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Executive Summary

This Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment has been researched and prepared on behalf of North Oak Homes (Maximus) and assesses the archaeological potential of land at Marden, Hereford. This report forms the desk-based assessment required by paragraph 128 of the NPPF to identify the presence of (archaeological) heritage assets and the potential for as yet to be discovered assets.

This report also assesses the setting and significance of the scheduled monument of Sutton Walls which is located within 650m of the study site boundary. A methodology consistent with industry guidance has been used: in particular Historic England’s Good Practice Advice Note 3 ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’ (Historic England 2015), Conservation Principles (2008) and Seeing History in the View (2011b). Site visits were undertaken to the scheduled monument and its surrounding landscape.

A number of listed buildings are noted within the wider area, including the Grade I listed St. Mary’s Church.

During the site visits, a key view from the scheduled Sutton Walls towards the Grade I listed St. Mary’s Church was identified. The proposed development has designed in an area of open space at its western extent to ensure that this key view is protected and conserved.

The proposed development includes sensitive design, landscaping and screening which will result in less than substantial (minor) harm to the setting and significance of the scheduled Sutton Walls.

Pre-application discussions have been held with Julian Cotton, Planning Archaeologist for Herefordshire Council who confirmed that further archaeological investigation would be required to determine a planning application. In line with this requirement, a geophysical survey has been undertaken. This has identified linear anomalies relating to former historic field boundaries and possible drainage features are noted in the western part of the study site. No anomalies indicative of Medieval settlement, or of earlier activity, are noted.

Archaeology is not considered to represent a constraint to proposed development of the study site. Further intrusive investigation may be required to confirm the absence of archaeological deposits and this could reasonably be secured by means of a condition on consent.
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

1.1 This Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment has been researched and prepared by Hannah Smalley of CgMs Consulting on behalf of North Oak Homes (Maximus).

1.2 The assessment considers land off Paradise Green, Marden, Hereford (hereafter referred to as the study site) which is being considered for residential development. The study site has an area of approximately 5.6ha and is centred at NGR 351834, 247137 (Fig. 1).

1.3 In accordance with government policy on archaeology within the planning process (Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework), this assessment draws together the available archaeological, topographic and land-use information in order to clarify the archaeological potential of the study site.

1.4 Additionally, in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 'Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments’ (CIfA 2014), it incorporates an examination of evidence in the Herefordshire Historic Environment Record (HER), the National Heritage List for England (NHLE), online sources, published and unpublished material, and charts historic land-use through a map regression exercise. A site walkover visit was made in November 2015 and January 2016, and the Herefordshire Archives were visited to examine historic maps and documents.

1.5 This assessment will also assess and define the significance and setting of the designated heritage asset of Sutton Walls and will describe the nature and significance of the potential impact of development within the study site upon this designated heritage asset.

1.6 As a result, the assessment enables relevant parties to assess the significance of any non-designated heritage assets within the study site and designated heritage assets in the surrounding area to which proposed development may impact upon, assess the potential for as yet to be discovered archaeological assets and enables potential impacts on heritage assets to be identified, along with the need for design, civil engineering or archaeological solutions.
2.0 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK

2.1 Statutory Framework

Ancient Monuments & Archaeological Areas Act 1979

2.1.1 The Ancient Monuments & Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended) protects the fabric of Scheduled Monuments, but does not afford statutory protection to their settings. Relevant policies relating to the protection of the setting of scheduled monuments are contained within national and local development plan policy, and guidance for assessing and managing change within the setting of heritage assets is set out Historic England’s Good Practice Advice Note 3 ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’ (Historic England 2015).

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

2.1.2 The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out broad policies and obligations relevant to the protection of listed buildings and their settings, as well as conservation areas. The following sections of the Act are relevant to the proposed development area:

- Section 66(1) states: ‘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’.

- Section 69 of the Act requires local authorities to define as conservation areas any ‘areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’ and Section 72 gives local authorities a general duty to pay special attention ‘to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area’ in exercising their planning functions. These duties are taken to apply only within a conservation area. The Act does not make specific provision with regard to the setting of a Conservation Area, which is provided by the policy framework outlined in section 2.2, below.

2.2 National Policy

2.2.1 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). More recently (March 2014), the government published Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on-line.
2.2.2 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
- Conservation of England’s heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, and
- Recognition that heritage contributes to our knowledge and understanding of the past.

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

2.2.4 *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. 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.

2.2.5 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.

2.2.6 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.

2.2.7 *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.

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

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG)

2.2.9 The NPPF is supported by the National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) which is an on-line resource that was published in March 2014. In relation to the historic environment, paragraph 18a-001 states that:

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

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

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

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

2.2.13 Paragraph 18a-013 concludes stating:
“The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance. When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset’s significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its on-going conservation.”

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

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

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

“Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 7). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.”
2.2.16 The Practice Guide acknowledges that the extent and importance of setting is often based on visual considerations, but that it can also be influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration; by spatial associations; and, by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.

2.2.17 In short, government policy provides a framework which:

- Protects the significance of nationally important designated Heritage Assets
- Protects the contribution made by settings of such designations to that significance
- In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions
- Provides for the investigation and recording of the significance of heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence publicly accessible.

2.2.18 In considering any planning application for development, the planning authority will be mindful of the framework set by government policy, in this instance the NPPF, by current Development Plan Policy and by other material considerations.

2.3 Local Policy

2.3.1 Herefordshire Council adopted their Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 on 16th October 2015. The following policies relating to archaeology are relevant:

**SS6 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS**

**DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD CONSERVE AND ENHANCE THOSE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSETS THAT CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS THE COUNTY’S DISTINCTIVENESS, IN PARTICULAR ITS SETTLEMENT PATTERN, LANDSCAPE, BIODIVERSITY AND HERITAGE ASSESSSTS AND ESPECIALLY THOSE WITH SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGNATIONS. IN ADDITION, PROPOSALS SHOULD MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THOSE ECOSYSTEMS ESSENTIAL TO THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING OF THE COUNTY’S RESIDENTS AND ITS ECONOMY. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD BE SHAPED THROUGH AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO PLANNING THE FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENTS FROM**
THE OUTSET, AND BASED UPON SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO DETERMINE THE EFFECT UPON EACH WHERE THEY ARE RELEVANT:

- LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS, ESPECIALLY IN AREAS OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY;
- BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY ESPECIALLY SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION AND SITES OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST;
- HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE ASSETS, ESPECIALLY SCHEDULED MONUMENTS AND LISTED BUILDINGS
- THE NETWORK OF GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE;
- LOCAL AMENITY, INCLUDING LIGHT POLLUTION, AIR QUALITY AND TRAINQUILLITY;
- AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD PRODUCTIVITY
- PHYSICAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING MINERALS, SOILS, MANAGEMENT OF WASTE, THE WATER ENVIRONMENT, RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY CONSERVATION.

THE MANAGEMENT PLANS AND CONSERVATION OBJECTIVES OF THE COUNTY’S INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONALLY IMPORTANT FEATURES AND AREAS WILL BE MATERIAL TO THE DETERMINATION OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS. FURTHERMORE ASSESSMENTS OF LOCAL FEATURES, AREAS AND SITES, DEFINING LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS IN OTHER DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS, NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS SHOULD INFORM DECISIONS UPON PROPOSALS.

LD4 – HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE ASSETS

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS AFFECTING HERITAGE ASSETS AND THE WIDER HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SHOULD:

1. PROTECT, CONSERVE, AND WHERE POSSIBLE ENHANCE HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS IN A MANNER APPROPRIATE TO THEIR SIGNIFICANCE THROUGH APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT, USES AND SYMPATHETIC DESIGN, IN PARTICULAR EMPHASISING THE ORIGINAL FORM AND FUNCTION WHERE POSSIBLE;
2. WHERE OPPORTUNITIES EXIST, CONTRIBUTE TO THE CHARACTER AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS OF THE TOWNSCAPE OR WIDER ENVIRONMENT, ESPECIALLY WITHIN CONSERVATION AREAS;
3. USE THE RETENTION, REPAIR AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF HERITAGE ASSETS TO PROVIDE A FOCUS FOR WIDER REGENERATION SCHEMES
4. RECORD AND ADVANCE THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ANY HERITAGE ASSETS TO BE LOST (WHOLLY OR IN PART) AND TO MAKE THIS EVIDENCE OR ARCHIVE GENERATED PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE AND
5. WHERE APPROPRIATE, IMPROVE THE UNDERSTANDING OF AND PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE HERITAGE ASSET.

THE SCOPE OF THE WORKS REQUIRED TO PROTECT, CONSERVE AND ENHANCE HERITAGE ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS SHOULD BE PROPORTIONATE TO THEIR SIGNIFICANCE. DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES SHOULD EMPHASISE THE ORIGINAL FORM AND FUNCTION OF ANY ASSET AND, WHERE APPROPRIATE, IMPROVE THE UNDERSTANDING OF AND PUBLIC ACCESS TO THEM.

2.3.2 A Supplementary Planning Document for Archaeology and Development was produced in April 2010. This provides guidance on and additional information in relation to archaeology.

2.3.3 This archaeological desk-based assessment aims to clarify the specific archaeological potential of the study site and, in accordance with the NPPF and local policy to identify the significance of any archaeological assets which might be impacted by development, enabling appropriate mitigation measures to be formulated. It also assesses the setting and significance of the scheduled monument of Sutton Walls and the potential impact proposed development within the study site may have on this designated heritage asset.
3.0 METHODOLOGY FOR SIGNIFICANCE AND SETTING ASSESSMENT

3.1 Establishing the Significance and Setting of Heritage Assets

3.1.1 The starting point for evaluating the impact of a proposed development on (archaeological) heritage assets is to establish the significance of those assets, as well as the contribution their setting makes to that significance. Guidance on approaches to establishing significance is laid out in Historic England documents, as summarised below.

National Planning Policy Framework

3.1.2 With regard to national and local planning policy the impact of development proposals on the setting of the nearby heritage assets need to be considered. Government policy on development affecting heritage assets and their settings is contained in the NPPF paragraphs 129 and primarily in paragraph 132. Paragraph 132 applies in particular to Designated Heritage Assets. Although the emphasis of these policies is on physical change, it is clear that development within the setting of a heritage asset can harm its significance, or cause loss to its significance.

3.1.3 Setting is defined in Annex 2 of NPPF 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"

The Setting of Heritage Assets

3.1.4 The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2015) sets out guidance on the management of change within the settings of heritage assets. It reiterates the NPPF Annex 2 definition of setting (see above). Key to this document is that the protection of the setting of heritage assets need not prevent change but the impact of change needs to be properly assessed.

3.1.5 The guidance sets out a 5 staged process for practical and proportionate assessment of potential impact of proposed development on the setting of heritage assets and the resultant decision making process. Stages 1 and 2 are used in the identification and assessment of a heritage baseline:

1. Identification of heritage assets which are likely to be affected by proposals – The guidance states that if development is capable of affecting the
contribution of a heritage asset’s setting to its significance, or the appreciation of its significance, it can be considered as falling within the asset’s setting. Importantly, it is made clear that an impact on setting does not necessarily equate to harm to the asset, and may be positive or neutral. This judgement of impact instead depends upon a detailed understanding of the individual heritage asset’s significance, of which setting may form a greater or lesser part.

2. **Assessment of whether and what contribution setting makes to the significance of a heritage asset** – This depends upon an understanding of the history and development of the site, utilising historic mapping where possible. This assessment should also be informed by the physical surroundings of the asset, including its relationship with other heritage assets, the way in which the asset is experienced and the asset’s associations and patterns of use. All this information will provide a baseline for establishing the effects of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset.

3. **Assessing the effects of proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset** – With the baseline information gathered at Stage 2 it will be possible to identify a range of effects a proposed development may have on the setting of a heritage asset, which will be evaluated as beneficial, neutral or harmful to the significance of the heritage asset. The location and siting, form and appearance, permanence and any other effects of proposals will all inform the assessment process.

4. **Maximising enhancement and reduction of harm on the setting of heritage assets** – Measures to reduce harm could include relocation of all or parts of a development, changes to the layout, screening, etc. Where harm cannot be eliminated, design quality of the proposed development may be one of the main factors in assessing the balance of harm and benefit.

5. **The final decision about the acceptability of proposals** – This will depend on the range of circumstances that apply to a heritage asset and the relative sensitivity to change. Decisions are therefore made on a case by case basis, recognising that all heritage assets are not of equal importance and the contribution made by their setting to their significance also varies.

3.1.6 The guidance reiterates the NPPF in stating that where the effect of a proposed development to the setting of a designated heritage asset would result in ‘substantial’ harm to its significance, this harm can only be justified if the development delivers substantial public benefit and that there is no other alternative (i.e. redesign or
relocation). This appraisal considers Stages 1 to 3 for each asset or group of assets. Following this, Stage 4 will be considered for those assets where there is a potentially significant effect on their settings.

**Conservation Principles**

3.1.7 Conservation Principles was published by English Heritage (now Historic England) in 2008. The guidance relates to the sustainable management of the historic environment. Four key values are ascribed to heritage assets (pages 27 to 32 of the document), and understanding these values is fundamental to understanding their significance. The four values are:

- Evidential
- Historical
- Aesthetic
- Communal

3.1.8 The Guidance sets out a staged approach in determining these values (introduced in paragraphs 5 and 6). It is this approach which is used to undertake ‘Stage 2’ above.

3.2 **Methodology for Assessment of Predicted Impacts on Asset Significance**

**Assessment of impacts**

3.2.1 The assessment of the overall effect of the proposed development on the significance of heritage assets is evaluated by taking into account both the significance of the heritage asset and the degree of harm or benefit on that significance which would result from the proposed development.

3.2.2 The **significance of heritage assets** is a term which is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF, and comprises the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. Table 1 sets out the criteria for establishing the significance of heritage assets, which is informed established practice such as that outlined in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)(HA 2008). For the purposes of this Appraisal, the significance of heritage assets is classified into three categories: High, Moderate and Low. All designated heritage assets are considered to be of high significance.
Table 1: Criteria for assessing the significance of heritage assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Relevant Heritage Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>The receptor has little ability to absorb change without fundamentally altering its present character, is of high value, or of international or national importance.</td>
<td>SMs &amp; Areas of Archaeological Importance. Archaeological sites of schedulable quality &amp; significance. Listed buildings (all grades). Registered Historic Parks and Gardens (all grades). Historic Battlefields World Heritage Sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The receptor has moderate capacity to absorb change without significantly altering its present character, has some environmental value, or is of regional importance.</td>
<td>Local Authority designated sites e.g. Conservation Areas and their settings. Undesignated sites of demonstrable regional importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The receptor is tolerant of change without detriment to its character, is of low environmental value, or is of local importance.</td>
<td>Sites with significance to local interest groups. Sites of which the significance is limited by poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.3
The assessment of the degree of harm or benefit to the significance of designated assets is based upon the extent to which factors that contribute to the significance of the assets would be affected, either through physical impacts or changes to their setting. Setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of the asset, may affect the ability to appreciate significance, or may be neutral.

### 3.2.4
Level of harm to the significance of a heritage asset is dependent on the contribution of the heritage assets setting to its significance and the overall degree of change to its setting.

### 3.2.5
Table 2 provides definitions for varying degrees of harm to heritage assets, which allows an effect to be categorised, with the benefit of professional judgement. This provides a sliding scale of harm which, alongside an understanding of the significance of the heritage assets affected, allows for an informed decision to be taken, taking account of the harm identified and the benefits of the proposed development.
### Table 2: Criteria for Appraisal of degree of harm to the significance of heritage assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of harm</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Substantial                          | - Total or substantial loss of the significance of a heritage asset.  
- Substantial change affecting the setting of a heritage asset, such that the significance of the asset would be totally lost or substantially reduced (e.g. the significance of a designated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its designation would be questionable; the significance of an undesignated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its categorisation as a heritage asset would be questionable). |
| Less than substantial – Moderate     | - Partial loss or alteration of the significance of a heritage asset.  
- Considerable change affecting the setting of a heritage asset, such that the asset’s significance would be materially affected/considerably devalued, but not totally or substantially lost. |
| Less than substantial – Minor         | - Slight loss of the significance of a heritage asset. This could include the removal of fabric that forms part of the heritage asset, but that is not integral to its significance.  
- Some change affecting the setting of a heritage asset, but not to the degree that would result in a meaningful devaluation of its significance.  
- Perceivable level of harm, but insubstantial relative to the overall interest of the heritage asset. |
| Negligible/No material harm           | - A very slight change to a heritage asset which doesn’t result in material harm to its significance.  
- Very minor change to a heritage asset’s setting which would not materially affect the heritage asset’s significance. |
| No harm/Neutral                       | - No effect to a heritage asset or its setting.                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

3.2.6 The predicted impacts and their effect on the significance of heritage assets has been informed with reference to the matrix shown in Table 3 below, which combines the ratings for the sensitivity of the heritage asset with the predicted magnitude of change which would result from the proposed development. This process is not quantitative or prescriptive, but relies upon professional judgement at each step. However the factors considered in informing these judgments and in arriving at the various rankings of value and magnitudes of impacts are observable facts (i.e. numbers of assets, spatial relationships, designations, impacts).
Table 3: Criteria for assessing significance of effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity of receptor</th>
<th>Magnitude of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Adverse</td>
<td>Moderate Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial harm/Major-high</td>
<td>Less than substantial harm/Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Minor Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to Minor harm</td>
<td>Minor harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minor harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to Minor harm</td>
<td>No harm/Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No harm/Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No harm/Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>No harm/Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No harm/Benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.7 The matrix above is a useful framework to understand the scale of effect and significance of the asset in relation to harm caused by proposed development and aids the articulation of professional judgement in a consistent manner. Designated Heritage Assets are high sensitivity receptors.

**Other considerations**

**Impacts other than direct or visual**

3.2.8 In addition to the location, scale and form of the proposed development, noise, light and the generation of increase traffic will also be a consideration in determining an impact upon the setting of a designated heritage asset.

3.3 **Methodology for determining scope of assessment**

3.3.1 This Assessment focuses on the significance and setting of Sutton Walls - proposed development would not have any direct physical impacts to this designated heritage asset. To inform this appraisal a 1km radius search of the Herefordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) centred on the study site was conducted, and is referenced to, where relevant, in the report.
4.0 GEOLOGY, TOPOGRAPHY AND SITE CONDITIONS

4.1 Geology

4.1.1 The solid geology of the study site comprises interbedded siltstone and sandstone of the Raglan Mudstone Formation. A superficial deposit of alluvium (comprising clay, silt, sand and gravel) is present across the southern extent of the study site, associated with the minor water course defining the site’s southern boundary. River Terrace Deposits, comprising sand and gravel are also mapped across the north-western extent of the study site (British Geological Survey Sheet No 198 1989).

4.1.2 Soils across the study site are mapped as “slightly acidic loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage” (Soilscape 8 on the LandIS online soil database).

4.1.3 No geotechnical information for the study site was available at the time of writing (January 2016).

4.2 Topography

4.2.1 The study site is located in the broad valley of the River Lugg. The study site gently slopes downwards in a south-westerly direction towards a minor stream which defines the site’s southern boundary and the River Lugg which flows southwards, passing to the north and west of the study site, between 300m and 460m respectively. High ground within the study site is confined to the roadside area of Paradise Green, at a height of 61m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). The site then slopes downwards in a south-westerly direction to 58m AOD at the south-western tip and southern site boundary.

4.3 Site Conditions

4.3.1 The site was visited in November 2015 and January 2016, and a walkover survey conducted of the study site, its immediate surrounding area and Sutton Walls scheduled monument.

4.3.2 The study site comprises a single arable field, bound to the north by Paradise Green and to the south by a minor watercourse (Plates 1-5). Available online aerial photographic review shows that the area has previously been occupied by polytunnels (Google Earth ©). The line of the western half of the watercourse is a modern culvert cutting, undertaken sometime between 1843 and 1886, diverting the former route of
the watercourse along the later established field boundary (Plates 4-5). Across the
western tip of the site, pockets of uneven ground were noted and are visible on the
LIDAR data (see Appendix 2). It is likely that these areas relate to modern ground
disturbance possibly associated with former agricultural practices, although, an
archaeological origin cannot be entirely dismissed. Mature hedgerows form the
majority of the site boundary although the western end of the study site is provided
by metal fencing (Plate 6).

4.3.3 The scheduled monument of Sutton Walls is clearly visible from the study site (Plate
2). Partial views of the Grade I listed St Mary’s Church are visible from the western tip
of the study site, with limited and intermittent views of the church spire from the
remainder of the study site, although this is screened in places by a mature hedgerow
defining the northern site boundary (Plates 7-8). There are no views of the study site
from the church itself or from its associated graveyard. The graveyard boundary is
well-defined by a mature hedgerow. Limited and intermittent views of the Grade II
listed buildings of Church House, associated barn and ciderhouse are visible from the
western extent of the study site only (Plate 10). There is no intervisibility between the
study site and the remaining listed buildings located within the search radius.

4.3.4 The study site can be seen from the north-western boundary of the scheduled
monument of Sutton Walls (Plates 11-13). There are no views from the interior of the
monument facing out due to the mature woodland belt which surrounds the fort and
which covers the earthwork defences (Plates 16-17). From the perimeter of Sutton
Walls scheduled monument, clear views of the surrounding and wider countryside are
afforded in all directions (Plates 11-15, 18-20), predominantly comprising a rural
landscape, but also crossed by road and rail infrastructure. The built forms of Marden
and Sutton St Nicholas are visible in the wider setting of the monument, along with
isolated residential and small ribbon development (Plate 20).
5.0 **ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, INCLUDING ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The timescales used in this report are as follows:

**Prehistoric**
- Palaeolithic: 800,000 - 10,000 BC
- Mesolithic: 10,000 - 4,500 BC
- Neolithic: 4,500 - 1,800 BC
- Bronze Age: 1,800 - 600 BC
- Iron Age: 600 - AD 43

**Historic**
- Roman: AD 43 - 410
- Saxon/Early Medieval: AD 410 - 1066
- Medieval: AD 1066 - 1485
- Post Medieval: AD 1486 - 1800
- Modern: AD 1800 - Present

5.1 **Introduction**

5.1.1 This assessment is based on a consideration of evidence in the Herefordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) and the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) for the study site and a zone 1km in extent (study area) surrounding its boundary. Historic maps and documents were examined at Herefordshire Archives. Published and unpublished works were consulted for further background information. Open source Environment Agency LIDAR data was also reviewed for the identification for potential archaeological features.

5.1.2 The scheduled monument of Sutton Walls Iron Age hillfort (NHLE1001747) is sited c.650m to the south of the study site boundary. The Grade I listed St Mary’s Church is located c.430m to the west of the study site along with five Grade II listed grave markers sited within the associated graveyard. A further five Grade II listed buildings are located within 250m of the study site boundary.

5.1.3 This chapter reviews existing archaeological evidence for the study site and the archaeological/historical background of the general area, and, in accordance with the NPPF, considers the potential for as yet undiscovered archaeological evidence on the
study site. Chapter 5 subsequently considers the study site conditions and whether the theoretical potential identified in this chapter is likely to survive.

5.2 Previous Archaeological Investigations

5.2.1 There has been no previous intrusive archaeological investigation of the study site itself, or of its immediate surrounding area. A programme of archaeological investigation was conducted at Marden Court Farm, c.300m west of the study site (HER43222), where Medieval earthworks were recorded.

5.2.2 The study site does lie within the extensive area studied as part of the Lower Lugg Valley Archaeology and Aggregates Project, funded by the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund. This assessment included an archaeological synthesis of the area, including the study site, and also included a systematic review of aerial photography.

5.2.3 The study site has also recently been subject to a geophysical survey (Archaeological Services Durham University 2016, Appendix 3). The results of this survey identify a number of linear anomalies associated with former field boundaries. A small cluster of anomalies is noted in the northern tip of the study site; these anomalies are aligned at right angles to the historic field boundaries and are likely to be contemporary with those features; they are not thought to represent significant settlement activity. Further ephemeral linear features across the west of the study site may relate to possible drainage features.

5.2.4 The results of the aerial photographic analysis and geophysical survey are discussed further in the relevant sections below.

5.3 Prehistoric (Palaeolithic – Iron Age/Romano-British)

5.3.1 Little evidence for early to middle Prehistoric activity is recorded within the search radius. However, given the presence of the Iron Age hillfort of Sutton Walls located c.650m to the south of the study site (NHLE 1001747), it is likely that the local area was utilised prior to the occupation of Sutton Walls. This is further demonstrated by the results of a series of archaeological investigations conducted at Wellington Quarry (HER 5522) c.1.5km to the west of the study site, where evaluation and salvage recording revealed a long history of human activity on the floodplain of the River Lugg, comprising sporadic use by Mesolithic hunter-gatherers, evidence of mid to late Neolithic Bronze Age Activity and a late Iron Age settlement.
5.3.2 There is currently no definitive evidence for Prehistoric activity to be present within the study site itself. As part of the Lower Lugg Valley Aggregates Project, an area of cropmark activity was mapped within the study site (see Appendix 1). However, the majority of these cropmarks can be attributed to former field boundaries as seen on the 1720 and 1840 maps of Marden. A discrete area of ephemeral possible ditch features is noted predominantly in the northern tip of the study site; their shape and form do not suggest the presence of significant settlement activity and their relationship with the later mapped field boundaries suggests that they are later in date.

5.3.3 A series of undated cropmarks are recorded in the HER c. 550m to the south of the study site (HER31970, HER20527). Although undated, it is possible that these cropmarks may be attributed to the late Prehistoric or Romano-British period; the possible identification of outer ditches to the hillfort on the north-west corner of Sutton Walls is also noted. The extent and location of these cropmarks were not mapped as part of the Lower Lugg Valley Aggregates Project.

5.3.4 Located c.340m to the north-east of the study site is a flint knife findspot (HER 8416) and c.500m to the west of the study site, an Iron Age bell was recovered from a pond (HER 6546). These findspots further demonstrate that the local landscape was occupied and utilised during this period, with a particular emphasis for the later Prehistoric, as larger areas of former woodland would have been cleared and more settled and farmed landscapes emerge.

5.3.5 During the late Prehistoric period, primary settlement focus may have been confined to the Sutton Walls hillfort, although isolated farmsteads or occupation sites may also have developed throughout the surrounding landscape. Recent geophysical survey of the study site does not suggest the presence of Prehistoric settlement activity within the study site. It is likely that the study site lay within the surrounding agricultural lands of the Sutton Walls. Sheppard (1979, 33-38) states that a possible considerable tract of land must have been cultivated in the vicinity of the fort and this tract would have coincided, in part, with areas suggested as likely eleventh-century arable land. Kenyon also describes the Sutton Walls community as 'rich in herds', which would have been supported by surrounding areas of pasture. The study site is shown to lie within the hypothetical bounds of the Sutton Walls Chieftainty (Sheppard 1979, Figure 9).

5.3.6 It is clear that the study site lies within a utilised Prehistoric landscape, particularly from the late Prehistoric period onwards. However, there is currently no evidence to
suggest that the study site itself was subject to occupation activity and is more likely to have lain within an area of agricultural land surrounding the Iron Age hillfort of Sutton Walls. On current evidence, a low potential for significant occupation activity is identified for the study site. Archaeological activity within the study site may be limited to that of former agricultural practices and isolated find spots.

5.4 **Roman**

5.4.1 Continuing settlement activity from the Iron Age hillfort at Sutton Walls is recorded to be present up until the first half of the 3rd century A.D. By the end of the 3rd century, the hillfort then appears to revert to agricultural use (Kenyon 1953).

5.4.2 Evidence of Roman activity noted within the HER for the remaining search area is limited to that of a single Romano-British pottery findspot (HER6543), over 600m to the west of the study site. Sited further afield and discovered during the Wellington Quarry works over 1.5km to the north-west, was a 1st-4th century Roman settlement, villa and associated activity (HER5522).

5.4.3 While there are known sites of Roman activity within the local area, the foci of settlement within 1.5km of the study site have been identified outside of the study site boundary. Geophysical survey of the study site does not suggest the presence of significant occupation activity. The study site itself may have continued to have occupied an area of agricultural hinterland. On the basis of current evidence, it is considered that there is a low potential for significant buried archaeological remains of the Roman period to survive within the study site.

5.5 **Saxon - Medieval**

5.5.1 During salvage recording at Wellington Quarry, c.630m to the west of the study site, a probable early Medieval watermill, along with a fish weir and dam were discovered (HER 51637). The manor of Marden is believed to have developed during the Saxon period. The vast majority of names within the manor appear to be of Anglo-Saxon derivation (Sheppard 1979, 30). The name Marden is believed to be derived from *Maund or Magene* (the name of the district of the area) combined with the Old English suffix *wordign* (an enclosure). Sheppard further states that King Offa had owned Marden which had earlier been a *Magoneate* Royal estate. A church had been reputedly founded at Marden around 800 A.D, in penance of the murder of King Ethelbert by King Offa, supposedly built on the site of the initial burial.
5.5.2 The Domesday Survey confirms that the settlement of Marden was already flourishing at the commencement of the Medieval period, with a likely settlement focus around St Mary’s Church, c.400m to the west of the study site. The manor is recorded as having a total of 31 plough teams, 40 acres of meadow, one mill, a fishery and two salthouses. A suggested 11th century land-use plan produced by Sheppard (1979) shows the study site lying within an area of waste on the northern fringe of a large area of probable arable field surrounding Sutton Walls. Around c.1300, likely at the point of a population peak, the study site is shown to lie within an area of closes, although the formation of these closes may have occurred during the later Medieval period.

5.5.3 It is unclear whether the establishment of these closes was also accompanied by Medieval dwellings. The presence of earthworks and a pond noted c.100m to the north-west of the study site is recorded as possibly being associated with a shrunken or shifted village (HER 9227) and it is noted that the expansion of linear settlement along Paradise Green in the Medieval period remains uncertain. The HER notes that other cropmarks may denote possible Medieval settlement features (HER 31033). However, the results of a recent geophysical survey do not suggest the presence of significant settlement activity; instead the majority of cropmarks recorded within the study site can be attributed to former field boundaries.

5.5.4 The study site lies some distance from the principle settlement core of Marden which is focused around the Church of St Mary. The study site is likely to have been part of the agricultural hinterland of the village, certainly during the Saxon and Early Medieval period. A low potential for archaeological remains of the Saxon/Early Medieval period is therefore identified. This is also likely to be the case in the Medieval period and is further supported by the presence of Medieval or later ridge and furrow recorded to the west of the study site (HER 38463) and the suggested Medieval land use plans produced by Sheppard (1979, Figures 7 and 8). Possibly as early as the later Medieval period, the study site was subject to piecemeal enclosure, forming a series of small closes. It is uncertain whether the formation of these closes was also accompanied by isolated areas of settlement activity, forming a linear hamlet along Paradise Green. However, the recent geophysical survey results did not identify any potential roadside settlement activity within the study site. On the basis of current evidence, a low potential for significant Medieval settlement activity is identified for the study site, as the area is likely to have remained in agricultural use.
5.6 **Post-Medieval and Modern**

5.6.1 The Post-Medieval period sees the establishment of large farmsteads extending from the historic core of Marden eastwards along Paradise Green. This is illustrated by the presence of 17\textsuperscript{th} century farmsteads of Upper Paradise Farm (HER 38865 – 165m to the north-east) and Brook Farm (HER 21651 – 760m to the north) and the Post-Medieval Lower Paradise Farm (HER 46263) sited opposite the study site, on the northern side of Paradise Green.

5.6.2 In this period, understanding of settlement, land-use and the utilisation of the landscape is enhanced by cartographic and documentary sources which can give additional detail.

5.6.3 The 1720 Coningsby’s map of Marden provides the earliest detailed plan of the study site. The study site comprises up to eight irregularly enclosed closes (Known as Pools Close, Bakers Croft, Court Head, Hopp Yard and a number of closes owned by Widdow English and Widdow Whiting). Piecemeal enclosure of this area may have begun as early as the Medieval period and was certainly completed prior to 1608, as evidenced in the 1608 Marden survey. The majority of closes were used as pasture, but orchards and hop-yards also occurred near dwellings (Sheppard 1979, 15). The study site is shown to contain two areas of orchard and a hop-yard, with the remaining closes as possible areas of pasture. Buildings associated with Paradise Farm and Lower Paradise Farm are noted to the north of the study site and the settlement at Marden is also illustrated. A number of small structures are depicted at the western end of Paradise Green, beyond the western site boundary. A possible building is noted along the northern field boundary of Pools Close, possibly representing a small barn or building of agricultural use, at the north-western end of the study site, although this is difficult to distinguish.

5.6.4 Although minor boundary changes are noted on the 1808 Marden Enclosure map (Fig. 3), the study site remains unchanged from that of the earlier 1720 map to that shown on the 1840s Paradise Estate map (Fig.4). The probable agricultural building noted within Pools Close at the western end of the study site is clearly shown.

5.6.5 By 1886 (Fig. 5) former field divisions within the study site have been removed and the minor watercourse defining the south-eastern site boundary has been re-routed to run along the entire length of the southern site boundary. The study site now comprises three enclosed fields, with the northern-most denoted as an orchard, remnants of former field divisions remain as tree lines within the enclosed fields (Fig.
6). The former building present at the western end of the study site has been removed.

5.6.6 The 1904 Ordnance Survey (Fig. 7) shows that the study site remains relatively unchanged although the tree lines associated with the relict field boundaries have now been removed. The subsequent Ordnance Survey map of 1971-72 (Fig. 8) no longer denotes the northern-most field as orchard and the study site remains largely unchanged. This continues to be the case on the later 1995 Ordnance Survey (Fig. 9), although both these maps show ribbon style development of detached residential properties on the northern side of Paradise Green, opposite the study site, and to the north-east of the study site.

5.6.7 The map regression and historical documentation clearly shows that the study site has been used as an area of enclosed agricultural land throughout the Post-Medieval and Modern period. Although a small area of structural debris may be present at the western end of the study site, associated with a probable agricultural building, a low potential for the presence of any significant buried archaeological remains dating from the Post-Medieval or Modern periods is identified for the study site.

5.7 **Designated Heritage Assets**

5.7.1 Located within the 1km search radius of the study site is one scheduled monument and seventeen listed buildings (one Grade I, one Grade II* and 15 Grade II).

5.7.2 This report addresses archaeological designated heritage assets.

**Scheduled Monument**

5.7.3 As outlined in 5.1.2, the scheduled monument of Sutton Walls Iron Age Hillfort (NHLE1001747) is located c.650m to the south of the study site. The scheduled hillfort comprises a single rampart and ditch which encircles the crest of a long narrow mound of glacial gravel which rises steeply above the flood plain of the River Lugg, from c.89m AOD to 98m AOD. The hillfort encompasses an area of approximately 17.6ha. The list description of the monument is brief (see 5.9.5), however further information is provided by Kenyon’s excavation report (Kenyon 1953).

5.7.4 The earliest phase of Iron Age occupation precedes the construction of the ramparts, although a timber palisade may be associated with this period. The second phase of occupation is marked by the construction of the defences which encircle the hilltop. The hillfort comprised two entrances, one at each of the eastern and western ends. The ramparts were placed at the lip of the steep slope of the hill. The construction
material for the ramparts were obtained in part from the ditch cut at the foot of the slope and in part from gravel obtained from wide scoops at the rear of the ramparts. In these scoops, huts were built and a considerable accumulation of occupation debris was recorded.

5.7.5 During the third phase of occupation, dated to around 25 A.D., the ramparts were raised in height, the revetment at the western entrance was partly rebuilt and huts within the interior were rebuilt. The fourth phase is marked by the presence of the Romans. Re-cutting of the defensive ditch took place but, soon after, a large number of bodies with clear evidence of conflict and wounds, were thrown into the ditch. Following this, the ramparts at the entrance were either slighted or the revetments were allowed to fall rapidly into decay. Occupation continued in the interior of the camp, with two successive layers of occupation activity recorded with limited Roman pottery.

5.7.6 The fifth phase of occupation is defined by the construction of more stone built structures at the end of the 2nd century A.D. By this date Roman type wares had completely superseded the former native types of pottery. Towards the end of the 3rd century occupation within the hillfort ceases and the interior of the fort was turned over to agriculture; the subsequent ploughing truncated much of the later occupation layers. This final phase lasted well until the 4th century A.D.

5.7.7 No evidence of Saxon occupation was recorded during the programme of excavation. A large part of the western extent of the hillfort was subject to gravel extraction, primarily during the second world war and was ceased prior to and as the result of the scheduling of the monument.

5.8 **Historic Landscape**

5.8.1 The Herefordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation identifies the study site as lying within an area that has undergone ‘adaption of an earlier enclosure system’ (HHE304). As illustrated in Coningsbury’s 1720 map of Marden, the study site previously occupied a number of irregular closes, possibly enclosed as early as the Medieval period. However, many of these historic boundaries were subsequently removed by the late 19th century. Although the study site remains an area of agricultural land, former historic landscape features within the site have been removed. Surviving historic boundaries that may be considered important in line with the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 are those that define the study site’s northern, eastern and south-eastern site.
boundary (the south-western boundary is excluded as this post-dates the 1840 Inclosure Act).

5.9 **Assessment of Significance**

**The study site**

5.9.1 The scheduled monument and listed buildings located within the search radius of study site are of national significance.

5.9.2 A low potential for significant archaeological remains is identified for the study site for all periods. Primarily, archaeological activity within the study site is likely to be limited to that of former agricultural practices. Continued agricultural practice through to the present day is likely to have caused a level of truncation of archaeological deposits within the study site, should they be present. Based on the nature of anticipated archaeological activity within the study site and the impact of later agricultural practices upon these, archaeological deposits that may be present are considered, on current evidence, to be no more than of local significance.

5.9.3 The surviving field boundaries that define the study site boundary that were in existence on the 1840s Estate map may be classified as important in accordance with the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations, these are of no more than local significance.

**Sutton Walls**

5.9.4 This section defines and assesses the significance and setting of Sutton Walls and assesses the effect of proposed development upon its significance.

**Description**

5.9.5 The list description and information provided by Historic England comprises the following:

Situated on a hill of slight elevation with a plateau-like top. Fort irregularly shaped following the natural contours. The defences consist of a single steep scarp. At foot is wide berm. Five entrances, only two original – one at E, other at W. Plan and scarp suggests an early Iron Age origin. Pottery found in great abundance in both Iron Age and Roman levels in almost all areas excavated and in quarry debris. In 1953 finds discovered at Sutton Walls at NWN border of camp – included a beaker, upper parts of two human skulls and pottery and a straddle stone.
Further detail regarding the occupation activity recorded at Sutton Walls is provided in Keyon’s excavation report and is summarised above in paragraphs 5.7.2 - 5.7.6.

**Setting**

As outlined above, the hillfort occupies a natural gravel hillock rising from the River Lugg valley floor. Geographically, the hillfort is sited in a commanding position within the Lugg Valley, with views in all directions over a predominantly rural, enclosed agricultural landscape and with clear views of the River Lugg to the west. The surrounding enclosed agricultural landscape forms the immediate setting of the monument, illustrating its topographic prominence. However, the settlements of Marden and Sutton, along with isolated farmstead and roadside hamlets such as Wallsend, Franklands Gate and Fromington fall within the intermediate and wider setting of the monument along with established road and rail infrastructure. These built and more recent elements of the landscape are clearly visible from the boundary of the scheduled monument.

Sutton Walls is a prominent feature of the landscape and can be viewed via a wide panorama and from a distance.

**Summary of Significance**

The significance of the scheduled monument is primarily derived from the physical remains – both upstanding and below ground - of the hillfort itself (its evidential and historical value) and its potential to contain further significant archaeological deposits. The significance of the monument is contributed to, to a lesser degree, by its setting, which enables an appreciation of the hillfort’s topographic positioning, its connection with and utilisation of the surrounding landscape.

**Assessment of relationship of Sutton Walls to the study site**

The study site is located within the wider setting of the scheduled monument. Due to the monuments’ natural topographic dominance, the hillfort is clearly visible from the study site. It is noted that the belt of trees surrounding the monument prevents an aesthetic appreciation of the upstanding hillfort remains.

The study site is visible from the north-western boundary of the scheduled monument. A row of mature trees flanking the route of the public footpath heading south from Marden towards the hillfort helps to screen views of the study site. It is noted that views from the scheduled monument towards the study site include the built form of
Marden which provides an established backdrop of residential development sited within the wider setting of the monument.
6.0 THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT ON HERITAGE ASSETS

6.1 The Proposed Development

6.1.1 An application for residential development of the study site is to be submitted to the local planning authority.

6.2 Impact on (Archaeological) Heritage Assets

Scheduled Monument of Sutton Walls

6.2.1 A key view from the Scheduled Sutton Walls towards the Grade I listed St. Mary’s Church will be conserved and protected by the provision of open space across the western third of the study site.

6.2.2 Proposed residential development within the study site would alter a small part of the wider setting of the scheduled monument of Sutton Walls; it would not alter our understanding or appreciation of the monument. The physical remains of the monument and the vast majority of its wider setting would remain unaffected.

6.2.3 It is noted that development within the study site would change it from being an area of agricultural land to being an area of residential build. Equally, it is noted that the setting of the scheduled monument, as it is currently experienced, does include modern residential development. Sensitive design and enhancement of landscape screening will ensure this change to the wider setting of Sutton Walls will be minor.

6.2.4 It is concluded development of the study site will have a less than substantial (minor) impact on the setting and significance of Sutton Walls.

Potential Archaeological Impacts

6.2.5 The cutting of foundations and groundworks associated with construction of the proposed development would impact upon any unknown archaeological deposits within the study site.

6.2.6 A low potential for significant archaeological remains is identified for the study site for all periods. Primarily, archaeological activity within the study site is likely to be associated with former agricultural practices of local significance. It is anticipated that should archaeological activity be present within the study site it would not be of sufficient significance to preclude or constrain development.
6.2.7 The historic hedgerows defining the study site boundary would be principally unaffected by the proposed development; a small section of hedgerow would be removed to facilitate site access.
7.0 **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

7.1 This report forms the (archaeological) heritage statement required by the NPPF and has identified and assessed as appropriate archaeological heritage assets, the potential for as yet to be discovered archaeological assets and the effect of the proposed development on those assets. This assessment also considers the setting and significance of Sutton Walls scheduled monument.

7.2 A number of listed buildings are noted within the wider area, including the Grade I listed St. Mary’s Church.

7.3 During site visits, a key view from the scheduled Sutton Walls towards the Grade I listed St. Mary’s Church was identified. The proposed development has designed in an area of open space at its western extent to ensure that this key view is protected and conserved.

7.4 The proposed development includes sensitive design, landscaping and screening which will result in less than substantial (minor) harm to the setting and significance of the scheduled Sutton Walls.

7.5 Pre-application discussions have been held with Julian Cotton, Planning Archaeologist for Herefordshire Council who confirmed that further archaeological investigation would be required to determine a planning application. In line with this requirement, a geophysical survey has been undertaken. This has identified linear anomalies relating to former historic field boundaries and possible drainage features are noted in the western part of the study site. No anomalies indicative of Medieval settlement, or of earlier activity, are noted.

7.6 Archaeology is not considered to represent a constraint to proposed development of the study site. Further intrusive investigation may be required to confirm the absence of archaeological deposits and this could reasonably be secured by means of a condition on consent.
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Plate 1: Located centrally along the northern site boundary of the study site from Paradise Green, looking south-east across the study site.

Plate 2: From the north-western site boundary, looking south towards Sutton Walls.

Plate 3: At the western tip of the study site, looking north-east.

Plate 4: At the western tip of the study site, looking east, southern site boundary on the right.
Plate 5: Looking east along the southern site boundary

Plate 6: Mature hedgerow along Paradise Green defining the northern site boundary

Plate 7: At the western site boundary looking north-west towards St Mary's Church

Plate 8: From the northern side of Paradise Green, looking west towards St Mary's Church
Plate 9: Looking towards Sutton Walls from the eastern end of lane leading to St Mary’s Church

Plate 10: At the western tip of the study site, looking north-west towards Church House and Barn

Plate 11: Looking north-west towards the study site from the northern public footpath entrance to Sutton Walls

Plate 12: Sited along the north-western periphery of Sutton Walls looking north towards the study site
Plate 13: At the western periphery of Sutton Walls, looking north towards the study site.

Plate 14: Looking south towards Downfield at the southern side of Sutton Walls.

Plate 15: Looking west along the southern side of Sutton Walls.

Plate 16: Looking north across the eastern interior of Sutton Walls.
Plate 17: At the eastern end of Sutton Walls, looking south

Plate 18: Along the central northern boundary of Sutton Walls, looking north

Plate 19: Along the central northern boundary of Sutton Walls, looking north

Plate 20: To the east of the northern public footpath entrance to Sutton Walls, looking north towards Marden
Appendix 1: Herefordshire HER, Designated Heritage Assets, HLC data and Lower Lugg Valley ALSF assessment
**Designated Heritage Assets**

**Scheduled Monuments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ListEntry</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001747</td>
<td>Sutton Walls (camp)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listed Buildings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ListEntry</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1099361</td>
<td>BENNETT MONUMENT ABOUT 50 YARDS SOUTH-EAST OF CHURCH OF ST MARY</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099362</td>
<td>HARRIS MONUMENT ABOUT 20 YARDS EAST-NORTH-EAST OF CHURCH OF ST MARY</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099363</td>
<td>HEADSTONE ABOUT 15 YARDS EAST-SOUTH-EAST OF CHURCH OF ST MARY</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099364</td>
<td>BARN AND CIDERHOUSE ATTACHED TO NORTH-EAST OF CHURCH HOUSE</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099365</td>
<td>UPPER PARADISE FARMHOUSE</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099375</td>
<td>BRADNOR</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099376</td>
<td>IVY COTTAGE</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099402</td>
<td>NEW HOUSE FARMHOUSE AND FRONT GARDEN WALLS</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099403</td>
<td>OLD SCHOOL HOUSE</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1178842</td>
<td>STABLES ATTACHED TO THE NORTH END OF NEW HOUSE FARMHOUSE</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1179155</td>
<td>BROOK FARMHOUSE</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302203</td>
<td>CHURCH OF ST MARY</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348930</td>
<td>BASE OF CHURCHYARD CROSS ABOUT 35 YARDS EAST-SOUTH-EAST OF CHURCH OF ST MARY</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348950</td>
<td>DANIEL MONUMENT ABOUT 25 YARDS EAST OF CHURCH OF ST MARY</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348951</td>
<td>CHURCH HOUSE</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348952</td>
<td>LEYSTONE BRIDGE</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348953</td>
<td>HOP KILN AND ADJOINING BUILDING ABOUT 20 YARDS WEST-NORTH-WEST OF UPPER PARADISE FARMHOUSE</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Herefordshire HER**

**Monuments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMRNO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MONTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8532</td>
<td>Shrunken settlement earthworks, Marden</td>
<td>SHRUNKEN VILLAGE (Medieval to 19th Century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31033</td>
<td>Settlement Features, East of Old School House, Marden</td>
<td>FIELD BOUNDARY (Post Medieval), HOUSE PLATFORM (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48844</td>
<td>Water Management Features, Wellington Quarry, Wellington</td>
<td>BOUNDARY (Post Medieval), DITCH (Post Medieval), WATER CHANNEL (Post Medieval), WATER MEADOW (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48847</td>
<td>Water Management Features, Northwest of Laystone Green, Wellington</td>
<td>WATER MEADOW (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21651</td>
<td>Brook Farm, Marden</td>
<td>BUILDING (Post Medieval), FARM (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UID</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TYPE (Period)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21651</td>
<td>Brook Farm, Marden</td>
<td>BUILDING (Post Medieval), FARM (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46262</td>
<td>Woodbine (The Woodbine)</td>
<td>FARM? (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38865</td>
<td>Upper Paradise Farm, Marden</td>
<td>FARM (Post Medieval), HOUSE (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46263</td>
<td>Lower Paradise Farm, Marden</td>
<td>FARM (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6543</td>
<td>RB pottery, Hill Crest, Marden</td>
<td>FINDSPOT (Roman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6546</td>
<td>Celtic bell, pond, nr church, Marden</td>
<td>FINDSPOT (Iron Age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8416</td>
<td>Flint knife, Marden</td>
<td>FINDSPOT (Prehistoric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9227</td>
<td>Earthworks and pond, Marden</td>
<td>POND (undated), SHRUNKEN VILLAGE? (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9558</td>
<td>Ridge &amp; furrow, N of Marden, Wellington</td>
<td>RIDGE AND FURROW (Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10160</td>
<td>Holy Well, Marden Church, Marden</td>
<td>WELL (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10161</td>
<td>'Conny Geer' field, north of Church, Marden</td>
<td>RABBIT WARREN (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20527</td>
<td>Cropmarks of rectangular enclosure with circular feature, 300m NW Sutton Walls Hill Fort, Marden</td>
<td>SITE (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23295</td>
<td>Catchpoles Weir, Marden</td>
<td>WEIR (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23296</td>
<td>River fishery, Bracedory, Marden</td>
<td>FISHERY (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30837</td>
<td>Moreton junction</td>
<td>RAILWAY JUNCTION (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31890</td>
<td>Yays Cottage, Moreton Bridge Road, Marden</td>
<td>HOUSE (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31891</td>
<td>Old road to Freens Court</td>
<td>ROAD (Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31970</td>
<td>Cropmarks at north west edge of Sutton Walls</td>
<td>RECTILINEAR ENCLOSURE (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38462</td>
<td>The Old School House</td>
<td>SCHOOL (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38463</td>
<td>Earthworks of ridge and furrow, Bell Field, Marden</td>
<td>RIDGE AND FURROW (Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31184</td>
<td>Landscape Park, Marden Court, Marden</td>
<td>LANDSCAPE PARK (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38668</td>
<td>Black Poplar</td>
<td>NATURAL FEATURE (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43222</td>
<td>Medieval Earthwork, Marden Court Farm, Marden</td>
<td>DEFENCE WORK (Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51637</td>
<td>Probable Early Medieval Watermill, Salvage Recording Area 11, Wellington Quarry, Wellington</td>
<td>DAM? (7th Century to 8th Century), FISH WEIR? (7th Century), WATERMILL? (8th Century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9099</td>
<td>Laystone Bridge</td>
<td>BRIDGE (Post Medieval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6900</td>
<td>St Mary, Church, Marden</td>
<td>CHURCH (Medieval)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVUID</th>
<th>OLDREF</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>EVENTTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EHE912</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>Marden Court, Marden</td>
<td>EXCAVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHE43222</td>
<td>43222</td>
<td>Marden Court, Marden</td>
<td>TRIAL TRENCH, WATCHING BRIEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Summary

The project

1.1 This report presents the results of a geophysical survey conducted in advance an application for proposed residential development at Paradise Green, Marden, Herefordshire. The works comprised approximately 5.6ha of detailed geomagnetic survey.

1.2 The works were commissioned by CgMs Consulting and conducted by Archaeological Services Durham University.

Results

1.3 Possible soil-filled features have been identified.

1.4 Possible drains have been detected.

1.5 Former field boundaries, as shown on historic OS editions, have been detected.

1.6 Services have been detected.
2. **Project background**

**Location** (Figure 1)

2.1 The proposed development area (PDA) was located at Paradise Green, Marden, Herefordshire (NGR centre: SO 51834 47137). One survey of approximately 5.6ha was conducted in a single land parcel. To the north-east was the village of Marden, with residential properties along Paradise Green along the north-west edge. Open farmland lay to the south and west. Sutton Walls fort stood to the south-east, and All Saints Church to the west.

**Development proposal**

2.2 The area is proposed for residential development.

**Objective**

2.3 The principal aim of the survey was to assess the nature and extent of any sub-surface features of potential archaeological significance within the PDA, so that an informed decision may be made regarding the nature and scope of any further scheme of archaeological works that may be required in relation to the development.

2.4 The regional research framework *The Archaeology of the West Midlands: a framework for research* (Watt 2011) contains an agenda for archaeological research in the region, which is incorporated into regional planning policy implementation with respect to archaeology. This research has the potential to inform regional research priorities within that framework.

**Methods statement**

2.5 The surveys have been undertaken in accordance with instructions from the client and national standards and guidance (see para. 5.1 below).

**Dates**

2.6 Fieldwork was undertaken between 10th and 11th February 2016. This report was prepared for February 2016.

**Personnel**

2.7 Fieldwork was conducted by Tessi Loeffelmann and Richie Villis (supervisor). Geophysical data processing and report preparation was by Richie Villis, with illustrations by David Graham and Helen Drinkall. The Project Manager was Duncan Hale.

**Archive/OASIS**

2.8 The site code is **MPG16**, for **Marden Paradise Green 2016**. The survey archive will be retained at Archaeological Services Durham University and a copy supplied on CD to the client for deposition with the project archive in due course. Archaeological Services Durham University is registered with the [Online Access](#) to the Index of archaeological investigations project ([OASIS](#)). The OASIS ID number for this project is **archaeol3-243743**.
3. Historical and archaeological background

3.1 A detailed archaeological desk-based assessment has been conducted for the proposed development (CgMs Consulting 2016); the results of that assessment are summarised here.

3.2 There are no known heritage assets from the prehistoric, Roman, Saxon, Medieval or Post-Medieval periods within the survey area, although the wider area has been exploited through prehistory and history. Sutton Walls, an Iron Age hillfort and scheduled monument lies 650m to the south and evidence of Saxon and Medieval settlement is present throughout the village of Marden to the north.

3.3 The assessment concluded that a moderate potential for medieval occupation activity may be present along the northern boundary of the survey area, but the remainder of the area has a low potential for archaeological deposits of all other periods. Archaeological activity in the survey is likely to be associated with former agricultural practices of local significance.

4. Landuse, topography and geology

4.1 At the time of survey the PDA comprised a single arable field under immature cereal crop. An open drain bounded the area to the south, with a post and wire fence and hedge along the east edge. The north and west of the area was bounded by a post and wire fence and hedge to the road.

4.2 The PDA occupied a south and east facing slope, with elevations of between 61m and 56m OD.

4.3 The underlying solid geology of the PDA comprises interbedded Silurian period siltstone and mudstone strata of the Raglan Mudstone Formation, which are overlain by Holocene Alluvium of clay, silt, sand and gravel along the south of the area, with Quaternary River Terrace Deposits of sand and gravel along the north edge.

5. Geophysical survey

Standards

5.1 The surveys and reporting were conducted in accordance with Historic England guidelines, Geophysical survey in archaeological field evaluation (David, Linford & Linford 2008); the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for archaeological geophysical survey (2014); the CIfA Technical Paper No.6, The use of geophysical techniques in archaeological evaluations (Gaffney, Gater & Ovenden 2002); and the Archaeology Data Service & Digital Antiquity Geophysical Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice (Schmidt 2013).

Technique selection

5.2 Geophysical survey enables the relatively rapid and non-invasive identification of sub-surface features of potential archaeological significance and can involve a suite of complementary techniques such as magnetometry, earth electrical resistance, ground-penetrating radar, electromagnetic survey and topsoil magnetic susceptibility survey. Some techniques are more suitable than others in particular
situations, depending on site-specific factors including the nature of likely targets; depth of likely targets; ground conditions; proximity of buildings, fences or services and the local geology and drift.

5.3 In this instance, based on desktop work, it was considered possible that cut features such as ditches and pits might be present on the site, and that other types of feature such as trackways, wall foundations and fired structures (for example kilns and hearths) might also be present.

5.4 Given the non-igneous geological environment of the study area a geomagnetic technique, fluxgate gradiometry, was considered appropriate for detecting the types of feature mentioned above. This technique involves the use of hand-held magnetometers to detect and record anomalies in the vertical component of the Earth’s magnetic field caused by variations in soil magnetic susceptibility or permanent magnetisation; such anomalies can reflect archaeological features.

Field methods

5.5 A 30m grid was established across the survey area and related to the Ordnance Survey National Grid using a Leica GS15 global navigation satellite system (GNSS) with real-time kinematic (RTK) corrections typically providing 5-10mm accuracy.

5.6 Measurements of vertical geomagnetic field gradient were determined using Bartington Grad601-2 dual fluxgate gradiometers. A zig-zag traverse scheme was employed and data were logged in 30m grid units. The instrument sensitivity was nominally 0.03nT, the sample interval was 0.25m and the traverse interval was 1m, thus providing 3,600 sample measurements per 30m grid unit.

5.7 Data were downloaded on site into a laptop computer for initial processing and storage and subsequently transferred to a desktop computer for processing, interpretation and archiving.

Data processing

5.8 Geoplot v.3 software was used to process the geophysical data and to produce both a continuous tone greyscale image and a trace plot of the raw (minimally processed) data. The greyscale image and interpretations are presented in Figures 2-5; the trace plot is provided in Figure 6. In the greyscale image, positive magnetic anomalies are displayed as dark grey and negative magnetic anomalies as light grey. A palette bar relates the greyscale intensities to anomaly values in nanoTesla.

5.9 The following basic processing functions have been applied to the geomagnetic data/each dataset: [only include those used]

clip 
clips data to specified maximum or minimum values; to eliminate large noise spikes; also generally makes statistical calculations more realistic

zero mean traverse
sets the background mean of each traverse within a grid to zero; for removing striping effects in the traverse direction and removing grid edge discontinuities
**de-stagger** corrects for displacement of geomagnetic anomalies caused by alternate zig-zag traverses

**interpolate** increases the number of data points in a survey to match sample and traverse intervals; in this instance the data have been interpolated to 0.25m x 0.25m intervals

**Interpretation: anomaly types**

5.10 A colour-coded geophysical interpretation plan is provided. Two types of geomagnetic anomaly have been distinguished in the data:

- **positive magnetic** regions of anomalously high or positive magnetic field gradient, which may be associated with high magnetic susceptibility soil-filled structures such as pits and ditches

- **dipolar magnetic** paired positive-negative magnetic anomalies, which typically reflect ferrous or fired materials (including fences and service pipes) and/or fired structures such as kilns or hearths

**Interpretation: features**

5.11 A colour-coded archaeological interpretation is provided.

5.12 Weak and ephemeral positive magnetic anomalies have been detected across the area. These may reflect the remains of soil-filled features. Narrow and straight anomalies, in a regular pattern, detected in the west of the area, may reflect land drains rather than archaeological features. A linear dipolar magnetic anomaly has been detected in the north of the area. This almost certainly reflects a ditch feature, filled by either fired and/or ferrous waste.

5.13 A rectilinear pattern of weak positive magnetic and chains of weak dipolar magnetic anomalies has been detected across the centre and east of the area. This corresponds to a series of former field boundaries as shown by historic OS editions. The historic OS editions also shown trees in this area; some of the ephemeral anomalies detected here may relate to this former land-use.

5.14 Chains of strong dipolar magnetic anomalies have been detected in the west of the area. These almost certainly reflect services. Similar anomalies have been detected on the north-west edge of the area, which are likely to reflect another service, just beyond the survey extent.

5.15 Small, discrete dipolar magnetic anomalies have been detected across the survey area. These almost certainly reflect items of near-surface ferrous and/or fired debris, such as horseshoes and brick fragments, and in most cases have little or no archaeological significance. A sample of these is shown on the geophysical interpretation plan.

5.16 Higher concentrations of dipolar magnetic anomalies have been detected along the south-east and north-west edges of the area. Gravel and occasional brick fragments were noted on the ground in these areas. These anomalies are likely to reflect the change in superficial geology (the gravels) and areas of dumped material (brick and mortar fragments), possibly used in boggier areas of the field.
6. **Conclusions**

6.1 Approximately 5.6ha of detailed geomagnetic survey was undertaken on land at Paradise Green, Marden, Herefordshire, prior to an application for proposed residential development.

6.2 Possible soil-filled features have been identified.

6.3 Possible drains have been detected.

6.4 Former field boundaries, as shown on historic OS editions, have been detected.

6.5 Services have been detected.

7. **Sources**

CgMs Consulting 2016 *Land at Marden, Hereford: archaeological desk-based assessment*. Unpublished report CP/HS/20799, CgMs Consulting

CIfA 2014 *Standard and Guidance for archaeological geophysical survey*. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
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Figure 6: Trace plot of geomagnetic data