.</td>
<td>TG 302 142</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF9688</td>
<td>Site of undated earthwork 'entrenchment'</td>
<td>An 'entrenchment' is shown on a map of Mousehold Heath of 1585. There is now no visible sign of any earthworks on the site. A curving ditch feature has been recorded, however, approximately 140m to the south of the mapped position of NHER 9688, which has been interpreted as possible evidence of 'entrenchment' during the medieval to post medieval period (see NHER 51933).</td>
<td>TG 2873 1183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF13586</td>
<td>East Norfolk Railway (later Great Eastern), Cromer line</td>
<td>Work on the East Norfolk Railway began in 1867, designed to create a route from Norwich to Cromer. It opened at North Walsham in 1874, at Gunton in 1876 and finally at Cromer in 1877, and the line is still in use today.</td>
<td>TG22SE</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF18334</td>
<td>Site of possible garden features of post medieval date</td>
<td>A group of ditches visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs may represent garden features of post medieval date, associated with Old Hall, which once stood immediately to their west but was demolished in the 1950s.</td>
<td>TG 2978 1430</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF18875</td>
<td>Site of possible Neolithic oval barrow or mortuary enclosure</td>
<td>A possible Neolithic oval barrow or mortuary enclosure is visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs.</td>
<td>TG 2826 1337</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF18911</td>
<td>Possible post medieval woodland boundary bank</td>
<td>The cropmark of a possible curvilinear bank, perhaps relating to a post medieval boundary, is visible on an aerial photograph of this area that was taken in 1979. It continues the boundary of a 19th century woodland although it could have an earlier origin.</td>
<td>TG 3062 1358</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF30518</td>
<td>Rackheath Park</td>
<td>Probably a deer park by the late 16th century when the estate was owned by the Pettus family. From the later 18th century the estate was owned by the Straceys. The park was extended to the south, taking in part of former Mousehold Heath following the c. 1801 Parliamentary Enclosure of Rackheath.</td>
<td>TG 2757 1279</td>
<td>Post-medieval-modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF33632</td>
<td>Roman brooches and medieval coin</td>
<td>Metal detecting at this location in 1998 recovered a medieval penny of Henry V. Several Roman brooches are also said to have been found here but this information is unconfirmed.</td>
<td>TG 29 14</td>
<td>Roman to medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF33750</td>
<td>Multi-period pottery sherds and prehistoric flints, water pipeline at New Rackheath</td>
<td>Observations in 1998 along the line of a water pipeline recovered a range of artefacts. Finds included pieces of Roman and medieval pottery, an undated iron vessel handle and worked flints. Additionally, some burnt flints were found in pits.</td>
<td>TG 2762 1335</td>
<td>Prehistoric to medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF40476</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age arrowhead and medieval harness pendant</td>
<td>Metal detecting in April/May 2001 recovered a medieval harness pendant. Later on in 2001 a Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age barbed and tanged arrowhead was also found at this location.</td>
<td>TG 28 12</td>
<td>Prehistoric to medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF43668</td>
<td>Medieval coins</td>
<td>Metal detecting before September 2003 recovered a short cross penny of Edward I and a halfpenny of Alexander III of Scotland.</td>
<td>TG 28 12</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF43961</td>
<td>Multi period metal object scatter</td>
<td>Metal detecting at this site has recovered a large number of metal objects dating from the Iron Age to post medieval periods. Particularly noteworthy finds include a post medieval lead powder charger cap, an Iron Age or Roman terret and a medieval dagger quillon.</td>
<td>TG 29 13</td>
<td>Prehistoric to medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF43962</td>
<td>Multi-period finds</td>
<td>Metal detecting in 2003 and 2012 recovered a medieval coin; post-medieval jetton and coin weights and Roman, medieval, medieval/post-medieval and post-medieval metal objects. The metal finds include a medieval/post-medieval signet ring and post medieval knives and a lead weight.</td>
<td>TG 29 14</td>
<td>Roman to post-medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF43963</td>
<td>Mesolithic flint axehead and medieval to post medieval finds</td>
<td>Metal detecting here between 2003 and 2008 recovered an Early Mesolithic flint tranchet axehead; a post-medieval coin and a number of other metal objects,</td>
<td>TG 29 14</td>
<td>Prehistoric to post-medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF50366</td>
<td>Multi-period finds</td>
<td>Medieval and post medieval objects, including a 15th-16th century coin weight, were found during metal detecting in 2006.</td>
<td>TG 29 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF54052</td>
<td>Cropmarks of Bronze Age ring ditch</td>
<td>The cropmark of a possible Bronze Age ring ditch is visible on aerial photographs of this area taken in 1990. It is sub-circular to sub-oval in plan and might suggest that a round barrow once stood here.</td>
<td>TG 3031 1326</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF55996</td>
<td>Site of possible embanked enclosure of unknown but probably medieval or post medieval date, north of Old Hall</td>
<td>A possible small embanked enclosure of unknown date is visible as earthworks on aerial photographs taken in 1946. Its origin and function are unknown, but given its relatively low-lying position – at the head of a now largely dry valley, marked by a line of ponds – an association with drainage, stock management, or agricultural activity such as hay-making seems probable.</td>
<td>TG 2970 1453</td>
<td>Undated (medieval-post-medieval?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF56006</td>
<td>Site of undated settlement on Rackheath and Salhouse parish boundary</td>
<td>A probable settlement of unknown date is visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. The site is evident as a linear arrangement of rectilinear enclosures ranged along a double-ditched trackway or road.</td>
<td>TG 2933 1432</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF56007</td>
<td>Possible fragment of undated settlement</td>
<td>A rectilinear arrangement of undated ditches, visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs, may represent part of a more extensive linear settlement, ranged along a trackway or road.</td>
<td>TG 2913 1340</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF56008</td>
<td>Site of probable settlement of unknown date</td>
<td>A probable settlement of unknown date is visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. The site is evident as a linear arrangement of rectilinear enclosures ranged along what is now a field boundary but may once have been (at least in part) a road or trackway named Ravensgate Way on a map of 1585</td>
<td>TG 2870 1320</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF56019</td>
<td>Site of possible multi-phase settlement of unknown date, north of Cherry Tree Farm</td>
<td>A probable multi-period and undated settlement site is visible as the cropmarks of enclosures, probable trackways, and other features on aerial photographs.</td>
<td>TG 2816 1302</td>
<td>Undated (prehistoric-medieval?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF56224</td>
<td>Site of possible Iron Age to Roman period field system</td>
<td>Fragmentary cropmarks of unknown date, visible on aerial photographs, may represent remnants of a field system of possible Iron Age to Roman date.</td>
<td>TG 2932 1466</td>
<td>Undated (prehistoric – Roman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF56323</td>
<td>Site of possible boundary bank</td>
<td>A possible boundary bank, probably of medieval to post medieval date, is visible as a cropmark and/or soilmark on aerial photographs. The bank, partially flanked by a ditch on its east side, follows a dog-leg course for some 370m, perhaps following a natural channel leading from or ending at a pond to its north. The northern end of the feature may correspond with part of a field boundary depicted on 19th century maps.</td>
<td>TG 2976 1405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MNF56326 | Site of undated and probably post medieval field boundaries and other cropmarks | A group of undated and probably post medieval field boundaries and other cropmarks is visible on aerial photographs. | TG 2974 1488 | Post-medieval  
| MNF56329 | Site of undated and post medieval field boundaries and other cropmarks | An extensive group of undated and post medieval field boundaries and other cropmarks is visible on aerial photographs across the site of Rackheath Airfield. | TG 2854 1396 | Undated (prehistoric-post-medieval?)  
| MNF56539 | Medieval, post medieval and undated finds | Metal detecting in 2007 – 2008 recovered a possible Bronze Age unidentified object, and medieval and post medieval metal finds, including a gilt medieval horse harness pendant and a post medieval lead bird feeder. | TG 28 13 | Prehistoric to post-medieval  
| MNF57567 | Roman, Medieval and Post-Medieval finds | Metal detecting in 2008-9 revealed Roman, medieval and post-medieval finds. | TG 28 13 | Roman to post-medieval  
| MNF57600 | Site of World War Two Anderson shelter | A small World War Two Anderson type air raid shelter was visible on aerial photographs from 1945 in the garden of a residential property. | TG 2870 1274 | Modern  
| MNF57601 | Undated linear ditch feature | An undated linear ditch feature was visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs. | TG 2855 1275 | Undated  
| MNF57602 | Undated linear and curvilinear features | Undated linear and curvilinear features were visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs, possibly representing field boundaries or land division. | TG 2841 1276 | Undated  
| MNF57603 | Possible medieval to post medieval linear features and stack stand or undated ring ditch | Possible medieval to post medieval linear features and a stack stand or undated ring ditch are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. The linear ditches may relate to medieval to post medieval land division. | TG 2844 1266 | Undated (medieval – post-medieval?)  
| MNF57604 | Undated linear feature, possible medieval to post medieval field boundary | An undated linear ditch feature is visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs. It is on a similar alignment to, and therefore may perhaps be related to the settlement described in NHER 50729. | TG 2921 1319 | Undated (medieval – post-medieval?)  
| MNF57605 | Undated linear features, possible medieval to post medieval field boundaries | Two undated linear ditch features are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. They are on a similar alignment to, and therefore may be related to the settlement described in NHER 50729. | TG 2939 1348 | Undated (medieval – post-medieval?)  
<p>| MNF57607 | Undated linear and curvilinear ditch features, possible medieval to post medieval field boundaries | Two undated linear ditch features and possibly related curvilinear features are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. It is likely that they represent medieval to post medieval field boundaries, although their proximity to Bronze Age ring ditches (NHER 45115 and 45116) may indicate an earlier origin for the site. | TG 2996 1355 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MNF57608</th>
<th>Cropmarks of two possible Bronze Age ring ditches</th>
<th>The cropmarks of two possible Bronze Age ring ditches are visible on aerial photographs of this area taken in 1946. They are sub-circular to sub-oval in plan and might suggest that round barrows once stood here.</th>
<th>TG 2983 1261</th>
<th>Prehistoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MNF57609</td>
<td>Cropmark of possible Bronze Age ring ditch</td>
<td>The cropmark of a possible Bronze Age ring ditch is visible on aerial photographs of this area taken in 1946. It is sub-circular to sub-oval in plan and might suggest that a round barrow once stood here.</td>
<td>TG 2948 1233</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57610</td>
<td>Site of undated linear ditch features visible as cropmarks</td>
<td>Undated linear and curvilinear ditch features are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs, one of which appears to be on the same alignment as a linear feature 280m to the west (NHER 51931). These features may relate to medieval to post medieval land division, although they do not appear to correspond with historic maps of the area, and may relate to an earlier phase of land division, perhaps Iron Age to Roman in date.</td>
<td>TG 2918 1228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57611</td>
<td>Site of undated linear ditch feature visible as a cropmark</td>
<td>An undated linear feature is visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs. This northwest-southeast linear ditch appears to be on the same alignment as a linear feature 280m to the east (NHER 51930) which may relate to medieval to post medieval land division, although neither feature appears to correspond with the field boundaries on the historic maps of the area, and therefore may both relate to an earlier phase of land division, perhaps of Iron Age to Roman date.</td>
<td>TG 2890 1224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57612</td>
<td>Undated multi-phase linear and curvilinear features</td>
<td>Undated linear and curvilinear features are visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. Their orientation is generally at odds with that of the modern field pattern, although seems to echo the medieval to post medieval site to the east (NHER 51947) in places, as well as the possible Iron Age to Roman trackway to the north (NHER 51930) in others, suggesting a multi-phase site.</td>
<td>TG 2919 1206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57613</td>
<td>Site of possible medieval to post medieval linear ditch feature</td>
<td>A curving ditch feature visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs, approximately 140m to the south of the mapped position of NHER 9688, may be interpreted as possible evidence of ‘entrenchment’ on Mousehold Heath during the medieval to post medieval period. It is possible that another section of this entrenchment was visible 485m to the west (NHER 51918).</td>
<td>TG 2833 1177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57619</td>
<td>Site of undated possible double-ditched enclosure and possible pit</td>
<td>An undated possible double-ditched enclosure and possible pit were visible as cropmarks on aerial photographs. Their blurred edges suggest that these features may in fact be geological.</td>
<td>TG 2861 1225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57668</td>
<td>Post-medieval coin</td>
<td>Metal detecting in 2008 recovered a post-medieval coin</td>
<td>TG 28 13</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57669</td>
<td>Post-medieval coins</td>
<td>Metal detecting in 2008 revealed two post-medieval coins.</td>
<td>TG 28 13</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57672</td>
<td>Post-medieval coin and spoon</td>
<td>Metal detecting in 2008 recovered a post-medieval coin and an incomplete spoon.</td>
<td>TG 28 14</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57768</td>
<td>Medieval coin and post medieval cloth seal</td>
<td>Metal detecting in 2009 recovered a medieval coin and a post-medieval cloth seal. Metal detecting in 2010 a Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age flint scarper and medieval buckle were recovered.</td>
<td>TG 28</td>
<td>Prehistoric to post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF57867</td>
<td>Post-medieval lead disc</td>
<td>Metal detecting in 2009 recovered a post-medieval lead disc, either a lead weight or token.</td>
<td>TG 29</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF58283</td>
<td>Former extent of Mousehold Heath</td>
<td>The origins of Mousehold Heath are unknown, but it remained little altered between the 16th century and the end of the 18th century. This site represents the maximum known extent of the heath, as depicted on Faden’s Map of Norfolk (1797).</td>
<td>TG 286</td>
<td>Medieval – Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF59099</td>
<td>Roman, medieval and post medieval finds</td>
<td>Metal-detecting in 2010 and 2012 recovered medieval and post-medieval pottery sherds; medieval and post-medieval coins, jettons and tokens and Roman, medieval, medieval/post-medieval and post-medieval metal objects.</td>
<td>TG 29</td>
<td>Roman to post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF62423</td>
<td>Salhouse Hall Park</td>
<td>Historic parkland associated with Salhouse Hall.</td>
<td>TG 3016</td>
<td>Post-medieval - modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF63206</td>
<td>11th to 12th century pit and possible early modern plough furrow</td>
<td>In October 2011 a geophysical survey detected a number of anomalies of potential archaeological origin including possible continuation of enclosures recorded under NHER 50729 and a possible roundhouse or ring gully. However, subsequent excavation of several trial trenches recorded only a single pit containing a sherd of 11th or 12th century pottery and a small number of likely 18th century to modern plough furrows. It is likely that the anomalies detected during the geophysical survey were caused by variations in the natural geology.</td>
<td>TG 2899</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF69007</td>
<td>Post-medieval gravel quarry and modern field boundaries</td>
<td>A geophysical survey of this area undertaken in 2014 revealed little evidence for archaeologically significant remains. An area of disturbed ground identified at the northern edge of the southern field marks the location of a large 19th-century gravel pit. The other anomalies detected appear to mark the lines of several 20th-century field boundaries.</td>
<td>TG 2817</td>
<td>Post-medieval - modern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>