

8. CULTURAL HERITAGE

8.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an outline appraisal of known cultural heritage assets within the various sites that form part of the Army Basing Programme on Salisbury Plain. It also assesses the potential impacts from the proposed developments on the cultural heritage resource which consists of archaeology, built heritage and the historic landscape.

This chapter represents the environmental appraisal of the recommended site options for the SFA, garrison sites and training areas. The impact assessment of the now discarded sites is preserved in Appendix 8C.

8.2 Policy Context

Prior to 2006, developments on MOD land were subject to Crown Immunity and therefore not subject to planning legislation. Crown Immunity was revoked in 2006 and ensured that the Crown was required to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (DCLG Circular 02/2006)¹.

The removal of Crown Immunity means that developments where there may be an impact upon the character or fabric of a listed building are now subject to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990² and are required to apply for listed building consent. The Act imposes a duty on the Secretary of State to compile lists of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. In consideration of proposals within the setting of Listed Buildings, the 1990 Act establishes a requirement to have special regard to the desirability of preserving that setting (Section 66).

Section 72 of the 1990 Act establishes a desirability to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area. A conservation area is an area of local interest designated principally by the Local Planning Authority.

Crown Immunity is still in force with regards to the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979³. This removes the requirement for Scheduled Monument Consent with regards to applications which directly impact upon a Scheduled Monument. It is MOD policy to replace this with a requirement for Scheduled Monument Clearance (under CLG 02/06). This is a more streamlined process which takes into consideration the specific requirements of Crown Land but remains as a formal application process to English Heritage and the Secretary of State who will respond directly to applications. This also provides the opportunity to establish Standing Clearance Permissions, an agreement between the MOD and English Heritage and the Secretary of State, which defines categories of minor works which can be undertaken without making an application for specific Scheduled Monument Clearance, providing they adhere to the terms of the Standing Clearance agreement.

English Heritage is enabled by Section 8C of the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953⁴ (introduced by paragraph 10 of Schedule 4, of the National Heritage Act 1983⁵) to

¹ DCLG 2006, *Crown Application of the Planning Acts Circular 02/2006*.

² Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. TSO. London

³ Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. TSO. London.

⁴ Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953. TSO. London.

compile a Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. Although designated of national interest, a park or garden on the register is not otherwise statutorily protected, although Local Planning Authorities are required to include policies for their protection in their Local Plan.

The principles of the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986⁶ may apply to any previously unidentified military aircraft crash site discovered as part of the baseline studies. If this does occur, the wreckage will not be disturbed unless necessary. If disturbance is required to allow development to proceed, the regulations of the Act will be followed in full.

8.2.1 ***Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill 2013***

The Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill was passed in 2013. The bill brings in a number of legal reforms in relation to the historic environment, particularly listed buildings and conservation areas. The aim is to make heritage protection more efficient and effective by removing legislative burdens. The main tenets of the bill include the simplification of conservation area consent by removing the requirement for separate applications for both planning consent and for conservation area consent. It also addresses listed buildings through the improvement of listing descriptions to identify which elements are significant, allowing other elements to be specifically excluded. Further reform will see the establishment of Listed Building Orders which will enable the authorisation of particular schemes of work without a requirement for Listed Building Consent.

8.2.2 ***National and Local Policy***

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)⁷

The NPPF sets out Government planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. Section 12 of the NPPF sets out the importance of being able to assess the significance of heritage assets that may be affected by a development. Significance is defined in Annex 2 as being the, “*value of an asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic interest.*”

The definition of significance provided in Annex 2 also clearly states that significance is not only derived from an asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. The setting of a heritage asset is defined in Annex 2 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.*”

Paragraphs 128 and 129 of the NPPF state that when determining applications, local authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of assets that may be affected by a development, to a level of detail that is proportionate to their importance and that is no more than sufficient to understand the potential impact on their significance; this should also include assets where their setting may be affected by a proposal.

Paragraph 132 recognises that heritage assets are irreplaceable and that where proposed development may impact on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be placed on its conservation; the more important the asset, the greater the weight

⁵ National Heritage Act 1983. TSO. London

⁶ Protection of Military Remains Act 1986. TSO. London.

⁷ National Planning Policy Framework 2012. DCLG. London

should be. Substantial harm to or loss of assets of the highest significance, for example scheduled monuments, registered battlefields, Grade I and II* listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and World Heritage Sites should be wholly exceptional. The NPPF notes that alteration or destruction of a heritage asset or development within its setting can harm its significance.

Where substantial harm is found, substantial public benefits must be achieved to outweigh this loss. The NPPF sets out four tests in paragraph 133 for local authorities to consider when assessing applications of this nature.

The NPPF states that the effect of a planning application on non-designated heritage assets should be taken into account when considering the application. Paragraph 135 sets out the need for a balanced judgement between the significance of the heritage assets and the scale of any harm or loss, when considering assets directly or indirectly affected by proposed development.

At paragraph 139, the NPPF recognises that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest may be of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument. In such cases the NPPF directs that such assets are to be considered subject to the policies for designated assets.

Development with the potential to impact upon World Heritage Sites or their setting is addressed in paragraphs 137 and 138. Paragraph 137 states the importance for local planning authorities to treat more favourably those proposals which seek to preserve the elements of the setting which make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of World Heritage Sites. Paragraph 138 recognises that not all elements of a World Heritage Site contribute to its significance. It requires a local planning authority to carefully look at development proposals which could impact upon World Heritage Sites and if the loss or removal of any part of an element or building which contributes to the significance is proposed, the test of substantial or less than substantial harm of paragraphs 132 and 133 should apply as appropriate to the asset, and its contribution to the overall significance. Conversely then, the removal of a structure or element which does not contribute to the overall significance should be viewed more favourably, under the guide of paragraph 137.

National Planning Policy Guidance (2014)⁸

The NPPG was published as a web-based resource in March 2014. This document provides up to date advice for the application of the policies within the NPPF. Guidance related to heritage issues is provided in the conserving and enhancing the historic environment section of the guide. The NPPG starts by reiterating the importance of conserving the historic environment as stated in the NPPF: *“Protecting and enhancing the historic environment is an important component of the National Planning Policy Framework’s drive to achieve sustainable development.”*

The NPPG provides useful guidance on the assessment of substantial harm. As the primary test of the effect of development upon the significance of heritage assets, guidance is given in the NPPG as to how to assess if the harm is substantial or not. The NPPG starts out by stating that *“in general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases.”* It further states that *“it is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of*

⁸ National Planning Policy Guidance. 2014. DCLG. London

the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.”

When establishing the parameters of what constitutes substantial harm, the NPPG points to total destruction being the most ‘*obvious*’ cause of substantial harm. Anything less than this should be judged on its own merits. Partial destruction may remove elements of an asset which were detrimental to its significance and therefore may not be harmful at all. When discussing works that are moderate or minor in scale, the NPPG advises that these are ‘*likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all*’. The importance of considering each development on its own merits is reinforced by the statement that even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm to an assets’ significance.

The publication of the NPPG caused the deletion of a number of planning documents and circulars. Of particular relevance to this study is the revocation of the circular relating to World Heritage Sites (Circular 07/09 Protection of World Heritage Sites 2009). This document has been replaced with a sub-section of its own within the NPPG. The text provides guidance on how to apply the terminology of World Heritage Sites to the NPPF, in terms of the use of the phrase Outstanding Universal Value to ascribe importance to a WHS. The guidance states: “*The cultural heritage within the description of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) will be part of the World Heritage Site’s heritage significance and the NPPF policies will apply to the OUV as they do to any other heritage significance they hold* (Reference ID: 18a-031-20140306).

The guidance also provides advice on how to assess impacts of development upon World Heritage Sites (WHS). It states that any change which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of a WHS needs to be assessed in terms of impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and its heritage significance including setting.

PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide⁹

Following the publication of the NPPG, a number of planning documents, circulars and guidance papers were deleted. The PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide was not amongst these documents. English Heritage are currently preparing a good practice guide to accompany the NPPG, providing additional clarity where needed. Until such a time as this good practice guide is published, the PPS5 Planning Practice Guide remains in force as a material consideration in the planning process and is to be utilised alongside the guidance offered in the NPPG.

The document was originally published alongside the now defunct PPS5 to provide further clarity to the shortened planning document. When the NPPF was published in 2012, this marked the deletion of the Planning Policy Statements themselves but also a large number of the practice guidance documents associated with them. The practice guide for PPS5 however was saved and was to be used in conjunction with the NPPF until such time as the guidance documents were updated. The document, although written to be used in conjunction with PPS5 contains guidance still relevant to the NPPF. In particular, the guidance offered when considering development applications that may affect non-designated heritage assets (paragraphs 83 and 84) and designated assets (paragraphs 85 – 112). For non-designated assets, the guide states that “*the desirability of conserving them and the contribution their*

⁹ PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide. 2010. English Heritage.

setting may make to their significance is a material consideration, but individually less of a priority than for designated assets or their equivalents” (paragraph 83).

For designated assets, the document states “*any harmful impact on the significance of designated assets needs to be justified on the grounds set out in HE9.2 (substantial harm or total loss) or HE9.4 (less than substantial harm)*” (paragraph 85). This is clarified in paragraphs 91 to 95 which set out parameters for establishing the definition of substantial harm. Paragraph 91 states: “*where substantial harm to, or total loss of, the asset’s significance is proposed a case can be made on the grounds that it is necessary to allow a proposal that offers substantial public benefits.*” This suggests that substantial harm is equated to serious harm, or total loss of significance.

The document also provides guidance with regards to developments affecting the setting of heritage assets (paragraph 113 to 124).

South Wiltshire Core Strategy (2012)¹⁰

A number of the proposed development sites are located within the area covered by the South Wiltshire Core Strategy (SWCS), formerly the Salisbury Local Plan Area. This document provides the framework for development within the south Wiltshire area for the next 20 years. The document provides a special strategy and planning guidance for the area which includes Salisbury and the Salisbury Plain Training Area (SPTA) and forms part of the development plan for south Wiltshire and the local development framework for Wiltshire.

With regards to heritage, the strategy seeks to ensure heritage is well considered in the delivery of its strategic objectives. This includes the implementation of a heritage strategy for Wiltshire which will seek to improve the protection afforded to significant non-listed buildings and listed buildings at risk by issuing a set of guidance notes to assist in this. These measures will help to deliver Strategic Objective 5 of the core strategy.

The SWCS retains all policies from the former Salisbury District Local Plan of 2011 which are directly relevant to the historic environment. The saved policies are listed in Annex C of the SWCS, but not all are relevant to this project. Those policies which are of relevance to this study are listed in Appendix 8A. In addition to this, the local plan policies also identified an area of special archaeological significance within the Salisbury area which encompasses a large portion of the SPTA. Individual baseline assessments for proposed developments which lie within the area of special archaeological significance will take account of this.

Wiltshire Core Strategy (November 2013 – Draft)¹¹

A number of the proposed development sites lie within the former Kennet District Council and were covered by the Kennet Local Plan. This is in the process of being replaced by the Wiltshire Core Strategy, but in the interim, one policy relevant to the desk-based assessments relating to the historic environment has been saved. This is:

¹⁰ South Wiltshire Core Strategy Adopted February 2012, Wiltshire Council

¹¹ Wiltshire Core Strategy draft documentation accessed online (www.wiltshire.gov.uk)

Policy HH1 – Protection of Archaeological Remains

Planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an adverse impact on the archaeological deposits or remains on or under a site of national importance (whether scheduled or not) or its character or setting. Sites of significant regional or local importance, especially those which make a positive contribution to the historic landscape, will also be protected from inappropriate development.” (Kennet Local Plan 2004 – saved policy).

The Wiltshire Core Strategy is in the process of consultation and legal review prior to formal adoption during 2014. At present, the historic environment is discussed in Core Policy 58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment, with further specific policy guidance given in Core Policy 59: The Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site and its setting.

Core Policy 58 at present states that “*development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic environment. Designated heritage assets will be conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner appropriate to their significance.*”¹²

Stonehenge World Heritage Site Management Plan (2009)¹³

A management plan has been created for the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites WHS. This document was adopted by the former Salisbury District Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance in 2009 and is therefore a material consideration in the planning process. The management plan provides a long term strategy for the management and protection of the Stonehenge part of the WHS. The document provides a framework for decision making in order to maintain and enhance the Outstanding Universal Value of the WHS. The plan also identifies a number of priorities to undertake as part of implementation.

The management plan is currently under review and will be replaced in 2015 with a joint management plan covering the Avebury and Stonehenge sections of the WHS jointly.

In 2013 at a meeting of UNESCO in Phnom Penh, a number of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Value were adopted as drafts for those assets which did not have a Statement approved when they were inscribed on the World Heritage List. One of these sites was the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites WHS. The Statement largely incorporates the aspects of the Outstanding Universal Value already stated in such documents as the 2009 Management Plan and provide an elaboration on the Statement of Significance provided in the Management Plan incorporating aspects such as Authenticity and Integrity, which were previously absent from the Statement of Significance in the 2009 Management Plan.

The retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV)¹⁴ states that the property of the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites WHS is “*internationally important for its complexes of outstanding prehistoric monuments...they represent a unique embodiment of our collective heritage*”. The document states that it is the outstanding survival of the

¹² Wiltshire Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document: Hearing Session Tracked Change Version September 2013

¹³ English Heritage, 2009. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Management Plan*. English Heritage. London.

¹⁴ UNESCO, 2013. *Adoption of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value*. 37th Session World Heritage Committee Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

monuments and sites including settlements, burial grounds and large earthwork and stone structures and their settings which create a landscape “*without parallel*”.

The Stonehenge Management Plan 2009 also contains as an appendix a copy of the 1970 Concordat between the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works (now DCMS) regarding future building works at Larkhill. The legal status of this document cannot be ascertained and it is uncertain whether it is to be included in the new management plan to be produced in 2015. The Concordat lays down a series of measures to be undertaken for the avoidance of the construction of buildings which would be visible from Stonehenge. A line was drawn on a map marking a line, south of which no new buildings larger than 5m in height should be constructed. None of the proposed Service Family Accommodation (SFA) sites for Larkhill are located south of the line indicated in the Concordat. Any buildings to the north of this line should be within certain limits and anything over these agreed limits needs to be agreed with the DCMS prior to development.

8.2.3 **Ministry of Defence guidance**

Heritage forms an integral part of the MOD’s sustainability strategies and policies. There are a number of documents and publications which outline the duties to protect and enhance the historic environment within MOD land.

Sustainable development checklist (Ministry of Defence 15th February 2012) and Joint Services Publication Handbook 362 Volume 3 Sec 3 Leaflet 12 (2010)

The checklist¹⁵ was published to inform and guide the individuals who submit development proposals to ensure that they have identified the sustainable aspects of their submission and to demonstrate that these have been taken into account. The document provides a checklist which includes consideration of the historic environment. The document states that development proposals should be undertaken so that they ‘*protect and where possible enhance the MOD historic environment in recognition that it is an integral part of cultural heritage and the role it plays in supporting defence capability.*’

This checklist is also supported by a specific information leaflet contained within the Joint Services Publication Handbook 362, Volume 3 Section 3 Leaflet 12¹⁶. The leaflet is solely concerned with the historic environment and states the policy, protection and care involved in the statutory and non-statutory obligations of the MOD in managing the historic environment.

Defence Infrastructure Organisation Estate and Sustainable Development (June 2013)

This document was primarily created to outline the measures the MOD are taking to combat climate change upon assets within their estate; however, it contains a useful mission statement with regards to the MOD’s approach to the conservation of heritage assets within their estate:

“It is policy to sustainably manage and continually improve the estate, including the heritage assets...As a government department, the MOD has a duty to be exemplar in the management of its historic estate”¹⁷.

¹⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sustainable-development-checklist>

¹⁶ MOD, 2010. *Joint Services Publication Handbook 362, Vol. 3, Sec. 3, Leaflet 12.*

¹⁷ MOD, 2013. *Defence Infrastructure Organisation Estate and Sustainable Development.*

As part of this, the DIO has implemented a number of internal heritage management systems including the identification of heritage assets and the implementation of a staged level of acceptable training allowed on certain areas. The information is cascaded through to the military commanders to factor into the planning of training exercises to ensure that no damage occurs to the heritage assets within the SPTA.

There are three different archaeological groupings identified by the DIO.

1. Archaeological Sensitivity Groups (ASGs). This particular dataset was published in 1993 and represents one of the earliest identification of important archaeological assets on the SPTA, before intensive analysis of the archaeological resource was undertaken. There are 13 ASGs identified within the SPTA and they are used to inform decisions regarding activity and military training on the Plain. In addition, management actions were identified, most of which have already been achieved within the thirteen ASGs.
2. Important and Fragile Sites (IFS). These were identified using results from the analysis of the SPTA estate by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME), now English Heritage. This survey identified a number of important monuments, a number of which have not been identified for scheduling but display qualities and values equivalent to scheduled assets. The IFS provides a mechanism to identify these assets and afford them the protection they deserve through fencing and identification on military mapping for avoidance during exercises on the SPTA. They provide an extra layer of protection even for scheduled assets. Most scheduled monuments are identified on mapping and movement across these is to be avoided where at all possible, however there are instances where manoeuvres can cross scheduled monuments. IFS are designated as, for the most part, out of bounds for the military when on vehicular manoeuvres on the Plain. As a result, these sites mostly lie within permanent, fenced off penning.
3. Archaeological Sensitivity Data (ASD) is a fluid dataset which is constantly being reviewed, altered and expanded. The ASD identifies areas of archaeological sensitivity on the SPTA derived from previous datasets, new aerial photographic records, new archaeological discoveries and the results of any fieldwork events on the SPTA. The ASD areas are taken into account during decision making on the SPTA. It is split into four categories named Constraint 1-4. Those ASD areas identified within constraints 1-3 are of the highest sensitivity. Any requests for military manoeuvres and in particular any requirements for groundworks or heavy artillery movements would be refused or subject to strict movement parameters in these areas. Those ASD areas within constraint 4 are still of heritage significance, but requests to perform intrusive groundworks manoeuvres or track heavy vehicles across the area would normally be granted, subject to review of details and location.

8.2.4 **Government duties**

As a Government Agency, the MOD is required to conform not only to the statutory requirements for the safeguarding of heritage assets, but also to have a duty of care towards the historic environment, its protection and conservation. This duty is set out in the *Protocol for the Care of the Government Historic Estate*¹⁸. This Protocol makes it mandatory for government agencies to commission regular condition surveys, implement a planned programme of repairs and maintenance and protect heritage at risk. It also requires that the

¹⁸ DCMS, 2009. *Protocol for the Care of the Government Historic Estate*.

significance of heritage assets be taken into account when planning change. In addition, it outlines the duty of departments to comply with the statutory procedures outlined above.

8.2.5 **English Heritage guidance**

Setting of Heritage Assets¹⁹

The document provides guidance on the process by which '*the implications for the significance of heritage assets of change affecting their settings can be evaluated*'. It outlines the process by which impacts on setting should be identified and evaluated, having specific regard to the magnitude of change, the durability and reversibility of change and the sensitivity of the heritage asset to that change. When assessing change within the setting of a heritage asset, the document provides guidance on factors to be considered when assessing the magnitude of change, including:

- the number and significance of the heritage assets affected;
- the proximity of the asset;
- the prominence of both the asset and the development;
- the scale of the development;
- the durability and reversibility of the change;
- the sensitivity of the asset to change; and
- the implications of other factors such as noise, movement and light.

Military Heritage guidance

There are a number of English Heritage publications which provide guidance on topics related to 20th century military heritage. Detail of the scope of these documents is provided in the overview desk-based assessment for all of the sites:

- Twentieth-Century Military Sites (2003);
- Historic Military Aviation Sites: conservation management guidance (2003);
- Military Aircraft Crash Sites (2002); and
- Military Wall Art (2004).

¹⁹ English Heritage 2011. *Setting of Heritage Assets*. London.

8.3 Assessment methodology

The searches for designated assets were undertaken within a two-stage buffer. A 1km buffer was used to identify all designated assets: Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and World Heritage Sites. A wider search area of 5km was used to identify those assets of the highest significance, as defined by paragraph 132 of the NPPF, namely listed buildings Grade I and II*, Registered Parks and Gardens Grade I and II*, Registered Battlefields, Scheduled Monuments and World Heritage Sites.

Non-designated assets such as archaeological sites, findspots, and historic buildings were identified within a 200m buffer from the proposed development boundaries, as agreed with the DIO Archaeologist.

Only those assets which are considered likely to experience an impact have been discussed in this OEA. Please refer to the individual site heritage baselines for a full discussion of the assets. Where development is proposed within an existing garrison, the assessment process has taken into account the nature of the proposals, i.e., the addition of military buildings within an existing military context and the evolution of military garrisons.

The significance of heritage assets is determined by professional judgement, guided by statutory and non-statutory designations, national and local policies, and archaeological research agendas.

Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that heritage assets with the highest level of significance comprise Scheduled Monuments, registered battlefields, Grade I and II* listed buildings and registered parks and gardens and World Heritage Sites. At paragraph 139 the NPPF also recognises that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest may be of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument, and in such cases are to be considered subject to the policies for designated assets.

There are a number of assets identified within the baseline reports where a value cannot yet be assigned. There may be assets identified through aerial photography whose typology and form are not distinctive enough to assign an absolute identification of the asset. Without archaeological fieldwork, the nature and function of the asset cannot be known and therefore a value cannot yet be assigned. Similarly, where there is potential for archaeological deposits to exist within a proposed site, but there has been no archaeological fieldwork to test this, the value of any deposits is unknown or uncertain. With the non-designated historic buildings identified within the Wessex reports, these have been identified through map regression and not verified through internal and external inspection. Therefore, although the building footprint appears unchanged from historic mapping, the building may be a modern reproduction. Therefore, until this can be assessed with confidence, the value is judged to be uncertain.

Table 8.1 summarises the factors for assessing the significance (or importance) of heritage assets.

Table 8.1: Proposed resource / receptor evaluation criteria

Value of receptor	Example criteria
Very high	<p>Remains of inscribed international importance, such as World Heritage Sites.</p> <p>Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings.</p> <p>Grade I and Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>Scheduled Monuments.</p> <p>Registered battlefields.</p>
High	<p>Non-designated archaeological assets of schedulable quality and importance.</p> <p>Non-designated buildings, monuments, sites or landscapes that can be shown to have particularly important qualities in their fabric or historical association.</p> <p>Grade II Listed Buildings.</p> <p>Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Grade II Registered Parks.</p>
Medium	<p>Assets of high archaeological resource importance and designated as being of archaeological sensitivity as identified through consultation.</p> <p>Non-designated buildings, monuments, sites or landscapes that can be shown to have important qualities in their fabric or historical association.</p> <p>Historic townscapes or groups of buildings with historic integrity in that the assets that constitute their make-up are clearly legible.</p>
Low	<p>Non-designated buildings, monuments, sites or landscapes of local importance and of modest quality.</p> <p>Locally important historic or archaeological assets, assets with a local importance for education or cultural appreciation and of medium archaeological resource rating.</p> <p>Assets that are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade.</p> <p>Parks and gardens of local interest.</p>
Very low	<p>Assets identified as being of no historic, evidential, aesthetic or</p>



Value of receptor	Example criteria
	communal interest. Assets whose values are compromised by poor preservation or survival or of contextual associations to justify inclusion into a higher grade.
Uncertain	The value of the asset cannot yet be ascertained. More assessment or fieldwork would be required to establish a value.

Once a level of significance has been assigned, the magnitude of impact from the proposed development is assessed. Potential impacts are defined as a change resulting from the proposed development which affects a heritage asset. These impacts are considered in terms of being either adverse or beneficial and in terms of being direct, indirect or cumulative, constructional or operational. The assessment of impact will include consideration of a heritage asset's setting which will vary from case to case and cannot be generically defined.

The magnitude of an impact can be judged on a five-point scale (see Table 8.2). The impact score is arrived at without reference to the importance of the asset and the impact is assessed without taking into account any subsequent mitigation proposals.

Table 8.2: Proposed impact evaluation criteria

Magnitude of impact	Example criteria
Very high	<p>Change such that the value ('significance') of the asset is severely altered or vitiated.</p> <p>Comprehensive change to setting affecting importance ('significance'), resulting in severe changes in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</p>
High	<p>Change such that the value ('significance') of the asset is affected.</p> <p>Changes such that the setting of the asset is noticeably different, affecting significance resulting in moderate changes in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</p>
Medium	<p>Change such that the value ('significance') of the asset is slightly affected.</p> <p>Changes to the setting that have a slight impact on significance resulting in changes in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</p>
Low	<p>Changes to the asset that hardly affect value ('significance').</p> <p>Changes to the setting of an asset that have little effect on significance and no real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.</p>
Very low	<p>The proposed development does not affect the value ('significance') of the asset.</p> <p>Changes to the setting do not affect the significance of the asset or our appreciation of it.</p>

The assessment of effects will be undertaken in two stages. The magnitude of impact will first be assessed without reference to the sensitivity of the resource. The findings of this assessment will then be cross-referenced with the value of the asset in terms of its importance and sensitivity in order to categorise the effect that is likely to result from the proposed development.

Following the categorisation of effects using this methodology, further consideration of whether an effect is significant and requires mitigation is carried out using professional judgement. Account is taken of whether effects are considered to be positive or negative, permanent or temporary, direct or indirect, the duration and frequency of the effect and whether any secondary effects are caused.

Following the initial assessment of effects, mitigation may be considered to reduce the magnitude of any adverse effects. Mitigation is used to reduce or compensate for any adverse effects or to enhance positive effects. Re-assessing impact effects after mitigation allows the residual effect of an impact to be determined (Table 8.3).

Taking the value and magnitude into account, these criteria can be combined to produce an overall evaluation of whether an effect is significant. In instances within the matrix where there is a transition between levels of significant effect, the actual reported level of significant effect is a matter of professional judgement. This has considered more particularly the heritage significance of the asset and the degree to which the level of impact will affect heritage significance.

Within the NPPF, impacts affecting the significance of heritage assets are considered in terms of harm and there is a requirement to determine whether the level of harm amounts to 'substantial harm' or 'less than substantial harm'. The on-line National Planning Policy Guidance provides some assistance in the determination of whether works constitute substantial harm by stating that "*substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases.*"²⁰

The OEA provides an assessment of the significance of effect based upon the proposals as currently understood. It is important to note that there is no direct correlation between the significance of effect and the level of harm caused to heritage significance. A major effect on a heritage asset would be more often be the basis by which to determine that the level of harm to the significance of the asset would be substantial, however as NPPG points out, anything less than total destruction could be less than substantial harm. A moderate effect is unlikely to meet the test of substantial harm and would therefore more often be the basis by which to determine that the level of harm to the significance of the asset would be less than substantial. In all cases determining the level of harm to the significance of the asset arising from development impact is one of professional judgement.

²⁰ National Planning Policy Guidance, 2014, paragraph 018.

Table 8.3: Proposed impact evaluation criteria

Importance of Receptor	Magnitude of Impact				
	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Very high	Major	Major / Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
High	Major / Moderate	Moderate	Moderate / Minor	Minor	Negligible
Medium	Moderate	Moderate / Minor	Minor	Minor / Negligible	Negligible
Low	Minor	Minor	Minor / Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
Very low	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

8.4 Limitations

The Larkhill, Tidworth, Perham Down and Bulford assessments were undertaken by URS but baseline reports were prepared by Wessex Archaeology. The baseline assessment of the aforementioned garrisons and any associated site visits were therefore the responsibility of Wessex Archaeology and any comment on non-designated buildings within these garrisons within the OEA is based on information contained within the Wessex Archaeology reports.

The Wessex Archaeology baseline reports identified a small number of potentially important historic buildings through map regression in their garrison reports. The historic, architectural and evidential value of the buildings was not confirmed through a visual external and internal site inspection. Therefore the buildings identified within the Wessex reports should be seen as a starting point and in no way representing an exhaustive list.

Photogrammetry survey was commissioned as part of this report, however the results were not available at the time of preparation of this OEA.

8.5 Baseline conditions

8.5.1 *Bulford*

Bulford Garrison site

Overview

The baseline assessment for the proposed garrison developments was undertaken by Wessex Archaeology²¹. The full baseline report is presented in Appendix 8B. The following is a summary of the Wessex Archaeology report. The assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.2. For ease of reference with the baseline reports, the Wessex Archaeology reference numbers have been used to identify those assets discussed.

The Bulford Conservation Area, within which are a number of listed buildings, is located to the west of the garrison site. Within the conservation area there are a number of designated assets focused on the High Street and Old Coach Road including the Grade I listed St Leonards Church and several Grade II listed cottages (WA32, WA33 and WA34). An 18th century triangulation pillar, remodelled in 1936 (WA31) is located in open fields to the south-east of the garrison site

Other highly graded assets are located to the south-west of the garrison site and comprise assets within Amesbury Park (Grade II* registered historic park) including the Grade I listed Amesbury Abbey. Amesbury Park is located west of Amesbury and on the north side of the River Avon. The north and west aspects of the park are defined by late 18th century tree planting. Amesbury Abbey is located at the centre of the park with pleasure grounds extending to the north. The northern boundary of the park is defined by a tree belt along the A303.

Prehistoric to Roman

The first activity recorded in the archaeological record in the study area dates from the Neolithic period with activity increasing in the Bronze Age. The study area is dominated by ceremonial and funerary structures built in grassland created during the woodland clearances of the Mesolithic. The majority of the Scheduled Monuments in the 1km study area are Bronze Age barrows. There are also a small number of isolated burials recorded within the site. These may be associated with barrows which had been flattened, or may be burials associated with the funerary landscape. Given the nature and density of prehistoric monuments in the study area, it is considered possible that further prehistoric archaeology may exist within the footprint of the garrison, some of which may survive in the isolated islands which have not witnessed as much disturbance as other areas of more intensive development.

Later prehistoric evidence has been recovered in the form of field systems located to the south of the garrison which could date to the Iron Age and Roman period and a small amount of Iron Age pottery has been found in the area. It would seem that the Iron Age and Roman activity was focussed more towards the northern portion of the SPTA.

²¹ Wessex Archaeology, 2014. *Project Allenby/Connaught Bulford, Wiltshire Archaeology Desk-based Assessment*. Ref: 10148.31.

Medieval

The early medieval period is characterised by the shift in land-use patterns where the field systems that covered the downs in the later prehistoric periods were replaced with settlement on the valley floors and grazing on the downs, with open field systems on the slopes. There is one record of an Anglo-Saxon burial within an earlier Bronze Age burial to the north of the site but otherwise there is very little evidence for early medieval, medieval or post-medieval activity within the study area.

Modern

Land at Bulford was acquired by the War Office in 1898 and by 1900 was being used as a tented camp for the use of the Cavalry. The Ordnance Survey map of 1901 shows that the only permanent structures were the reservoir and an engine house located on the east side of the encampment. By 1903 the encampment comprised permanent buildings arranged in a regular grid extending to both the east and west sides of the Marlborough Road. Most of these buildings appear to have been of timber construction but some such as the Warrant Officers' accommodation may have been brick built. Between 1903 and 1906 the site was used by the School of Mounted Infantry and by 1905 this had been joined by a number of Artillery Brigades²².

During WWI, large, temporary camps were established around the garrison. Work began in the autumn of 1914 for accommodation for the British Section of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force and was later occupied by New Zealand troops. The Canadian Expeditionary Force joined them in 1914 but it was the heavy presence of New Zealanders which is commemorated today with the Bulford Kiwi, cut into the chalk slope of Beacon Hill overlooking Bulford Garrison²³. The training required for WWI was undertaken on the Plain and in the surrounding area, traces of which have been found in the form of practice trenches.

The camp underwent a period of expansion and remodelling during the 1920s. The Ordnance Survey map of 1925 shows the core of the site to comprise smaller building units and these are likely to have been retained from the earlier phases. New buildings introduced to the site comprise a number of riding schools, a lorry shelter, welfare and leisure related buildings. The site was provided with three churches including St George's Garrison Church (WA112) which is located on the east side of Marlborough Road at the southern end of the camp. The Ordnance Survey map of 1948 shows that despite a further period of building during the 1930s and 1940s, many of the earlier buildings and the essential layout of the site had been retained. New buildings of the 1930s and 1940s comprise the mess located to the south of the Garrison Church with its characteristic winged plan form and other larger building forms including new groups of buildings on the west side of the garrison site.

The site underwent a period of rebuilding during the 1960s and into the present day and this has removed many of the earlier buildings. Earlier buildings, possibly from the 1920s, which remain in situ according to the historic map regression, include the Old Bakery (WA109), the Bulford Study Centre (WA110), the BSC Annexe (WA 111) and St George's Garrison Church (WA112), the former riding school (building KW0415), the Soldiers' Institute (building KW0618), the ABF Building (building WD0423), RMP Dogs (buildings WI0257 and PC0707),

²² James, N. D.G., 1987. *Plain Soldiering A history of the Armed Forces on Salisbury Plain*. The Hobnob Press. Salisbury

²³ Ibid



the Gymnasium (building KW0415), the Beacon Club (building KW0418) and the Old School (building WI0082). These buildings are not statutorily designated but may retain historic interest. Further visual assessment including internal inspection is required to assess whether these buildings are of historic value.

The setting of buildings within the garrison site has evolved as the site itself has expanded. Remaining structures of the 1920s and 1930s are unlikely to have retained intact much of their original and historic setting arranged in discrete building blocks. The garrison church at the southern end of the site has a particularly open and formal grassed setting with tree belts to the east and south. Its formal setting is enhanced by its spatial relationship to the 1930s mess located immediately to the south-east again within a formal grassed setting open to the south.

A number of archaeological events have taken place within the site, most of which yielded no archaeological results. Those which did find archaeology, found limited evidence such as post-holes, fragments of prehistoric pottery and truncated ditches. The archaeological fieldwork events identified that large areas of the site had been truncated by the development and redevelopment of the camp, but that areas of archaeological potential do survive in those areas which have seen relatively little development.

Table 8.4 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

Table 8.4: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1009964	Two round barrows at Rawlinson Road	Very high	None
1358981	Area of slit trenches and air raid shelters	Medium	None
n/a	Unidentified historic buildings	Uncertain	Detailed site walkover with internal inspection
n/a	The Old Bakery building	Uncertain	Detailed site walkover with internal inspection
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits within the proposed development areas	Uncertain	Archaeological fieldwork
MWI11920/219177	Findspot of Beaker Bronze Age pottery	Low	None
219357 and 915424	Findspot of Bronze Age axe and pottery	Low	None
MWI12158	Site of a round barrow	Medium	None
219407	Site of 3 round barrows	Medium	None
MWI11923	Bronze Age pit	Medium	None
n/a	Site of Old Sandhurst Block	Low	None
219141	Iron Age/Roman field system and trackway	Medium	none

Bulford SFA

Overview

The World Heritage Site of Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites lies within the 5km search area, to the west of the SFA sites.

Within 1km of the SFA sites are 37 scheduled monuments, one Grade I and 18 Grade II listed buildings.

There are 171 scheduled monuments, one Grade II* registered park and garden and 21 Grade I and II* listed buildings within the 5km search area.

The baseline established that none of the Scheduled Monuments, the registered park and garden of Amesbury Abbey or the Outstanding Universal Value of the WHS would be impacted by the proposed development due to the distance from the development, intervening vegetation and the negligible level of change to the historic landscape and setting of the assets in this extended search area. The assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.2.

Bulford Conservation Area is located to the north-west of the SFA. The conservation area contains a number of Grade II listed buildings located primarily on the north bank of the river off Old Coach Road. The Grade I listed church of St Leonard is located on High Street further to the west. The conservation area is focused on High Street and Old Coach Road; the eastern extent of the conservation area is part defined along Salisbury Road. The conservation area retains an open rural setting to its north and to the south and the setting and character of the conservation area is defined by vernacular buildings loosely grouped along the banks of the river. St Leonard's church forms a focal point of the conservation at the junction of Church Lane and High Street. The rural and open setting has been lost on the south-eastern edge of the conservation area with an extensive development of modern housing arranged around closes set off Churchill Avenue.

Prehistoric to Roman

The area now occupied by Bulford has seen human activity and occupation from the Neolithic period. The first recorded mention of Bulford is in the Domesday survey as an estate of Amesbury Abbey. Enclosure began in 1502 and by the time of the tithe awards in 1838 the site of Bulford Camp was occupied by large arable fields. The War Office began buying land on Salisbury Plain in 1897, Bulford Camp opened in 1898 and by 1901 a tented and hutted camp was in place. By 1910 these temporary buildings had been replaced by more permanent structures and the railway had been extended from Amesbury to the camp. Estates of houses for military families were built around the perimeter of the camp between the wars, in the 1950s and 1960s and in the early 21st century. Bulford is one of four possible locations for the building of service family homes on Salisbury Plain between 2016 and 2019.

The baseline assessment has identified the presence of extensive prehistoric activity and modern military activity within the proposed development site and study area. Evidence for prehistoric activity of the Neolithic and in particular the Bronze Age is spread along a band from the World Heritage Site to the southwest, running gradually north-west and north, broadly following the valleys of the River Avon and Nine Mile River. Also located within the 5km search area are the ritual sites at Durrington Walls, Woodhenge and Stonehenge with all of the associated monuments such as the Cursus and all of the barrows also located within the search area. There is a distinct reduction in the number of scheduled and non-designated

prehistoric assets to the south of the A303, outside the boundary of the SPTA and off the chalk downland.

There is less evidence in this area for Iron Age and Roman activity. This is a reflection of the pattern across the Plain with Iron Age settlement and Roman settlements identified thus far being located on the Higher Plain to the north and to the west. A field system has been identified lying partially within B7 which could date to the Bronze Age or Iron Age and this is the only prehistoric monument located in the proposed site boundary. It is likely this field system was established in the Bronze Age and re-used in later periods including the Iron Age and Roman periods²⁴. The Roman road linking Old Sarum to Mildenhall runs to the east of the SFA and an isolated findspot of eight Roman coins was located within the SFA.

Medieval

Medieval evidence is limited. Early medieval and medieval activity has been found on Beacon Hill to the east of the proposed development and the settlement of Bulford was established during the early medieval period. The land within the SFA sites is likely to have been used for agricultural purposes. A farmstead called Bulford Pennings was established to the east of the SFA during the early modern period and is shown on the 1879 Ordnance Survey map.

Modern

The evidence of activity increases in the modern period with the establishment of Bulford Camp. A large number of the non-designated assets in the proposed development area are records of military practise trenches, gun sites, barrage balloon sites or other military features. This caused the demolition of Bulford Pennings.

Rifle ranges were set up at Bulford Garrison in 1898 and by 1901 these had been incorporated into a tent and hut encampment, situated either side of the Marlborough to Salisbury road. The Amesbury and Military Camp Light Railway, a branch of the London and South Western Railway was extended from Amesbury through Bulford to a terminus 3km to the east in 1906. There was a station for the villagers to the south of the village and another for Bulford Camp. The line was closed in 1963.

The camp was a principal base of the Royal Artillery from 1905-77 and the base of the New Zealand Expeditionary force from 1914-18²⁵. After the Great War the image of a kiwi was cut into the side of Beacon Hill to commemorate the New Zealand troops. There are also the remains of the military in the form of practice trenches on Beacon Hill and Bulford Ranges and it is likely these remains extend south of the garrison as well.

The camp was accessed from the village by Bulford Road and Bulford Drove. Military housing estates for soldiers and their families were built around the perimeter of the camp, including estates on the site of Sling Barracks in 1937 to 1938, 1952, and 1968, and the Australian Estate to the east of the camp in 1963; the Irish Estate to the north-west in 1968; and the Canadian Estate to the west in the same year. Further Army housing was built to the west of Bulford Road in 1969. In 2010, the Canadian Estate was demolished and replaced by more modern, upgraded accommodation.

²⁴ Defence Estates. 2009. *Integrated Rural Management Plan. Defence Training Estate Salisbury Plain. Volume 2 – Part E. Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.*

²⁵ James, N. D.G., 1987. *Plain Soldiering A history of the Armed Forces on Salisbury Plain.* The Hobnob Press. Salisbury.



Table 8.5 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

Table 8.5: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1015216	Bowl barrow 770m northwest of New Barn	Very high	None
1009933	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	None
1009545	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	None
1009602	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	None
1009604	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	None
1009605	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	None
1009564	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	None
1009969	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	None
1009931	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	None
219316	A group of small circular objects possible barrows	High	None
1009903	Beacon Hill monuments	Very high	None
502630	Site of railway station on the Newton Tony Bulford branch line	Low	None
1360410	Extensive area of trenches and fieldwork	Medium	None
MWI12077	Bulford Camp military trenches	Medium	None



Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1358981	Area of slit trenches and air raid shelters	Medium	None
1358978	20 th century military features including gunposts and trenches	Medium	None
1358974	Area of military practice trenches	Medium	None
219141/MWI12268	Iron Age/Roman field system and trackway	Medium	None
MWI12246/219332	Circular feature identified from APs.	Medium	None
MWI12246/914483	Circular feature identified from APs.	Medium	None
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits within the SFA sites	Uncertain	Archaeological fieldwork

8.5.2 *Larkhill*

Larkhill Garrison site

Overview

The baseline assessment for the proposed garrison developments was undertaken by Wessex Archaeology²⁶. The full baseline report is presented in Appendix 8B. The following summary is extracted from the Wessex Archaeology report. For ease of reference with the baseline reports, the Wessex Archaeology reference numbers have been used to identify those assets discussed.

There is a single Grade I and several Grade II* designated assets within the 5km ZVI that are located to the east of the garrison site. These buildings are each located within established rural settlements e.g. the Church of St Leonard, Bulford (Grade I), All Saints Church Durrington (Grade II*), the church of St Mary Bilston (Grade II*) and the Old Manor House, Bilston (Grade II*).

Other highly graded assets are located to the south-east of the garrison site and comprise assets within Amesbury Park (Grade II* registered park) including the Grade I listed Amesbury Abbey.

Prehistoric to Roman

The Wessex Archaeology baseline has established that there is potential for the presence of buried archaeological remains, in particular relating to prehistoric funerary and ceremonial monuments, settlement and agricultural practices. Any such remains may potentially be of considerable value due to their potential to elucidate the development of the WHS. It was highlighted that the future development may have the potential to directly impact upon the very high value assets of the Larkhill long barrow (**1363128**) located within the site and Knighton Long Barrow (**1010052**) at the northern edge of the shangarsite.

The southern extent of the site lies within the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites WHS. The only remaining designated heritage asset located within the site is the Scheduled Monument and asset of very high value, Long Barrow at Larkhill Camp (**1363128**). However, a second Scheduled Monument, Knighton Long Barrow (**1010052**) is located immediately outside of the northern perimeter of the site. All of the assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.1.

There is potential for archaeologically significant remains from other periods to be encountered, particularly relating to earlier phases of the military camp's development. Previous archaeological investigations, in combination with historic map regression and consideration of the known history of the sites have suggested that any archaeological remains present may have been subject to a considerable degree of modern disturbance within previously developed parts of the military camp. Buried archaeological remains within less intensively developed parts of the site may have survived relatively well. Nevertheless, the degree of survival of buried archaeological remains within previously un-investigated parts of the sites cannot be accurately predicted on the basis of the available information.

²⁶ Wessex Archaeology 2014 *Project Allenby/Connaught Larkhill, Wiltshire Archaeological Desk-based Assessment*. Ref: 101480.41.



Aerial photographic evidence indicates the probable existence of a field system likely of prehistoric or Romano-British date within a lawned area to the north of the Packway (**MWI12780**). A further field system to the north of the site (**MWI11808**) might have extended into the sports fields to the north. A ditch of possible Bronze Age date was excavated in the northern part of the site by Wessex Archaeology and settlement activity was encountered during a watching brief. Two pits of Neolithic or Bronze Age date (**MWI12538**) were excavated in the eastern half of the site during a small evaluation in 2003²⁷.

Modern

Numerous in-filled practice trenches, probably dating to the First World War, are located in the western half of the site (**1363138**) and to the north (**MWI11749/1363128**). An early 20th century military railway (**MWI2603/1363632**) crossed the southern part of the site. Few structures predating the 1960s survive.

The War Office established a flying field at Larkhill in 1909 to encourage the experimentation and development of military flying. Several hangars were built here in c.1910 and it was from here that the Bristol Aeroplane Company established the first flying school for the training of pilots. The Bristol Aeroplane Company worked closely with the War Office in developing various technologies including aerial observation of troop and artillery positions and the transmitting of radio signals from the air to the ground. The Larkhill flying school was closed in 1914 with operations split between the flying school at Old Sarum and at Brooklands (Surrey). The Grade II* hangars (**1391475**), which are located just outside of the present garrison site, are the sole surviving buildings of this period.

Larkhill camp was established in 1914 as a practice camp for the School of Gunnery, later the School of Artillery. The first buildings replaced those of the flying school and the camp was expanded during the period 1914-1918 and significantly thereafter during the period 1925 – 1926. The Ordnance Survey plan of 1925-1926 shows much of the garrison site to be occupied by a series of buildings and building types arranged in a regular grid layout. A further period of expansion of building across the site occurred during the 1930s from which period originate various non-designated buildings, some of which date from the Great War period, including those identified in the Wessex Archaeology report as WA 118, WA 119 and WA 120.

Further building works during the 1960s and into the present have removed many of the earlier buildings within the garrison site. Wessex Archaeology was not able to undertake a detailed survey of all existing buildings within the site and there is potential for a number of buildings of the period 1925-1939 to remain within the site. These buildings may be of historic value and would be considered non-designated heritage assets.

The setting of buildings within the garrison site has evolved as the site itself has expanded. Remaining structures of the period 1925-1939 are unlikely to have retained much of their original and historic setting. Buildings within the site are, however, part of an established developed area and although there may be areas of open space and long sight lines, for instance along Packway, it is not known without further survey whether or not these contribute to value.

²⁷ Wessex Archaeology, 2003: Project Allenby/Connaught Archaeological Evaluation. The Salisbury Plain Camps. WA Report no. 52279.4.

The group of hangars, part of the Larkhill flying school, are located outside of the garrison site to the south within an area of residential development. Their setting as part of a former flying field has been lost and their current setting contributes little to their heritage value.

Table 8.6 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

Table 8.6: Assets with the potential to be impacted by development at Larkhill and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required established value
1012167	Long Barrow at Larkhill Camp	Very high	None
1010052	Knighton Long Barrow	Very high	None
1363138	Military earthworks	Medium	None
MWI11749/1363128	Military earthworks	Medium	None
MWI12603/1363632	Military railway	Low	None
MWI12780	Prehistoric Field System	Medium	None
MWI11808	Prehistoric Field System	Medium	None
n/a	Non-designated asset (WA20)	Uncertain	Detailed site walkover with internal inspection
n/a	Non-designated asset (WA119)	Uncertain	Detailed site walkover with internal inspection
n/a	Non-designated assets on the south side of Packway	Uncertain	Detailed site walkover with internal inspection

Larkhill SFA

Overview

There are 18 Scheduled Monuments within 1km of these sites and 319 Scheduled Monuments within 5km. The majority of the Scheduled Monuments are located in the WHS to the south of the SFA.

There are 23 listed buildings within the 1km study area. Nineteen of these are included in the Durrington Conservation Area. Outside of the Durrington Conservation Area there are four listed buildings within the 1km study area, two listed Grade II* and two Grade II.

Medieval evidence within the sites is limited. The village of Durrington was established during this period, but there is no evidence of activity within the proposed development sites. The land is likely to have been used for agricultural purposes.

Prehistoric

Baseline evidence shows that there is currently little evidence for activity within the wider landscape surrounding the sites prior to the Neolithic period²⁸. Evidence for Neolithic activity within the landscape surrounding the site is dominated by large-scale ceremonial structures mostly located within the World Heritage site (WHS). However, large-scale monuments of this period also exist in the rest of the study area. Just inside of the study area, some 3km to the north-east of Stonehenge, is the henge of Durrington Walls (c. 2,500 BC) (**1009133**) and the adjacent but much smaller scale Woodhenge (built around 2,300 BC). Both henges contained large timber structures and would have been major focal points within the landscape. The recently discovered remains of ten late Neolithic houses situated inside and just outside the Durrington Walls henge may be the surviving remains of an extensive settlement²⁹. Assemblages of worked flint of Neolithic date have been recovered across the study area. Given the nature and density of prehistoric archaeology in the 1km study area of these sites, it is possible that further settlement, ceremonial and funerary monuments once existed within the study area. The area of chalk downland which surrounds Stonehenge contains one of the densest and most varied groups of Neolithic and Bronze Age field monuments in Britain. Included within the area is Stonehenge itself, the Stonehenge Cursus, the Durrington Walls henge, and a variety of burial monuments, many grouped into cemeteries. Henges are ritual or ceremonial centres which date to the Late Neolithic period (2800-2000 BC). They were constructed as roughly circular or oval-shaped enclosures comprising a flat area over 20m in diameter enclosed by a ditch and external bank. One, two or four entrances provided access to the interior of the monument, which may have contained a variety of features including timber or stone circles, post or stone alignments, pits, burials or central mounds. The assets are shown on Figure 3d of the Larkhill SFA baseline report.

Overall, baseline evidence for the study area for all of these sites suggests a high potential for the presence of archaeological remains of prehistoric date within the sites assessed. A previously investigated enclosure of Iron Age date is located to the east of the SFA (**915372**) and although modern agricultural activity may have diminished the level of preservation of any associated or similar remains that are present there is still high potential especially given the close proximity of Durrington Walls to the south. Recent work by Julian Richards as part of the 'Layers of Larkhill' project³⁰ uncovered several unexpected and important prehistoric features in an area that is heavily ploughed and has been subject to military developments in the First World War/ Post-First World War period. This perhaps is illustrative of the high archaeological potential of the region.

²⁸ Darvill (2005), *Stonehenge World Heritage Site: An Archaeological Research Framework*.

²⁹ M. Parker Pearson et al. *The Age of Stonehenge*. 2007. *Antiquity*, 81(313) pp 617–639.

³⁰ www.archaemedia.co.uk and <http://2day.ws/forceslarkhill/section/LayersofLarkhill>



Modern

In addition to the potential for prehistoric remains, a significant quantity of military ground works dating from WWI onwards, particularly within the SFA boundary (e.g. **12605 / 1363071, 1363078**) is likely to be of archaeological interest and further investigation is required to define the extent of these features. However, the general background of prehistoric archaeology within the study area suggests that the presence of unknown archaeological remains of local or regional value is likely.

Table 8.7 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

Table 8.7: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
n/a	World Heritage Site: Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites	Very high	None
1009133	Scheduled Monument of Durrington Walls	Very high	None
1009473	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	None
1009730	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	None
1009501	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	None
1009650	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	None
1009498	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	None
1009691	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	None
1009648	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	None
1009482	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	None
MWI 12605 / 1363071, 1363078	Military Earthworks	Medium	None
MWI 12344	Undated Linear Feature	Uncertain	Archaeological fieldwork
1363083	Former location of four rectangular concrete structures	Low	None
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits	Uncertain	Archaeological fieldwork

8.5.3 **Perham Down**

Perham Down Garrison site

Overview

The baseline assessment for the proposed garrison developments was undertaken by Wessex Archaeology³¹. This summary is taken from the Wessex Archaeology Report, which can be found in Appendix 8B. The assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.4. For ease of reference with the baseline reports, the Wessex Archaeology reference numbers have been used to identify those assets discussed. There is potential for buried archaeological remains dating to the prehistoric, Roman, Saxon and modern periods to remain in undisturbed areas.

One scheduled monument was identified within 1km of the site boundary, the boundary earthwork on Lamb Down (**1009833**). A further 58 scheduled monuments were identified in the wider 5km study area together with three Grade I and three Grade II* listed buildings. The Wessex Archaeology report identified that none of the assets within the wider 5km study area would experience setting impacts from the proposed development.

Prehistoric

The baseline report identified limited Neolithic activity but an increase in Bronze Age activity with a number of non-designated barrows located to the south of the garrison and the scheduled linear earthwork boundary on Lamb Down which is also located to the south of the garrison. The course of this ditch takes it through the garrison itself and archaeological evaluation has found traces of the feature, even in areas of heavy truncation from later development.

Extensive field systems have been identified within the study area from aerial photographs. They are undated but typologically date to the prehistoric and Roman period. A number of Iron Age pits and an enclosure have been located within the study area to the south, down slope along with isolated findspots of Roman pottery and coins.

Early Medieval

The Saxon period is represented by the findspot of a burial of a Saxon 'warrior' found with a spearhead and shield boss within the western part of the garrison in 1939. Further excavations have found no other burials or contemporary evidence indicating that this was a single interment.

Early modern and Modern

The study area was largely agricultural during the medieval and post-medieval period with the only major change occurring in 1897 when the land was sold to the War Department to create a permanent training area for the military. Perham Down was first used in 1899 when a tented camp was created with rifle ranges. There was little change here until the outbreak of WWI when the tented camp was replaced with a permanent garrison in 1915 with buildings constructed to the north and south of the Tidworth Road. A large hutted camp was also

³¹ Wessex Archaeology 2014, *Project Allenby/Connaught Perham Down Wiltshire Archaeological Desk-based Assessment*. Ref: 101480.21.

created in the north-western quadrant of the garrison, although not all of this area was covered with the temporary buildings. This hutted camp was demolished in the inter-war period.

The camp was increased once again in the 1930s when it was extended to the south of the Tidworth Road and the northern camp was also extended.

Between 1972-74, the Perham Down garrison was subject to extensive redevelopment. Virtually all of the historic WWI and WWII buildings were demolished, leaving only a small number of original structures, such as the Corporals Club and the two Officers mess buildings located south of the Tidworth Road. The newly designed barracks were named the Swinton Barracks and were located to the north of the Tidworth Road and later, the large service buildings were constructed in the north-western portion of the garrison.

Table 8.7 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

Table 8.8: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1009883/MWI17640	Portion of the boundary earthwork on Lamb Down	High	None
MWI17648	Field system	Medium	None
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits in northern portion of Perham Down Garrison	Uncertain	Archaeological fieldwork

Perham Down SFA

Overview

Four scheduled monuments and 14 listed buildings were identified within a 1km search area. The majority of the listed buildings were located within the conservation area of Ludgershall. A further 32 scheduled monuments and 15 listed buildings were located within 5km.

The baseline assessment established that 31 of the 32 scheduled monuments within 5km would not have their value or setting impacted.

Eight non-designated archaeological assets were identified from the English Heritage Archive and the Wiltshire Historic Environment Record.

Prehistoric to Roman

The baseline study has shown that there is evidence for prehistoric and Roman activity in the wider landscape evidenced by Scheduled Monuments; however, there is little evidence in the vicinity of the proposed development. A number of ditches and possible parallel trackways

have been identified as undated assets, although they may form part of a prehistoric track or field system. Compared with other areas of the Plain and the other sites within this Army Basing project, the study area contains relatively few scheduled monuments and less evidence for prehistoric activity. This may be due to research bias or more intensive modern activity here, but the River Bourne does form an interesting boundary separating this eastern portion of the SPTA and with a markedly less dense spread of Scheduled Monuments. The assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.4.

Works undertaken as part of the Eastern Infrastructure Project³² have gone some way to remedy this picture. The project has identified a significant number of additional prehistoric and Roman sites on the eastern part of the SPTA. This project was undertaken to enhance the training facilities in this area and included the provision of new tank tracks and other training sites. The project has identified a large number of new heritage assets. These include Iron Age settlements, burials, Neolithic pit groups and Roman cremations. Modern military remains, including camps and training features from both World Wars have also been recorded as part of this project.

Roman activity has been identified within the 200m search area in the form of findspots and Roman activity has been identified within the wider study area. There is a possible villa site located at Shoddesden Grange to the south-east of the proposed development, although this has not been verified and Roman buildings have been identified at Lambourne Hill to the east.

Medieval to Modern

Ludgershall was prominent in the medieval period due to its castle, a Scheduled Monument (1009912), which became a royal palace in the 13th century. The village was established at the same time as the castle and remained fairly nucleated.

The railway reached the area in 1882 and in 1901 a branch line was opened from Ludgershall to Tidworth. The village grew to small town status in the early 20th century due to the presence of Army camps at nearby Perham Down and Tidworth and in 1939 the War Office built a mobilization depot and workshops for the manufacture and repair of vehicles on the SFA site. In 1943 the United States Army and Navy prepared vehicles there for the invasion of Europe.³³

The Fowler and Busigny Barracks were established to the west of the SFA in 1938. Both of these barrack blocks were demolished in the 1960s and 1970s respectively and therefore the archaeological potential of this site is reduced. The military buildings and infrastructure within Coronna Barracks are still extant and the site walkover identified a number of extant WWII vehicle shed and the rare surviving vehicle waterproofing tank. Internal access was not granted for the WWII sheds due to asbestos, therefore their value cannot be fully ascertained at this stage. The archaeological potential is reduced here due to ground disturbance.

Table 8.7 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

³² The Eastern Infrastructure Project comprises the archaeological assessment and fieldwork along a 38km track and hardstanding which will enable the safe movement of military vehicles and personnel within the training estate.

³³ James, N. D.G., 1987. *Plain Soldiering A history of the Armed Forces on Salisbury Plain*. The Hobnob Press. Salisbury.



Table 8.9: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
n/a	Unknown archaeological assets within the garrison	Uncertain	Archaeological fieldwork
1009912	Ludgershall Castle	Very high	None
1336429	Armoured Vehicle Depot	Medium	None
1010138	Sidbury Hillfort	Very high	None
n/a	WWII sheds	Uncertain	Internal access
n/a	Vehicle waterproof testing tank	Medium	None

8.5.4 **Tidworth**

Tidworth Garrison site

Overview

The baseline assessment for the proposed garrison developments was undertaken by Wessex Archaeology³⁴. The full baseline report is presented in Appendix 8B. The following summary is extracted from the Wessex Archaeology report. For ease of reference with the baseline reports, the Wessex Archaeology reference numbers have been used to identify those assets discussed. The assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.3.

There are 13 scheduled monuments within the 1km search area. In particular there is the monument of the Seven Barrows barrow cemetery (**1015481**) consisting of five bowl barrows and two outliers. There are also a number of scheduled prehistoric boundary features within close proximity to the garrison including a section to the north with two sections situated to the west, possibly associated with the Devil's Ditch and with the network of linear boundaries spreading out from Sidbury Hill hillfort.

The Wessex Archaeology baseline established that there is archaeological interest within the site with the potential for buried archaeological remains, particularly related to the Bronze Age. No other adverse impacts were predicted for the setting of any of the other scheduled monuments, Grade I or II* listed buildings within the wider 5km study area.

Prehistoric to Roman

There is extensive evidence of prehistoric activity within the study area and surrounding landscape. Neolithic activity has been identified 1.1km from the garrison boundary in the form of a long barrow at Milston Down and there is extensive evidence of Bronze Age activity, primarily represented by funerary monuments of barrows situated on the valley slopes. There is evidence from within the garrison itself in the form of four cremation burials found during the construction of the Tank Regiments building in the centre of the site. There is evidence of later Bronze Age activity demonstrated by the appearance of linear boundary earthworks in the landscape.

There is evidence of Iron Age activity in the wider landscape with the Sidbury hillfort located to the north and the extensive field system and historic landscape of Figheldean Down to the west. There is little evidence for Roman settlement in the immediate surrounding area, with only a few pottery sherds and ditches demonstrating Roman activity. It may be that the garrison lay within a peripheral area to the main agricultural zone or settlement zones and therefore there would be less physical evidence remaining.

Early Medieval to Medieval

The Saxon and early medieval period saw a withdrawal from the downland to settlement within the valley floor. There is evidence of an early medieval origin for Tidworth through its inclusion in Domesday and the discovery of a small pottery assemblage to the north-east of the site. Medieval activity is prevalent within North Tidworth and there is evidence of medieval settlement in close proximity to the site itself. The most intensive period of occupation is

³⁴ Wessex Archaeology 2014, *Project Allenby/Connaught Tidworth Archaeological Desk-based Assessment*. Ref: 101480.11

thought to have been in the 12th to 14th centuries. The settlement remained fairly static in size and population throughout the post-medieval period, with agriculture being the main economy and the site located in an area of large arable fields. The most significant change occurred within this landscape when large tracts of Salisbury Plain were purchased by the War Office for military training purposes.

Modern

Tidworth camp was established in 1902 as a barracks for infantry and cavalry and was developed in phases during 1902, 1907, 1911 and 1914. The site was located immediately alongside Tidworth to the north-east, the small hamlet of Hampshire Cross and the South Tidworth estate.

The garrison was built around a regular grid of barrack groups with substantial brick buildings comprising barrack blocks and other support and ancillary buildings. The design of the buildings and the layout of the garrison reflected new developments and standardisation of design that was being introduced to military building in response to a demand for a better standard and quality of accommodation. The site comprised eight battalion units each to a standard layout comprising a parallel range of two paired barrack buildings facing across a central parade with a smaller range set perpendicular between. Ancillary buildings were arranged in a linear fashion away from the barracks and comprised, at the peak of development, laundry blocks, soldier's institute, drill halls and hospital mostly located to the north. Riding schools were attached to the cavalry barracks which were also provided with a veterinary hospital. Other welfare facilities included a market, shops and allotment gardens. Guardhouses and quartermasters stores were arranged south of the barracks and the paired Officers' Mess were located along The Mall which defines the southern perimeter of the garrison site.

During the 1920s and 1930s the garrison provided facilities for new mechanised units and new buildings were added around the site and some of the earlier buildings between the blocks were demolished but the essential layout of the site was largely retained until into the mid-20th century.

In recent years there have been numerous demolitions throughout the site and many of the original barrack blocks and associated structures have been replaced by new buildings; thus the site layout has lost much of its original symmetry, character and layout.

Within the garrison site there are seven designated assets all located within Jellalabad Barracks which represents the sole remaining original barracks to have been retained during recent periods of demolitions and new building. The designated buildings are all Grade II listed and comprise barrack blocks 56, 57, 61 and 62 (WA 23-26), the guardhouse, building 65 (WA22), the Quartermaster's store, building 64 (WA21) and the Officers Mess, building 73 (WA20). As the only remaining examples of these barracks they are particularly significant and have a high evidential and communal value.

Although access to the site has not been possible there is potential for further historic buildings of the period 1905-1948 to remain within the site. These structures should be considered as non-designated heritage assets and would be of potential heritage interest.

The original formal setting of designated and non-designated assets within the garrison site has been altered by extensive demolition and rebuilding. The designated assets that comprise the Jellalabad Barracks do, however, retain key elements of their setting namely their spatial relationship and formal grouping facing across the parade, particular to the south towards the guardhouse and beyond towards the Officer's mess. The northern aspect of the Barrack has

been lost by larger scale modern building and the setting of the Quartermaster's Store has been lost by recent demolitions which have separated the building from its historical associates. The arrangement of the Officers Mess on The Mall has been retained and both designated and non-designated buildings along The Mall retain a formal open setting to the south and an enclosed garden setting on their north aspect, the latter having been recently eroded by infill developments.

Although the Wessex Archaeology report does not provide any information in relation to non-designated assets within Tidworth, it can be assumed that there are potentially a number of assets within these locations that are of heritage interest. These would specifically include the Soldier's Institute (1901-1911) and St Michael's church (1925). The gardens at Tidworth Park, South Tidworth should also be considered a non-designated heritage asset.

Tidworth Park is an extensive area of former parkland associated with South Tidworth (also known as Tedworth) House. The gardens comprise areas of mature planting to the west of the house and enclose the stable court. The planting is defined on its northern edge along Humber Lane. Parkland with avenues and formal planting extend to the south of the House with mature planted informal parkland extending to the north of the house and to its east. The approach to the House is along the Avenue from the north east. The park forms the setting to the House and associated assets and is therefore relatively enclosed with the exception of the north vista which is more open and faces towards the Garrison site. The rural setting of the park has been retained to the south and east but its original open aspect to the north and west has been altered by the establishment and development of the garrison Site. The garrison site has evolved alongside the park and is now part of its setting and there are close associations between the house and the garrison, for instance with the polo field established to the east of the house since 1925 and the current use of the house as a recovery centre run by the Help for Heroes charity.

Table 8.10 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

Table 8.10: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1015481	Seven Barrows cemetery	Very high	None
n/a	Non-designated historic buildings within the garrison	Uncertain	Detailed site walkover including internal inspection
929256	Continuation of the scheduled boundary earthwork 1015482	Medium	None
MWI17722	Area of military practice trenches	Medium	None



Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1056368	Site of the Delhi military hospital	Medium	None
MWI17725	Area of military practice trenches	Medium	None
n/a	Unknown archaeological potential within the garrison	Uncertain	Archaeological fieldwork

SFA sites

As part of the ongoing consultation and masterplan process, the preferred SFA sites identified around Tidworth have now been removed. The Tidworth SFA provision is now restricted to 100 houses purchased from the market, with no new build anticipated. There will therefore be no impact upon the heritage resource identified in the desk-based assessment and as such, the Tidworth SFA sites will not be considered any further in this report. The assessment of the former preferred sites can be found in Appendix 8C.

8.5.5 *Upavon*

Upavon Garrison site

Overview

There are three scheduled monuments and six listed buildings (one Grade II*, five Grade II) within a 1km search area. A further 30 Scheduled Monuments and eight listed buildings (three Grade I and five Grade II*) were located within a 5km search area.

Thirty-one non-designated heritage assets are located within the 200m study area. The assets that have the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.5.

The baseline assessment identified that none of the scheduled monuments within the 5km search area would experience an impact from the proposed development (URS 2014, Upavon Heritage Baseline). Of the Scheduled Monuments within the 1km search area, only one, the round barrow within the grounds of RAF Upavon (*sic*) (**1010667**) would experience an impact. The other two, a boundary earthwork (**1009812**) and the round barrow on Bohune Down (**1003036**) would experience an impact upon their setting from the development. In the main, this is due to the proposed development being located entirely within the existing Upavon garrison which has already caused an impact to the setting of these monuments.

The addition of buildings in locations of former buildings would not substantively increase the impact. In addition, for the boundary earthwork, it is assessed that the setting of the linear boundary encompasses the surrounding prehistoric landscape including the barrow monuments and later Roman settlements and field systems. This association can be readily appreciated and the garrison already forms part of this landscape. The proposed development will be seen in the context of the existing development, and therefore will not present a significant change to the current landscape. Even if new tall elements were to be added to the garrison, this is unlikely to impact upon this asset. The value lies in the evidence it provides for Bronze Age land-use, land division and possible territorial markers. This evidence will not be altered by the introduction of tall buildings as views do not contribute a great deal to the setting of the asset.

Prehistoric to Roman

The baseline assessment has identified the presence of multi-period activity within the proposed development site and study area. Evidence for Bronze Age activity is in the form of a scheduled barrow monument within the garrison itself (**1010667**) and there are a large number of barrows in the wider 5km study area, particularly to the east of the proposed development. Evidence of Iron Age and Roman activity includes a settlement (**MWI13713**) located to the south of the proposed development on the airfield identified through evaluation in 2007.

This is a substantial settlement and is of schedulable quality. There is also the location of Chisenbury Trendle, a levelled hillfort located approximately 1.5km to the south of the garrison boundary and the Chisenbury Midden, an extensive Iron Age midden of considerable size covering an area of 2.5ha³⁵. Both of these assets are designated as Important and Fragile Sites on the DIO database³⁶. All of these assets add to the picture of intensive activity in this

³⁵ McOmish, D, Field, D, Brown, G. 2002. *The Field Archaeology of the Salisbury Plain Training Area*. English Heritage. Swindon.

³⁶ See section 8.5.2.

area during the Iron Age and Roman period. This is supported by the general historic landscape evidence which places Iron Age settlements at higher levels than earlier settlements and often within enclosures. There is the potential that the Iron Age settlement may even continue into the proposed development site.

There is evidence for Roman activity in the form of a group of artefacts found in close proximity to the Iron Age settlement. This is indicative of continued use of a settlement site which has been confirmed at the settlement site within the airfield. There is extensive evidence of Roman activity in the wider landscape with the Roman settlements at Compton Farm and Chisenbury Warren and the villa site at Enford in the river valley floor.

Medieval

The medieval period is under-represented within the search area but this is likely to be because the area was used mainly for agriculture with settlement located within the river valley to the west. There is an area of scheduled strip lynchets to the west of the garrison which attest to the presence of medieval agricultural activity in close proximity to the site. The settlement at Upavon was established during this period along with the church of St. Mary which replaced a Saxon predecessor.

Modern

The modern period is dominated by the establishment of the military on Salisbury Plain and in particular the establishment of the Central Flying School at Upavon in 1912. The Central Flying School of the Royal Flying Corps was built on high ground to the east of the village either side of the Andover Road in 1912. Temporary accommodation started to be replaced by permanent buildings including aircraft sheds on both sides of the road. The station was expanded under the RAF Expansion Scheme of 1923-24 and again prior to WWII when the hangars to the south of the A342 were built³⁷. Subsequent to WWII the station became a transport HQ for the RAF and was handed over to the Army in 1993 becoming known as Trenchard Lines.

Five of the original permanent buildings on the site dating to 1912-13 are listed, including the Officers' Mess (Grade II*) (**1365554**), the Avon Club (**1299342**), York Cottage (**1393045**), the Nettleton Block building 36 (**1393046**) and the Trenchard Building (**1186058**) (all Grade II). In addition there are a number of non-designated assets which date both from the initial phase of the station's development and the two periods of inter-war expansion.

Table 8.11 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

³⁷ James, N. D.G., 1987. *Plain Soldiering A history of the Armed Forces on Salisbury Plain*. The Hobnob Press. Salisbury.



Table 8.11: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish potential
1010667	Round barrow located in Upavon Garrison	Very high	None
n/a	Unknown archaeological potential at Upavon Garrison	Uncertain	Archaeological fieldwork
MWI13736	Area of military trenching	Medium	None
MWI10127/918906	Undated ditch on Upavon Down	Low	None
1365554	Officers Mess building 21	Very high	None
1393045	York Cottage	High	None
1299342	Avon Club building 110	High	None

8.5.6 SPTA – Army Basing

ETR (Bulford Danger Area)

Overview

The baseline study indicates that there is high archaeological potential within the site boundary. The site location and assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.8. Significant evidence for Bronze Age funerary archaeology is present within the 1km search area to the east of the site and it is possible that associated remains, although likely to be truncated, may be present at depth within the site. There has been a significant amount of modern disturbance within the site as a result of previous military use some of which is of archaeological interest as it dates from the WWI era. The baseline study identified one Grade II listed building within 1km that would not be impacted by the scheme. No non-designated built heritage assets would be impacted by the proposals.

A group of sixteen round barrows on Bulford Down (**Group 1009609 (MWI12140)**) are located to the east of the proposed ETR. Within the western half of the barrow group are traces of two sub-circular enclosures. This group of features is located on elevated ground directly overlooking the development area with the Nine Mile River located immediately beyond. This relationship is a fundamental aspect of the historic setting of the asset group.

A further barrow (**1009508**) is located just outside of the north east corner of the development site. As is the case with the barrow group of Bulford Down (**Group 1009609 (MWI12140)**), the relationship with the Nine Mile River is of key importance to the assets.

1009476, **1009500** and **1009470** are all bowl barrows located 500-600m to the north-east of the Bulford Danger Area. Located immediately to the south of the development area is a group of six disc barrows (**1009972**, **1010239**, **1010237**, **1010235**, **1009968** and **1009966**). This group of assets is located on slightly elevated ground. Modern development, including a road and buildings, has compromised the historic setting of the assets to some extent.

To the north-west of the development area beyond the Nine Mile River are two further bowl barrows (**1009611**; **1009567**). Woodland located on either side of the Nine Mile River effectively screens views from these assets.

1017929 is a bowl barrow located to the south-east of the Bulford Danger Area just north of Gallipoli Road, Sling Camp. The barrow is located 900m from the development, beyond a modern road, and the setting of the asset has already been compromised slightly. Approximately 900m to the north-east of the development site are five further bowl barrows (**1009476**, **1009517**, **1009538**, **1009484** and **1009640**) located on Milston-Bulford Down.

The long barrow and disc barrow in Briggerston Field (**1009482**) located 900m to the north-west of the Bulford Danger Area are completely screened by a large conifer plantation.

MWI12068/915450 is an extensive complex of 20th century practice trenches and slit trenches associated with military training at Bulford Camp, visible as earthworks on aerial photographs. The earthworks extend throughout the development site and buffer zone.

Table 8.12 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

Table 8.12: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1009609 / MWI 12140	Group of Round Barrows	Very high	None
1009508	Barrow	Very high	None
1009476	Barrow	Very high	None
1009500	Barrow	Very high	None
1009470	Barrow	Very high	None
1009972	Barrow	Very high	None
1010239	Barrow	Very high	None
1010237	Barrow	Very high	None
1010235	Barrow	Very high	None
1009968	Barrow	Very high	None
1009966	Barrow	Very high	None
1009611	Barrow	Very high	None
1009567	Barrow	Very high	None
1017929	Barrow	Very high	None
1009517	Barrow	Very high	None
1009538	Barrow	Very high	None
1009484	Barrow	Very high	None
1009640	Barrow	Very high	None
1009482	Long Barrow and Disc	Very high	None

	Barrow		
MWI12068/915450	Military practice Trenches	Medium	None

IBSR (Area 16 Impact Area)

Overview

The site location and assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.9.

The baseline study indicates that there is high archaeological potential within the site boundary. Significant evidence for Bronze Age and Iron Age archaeology is present within the 1km search area to the east of the site and it is possible that associated remains may be present at depth within the site, although they are likely to have been truncated by a significant amount of modern disturbance within the site as a result of previous military use.

There are no scheduled monuments or assets of very high value within the site itself but one Scheduled Monument is located within 1km. This is a field system of 'Celtic' date which is known as Thornham Down prehistoric and medieval landscape. The site group extends over a substantial area of downland with a large number of extant monuments. The features are exceptionally well preserved and an important example of an extensive prehistoric and medieval landscape. The group of features is given a single scheduled monument number (**1010219**). In addition, some of the field boundary features relating to this asset extend into the 200m buffer zone and the site itself and are recorded in the HER / English Heritage Archive (**MWI11809/218952**); these may be considered assets of high value. There are a total of 40 other scheduled monuments within 5km (excluding those within 1km) of the site but the development of training facilities, as long as these are of a small scale and massing, are expected to have an effect on only one of these. This is a barrow of Bronze Age date (**1009533**) located 1.2km to the south-west of the site. This is a nearly circular enclosure considered to be a prehistoric settlement, but possibly a henge, and an associated bowl barrow.

There are no listed buildings within the 1km study area. There are five Grade II* and two Grade I listed buildings within the 5km study area, but none will be affected³⁸.

Prehistoric

The wider area has been occupied since Neolithic times. There are many Neolithic and Bronze Age barrows on the downs and some prehistoric field systems. Probably the most abundant archaeological features across the Plain are those of later prehistoric field systems. These represent the first physical remains of widespread settlement and agriculture. During the 2nd millennium BC the preferred locations for settlement varied. Much of the Plain was enclosed at this time and control of land through division was important. There is little evidence for burial and ceremonial elements during this period³⁹. The field system represented within IBSR comprises a large number of small rectangular fields creating a large

³⁸ See URS 2014 *IBSR Heritage Baseline*.

³⁹ McOmish, D, Field, D, Brown, G. 2002. *The Field Archaeology of the Salisbury Plain Training Area*. English Heritage. Swindon.

conglomeration known as Celtic Fields. Dating the field systems is very difficult but cultivation was certainly underway in the late Bronze Age. Dating is usually taken from association with other forms of earthwork that are easier to date such as enclosures and ditches. It is likely that the field system on Thornham Down is mid to late Bronze Age in date.

Two main types of field system are apparent; regular and irregular. The field system on Thornham Down is regular coaxial as it forms a grid pattern. The axial geometry is adhered to regardless of topography suggesting that the field systems may have been laid out over a very short timescale. There is clear evidence that the field system on Thornham Down has been enlarged.⁴⁰ An asset of medium value comprising a possible Iron Age/Romano-British settlement indicated by a circular enclosure within rectilinear enclosures and a later prehistoric field system is located to the south of the ISBR area (**16219020**).

Medieval and Modern

The medieval farming economy on the Plain was of traditional sheep and corn. There is evidence for extensive ridge and furrow cultivation of medieval date upon Thornham Down⁴¹. Ploughing has reduced the prehistoric banks to low wide spreads of earth that survive intermittently for approximately 3km; the longest uninterrupted bank is about 1km long. They are similar to the remains of 'Celtic' fields on Lambourne Downs where only the long banks survive; the cross-divisions having been ploughed away.

Further assets of medium value include a medieval enclosure (**MWI11747**) located to the north of Area 16 within the 200m buffer zone on Enford Down. A further enclosure (**MWI11754**) is located to the west of Area 16 within the 200m buffer zone, also on Enford Down. A sheep fold known as Clarks Penning (**21904**) of low value is within the buffer zone. The feature also contains a military earthwork in the south-eastern end.

The site has been used as a firing range since the 1970s and significant ground disturbance has resulted, certainly to the immediate north of the site.

Table 8.13 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value.

⁴⁰ McOmish, D, Field, D, Brown, G. 2002. *The Field Archaeology of the Salisbury Plain Training Area*. English Heritage. Swindon.

⁴¹ McOmish, D, Field, D, Brown, G. 2002. *The Field Archaeology of the Salisbury Plain Training Area*. English Heritage. Swindon.

Table 8.13: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1010219	Thornham Down prehistoric and medieval landscape	Very high	None
1009533	Barrow	Very high	None
MWI11809/218952	Field System	High	None
MWI11747	Enclosure	Medium	None
MWI11754	Enclosure	Medium	None
219014	Sheep Fold	Medium	None

Nine Mile River Crossing

Overview

There are a total of eleven Scheduled Monuments within 1km of the Nine Mile River Crossing none of which will be effected by the proposals given their current relatively small scale. The baseline study identified one Grade II listed building within the 1km search area which would not experience impacts from the scheme⁴². No other designated or non-designated building would be impacted by the scheme.

The baseline study indicates that there is low to medium archaeological potential within the site boundary. This is due to the significant amount of modern disturbance within the site to the north of the river as a result of previous military use. Some of the assets of modern military date (**MWI12079/1360635**) located within the area of search for the crossing may be of archaeological interest as they may date from the earliest use of the area for military purposes during the First World War. However, in addition to the modern assets, there is a general background of prehistoric remains within the 1km study area and isolated features such as pits and ditches of this date may survive at depth.

Prehistoric and Early Medieval

The site location and assets with the potential to be impacted is shown on Figure 8.10. The wider area has been occupied since Neolithic times. There is evidence of Bronze Age occupation from the site of two scheduled barrow sites (**1009611, 1009567**) to the north-east of the proposed development area and the large barrow cemetery (**1009609**) located to the east.

⁴² See URS 2014 *Nine Mile River Heritage Baseline* for further details.

There would seem to have been a later Saxon settlement by the River Avon, as two mills are mentioned in the Domesday survey of 1086. The population of the Bulford estate at the time of the Domesday Book was between 125 and 145. There was enough land for nine plough teams but eight are recorded, three on the land worked by Amesbury Abbey and five operated by their tenants.

Medieval

There was a church at Bulford in the 12th century and early settlement is likely to have developed close to the River Avon and Nine Mile River to the west of the site.

The medieval farming economy was of traditional sheep and corn with the latter being the principal crop. In 1539 there were still two watermills, although they may both have been in the same building, and there was at least one inn. A new mill was built between 1726 and 1735 and in 1765 this was making paper. It continued producing paper until the 1870s with a succession of families running the mill. All of the mills were located to the west of the site. In the early 1700s, a new road was also built as a turnpike, from the north through Figheledean to join the London Road near Amesbury, and this ran through the eastern part of the village.

Modern

The 1838 tithe map is incomplete but shows the site to comprise open fields. A barrow is shown to the north and this asset is located just to the east of the 200m buffer zone. From around 1898 land around the Nine Mile Crossing began to be used for military training. From the beginning of the 20th century onwards, the camp became the main built element in the parish. In 1906 the Amesbury and Military Camp Light Railway was built and this defines the southern limits of the site.

Bulford garrison was the base of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force from 1914 -1918. Later Ordnance Survey maps show the development of the hard standing to the north of the Bourne Road which is renamed Bulford Droveaway. Carter barracks, a hutted camp north of Bulford Droveaway, were built 1939–40 and demolished in 1978. The first Canadian Battalion Parachute regiment were stationed at Carter Barracks in the lead up to D-Day. The outlines of the roads of the barracks are still present in this part of the site.

Table 8.14 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the Proposed development and their value in heritage terms.



Table 8.14: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1009567	Barrow	Very high	None
109611	Barrow	Very high	None
1009609	Barrow	Very high	None
MWI12079/1360635	Military feature of possible WWI date	Medium	None

8.5.7 SPTA – Complex Manoeuvre Environment

Copehill Down

Overview

The baseline study indicates that there is low archaeological potential within the site boundary. The assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.7.

There is only one scheduled monument within the 1km study area. A further 27 scheduled monuments are located within the 5km study area. None of these will be affected by development within the proposed training area. There are no listed buildings within a 1km search area of the site. There is one Grade I and five Grade II* listed buildings within a 5km search area of the site. The site walkover has determined that none of the above assets will be impacted by development on the proposed site, and therefore these assets are not taken forward for further assessment.

The Scheduled Monument and asset of very high value is a Long Barrow and Old Ditch linear earthwork on Tilshead Down (**1009297**) approximately 1km to the north of the site. The long barrow has a north-east to south-west axis. A boundary earthwork is aligned on the barrow. To the east of the barrow the boundary earthwork is planted with trees. To the west it is mostly destroyed. A long barrow, 130m along the south-west to north-east axis and approximately 50m overall width, including very large side ditches, is part of this monument. The barrow was partially excavated twice in the 19th century. There is some military damage within the monument. A boundary bank and ditch called "Old Ditch" is also part of this monument. The bank varies from 2m in width to non-existent. The ditch is up to 5m wide. The eastern area is planted with trees.

There are only two assets previously located within the site, both of low value. **MWI16795/931571** is a pit of Neolithic date located within the Indicative Training Area. The feature was a substantial isolated pit which was revealed in 1987 and a linear ditch of later prehistoric date which was located during a watching brief in 1987. An excavation undertaken in 1988 by Wessex Archaeology relocated the linear ditch and revealed an early Neolithic large isolated pit. A scatter of prehistoric artefacts associated with ephemeral subsoil features was recorded. The ditch was described as considerably later in date than the pit, and was abandoned almost immediately after construction⁴³. **MW16837** represents a small quantity of unstratified finds recovered from the topsoil during archaeological evaluation. These included worked and burnt flint (prehistoric) as well as a single sherd of Romano-British pottery to the east of the Indicative Training Area.

Previous archaeological investigations within the site have revealed few archaeological features. The exception is one pit of Neolithic date located towards the eastern edge of the proposed site and a late prehistoric ditch in the same location. Previous modern disturbance has almost certainly removed any archaeological remains that may have been present throughout the majority of the site.

Table 8.15 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development and their value in heritage terms.

43 Richards, J. (1988). Excavations at the SPTA FIBUA Site, Copehill Down 1987-8. Wessex Archaeology (1988.017).

Table 8.15: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1009297	Long Barrow and Old Ditch linear earthwork on Tilshead Down	Very high	None
MWI16795/931571	Neolithic Pit	Medium	None
MW16837	Un-stratified finds	Low	None

Imber

Overview

The site location and assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.6.

The baseline study has identified the presence of multi-period activity within the proposed development site and study area. The village itself has medieval origins and there is high potential for remains of this date within the settlement boundary. Outside of the immediate settlement, evidence for Neolithic activity is in the form of a long barrow which is a Scheduled Monument and asset of very high value (**1000002**) within the study area. There are a large number of Bronze Age barrows (e.g. **MWI3460/762845**, **MWI3462/762851**, and **MWI3463/762853**) in the wider 5km study area, particularly to the west of the proposed development. Evidence of Iron Age or Romano-British activity comprises a possible settlement (**1010024**) located to the west of the proposed development. This is supported by the general historic landscape evidence which places Iron Age settlements at higher levels than earlier settlements and often within enclosures⁴⁴. There is the potential that the Iron Age settlement may even continue into the proposed development.

There is evidence for Roman activity in the form of a group of burials but the exact location has not been accurately recorded and may be an erroneous location for this asset (**211095**). The first documentary reference to Imber is in 947 when the land is recorded as being held by Romsey Abbey as part of its Edington Estate. The Domesday survey records the village as being divided between the Abbey and the Earl of Hereford. It then passed through the hands of the de Rous and Hungerford families in the 13th century and to the Thynne family of Longleat between the 16th and 19th centuries, some land being acquired by the Wadman family in the 17th century.

The church of St Giles (Grade I, **1036472**) occupies the site of a mid-12th century building and dates from the late 13th century with additions in the early 15th centuries.

⁴⁴ Defence Estates. 2009. *Integrated Rural Management Plan. Defence Training Estate Salisbury Plain. Volume 2 – Part E. Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.*



Andrews' and Drury's map of 1773 shows Imber to be a large village with houses and farms either side of the main east to west road. By the time of the Imber parish tithe map of 1838 the village has contracted, with gaps in development to both sides of the main street. There was, however, development at this time with the Baptist chapel being built in 1833, the school in 1836 and the vicarage in 1840-41. The village's largest recorded population was 440, taken in the 1851 census. From this point the village's population started to decline.

The village does not change greatly between 1887 and 1900. By 1924 there was a further slight contraction with fewer buildings on the south side of the main street and this is confirmed by the population of 152 recorded by the 1931 census.

The War Office began buying land on Salisbury Plain for military manoeuvres in the late 19th century and land in Imber village was bought in the 1930s, the majority of the villagers becoming tenants of the military. On 1 November 1943 the residents were called to a meeting in the schoolroom and informed they must leave the village within 47 days as the site was needed to train American servicemen in the lead up to D-Day. Villagers claimed they were told they could return but after the war the decision was taken to extend the Army's tenure indefinitely. A rally was held in 1961 and attended by more than 2,000 people and it was subsequently agreed that the church would be maintained and opened for worship once a year. Access is also allowed on a periodic basis to the former Baptist Cemetery located in the northern portion of the village. The Baptist Chapel is no longer extant but the cemetery does remain and relatives of the interred burials visit the area when permitted.

The settlement of Imber has early medieval origins and the baseline study has identified that the Imber training area retains high potential for the presence of archaeological remains associated with the medieval and later settlement of the rural village of Imber, much of which may be retained as the village was abandoned in 1943 so not subject to the pressures of modern day development.

Table 8.16 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

Table 8.16: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1010027	Long Barrow	Very high	None
1010024	Romano-British Enclosure	Very high	None
MWI3460/762845	Bowl Barrow	Very high	None
MWI3462/762851	Bowl Barrow	Very high	None
MWI3463/762853	Bowl Barrow	Very high	None
1036472	Church of St Giles	Very high	None
211095	Roman Cemetery? Inhumation	High	None
1266896	Park	Medium	None
MWI3494	Field Systems	Medium	None
MWI3488	Field Systems	Medium	None
MWI3499	Field Systems	Medium	None
MWI3495	Field Systems	Medium	None
n/a	Baptist Cemetery	Medium	None

Berrill Valley

Overview

The baseline study has identified the presence of multi-period activity within the proposed development site and study area. Evidence for Bronze Age activity is in the form of a scheduled barrows and evidence of Iron Age or Romano-British activity comes in the form of a possible settlement located to the north of the proposed development area. This is supported by the general historic landscape evidence which places Iron Age and Roman settlements at higher levels than earlier settlements and often within enclosures.

The baseline study identified no listed buildings within 1km of the development and no non-designated built heritage assets would experience an impact from the proposals.

The site location and assets with the potential to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.11. The first documentary reference to the Berril Valley is in 947 when the land is recorded as being held by Romsey Abbey as part of its Edington Estate. The Domesday survey records the nearby village of Imber as being divided between the Abbey and the Earl of Hereford. It then passed through the hands of the de Rous and Hungerford families in the 13th century and to the Thynne family of Longleat between the 16th and 19th centuries, some land being acquired by the Wadman family in the 17th century.

A number of archaeological fieldwork investigations have taken place within the Berril Valley. An evaluation located towards the southern end of the Berril Valley on the western side within the 200m buffer zone was conducted by Wessex Archaeology in 1995⁴⁵. Two undated features, a shallow scoop and a single posthole, were recorded, as well as a number of linear features that are considered to be natural in origin. Wessex Archaeology also undertook a survey of lynchets on Chapperton Down from 2005 to 2007⁴⁶.

There are three Scheduled Monuments within the 1km study area and a further 43 located within the 5km study area. Most of these will not be affected by development within the proposed training area but the following three Scheduled Monuments are located on elevated ground potentially overlooking the valley. There are three non-designated heritage assets within the 1km search area from the Wiltshire Historic Environment Records (WHER) and English Heritage Archive (EHA) databases. There were a further 14 within the 5km search area. A large-scale asset of very high value is the scheduled group of remains on Chapperton Down (**1009301**) located to the north-east of Berril Valley within the 1km buffer zone. The Chapperton Down Prehistoric and Romano-British Landscape is an area of well preserved, historic landscape including an unexcavated settlement, field systems and associated contemporary and non-contemporary features. It is also designated an Important and Fragile site by DIO.

In addition to Chapperton Down, there are two assets of very high value at the south-eastern end of the valley. One is a bowl barrow (**1009589**) within the 1km buffer zone. A boundary feature (**1010096**) 700m south-west of The Plantation, West Lavington Down is also within 1km.

There are a number of assets of low value located on the south side at the south end of the Berril Valley. Two pits (**MWI3510**, **MWI3510**) located within the Berril Valley to the southern end on the western side and a ditch probably of military construction (**211119**) is located towards the northern end of the Berril Valley on the eastern side within the 200m buffer zone. Two small oval features of possible military origin (**884268**) located towards the southern end of the Berril Valley on the western side within the 200m buffer zone are also recorded. A boundary ditch (**211130**) is located towards the northernmost point of the Berril Valley. Another boundary ditch (**884083**) is located around the centre of the Berril Valley on the western side within the 200m buffer zone. Further ditches (**MWI3473**, **MWI3502**) and a linear feature on Rough Down (**MWI3495**) are located towards the northern end of the Berril Valley on the western side. **MWI3511** is a post hole located within the Berril Valley towards the centre on the eastern side.

⁴⁵ Wessex Archaeology. 1995. SPTA Berril Valley Extension Track. Wessex Archaeology.

⁴⁶ Wessex Archaeology, 2005,2006,2008. Chapperton Down re-survey of Lynchets

Table 8.17 lists the heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the proposed development and their value in heritage terms.

Table 8.17: Assets with the potential to be impacted and their value

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
1009301	Chapperton Down Prehistoric and Romano-British Landscape	Very High	None
1009589	Barrow	Very High	None
211064	Two Barrows	Very High	None
214922	Three Barrows	Very High	None
867812	Barrow	Very High	None
1010018	Field System	Very High	None
1009976	Field System	Very High	None
MWI3456	Barrow	High	None
MWI3468	Field System	Medium	None
MWI3469	Field System	Medium	None
MWI3470	Field System	Medium	None
MWI3494	Field System	Medium	None
MWI3510	Pit	Low	None
211119	Ditch	Low	None
884268	Oval Feature	Low	None
211130	Ditch	Low	None
884083	Ditch	Low	None
MWI3473	Ditch	Low	None

Asset No.	Name	Value	Work required to establish value
MWI3502	Ditch	Low	None
MWI3511	Post Hole	Low	None

8.5.8 *Historic Landscape Character*

The current landscape of SPTA is a broad area of strong, cohesive landscape character. The ownership of SPTA by the military has caused a dramatically different evolution of the landscape than is seen across the rest of the country resulting in the remarkable survival of a pre-20th century landscape. This landscape contains fieldscapes, downland and military. There is considerable time-depth across SPTA with the historic downland surviving intact contributing to the legibility of the historic landscape. The time-depth in this landscape is shown by the survival of prehistoric field systems such as Celtic fields which are then overlain by later linear boundaries and the Roman settlements which survive well across the Higher Plain of SPTA.

Settlement is generally located in ribbons along the river valleys with the higher ground occupied first by ritual and funerary monuments, then later utilised for agriculture, both arable and pasture. There are exceptions to this such as in the Iron Age and possible Romano-British periods when settlement moved up the valley slopes, culminating in the hillforts such as Sidbury Hill and Scratchbury Camp⁴⁷.

The historic land cover of the area cannot be readily inferred from the available environmental evidence found so far, which has been focussed on particular areas such as Stonehenge and areas of more recent excavation. Environmental sampling has shown that woodland was present over much of SPTA during the Mesolithic period, with pine and hazel present at Stonehenge, Woodhenge and Durrington Walls, particularly in close proximity to the River Avon. It is likely that the process of woodland clearance began in the Mesolithic period, in particular along the river valleys where evidence for activity has been found in the form of flint artefacts near Upavon⁴⁸. This theory suggests that rather than the Neolithic being the beginning of large scale woodland clearance for agricultural purposes, this was a process which began in the Mesolithic, not to create areas for agriculture, but rather to create easier hunting areas for wild game. Large, dense woodland is not conducive to effective hunting and it is likely that the river valleys were cleared for settlement, with woodland management on the chalkland to create open spaces and less dense woodland.

Environmental evidence from the Neolithic period indicates the arrival of cereal crops, including emmer wheat and barley, and the development of grassland which would have supported the main agricultural focus which was cattle and dairying. It is likely that significant woodland clearance took place during the Neolithic period with the establishment of the

⁴⁷ Defence Estates. 2009. *Integrated Rural Management Plan. Defence Training Estate Salisbury Plain. Volume 2 – Part E. Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.*

⁴⁸ McOmish et al 2002, *The Field Archaeology of Salisbury Plain.* p149.

monumental assets which were constructed during this period. The long barrows of the Neolithic period were constructed on higher ground, and were designed to be seen from a distance, but particularly from the river valleys and lower-lying ground. It would make sense if any woodland obscuring the views to and from these monuments was removed to enhance their visibility and to allow their identification as boundary markers to people travelling through the landscape. Evidence for Neolithic settlement is sparse throughout the Plain, but it is likely that if settlements were located within the river valleys, they could have been overlain by colluvial and alluvial gravels and would be difficult to see with the traditional survey techniques employed across SPTA. From 1600 BC onwards, the landscape of SPTA appears to have been much more open with large areas of grassland evident from the environmental evidence⁴⁹.

Bronze Age barrows continued with the focus on the river valleys within the landscape as the choice of location with long views across the landscape. The unenclosed settlements which began to emerge in this period are mostly located within the river valleys and on the downlands. The large-scale clearance of woodland also led to the establishment of the coaxial field systems also known as Celtic Fields which marked a major shift in land division and must have required either significant co-operation or a powerful central control. It has also been suggested that the establishment of these linear fields represented the first large-scale settlement of the area on a permanent basis⁵⁰.

The late Bronze Age and Iron Age saw the establishment of enclosed settlements on the downs and the creation of hillforts on the higher ground. Settlement appears to have been slightly more dispersed in this period with scattered, isolated farmsteads and larger enclosures appearing both on the lower downlands and higher up on the slopes with the hillforts on the highest points. This represents the first major settlement activity outside of the river valleys. This scattered settlement layout was replaced in the last few centuries of the 1st millennium BC with large, open nucleated villages of a size and scale not previously seen⁵¹. There is evidence of continued occupation of the Iron Age downland enclosures but it is the establishment of large settlements on the Higher Plain such as Chapperton Down and Chisenbury Warren and the recent discovery of villa sites in the valleys such as at Enford, that provide the view of the landscape in the Roman period. The villas provided a central control to the agricultural settlements and the surrounding downs landscape which was subject to intensive arable farming.

Following the withdrawal of Roman central government support in AD 410, there seems to have been another change in the landscape with a reduction in arable farming and an increase in woodland coverage in the Higher Plain. It is likely that the settlements on the Higher Plain were gradually abandoned, but over a period of centuries rather than a rapid withdrawal. Settlement was once again focussed on the river valleys with activity continuing during the medieval period and the establishment of the distinction between river valley meadow, arable and downland pasture may have arisen in this early medieval period⁵².

⁴⁹ McOmish et al 2002, *The Field Archaeology of Salisbury Plain*. p149

⁵⁰ *ibid*, 153

⁵¹ Defence Estates 2009, *Integrated Rural Management Plan: Defence Estates Salisbury Plain. Volume 2 – Part E: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage* ACH-13

⁵² *ibid*, 157



Woodland was re-established within the area of SPTA during the medieval period as part of the royal forests of Chute and Selwood. The forests were created by the 11th century and were not continual dense blocks of woodland, but rather areas of forest, parkland and open grassland. Royal parks were established at Ludgershall and Everleigh, both within the larger Chute Forest. The medieval period also saw the extension of cultivation activity onto the Higher Plain and within older monuments such as the hillforts at Casterley. This continued into the post-medieval and early modern period with settlement following the well-established pattern of location within the river valleys and the agricultural workers required travelling from the river valleys up to the Higher Plains.

The establishment of the military presence and acquisition of the SPTA post-1897 had a profound effect on the historic landscape. The acquisition in 1897 marked the virtual cessation of agricultural activity and allowed the preservation of the historic and prehistoric landscape to an extent not possible elsewhere in the UK. The garrisons were established on the edge of existing medieval settlements such as Bulford, Upavon, Tidworth and Ludgershall or in the case of Larkhill, in close proximity to the training areas. The military presence also had the effect on the landscape of removing settlements, such as the case at Imber, a medieval village which was abandoned in 1943 to allow troops to train for World War II. The effect of the military ownership of SPTA has been to preserve the landscape as it was in the late 19th century allowing it to mostly escape the damage caused by mechanised agricultural activity.

8.6 Potential Impacts

8.6.1 *Bulford garrison*

Potential impacts are shown on Figure 8.2. The proposals for the Bulford garrison involves the development of a number of areas for living, technical, welfare and office/training facilities. Twenty-two separate areas are proposed for development across the garrison.

Designated Assets

Development of area 18 in the eastern portion of the garrison has the potential to impact upon the setting of the scheduled monument of two round barrows at Rawlinson Road (**1009964**), assets of very high value. The setting of these barrows is largely defined by the existing garrison and this contributes nothing to the value of the asset. A visual relationship with the barrow on Beacon Hill (**1017930**) can still be appreciated. It is unlikely that the two-storey extension proposed here will have a significant impact upon the barrows. Although in close proximity, the new area 18 building will be attached to an extant building, in an area which already contains large buildings in the view. The value of the barrows lies in their archaeological and historic value and the evidence they provide for Bronze Age society, funerary rituals and land-use and these values will not be impacted by the proposed development. The impact is therefore judged to be **very low**.

Non-designated Assets

The development of area 11 for living accommodation in the north-west corner of the garrison has the potential to physically and permanently impact upon deposits associated with the findspot of Bronze Age pottery (**MWI11920/219177**), an asset of low value. Although as a findspot this asset has been removed, it is indicative of Bronze Age activity and the area including the sports ground immediately to the east has remained free from development on all of the series of historic Ordnance Survey mapping indicating that the potential for survival here could be high. The impact on these assets would remove their archaeological value and therefore it is judged to be **very high**.

The non-designated asset of a number of military features (**1358981**), an asset of medium value, covers an extensive area and is made up of a number of small sections of slit trench identified from aerial photographs. There is the potential for any of the development areas to impact upon portions of this asset, particularly those which have seen relatively low former development. These areas have the potential to physically and permanently remove sections of the practice trenches. However, only a small portion of this asset will be impacted by the development, leaving a large portion still available for archaeological research in the future. The impact is therefore judged to be **medium**.

The findspots of a Bronze Age axe (**219357**) and Bronze Age pottery (**915424**) are of no value in themselves as they are records of assets which have been removed. However they may be indicative of Bronze Age activity in the area. They are assets of low value but deposits associated with these may be permanently and physically impacted by the development of area 15 for technical buildings. This construction would remove the archaeological value of these deposits and would therefore be a **very high** impact.

The development of area 9 for technical buildings and area 6 for office/training facilities has the potential to impact upon Bronze Age archaeology. A number of round barrows were located in this area (**MWI12158, 219407**) and a Bronze Age pit was also found in close proximity (**MWI11923**). These are assets of medium value as they have been truncated by 20th century development. There is the potential for further Bronze Age deposits to be located in

this area. Their value would lie in their archaeological and historic evidence, which would be removed permanently by the developments. The impact of this is judged to be **very high**.

The development of area 1 for living accommodation has the potential to impact upon the footprint of the former Old Sandhurst block, an asset of low value. This block was constructed during the inter-war period and has been demolished. The foundations of the buildings could potentially provide information on the evolution of the design of military buildings. The construction of buildings upon this area would remove the potential to provide further information and is therefore judged to be a **medium** impact.

The Iron Age and Roman field system located to the south of the garrison footprint (**219141**) is an asset of medium value. Although the transcription from aerial photographs shows that the fields system stops abruptly at the edge of the garrison, there is the possibility that the field system may continue as a below-ground feature. The development of area 4 and area 17 for living accommodation at the southern boundary of the garrison has the potential to impact upon this asset. This will only remove a portion of the asset; the majority of the asset will remain intact for future study. The impact is therefore judged to be **medium**.

Development of area 10 may necessitate the demolition of the Old Bakery building. This would result in a very high impact however the value of this asset cannot yet be determined. Therefore no residual effect can yet be stated.

Other as yet unidentified buildings of historic interest may experience impacts from the proposed development. A detailed walkover within the garrison is required to identify those buildings of historic interest. It is possible to use a worse-case scenario that these buildings would experience a very high impact.

The construction of any of the new buildings in areas which have seen little previous development or truncation have the potential to impact upon unknown archaeological assets. These are assets of uncertain. The potential for the recovery of archaeological assets within the garrison is moderate. The physical and permanent impact upon assets, or portions of assets, is judged to be at a **very high** level.

Table 8.18: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1009964	Two round barrows at Rawlinson Road	Very Low
1358981	Area of slit trenches and air raid shelters	Medium
n/a	Unidentified historic buildings	Very High
n/a	The Old Bakery building	Very High
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits within the garrison	Very High
MWI11920/219177	Findspot of Beaker Bronze Age pottery	Very High
219357 and 915424	Findspot of Bronze Age axe and pottery	Very High
MWI12158	Site of a round barrow	Very High
219407	Site of 3 round barrows	Very High
MWI11923	Bronze Age pit	Very High
n/a	Site of Old Sandhurst Block	High
219141	Iron Age/Roman field system and trackway	Medium

8.6.2 *Bulford SFA*

South-western SFA

Designated Assets

The group of nine barrows (1015216, 1009933, 1009545, 1009602, 1009604, 1009605, 1009564, 1009969, 1009931) are located to the south of the A3028, south of the southern SFA site and are all assets of very high value. The development of the SFA has the potential to impact upon the setting of these barrows. The setting has been established as the surrounding landscape, and the view to the north toward the River Avon and Nine Mile River. This view is already impacted by Bulford village and the Bulford Garrison; however, the proposed development brings modern development much closer to the barrows and further up the slope, and therefore will be a prominent modern feature in this landscape. This will make it more difficult to appreciate the relationship between the watercourse and the cemetery. In addition to this, landscaping is proposed along the southern edge of the SFA site. Whilst this

will (after a period of approximately 10 – 20 years) screen the view of the houses, it will also bring in a band of vegetation, foreshortening the view available from the barrows.

Not all of the barrows in this group will have a visual impact from the development; however, as they form part of a contiguous grouping all located along the same ridge, an impact on one barrow will be an impact on the whole group as it will reduce the value of the group as a whole. The importance of these assets has been identified as their value as a group and the evidence they provide of Bronze Age funerary ritual and land use. The introduction of modern elements in close proximity to these monuments will reduce this, particularly as they were intended to be separate monuments from the contemporary settlements which were located lower down the valley slopes. The proposed development has the potential to reduce the understanding of the relationship between the monuments and the watercourses and to reduce their open visual aspect which contributes towards their value.

Of the nine barrows within this group, four (**1015216, 1009933, 1009545, 1009931**) are unlikely to have direct views of any of the proposed development sites, but due to their sharing a setting with the other five barrows within the group which will have direct views, they will experience an impact upon their setting. This is judged to be a **low** impact. The remaining five barrows (**1009602, 1009604, 1009605, 1009564, 1009969**) will have prominent views of the developments which will cause a significant visual impact, reducing the open feeling of the landscape which currently exists. This impact is judged to be **high** however as the vegetation matures, this will reduce to **medium** to take into account the restoration of a largely rural outlook, but also considers the foreshortening of the view.

The development of housing on the northern SFA site has the potential to impact upon the setting of the scheduled monument of the Beacon Hill monuments (**1009903**), an asset of very high value. The various elements of this asset indicate re-use of the site from the Bronze Age through to the Iron Age and the setting encompasses the river valley to the west and the other monuments located along Beacon Hill. The extant Bulford Garrison forms part of the setting of this asset but it does not contribute towards the value. Their value lies in the archaeological and historic knowledge of how societies interacted with funerary monuments and the material culture of Bronze Age and Iron Age societies. There is the potential for some areas of the development to be visible from the monuments however the Sling Plantation is remaining in situ and will effectively screen the development, making it appear as a slight expansion of the existing garrison with no significant change. This will not change any of the identified values or setting of the asset. Therefore, the impact is judged to be **very low**.

Non-designated Assets

A group of possible barrows, ring ditches or 20th century military features (**219316**) located to the east of the group of nine barrows and south of the A3028 have the potential to have their setting impacted by the development of the southern SFA. The function of these assets is uncertain, but given their location in close proximity to the barrows to the west, south and east, it is highly likely these assets are also barrows and are therefore of high value. The setting of these assets is the surrounding landscape and the contemporary barrows on this slope overlooking the River Avon. The value lies in their archaeological and historic value and the evidence it provides for Bronze Age society and funerary ritual. The construction of housing within the southern SFA will bring modern development in close proximity to the barrows. Even though the modern garrison and housing of Bulford is located to the south, this is at a much lower level and does not intrude upon views. Development within the southern SFA will bring housing further south up the slope and be slightly more dominant in the views towards the River Avon. This will have a detrimental effect on the understanding of the connection between the river and the assets, a setting which contributes towards the understanding of this asset. The visual and setting relationship between the barrows to the west, south and east will

remain intact. Landscape proposals have been put forward to screen the development from views from the south. Once mature, this will screen views of the housing from this asset and although it will foreshorten the view, will be at sufficient distance to appear as part of the rural landscape and be seen in the wider context. The impact is therefore judged to be **low** reducing to **very low** once the landscaping has matured.

The development of the northern SFA with housing and ancillary features such as roads and utilities as well as the clearance of Sling Plantation has the potential to physically and permanently impact upon the non-designated assets of the former railway station on the Newton Tony and Bulford branch line (**502630**), an asset of low value. The value of the railway site mainly lies in its historic value and the information it provides to the development of communication and transport networks on the Plain. The development of the SFA will remove this asset, but its historic value will remain through extant documentary evidence. The impact is therefore **high**.

A number of military archaeological assets have the potential to be impacted by the development of the northern SFA. Evidence of military practice trenches (**1358981**, **MWI12077**, **1360410**) was observed on aerial photographs and archaeological traces may be present preserved in the area of the SFA. These are assets of medium value and have archaeological and historic value in the information they can provide of the early military battle techniques and the evolution of warfare in the 20th century. The traces of these assets are extensive across the camp and in the surrounding area, therefore although the development of the northern SFA will physically and permanently impact upon these assets, enough survives which will not be impacted to ensure the archaeological value will survive. The impact is therefore considered to be **medium**.

The non-designated asset of an Iron Age/Roman field system (**219141/MWI12268**), an asset of medium value lies outside the southern SFA footprint, however is likely to continue westwards into the boundary of the southern SFA site. The value of this asset lies in its archaeological and historic value and in the information it provides for Iron Age and Roman settlement and land use. Only a small portion of the asset will be impacted by the proposed development, and substantial areas will be left in situ for future research. The impact is therefore judged to be **medium**.

A number of extensive areas of military features including trenches and earthworks (**1358978**, **1358974**) are assets of medium value and have the potential to be physically impacted by development. These assets cover a massive area and the development will reduce their archaeological value however substantial portions of the asset will remain for potential future study. The impact is therefore judged to be **medium**.

Two circular features (**MWI12245/219332**, **MWI12246/914483**) have the potential to experience permanent and physical impacts from the development of the south-western SFA. The function of these assets is not known; they could be military sites or ring ditches. Their value is medium and lies in their archaeological value. This would be removed by the proposed development and therefore the impact is judged to be **very high**.

The development of the SFA sites could potentially physically and permanently impact upon unknown archaeological assets within sites. These are assets of uncertain value. The impact is judged to be **very high**.

Table 8.19: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1015216	Bowl barrow 770m northwest of New Barn	Low
1009933	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Low
1009545	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Low
1009602	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	High to medium
1009604	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	High to medium
1009605	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	High to medium
1009564	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	High to medium
1009969	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	High to medium
1009931	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Low
219316	A group of small circular objects possible barrows	Low to very low
1009903	Beacon Hill monuments	Very Low
502630	Site of railway station on the Newton Tony Bulford branch line	High
1360410	Extensive area of trenches and fieldwork	Medium
MWI12077	Bulford Camp military trenches	Medium
1358981	Area of slit trenches and air raid shelters	Medium



Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1358978	20 th century military features including gunposts and trenches	Medium
1358974	Area of military practice trenches	Medium
219141/MWI12268	Iron Age/Roman field system and trackway	Medium
MWI12246/219332	Circular feature identified from APs.	Very high
MWI12246/914483	Circular feature identified from APs.	Very high
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits within the SFA sites	Very high

8.6.3 *Larkhill garrison*

Potential impacts are shown on Figure 8.1. Proposed development at Larkhill garrison includes living accommodation, welfare facilities, administration / training resources as well as the construction of technical facilities. Fifteen areas are currently identified for development with buildings ranging in size from one storey to three storeys. The majority of the development areas are located in the central part of the garrison, with new areas of development planned for the northern and western sections.

Designated Assets

It is considered that, as intervisibility between the majority of the designated heritage assets within the Study Area and the site could not be demonstrated to exist through the theoretical ZVI, the settings of these assets will not be impacted upon by the proposed development. Consequently, they have been scoped out of any further assessment. It has been established that any future development within the site has the potential to impact upon the settings of the following designated heritage assets:

- The Stonehenge World Heritage Site;
- The Scheduled Monument Long Barrow in Larkhill camp (**1012167**); and
- The Scheduled Monument at Knighton Long Barrow (**1010052**).

The World Heritage Site of Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites already has the Larkhill garrison as an established part of its setting, having been in place for a century. Although a substantial degree of screening is provided by existing structures and plantations, it is possible that new development may increase the visual prominence of the military camp and impact upon the WHS. The Outstanding Universal Value of the WHS includes:

The setting of the Neolithic long barrow (**1012167**) within the site has already been impacted upon by the establishment of Larkhill Garrison. At present the long barrow is located in area of lawn, with garrison buildings to the north and south. The value of this asset lies in its archaeological and historic value and the association with the other Neolithic monuments in close proximity including those within the WHS. The barrow has archaeological value in the evidence it can provide for Neolithic society and material culture. It also has value in the evidence it provides for Neolithic funerary rituals as well as land-use. The relationship between this asset and other monuments cannot currently be appreciated and this will not change with the development of area 1 in particular. The construction of three storey buildings in this location will have the potential to further dominate the barrow, however the setting will not change. There is the potential that development of area 1 may physically impact upon remains associated with the barrow. If outside the scheduled area, works will not require Scheduled Monument Clearance, however archaeological fieldwork would be required. The impact is judged to be **medium**.

The setting of Knighton Long Barrow (**1010052**) has also been impacted upon by the establishment of the military camp, though to a lesser degree than **1012167**. The asset is located in relatively open ground with clear visual relationships with the long barrows to the north-west and the Robin Hood's Ball causewayed enclosure. The value of the asset lies in the association with these other monuments and the setting is formed by the area to the north-west which contributes to the value, and the garrison to the east which does not contribute to the value. However the area directly to the east is currently open ground. The development of area 11 for one and two-storey living accommodation will remove this open area and bring the garrison in direct proximity to the barrow. Whilst the visual and setting relationship to the

north-west will be maintained, the setting to the east will be eroded. This will detract from the understanding and aesthetic appreciation of the asset and the impact is therefore judged to be **medium**.

Non-designated Assets

The non-designated asset of a number of military earthworks (**1363128/MWI11749**), an asset of medium value, covers an extensive area within the garrison. There is the potential for a number of the new development areas to impact upon portions of this asset. In particular, the development of areas 10, 7 and 6 for training facilities as these are located within areas of relatively low previous disturbance. The value of this asset lies in its archaeological and historic value, however as only a portion of the asset will be removed, there will be areas available for future research. The impact is therefore judged to be **medium**.

The development of area 5 for living accommodation has the potential to remove portions of the former military railway (**MWI12603/1363632**) which cuts across the southern boundary of the garrison. The value of this asset lies in its historic value and the information it provides for the development of the military transport network in the Plain. Only a small portion of this asset would be affected by the development and therefore the impact is judged to be **low**.

There are two areas of prehistoric field systems observed from aerial photographs located within garrison (**MWI12780, MWI11808**). The development of area 11 for living accommodation has the potential to permanently and physically impact upon the continuation of MWI11808 into the northern portion of the garrison. This will remove a portion of the asset, affecting its archaeological value, however substantial portions would survive intact for future research. The impact is therefore judged to be **medium**. The development of area 5 and 13 for living accommodation has the potential to permanently and physically impact upon MWI12780. Again, this will only remove a small portion of the asset which will reduce its archaeological value however large portions will remain in situ for future research. The impact is therefore judged to be **medium**.

The development of area 1 would involve the demolition of WA120, described in the Wessex Archaeology Desk Based Assessment for the Larkhill Garrison (see Appendix 8B) as an extant military building with potential heritage interest within Roberts Barracks. Whilst this impact will remain very high, until an internal inspection is carried out, a residual effect cannot be ascertained.

The demolition of buildings on the south side of The Packway and along Whinyates Road may also affect buildings of potential historic interest.

Table 8.20: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
n/a	Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site	Very Low
1012167	Long Barrow at Larkhill Camp	Medium
1010052	Knighton Long Barrow	Low
MWI11749/1363128	Military earthworks	Low
MWI12603/1363632	Military railway	Low
MWI12780	Prehistoric Field System	Low
MWI11808	Prehistoric Field System	Low
n/a	Non-designated asset (WA20)	Very high
n/a	Non-designated buildings of historic interest within the garrison	Very high

8.6.4 Larkhill SFA

Construction of this housing would require significant below ground disturbance across the selected sites. Construction of elements such as foundations, services and roads would all result in below ground impact. Chapter 4 provides details of the proposed development. Potential impacts are shown on Figure 8.1.

Designated Assets

There will be a potential direct impact upon the setting of the World Heritage Site and the asset of very high value and Scheduled Monument of Durrington Walls Henge (**1009133**).

The Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site is internationally important for its complexes of outstanding prehistoric monuments. The World Heritage property is of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) for the following qualities:

- *Stonehenge is one of the most impressive prehistoric megalithic monuments in the world on account of the sheer size of its megaliths, the sophistication of its concentric plan and architectural design, the shaping of the stones, uniquely using both Wiltshire Sarsen sandstone and Pembroke Bluestone, and the precision with which it was built.*



- *At Avebury, the massive Henge, containing the largest prehistoric stone circle in the world, and Silbury Hill, the largest prehistoric mound in Europe, demonstrate the outstanding engineering skills which were used to create masterpieces of earthen and megalithic architecture.*
- *There is an exceptional survival of prehistoric monuments and sites within the World Heritage site including settlements, burial grounds, and large constructions of earth and stone. Today, together with their settings, they form landscapes without parallel. These complexes would have been of major significance to those who created them, as is apparent by the huge investment of time and effort they represent. They provide an insight into the mortuary and ceremonial practices of the period, and are evidence of prehistoric technology, architecture, and astronomy. The careful siting of monuments in relation to the landscape helps us to further understand the Neolithic and Bronze Age.*

The final sentence in the above OUV is of particular relevance to the proposed development due to the potential impact on the setting of the WHS specifically the long ranging and open views from the WHS northwards from the north-western end of the field in which Durrington Walls is located. The important views northwards also include the view of the “sun gap” from Stonehenge looking northeast towards the summer solstice. The northern edge of the field marks the limits of the WHS. Towards the eastern end of the northern limits of the WHS (the roundabout end), views are currently partially restricted by the hedge that borders the southern side of The Packway but views northward from the north western edge of the WHS would contain the SFA development, however the landscape proposals should ensure that the development is only seen within the existing context of the garrison, rather than joining to Durrington to the east. The magnitude of impact on the setting of the World Heritage Site is therefore judged to be **low**.

The setting of Durrington Walls (**1009133**), an asset of very high value located to the south of The Packway may experience an impact as a result of the SFA development. Although the SFA is not visible from the majority of the henge, there may be impact on views northward from the western bank of the henge (a high point) across a relatively wide and far reaching corridor of presently undeveloped land. The SFA may be partially visible from the north henge bank, however landscape proposals have been put forward which would ensure the development is seen as part of the garrison and will blend into the agricultural surrounding to the north. There is the potential for the landscaping proposals themselves to cause an impact, if they are insensitively placed or use vegetation of an inappropriate size and type for the area. The values of this asset lie in its archaeological and historic value and the association with other sites in the WHS. The asset has the potential to reveal information on Bronze Age and Neolithic funerary and ritual activity and the link with the River Avon will be maintained. The setting of the asset is the other assets within the WHS and the surrounding landscape. The setting of the asset will be altered by the proposed development but it will not be changed to such an extent that it alters the values of the asset. The impact is therefore judged to be **low**.

A group of scheduled barrows (**1009473, 1009730, 1009501, 1009650, 1009498, 1009691, 1009648** and **1009482**), assets of very high value are located on Silk Hill approximately 5km to the north-east of the Larkhill SFA site. It is unlikely that there will be an impact upon intervisibility between these scheduled monuments and the WHS due to the intervening village of Durrington and Larkhill beyond. The bulk of the WHS lies further to the west and direct views towards Stonehenge and Durrington Walls are impeded by modern development. The setting of the asset will experience slight changes, but these will not affect the value of the barrow cemetery. The impact is judged to be **very low**.

The proposed development would not impact upon the setting of Durrington Conservation Area or the various associated heritage assets including designated and non-designated

buildings. Durrington village is located to the east of the proposed development area and its western aspect overlooks an extensive area of modern development which has eroded the rural setting of this aspect of the conservation area.

Non-designated Assets

A group of medium value assets consisting of military earthworks (**MWI12605/1363071, 1363078**) of potential WWI date have been plotted within the SFA during an aerial photographic survey in 2001. The value of these assets lies in their archaeological and historic value and the information they provide for military technique and tactics in the WWI period. The proposed SFA will remove large portions of this asset leaving only small areas in situ and available for future study. The impact is therefore judged to be **high**.

The location of four former rectangular concrete structures (**1363083**), assets of low value is located within the SFA. These assets are associated with the military use of the area and will be permanently and physically impacted by the proposed development. Their value lies in their archaeological and historic value and the evidence they can provide for the evolution of military technology and tactics. They also provide evidence for the use of the Plain by the military and their setting is provided by the garrison to the west. The removal of these assets will result in **very high** impact.

An undated linear feature (**MWI12344**) is an asset of uncertain value. It is likely that this represents a linear earthwork boundary and currently runs to the east of the SFA. If it continues on its trajectory, it will impact into the SFA which will be a direct and physical impact. The impact will be high, but the residual effect cannot be ascertained until further archaeological fieldwork is undertaken.

The development of the SFA site could potentially physically and permanently impact upon unknown archaeological assets within sites. These are assets of uncertain value. The impact is judged to be **very high**.

Table 8.21: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
n/a	World Heritage Site: Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites	Very low
1009133	Scheduled Monument of Durrington Walls	Low
1009473	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very low
1009730	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very low
1009501	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very low
1009650	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very low
1009498	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very low
1009691	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very low
1009648	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very low
1009482	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very low
MWI 12605 / 1363071, 1363078	Military Earthworks	High
MWI 12344	Undated Linear Feature	High
1363083	Former location of four rectangular concrete structures	Very high
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits	Very high

8.6.5 *Perham Down garrison*

Potential impacts are shown on Figure 8.4. The proposals for Perham Down garrison involves the construction of ten new areas for living accommodation, technical buildings and office/training structures. The buildings will be located throughout the garrison, with two large areas being developed to the north.

Designated Assets

The development of area 2 for living accommodation to the south of the Tidworth Road in the southern portion of the garrison has the potential to impact physically and permanently upon the continuation of the Scheduled Monument of the boundary earthwork on Lamb Down (**1009833**) which has been identified as non-designated asset **MWI17640/223682**. The asset as it travels through the Perham Down garrison is not scheduled and is not of the same quality as the scheduled portion. Therefore it is categorised as an asset of high value. Archaeological fieldwork has identified that this feature survives within the camp despite the construction of the garrison buildings, though it is heavily truncated. This asset also has the potential to be physically impacted by the construction of areas 9 and 1 for office/training structures and living accommodation respectively. The value of this asset lies in its archaeological and historic value and the information it can provide on Bronze Age society, land division and land use. The asset has the potential to contain artefacts which could give information on the material culture of the Bronze Age society. The setting is the broader prehistoric landscape. The removal of portions of this asset through the construction of the new buildings will remove some of the archaeological value of this asset; however, the scheduled and better preserved section will remain intact to the south of the site. The impact is therefore judged to be **medium**.

Non-designated Assets

The construction of living accommodation in area 6 has the potential to physically and directly impact upon the undated field system identified through aerial photographs (**MWI17648**), an asset of medium value. The value of this asset lies in its archaeological value and the evidence it can provide of the prehistoric landscape and land use. It also has historic value in the knowledge of the use of this landscape and association with the other, possibly contemporary field systems that are extant in the study area. The archaeological value of this asset will be removed by the construction and ancillary features such as roads and services. Only a portion of the asset will be removed however leaving a small area in situ for future research. This impact is judged to be **high**.

Although none of the identified non-designated field systems and linear features (**MWI17810**, **MWI17868**, **MWI17656**) encroach into the garrison boundary on the north-western edge, there is the potential for unknown archaeological deposits relating to the field systems or Roman archaeology associated with the number of isolated findspots in the area to occur here. The north-western portion of the site has experienced some landscaping as seen on the modern Ordnance Survey maps, possibly just to create a bund around the edge of the buildings to screen views, but this may have affected the level of survival. However there is still the potential for the construction of the combined stores, garages, troop offices and workshop, the associated infrastructure and the extension of the security fence line to physically impact upon any unknown archaeological asset and remove their archaeological value. These unknown assets are of low value but the potential impact is judged to be **very high**.

Table 8.22: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1009883/MWI17640	Portion of the boundary earthwork on Lamb Down	Medium
MWI17648	Possible field system	High
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits in Perham Down garrison relating to field systems	Very high

8.6.6 *Perham Down SFA*

Designated Assets

The Scheduled Monument of Ludgershall Castle (**1009912**), an asset of very high value, has the potential to have its setting impacted by the construction and operation of the housing and associated infrastructure within the SFA. The setting of this asset includes the contemporary Ludgershall Cross (also scheduled) located within the village and the landscape to the north and south which formed the royal hunting grounds of the castle. As a castle, the views from this asset also contribute to the value, which also lies in its archaeological and historic value as a rare monument type within the SPTA. There may be potential glimpsed views of the proposed development but the SFA is situated in such a way that it would not overly dominate, block or interrupt views from the castle to such an extent that the understanding of the defensive function was lost. It is likely the development would be seen in the context of a fringe development of Ludgershall, or even as a direct replacement if the Corunna Barracks and a continuation rather than a separate development leading to a minimal change in the landscape. The impact is therefore judged to be **very low**.

The scheduled Iron Age hillfort of Sidbury Hill (**1010138**), an asset of very high value, is located approximately 3.3km to the west of the SFA and has the potential to have its setting impacted by the proposed development. The value of this asset is in its archaeological and historic value, giving evidence of Iron Age society and land use. As an asset with a defensive function asset, the views add to the value and help towards the understanding of its function. The setting is the other Iron Age features in the area, the associated enclosures and field systems, some of which are located in close proximity to the proposed development. The development within the SFA site may be visible from Sidbury Hill and in views across to Ludgershall Castle, a former hillfort. The new buildings however would be located in an area which already contains buildings and would be seen as an extension of Ludgershall rather than an isolated housing development. Views of buildings from Sidbury hillfort would not impact upon the ability to understand its function, nor would it remove the historic and archaeological value. The setting would experience slight change, but the overall impact is judged to be **very low**.

Non-designated Assets

The construction of housing and associated infrastructure including roads and services within the Corunna Barracks has the potential to physically impact upon unknown archaeological deposits, in particular modern military trenches, a number of which have been identified to the north and south. These deposits are of uncertain value as their nature is unknown at present. The development of this area has the potential to permanently remove these deposits and their archaeological value. The impact is judged to be **very high**.

The construction of the SFA will involve the demolition of all of the extant standing structures within the site of the former Armoured Vehicle Depot (**1336429**). This will also remove the various WWII transport sheds on the north-west border of the site adjacent to Hedge-End Plantation and the vehicle waterproof testing tank in the southern part of the site, assets of medium and uncertain value. The demolition will remove the structures entirely and severely impact upon their value. The impact is judged to be **very high**.

Table 8.23: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
n/a	Unknown archaeological assets within Corunna Barracks	Very high
n/a	WWII vehicle sheds	Very high
n/a	Vehicle waterproof testing tank	Very high
1009912	Ludgershall Castle	Very low
1336429	Armoured Vehicle Depot	Very high
1010138	Sidbury Hillfort	Very low

8.6.7 *Tidworth garrison*

Proposed impacts are shown on Figure 8.3. The development of the Tidworth garrison involves the development of 28 areas of living accommodation, welfare facilities, office/training structures and technical buildings. The areas are spread across the barracks with a number of previously undeveloped areas earmarked for development.

Designated Assets

The scheduled monument of Seven Barrows barrow cemetery (**1015481**), an asset of very high value, is located just the north of the garrison, outside the boundary. The construction of areas 26, 27 and 7 for technical buildings has the potential to impact upon the setting of the asset. The setting of the asset already encompasses the Tidworth Barracks. It does not contribute towards the understanding of the asset, but the proximity does reduce the ability to connect the barrows with the surrounding landscape. The value of the asset lies in its archaeological and historic value and the knowledge it provides for Bronze Age land-use, society and funerary ritual. The proposed new buildings will add to the existing garrison and will be seen within that context. It is not thought likely that the new buildings will change the setting of the asset and the value will not be affected. The impact is therefore judged to be **low**.

The Scheduled Monument of a linear earthwork (**1015482**) is located to the north of the garrison. The line of this may extend into the garrison itself and this potential line has been identified as non-designated asset (**929256**) due to the low level of survival and is an asset of medium value. The construction of technical buildings in area 28 has the potential to physically impact upon this asset and remove a portion of it. This would reduce the archaeological value; however, the scheduled portion to the north would survive and the archaeological knowledge gained from the excavation could contribute towards the understanding of these monuments. The impact is therefore judged as **medium**.

Non-designated Assets

There are two areas of military practice trenches identified within the site from historic aerial photographs (**MWI17722**, **MWI17725**). They are now mostly located beneath buildings, however there are areas where traces may survive. The construction of area 11 and area 28 for technical buildings would potentially impact upon these assets. As only a portion of the larger asset would be impacted, the archaeological value would only be reduced, rather than removed and therefore the impact is judged to be **medium**.

The site of the former Delhi Hospital (**1056368**) within the garrison has the potential to be impacted by the new build transit blocks for all ranks. The hospital is an asset of medium value and although now demolished, may remain as foundations. As one of the original buildings on the site, converted from barrack blocks, the foundations could reveal important information on the evolution of military building design. The proposed development of area 1 for living accommodation would remove this asset and its archaeological value; however, there is the potential that it has already been impacted through its demolition. The impact is therefore judged to be **high**.

The development of the garrison could potentially physically and permanently impact upon unknown archaeological assets within site. These are assets of uncertain value but the impact is judged to be **very high**.

There are a number of non-designated buildings along the Mall and, as these are of potentially equal heritage value as the listed officers mess, proposals for their refurbishment or extension



should be carefully considered to retain any remaining features of heritage interest. The impact on these buildings is potentially **very high** however the residual effect cannot be ascertained.

Table 8.24: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1015481	Seven Barrows cemetery	Low
n/a	Non-designated historic buildings	Very high
929256	Continuation of the scheduled boundary earthwork 1015482	Medium
MWI17722	Area of military practice trenches	Medium
1056368	Site of the Delhi military hospital	High
MWI17725	Area of military practice trenches	Medium
n/a	Unknown archaeological potential within the garrison	Very high

8.6.8 *Tidworth SFA*

The Tidworth SFA proposals were removed from the preferred sites. Therefore no impacts area anticipated.

8.6.9 *Upavon garrison*

Potential impacts are shown on Figure 8.5.

Designated Assets

The construction of area 1 to the north and west of the scheduled asset of a round barrow in the grounds of RAF Upavon (**1010667**), has the potential to impact upon the setting of this asset of very high value. There is also potential for the construction to physically impact upon archaeological deposits relating to this asset, including other barrows which may have formed part of a cemetery at this location however these blocks are to be constructed on the site of demolished buildings and therefore the potential for archaeological assets to survive is reduced. The setting of the barrow currently contributes nothing to its understanding as it is within the garrison, surrounded by low-rise buildings and a car park. There are no views out of the garrison from the asset towards the wider landscape nor are any other barrows visible from the asset. Its value therefore lies in its archaeological and historical value, lies in the evidence it can provide for the distribution of barrow sites and the material evidence it may still hold providing information on Bronze Age society and culture. At two storeys, the living accommodation in area 1 will be fairly tall, but no higher than the buildings which are extant in the locality and should therefore reduce the dominating effect which could occur. The potential impact is judged to be **low**.

The construction of these buildings in area 1 also has the potential to impact upon the Grade II* Officers Mess (**1365554**), an asset of very high value. The buildings will be a replacement for extant structures and therefore do not represent a new addition to the area. The buildings will be two storeys in height which may cause a dominating effect if positioned too close to the grade II* building. The level of impact is judged to be **medium to low**.

There is the potential for the construction of the two storey living accommodation in area 2 to impact upon the setting of the Grade II listed York Cottage (**1393045**), an asset of high value. The buildings will represent a new impact, however the cottage is at a sufficient distance and focussed on the view westwards for the new building to not impact upon the setting and values of the asset. The impact is judged to be **low**.

There is the potential for the construction of two living accommodation buildings in area 2 to the west of the Avon Club, a Grade II asset of high value (**1299342**) to cause an impact to the setting of this building. It will be constructed directly in front of the building and within the open ground setting which has existed since the building was constructed. It will also overly dominate the grade II building and remove its values. The blocking of this view and introduction of two, two storey buildings will be a **very high** impact.

Non-designated Assets

Development of the areas within the Upavon Garrison which have seen less previous development have the potential to impact upon previously unknown archaeological assets. This would result in a **very high** impact.

The non-designated asset of a ditch (**MWI10127**) located to the west of the garrison boundary has the potential to run directly into the garrison and be physically and permanently impacted by the development of area 2. This is an asset of low value, but its archaeological and historic value will be reduced by the removal of a portion of it. The asset will remain largely intact outside the garrison and therefore the impact is judged to be **medium**.

Works to alter the extant hangar in area 6 may physically and permanently impact upon areas of practice trenches associated with the non-designated asset of medium value **MWI13736**. The impact may remove some part of this network of trenching, but extensive areas are still extant and therefore the understanding and value will be retained. The impact is judged to be **medium**.

Table 8.25: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1010667	Round barrow located in Upavon Garrison	Low
n/a	Unknown archaeological potential at Upavon Garrison	Very high
MWI13736	Area of military trenching	Medium
MWI10127/918906	Undated ditch on Upavon Down	Medium
1365554	Officers Mess building 21	Medium to Low
1393045	York Cottage	Low
1299342	Avon Club building 110	Very high

8.6.10 *Upavon SFA*

There are no SFA proposals for Upavon. Therefore no impacts are considered.

8.6.11 **ETR (Bulford Danger Area)**

The site location and location of potential assets to be impacted are shown on Figure 8.2. A new electronic target range is required to complement the existing small arms ranges in the Bulford Danger Area. This range occupies a footprint of 100m by 600m. A small control building will be positioned on one flank or to the rear of the range. The range floor will be well drained with any streams or drainage ditches being routed through culverts to allow the safe movement of troops down the range.

Designated Assets

The group of sixteen round barrows on Bulford Down (**Group 1009609 (MWI12140)**) are located within a few hundred metres to the east of the proposed range. This group of features overlooks the development area with the Nine Mile River located immediately beyond. Construction of any kind within the development site, particularly within the northern half of the site will affect the relationship between this elevated very high value asset group and the Nine Mile River. This relationship is a fundamental aspect of the historic setting of the very high value asset group and any form of construction is likely to have an impact upon the setting of these assets which are of very high value. The impact is judged to be **high**.

A further asset of very high value, a barrow (**1009508**), is located just outside of the north-eastern corner of the development site. As is the case with the barrow group of Bulford Down (**Group 1009609 (MWI12140)**), the relationship between the barrow and the river would potentially be affected by development. The impact is judged to be **high**.

Three further assets of very high value (**1009476, 1009500, 1009470**), all bowl barrows, will largely retain their relationship with the Nine Mile River and the larger asset group (**1009609, MWI12140**) to the south, but their wider setting will incur a medium impact from the construction of training elements. The impact is likely to be **medium**.

Located immediately to the south of the development area is a group of six disc barrows (**1009972, 1010239, 1010237, 1010235, 1009968 and 1009966**). This group of assets is located on slightly elevated ground. Construction within the development site, particularly within the southern half of the site, will affect the relationship between this asset group and the Nine Mile River. However, modern development, including a road and buildings, has already compromised the historic setting of the assets to some extent at least. Furthermore construction within the development site will not significantly affect intervisibility with the similar assets located on Bulford Down to the north-west. The impact upon these very high value assets is judged to be **medium**.

To the north-west of the development area beyond the Nine Mile River are two further very high value assets, both bowl barrows (**1009611; 1009567**). Woodland located on either side of the Nine Mile River effectively screens all potential views from/to the development area but construction will affect the wider setting of the barrows. The impact is expected to be **low**.

1017929 is a bowl barrow located to the south-east of the Bulford Danger Area just north of Gallipoli Road, Sling Camp. The barrow is located 900m from the development area beyond a modern road and the setting of the asset has already been compromised slightly. Impact is expected to be **low**.

Five further bowl barrows (**1009476, 1009517, 1009538, 1009484, 1009640**), also assets of very high value, are located on Milston-Bulford Down. The barrows would retain their relationship with the Nine Mile River and the other barrows to the south on Bulford Down but



their wider setting would potentially be affected by development. The impact is judged to be **low**.

The long barrow and disc barrow in Brigmerston Field (**1009482**) are located 900m to the north-west of the Bulford Danger Area. The assets are completely screened by a large conifer plantation and the impact upon this asset of very high value is expected to be **very low**.

Non-designated Assets

An asset of medium value comprising an extensive complex of 20th century practice trenches and slit trenches associated with military training at Bulford Camp is located within the site (**MW112068/915450**). The earthworks extend throughout the development site and buffer zone. Given the scale of the proposed development, impact is expected to be **medium**.

Table 8.26: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1009609/MWI 12140	Group of Round Barrows	High
1009508	Barrow	High
1009476	Barrow	High
1009500	Barrow	Medium
1009470	Barrow	Medium
1009972	Barrow	Medium
1010239	Barrow	Medium
1010237	Barrow	Medium
1010235	Barrow	Medium
1009968	Barrow	Medium
1009966	Barrow	Medium
1009611	Barrow	Medium
1009567	Barrow	Low
1017929	Barrow	Low
1009517	Barrow	Low
1009538	Barrow	Low
1009484	Barrow	Low
1009640	Barrow	Low
1009482	Long Barrow and Disc Barrow	Low

MWI12068/915450	Military practice trenches	Low
-----------------	----------------------------	-----

8.6.12 **IBSR (Area 16 Impact Area)**

A description of the proposed development is contained within Chapter 4. The site location and assets to be potentially impacted are shown on Figure 8.9.

Designated Assets

Any development within this site is likely to have an impact on the setting of the scheduled field system located within 1km to the north of site. This may also be the case for the non-designated assets associated with the prehistoric field system. The group of high value features is given a single scheduled monument number (**1010219**). In addition, some of the field boundary features relating to this asset also extend into the 200m buffer zone and the site itself and are recorded in the HER/EHA (**MWI11809/218952**) and these may be considered assets of high value. The impact is judged to be **low**.

There is a barrow of Bronze Age date (**1009533**) located 1.2km to the south-west of the site. The proposed buildings at the site will result in an impact on the setting of this very high value asset. The impact is judged to be **low**.

Non-designated Assets

Further assets of medium value include a medieval enclosure (**MWI11747**) located to the north of Area 16 within the 200m buffer zone on Enford Down. A further enclosure (**MWI11754**) is located to the west of Area 16 within the 200m buffer zone also on Enford Down. A sheep fold known as Clarks Penning (**21904**) of medium value is within the buffer zone. The feature also contains a military earthwork in the south-east end. The impact on these assets of medium value is judged to be **low**.

Table 8.27: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1010219	Thornham Down prehistoric and medieval landscape	Low
1009533	Barrow	Low
MWI11809/218952	Field System	Medium
MWI11747	Enclosure	Low
MWI11754	Enclosure	Low
219014	Sheep Fold	Low

8.6.13 ***Nine Mile River Crossing***

The site location and location of assets with the potential to be impacted is shown on figure 8.10. A new 'backdoor access' to SPTA is proposed for Bulford. The new access will allow vehicles to enter SPTA directly from Bulford Garrison without using the public highway. The new entrance will be linked to the stone track network on SPTA via a new track from the garrison gate. It is proposed that the track will cross the Nine Mile River by means of a ford or bridge.

Designated Assets

Any development around the present area of hard standing may have an impact on scheduled round barrows and assets of very high value (**1009567** and **1009611**) located immediately to the east of the site boundary. The setting of these designated assets, although already partially compromised by the large area of hard standing and car parking, may be impacted by any development that includes upstanding structures, temporary or otherwise. The impact on these assets of very high value is judged to be **low**.

The development will not have an impact on the setting of any further scheduled monuments and assets of very high value, including the large barrow grouping (**1009609**) on Bulford Down the east. The intervening terrain and woodland suggests that there will be no views. The impact is therefore judged to be **very low**.

Non-designated Assets

Some of the assets of modern military date (**MWI12079/1360635**) located within the Indicative Training Area may be of archaeological interest as they may date from the earliest use of the area for military purposes during the First World War. The impact upon this group of medium value assets will be **medium**.



Table 8.28: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1009567	Barrow	Low
109611	Barrow	Low
1009609	Barrow	Very low
MWI12079/1360635	Military feature of possible WWI date	Medium

8.6.14 *Military Training - Complex Manoeuvre Environment*

Copehill Down

The site location and potential impact are shown on Figure 8.7. The purpose built Fighting in Built-up Areas (FIBUA) facility at Copehill Down will be modified to introduce new training features. In summary, it is understood that the changes to Copehill Down will be minor and as this is an entirely artificial village it is unlikely that any significant environmental effects would arise as a result.

Outside the existing boundary of Copehill Down a light industry / warehouse zone is proposed adjacent to the railway siding training feature that currently exists. The section of railway siding is quite short and it is assumed for the purposes of the OEA that the proposed light industry / warehouse zone would be of a proportional, relatively small scale.

Designated Assets

The impact on the setting of Long Barrow and Old Ditch linear earthwork on Tilshead Down (**1009297**) will be **low**. This is because the setting of this asset is the edge of the Berril Valley and the other prehistoric assets to the north, particularly the scheduled Chapperton Down prehistoric landscape. The values of this asset lie in its archaeological value and the evidence it provides for prehistoric land-division and social function. It also provides valuable evidence for possible territorial markers with the long barrows situated along its length also adding to the value and setting. The proposed development will not significantly alter the outlook from or towards this monument. The development will be seen in the context of the existing Copehill Down artificial village, an already inconspicuous addition to this landscape.

Non-designated Assets

The site of the Neolithic pit (**MWI16795/931571**) is an asset of medium value. There is the potential for this asset to experience physical impacts from the proposed development, however given the low level impact of the proposed development, this impact is judged to be **low**. The archaeological value of the asset has already been removed by excavation and any associated assets may have been removed through extensive excavations which have taken place here.

A number of unstratified finds (**MWI16837**) are of low value. They are in and of themselves merely records of archaeology, with the physical fabric having been removed, however there is the potential for the recovery of deposits associated with the finds. The proposed development would remove these deposits, however it is likely they have already experienced significance truncation from troop movements and construction of Copehill Down. The impact is therefore judged to be **low**.

Table 8.29: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1009297	Long Barrow and Old Ditch linear earthwork on Tilshead Down	Low
MWI16795/931571	Neolithic Pit	Low
MW16837	Un-stratified finds	Low

Imber

The development proposals currently include the construction of several new permanent buildings located as infill between existing buildings in the village environment. It is also proposed to undertake repairs to the existing structures which have become potentially unsafe owing to wear and tear.

Although there are few recorded assets within the village, construction involving below ground disturbance will almost certainly impact archaeological remains of medieval or late medieval date. Construction outside of the village, particularly to the east, may disturb archaeological remains associated with the agricultural use of the landscape from the prehistoric period onwards. Any ground works undertaken within the village are likely to encounter archaeological remains associated with domestic habitation or agricultural use of post-medieval or medieval date. Ground works outside of the village are more likely to impact archaeological remains associated with agricultural activity of prehistoric or medieval date. As the new buildings are unlikely to have any associated services or be cellared, below ground impact will be minimal.

Designated Assets

There is potential for impact on the setting of a scheduled monument and asset of very high value comprising a long barrow (**1010027**) located to the south of the village. The impact on the setting of this asset is judged to be **low**. The barrow is situated in an open landscape with views across to other prehistoric monuments in the area. The proposed development may add to the number of buildings in the area, but they will be in an existing military village context. Therefore, the change to the setting will be slight.

The setting of the Church of St Giles (**1036472**), an asset of very high value may experience an impact from the construction/installation of temporary training structures such as ISO containers. The tower of the church can be viewed from a wide surrounding area, in particular to the east and still acts as a marker point within the landscape, despite the abandonment of the village. There is the potential for new buildings to be constructed in areas which would impede or reduce the ability to identify the tower in long distance view and remove an important part of the setting of this asset. The impact is likely to be **medium**.

Impact on the setting of a very high value asset an enclosure of Romano-British (**1010024**) is judged to be **low**. However, it is important to note that access to and from the Complex Manoeuvre Environment, particularly approaching the bridge sites, may result in direct

physical impact particularly as a result of wheeled vehicles traversing any sensitive areas on a regular basis. However, based on current information, the physical impact upon this very high value asset is also judged to be **low**.

Non-designated Assets

There may be an impact on the setting of three very high value asset bowl barrows (**MWI3460/762845**, **MWI3462/762851**, and **MWI3463/762853**). The barrows are located just outside of the 200m buffer zone to the north of the village. Development restricted to a low number of ISO containers or structures of similar scale to the east of the current village limits may have an impact judged to be **low**.

The Baptist Cemetery, and asset of medium value may experience setting impacts from future development. There is also the potential that development could encroach into the boundary of the cemetery and potentially disturb human remains. The value of this asset is the archaeological, historic and communal value. The cemetery, although not in use, is still visited by relatives of those buried on the occasions when access to Imber is granted. It is therefore still a place of commemoration and remembrance and forms an important part of the collective memories of Imber and the village inhabitants. The cemetery also provides information on the village of Imber. Though only small, it accommodated both the Church of St. Giles and a Baptist Chapel, which is no longer extant. The setting of the cemetery is the village of Imber. Although much altered since the ownership by the MOD, the form of the village survives and the memory of the village is maintained by former residents and the cemetery still attracts visitors. Development in close proximity to the cemetery would impact upon the ability for tranquil reflection in a rural area. Depending on the location of the buildings, there is also the potential for visual and setting links with the remainder of the village to be severed by insensitive placement. The impact is therefore judged to be **medium**.

The EHA records a Roman inhumation cemetery (**211095**) containing circa 15 burials in military trench construction in 1916. This is recorded as being located in the centre of Imber village; however, it appears to be a spurious location. This asset would be of high value but there is no knowledge of this asset from any of the local stakeholders and it is likely that the grid-reference given to create the GIS file was incorrect. Should the location of the burials be correct and further funerary archaeology of this date is present within the village (and potentially impacted through development) the impact would be **high**.

An asset of low value is a small park situated to the north of Imber Court (**1266896**). Any construction within the park may have an impact on archaeological remains associated with the late medieval Imber Court or earlier structures. Development also has the potential to impact upon the setting of this park by removing the association with Imber Court and reducing the historic and evidential value. The impact is likely to be **medium**.

There are several field systems of medium archaeological value located just outside of the village but within the indicative training area. **MWI3494** is an undated field system to the west of the village. Another undated field system is located to the north-west of Imber (**MWI3488**) and also to the south-west (**MWI3499**). To the east of the village is a linear feature (**MWI3495**). Construction ground works are expected to be limited and impact upon these features is likely to **low**.

Table 8.30: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1010027	Long Barrow	Low
1010024	Romano-British Enclosure	Low
MWI3460/762845	Bowl Barrow	Low
MWI3462/762851	Bowl Barrow	Low
MWI3463/762853	Bowl Barrow	Low
1036472	Church of St Giles	Medium
211095	Roman Inhumation Cemetery?	Medium
1266896	Park	Low
MWI3494	Field Systems	Low
MWI3488	Field Systems	Low
MWI3499	Field Systems	Low
MWI3495	Field Systems	Low
n/a	Baptist Cemetery	Medium

Berril Valley

It is proposed that the Complex Manoeuvre Environment will be created as a linear training feature along the Berril Valley track, south east of Imber village. The site location and potential impacts are shown on Figure 8.5. The proposed development would comprise a number of movable, probably wooden structures that would simulate buildings lining a highway. It is understood that these would not require foundations or hard standing and as they are portable they could not be large structures. The final layout and location of any structures within this area has not yet been determined, therefore the impacts set out below assume a worse-case scenario. Once more developed proposals are put forward, these impacts could be reduced.



Designated Assets

The large-scale asset of very high value comprising the group of remains on Chapperton Down (**1009301**) is located to the north-east of Berril Valley within the 1km buffer zone. It is also designated an Important and Fragile Site by DIO. In addition to Chapperton Down, there are two assets of very high value at the south-eastern end of the valley. One is a bowl barrow (**1009589**) within the 1km buffer zone. The impact on the setting of this asset is judged to be **low**. It is important to note that access to and from the Complex Manoeuvre Environment, particularly approaching the bridge sites, may result in direct physical impact particularly as a result of wheeled vehicles traversing any sensitive areas on a regular basis. In their survey of lynchets on Chapperton Down, Wessex Archaeology have noted that *“the greatest threat to these field systems comes from vehicles repeatedly crossing or turning on them, exposing the underlying soils, and leading to more rapid erosion. The threat from military digging remains present. This is offset to some extent by the presence of the historical impact craters, which form an ideal basis for infantry ‘foxholes’. The possible excavation of more of these emplacements outside areas of existing historical damage could potentially represent a significant risk⁵³”*. However, based on current proposed development information, the physical impact upon this very high value asset is also judged to be **low**.

The two field systems (**1010018**, **1009976**), assets of very high value, will not be impacted by the proposed development. Their setting is the adjacent Chapperton Down prehistoric landscape and the surrounding landscape. The setting may be slightly changed by the creation of the CME, however this will not alter the value of these assets. The impact is therefore judged to be **very low**.

Non-designated Assets

The setting of several assets of medium value may be affected. A field system located just east of Imber village (**MWI3468**) is located towards the northernmost point of the Berril Valley on the eastern side and may be associated with the Iron Age settlement on Chapperton Down. A further field system is located to the north of Chapperton Down (**MWI3469**) towards the northern end of the Berril Valley on the eastern side. Field system **MWI3470** is located towards the centre of the Berril Valley on the eastern side. Another field system east of Imber (**MWI3494**) is located towards the northern most point of the Berril Valley on the western side. The impact upon the setting of these assets will be **low**.

⁵³ Wessex Archaeology, 2005,2006,2008. Chapperton Down re-survey of Lynchets.

Table 8.31: Potential impact on heritage assets

Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
1009301	Chapperton Down Prehistoric and Romano-British Landscape	Low
1009589	Barrow	Low
211064	Two Barrows	Low
214922	Three Barrows	Low
867812	Barrow	Low
1010018	Field System	Very low
1009976	Field System	Very low
MWI3456	Barrow	Low
MWI3468	Field System	Low
MWI3469	Field System	Low
MWI3470	Field System	Low
MWI3494	Field System	Low
MWI3510	Pit	Low
211119	Ditch	Low
884268	Oval Feature	Low
211130	Ditch	Low
884083	Ditch	Low
MWI3473	Ditch	Low
MWI3502	Ditch	Low



Asset No.	Name	Impact before mitigation
MWI3511	Post Hole	Low

8.7 Mitigation

This section has been sub-divided into three sections: design and layout recommendations; recommendations for evaluation and finally, mitigation proposals. Each site will be considered under these three headings.

The Wessex Archaeology baseline reports identified a small number of non-designated historic buildings within the garrison sites through historic map regression as part of their baseline data gathering. However, a visit to each of the garrison sites was not undertaken and a detailed assessment was not carried out. Therefore, the buildings identified thus far are seen as a starting point and do not represent an exhaustive list. As the buildings were only identified through map regression, their historic value cannot be stated with confidence until an external and internal inspection is carried out for each garrison site.

The recommendations for the proposed layout and for evaluation should be considered concurrently. The results from the evaluation phase may feed into further recommendations for the design and layout of the proposals for example if heritage assets of high value are uncovered during evaluation or internal inspection of historic buildings identifies elements of high value which should not be subject to refurbishment or other proposals.

A number of recommendations have been made with regards to the proposed designs for both the garrisons and the SFA sites. If these recommendations are taken into account at the detailed planning and design stage, a number of the adverse effects thus far identified can be reduced.

The archaeological mitigation proposed for each proposed development area is the same. To avoid repetition, the mitigation is stated here. It is difficult to propose suitable mitigation for the below-ground archaeology at this stage, however if archaeological deposits of medium or high value are identified during the evaluation phase, a programme of archaeological investigation within the footprint of the proposed development will take place. This could be in the form of an excavation prior to development, or a watching brief undertaken during the development programme. Any work will be undertaken in consultation with English Heritage, DIO and Wiltshire Council heritage advisors and be guided by a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) approved by all parties.

Site specific mitigation is stated below.

8.7.1 *Bulford garrison*

Design and Layout Recommendations

No alterations are recommended at this time. Should the results of the evaluation uncover assets of the highest significance, changes to the design proposals may be proposed.

Evaluation

A detailed walkover will be undertaken to identify buildings of historic interest prior to the finalisation of the design proposals. This will include an internal inspection of the buildings. In particular the Old Bakery building will be examined to establish any historic value.

A programme of archaeological fieldwork consisting of evaluation trial trenching should be undertaken within areas proposed for development as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development areas. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI and undertaken only in those areas where assessment has shown relatively low previous development or disturbance.

Should the evaluation reveal archaeology of very high value or identify buildings of the highest value, the results should be factored into the design proposals and if necessary, adjustments made to the layout in order to preserve the archaeology in situ.

Mitigation

A programme of building recording will be undertaken prior to the refurbishment and demolition of any buildings of historic value. The level of building recording will be appropriate to the value of the asset and determined through consultation with English Heritage, DIO and Wiltshire Council heritage advisors. The work will be guided by a WSI approved by all parties.

8.7.2 Bulford SFAs

Design and Layout Recommendations

It is recommended that a series of viewpoints and visualisations be produced as part of the further assessment to illustrate the proposed developments from a variety of sites. It would be useful to produce visualisations from certain identified heritage assets, but also to produce photomontages showing the views between heritage assets to show how and if the proposed developments will intrude, distract or detract from this view. In particular viewpoints are recommended from:

- The barrow group south of the A3028 towards the proposed development;
- A 360° view from the barrow group south of the A3028;
- From Beacon Hill scheduled monument towards the Nine Mile River, over site B19.

It is recommended that any landscaping proposals also be factored into the photomontages to establish whether they in themselves would result in an adverse impact to the setting of the barrow cemetery south of the A3028, Double Hedges. If analysis of the photomontages establishes that the landscape proposals do cause an adverse effect upon the setting of the barrow cemetery, alternative proposals should be considered and assessed.

Evaluation

A programme of archaeological fieldwork consisting of geophysical survey followed by trial trenching where necessary should be undertaken as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development areas, particularly with regards to the two circular features at the northern edge of the parcel, (914483, 219332) and the former railway station near Tidworth Road (502630). The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI.

Should the evaluation reveal archaeology of very high value, the results should be factored into the design proposals and if necessary, adjustments made to the layout in order to preserve the archaeology in situ.

Mitigation

It is difficult to propose suitable mitigation for the below-ground archaeology at this stage, however if archaeological deposits of medium or high value are identified during the evaluation phase, a programme of archaeological investigation within the footprint of the proposed development will take place. This could be in the form of an excavation prior to development, or a watching brief undertaken during the development programme. Any work will be

undertaken in consultation with English Heritage, DIO and Wiltshire Council heritage advisors and be guided by a WSI approved by all parties.

8.7.3 *Larkhill garrison*

Design and Layout Recommendations

No alterations to the design proposals are recommended at this time. Should the results of the evaluation uncover assets of the highest significance, changes to the design proposals may be proposed.

Evaluation

A detailed walkover will be undertaken to identify buildings of historic interest prior to the finalisation of design proposals. This will include an internal inspection of the buildings. In particular, asset WA120 will be assessed to establish any historic value.

A programme of archaeological fieldwork consisting of evaluation trial trenching should be undertaken within areas proposed for development as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development areas. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI and undertaken only in those areas where assessment has shown relatively low previous development or disturbance.

Should the evaluation reveal archaeology of very high value or identify buildings of the highest value, the results should be factored into the design proposals and if necessary, adjustments made to the layout in order to preserve the archaeology in situ.

Mitigation

A programme of building recording will be undertaken prior to the refurbishment and demolition of any buildings of historic value. The level of building recording will be appropriate to the value of the asset and determined through consultation with English Heritage, DIO and Wiltshire Council heritage advisors. The work will be guided by a WSI approved by all parties.

8.7.4 *Larkhill SFA*

Design and Layout Recommendations

Reconsider development in area 11. Any development within area 11 should try to stay at one storey. Reconsider development of three storeys in area 1.

Should the results of the evaluation uncover assets of the highest significance, further changes to the design proposals may be proposed.

Landscaping proposals should be carefully considered and consultation with the heritage specialist is advised when developing these proposals.

Evaluation

It is recommended that a series of viewpoints and visualisations be produced as part of the further assessment to illustrate the proposed developments from a variety of sites. It would be useful to produce visualisations from certain identified heritage assets, but also to produce photomontages showing the views between heritage assets to show how and if the proposed developments will intrude, distract or detract from this view. In particular viewpoints are recommended from:

- Durrington Walls scheduled monument – the northern edge of the asset;
- Stonehenge, along the sun gap; and
- Areas within the World Heritage Site to establish intervisibility.

It is recommended that any landscaping proposals also be factored into the photomontages to establish whether they in themselves would result in an adverse impact to the setting of Durrington Walls and the World Heritage Site, views to and from. If analysis of the photomontages establishes that the landscape proposals do cause an adverse effect upon the setting of the barrow cemetery, alternative proposals should be considered and assessed.

A programme of archaeological fieldwork consisting of geophysical survey followed by trial trenching where necessary should be undertaken as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development area. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI.

Should the evaluation reveal archaeology of very high value, the results should be factored into the design proposals and if necessary, adjustments made to the layout in order to preserve the archaeology in situ.

8.7.5 ***Perham Down garrison***

Design and Layout Recommendations

No alterations are recommended at this time. Should the results of the evaluation uncover assets of the highest significance, changes to the design proposals may be proposed.

Evaluation

A detailed walkover will be undertaken to identify buildings of historic interest prior to the finalisation of the design proposals. This will include an internal inspection of the buildings.

A programme of archaeological fieldwork consisting of evaluation trial trenching should be undertaken within areas proposed for development as part of the next stage of works in particular in Area 2 to identify any continuation of the ditch **MWI17640**. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development areas. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI and undertaken only in those areas where assessment has shown relatively low previous development or disturbance.

Should the evaluation reveal archaeology of very high value or identify buildings of the highest value, the results should be factored into the design proposals and if necessary, adjustments made to the layout in order to preserve the archaeology in situ.

Mitigation

A programme of building recording will be undertaken on all buildings of historic interest within the garrison before any demolition or refurbishment work takes place.

8.7.6 ***Perham Down SFA***

Design and Layout Recommendations

No alterations are recommended at this time. Should the results of the evaluation uncover assets of the highest significance, changes to the design proposals may be proposed.

Evaluation

A detailed walkover will be undertaken to identify buildings of historic interest prior to the finalisation of the design proposals. This will include an internal inspection of the buildings in particular the WWII American vehicle sheds and the smaller transport sheds adjacent to the railway line at the western end of the SFA.

Given the area proposed for the Perham Down SFA, it is unlikely that geophysical survey would be an appropriate form of evaluation. It is therefore recommended that a programme of archaeological fieldwork consisting of evaluation trial trenching should be undertaken in areas which have traditionally seen low disturbance or previous development.

Should the evaluation reveal archaeology of very high value or identify buildings of the highest value, the results should be factored into the design proposals and if necessary, adjustments made to the layout in order to preserve the archaeology in situ.

8.7.7

Tidworth garrison

Design and Layout Recommendations

No alterations are recommended at this time. Should the results of the evaluation uncover assets of the highest significance, changes to the design proposals may be recommended.

Evaluation

It is recommended that a series of viewpoints and visualisations be produced as part of the further assessment to illustrate the proposed developments from a variety of sites. It would be useful to produce visualisations from certain identified heritage assets, but also to produce photomontages showing the views between heritage assets to show how and if the proposed developments will intrude, distract or detract from this view. In particular viewpoints are recommended from:

- Seven Barrows cemetery.

It is recommended that any landscaping proposals also be factored into the photomontages to establish whether they in themselves would result in an adverse impact. If analysis of the photomontages establishes that the landscape proposals do cause an adverse effect upon the setting of the barrow cemetery, alternative proposals should be considered and assessed.

A detailed walkover will be undertaken to identify buildings of historic interest prior to the finalisation of the design proposals. This will include an internal inspection of the buildings, particularly those lining The Mall at the southern end of the garrison.

A programme of archaeological fieldwork consisting of evaluation trial trenching should be undertaken within areas proposed for development as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development areas. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI and undertaken only in those areas where assessment has shown relatively low previous development or disturbance.

Should the evaluation reveal heritage of very high value, the results should be factored into the design proposals and if necessary, adjustments made to the layout in order to preserve the archaeology in situ.

Mitigation

A programme of building recording will be undertaken prior to the refurbishment and demolition of any buildings of historic value. The level of building recording will be appropriate to the value of the asset and determined through consultation with English Heritage, DIO and Wiltshire Council heritage advisors. The work will be guided by a WSI approved by all parties.

8.7.8 *Upavon*

Design and Layout Recommendations

Careful consideration of the design of the two-storey building in Area 1 the south-west quadrant of the garrison is recommended. It is suggested that these blocks be of low height to reduce setting impacts upon the scheduled barrow located immediately to the south and east of the proposed blocks. Also, it is recommended that the blocks be placed away from the Grade II* Officers Mess building to avoid overcrowding and domination of the asset.

Careful consideration of the design of the three storey building within Area 7 is recommended. It is situated in close proximity to the original post office building and is around the original quadrant and the potential height could cause it to have a dominating effect on the historic layout.

It is recommended that the construction of two, two-storey buildings within Area 2 opposite the Grade II listed Avon Club be removed from the design proposals. This would reduce the adverse effect currently predicted.

It is recommended in the first instance that details of the refurbishment of buildings of historic interest, either designated or non-designated, be circulated as early as possible in the further assessment phase to identify potential impacts upon the heritage resource and potential major adverse effects. Following this, a programme of building recording may be required prior to any alteration.

Evaluation

Although a number of historic buildings were identified, internal inspection to non-designated assets was not granted at the time of the site visits. Therefore a detailed walkover will be undertaken to identify buildings of historic interest prior to the finalisation of the design proposals. This will include an internal inspection of the buildings.

A programme of archaeological fieldwork consisting of evaluation trial trenching should be undertaken within areas proposed for development as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development areas. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI and undertaken only in those areas where assessment has shown relatively low previous development or disturbance.

Should the evaluation reveal archaeology of very high value, the results should be factored into the design proposals and if necessary, adjustments made to the layout in order to preserve the archaeology in situ.

Mitigation

A programme of building recording will be undertaken prior to the refurbishment and demolition of any buildings of historic value. The level of building recording will be appropriate to the value of the asset and determined through consultation with English Heritage, DIO and Wiltshire Council heritage advisors. The work will be guided by a WSI approved by all parties.

8.7.9 ***ETR Bulford***

Design and Layout Recommendations

No changes are recommended at this stage.

Evaluation

A programme of photogrammetry survey has been undertaken for this site, and the results are pending. The results of this survey will be analysed and the results used to inform and guide further archaeological fieldwork. A programme of geophysical survey followed by trial trenching where necessary should be undertaken as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development area. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI. This will be undertaken in areas where there has been relatively low previous development.

8.7.10 ***IBSR***

Design and Layout Recommendations

No changes are recommended at this stage.

Evaluation

A programme of photogrammetry survey has been undertaken for this site, and the results are pending. The results of this survey will be analysed and the results used to inform and guide further archaeological fieldwork. A programme of geophysical survey followed by trial trenching where necessary should be undertaken as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development area. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI. This will be undertaken in areas where there has been relatively low previous development.

8.7.11 ***Nine Mile River Crossing***

Design and Layout Recommendations

No changes are recommended at this stage.

Evaluation

A programme of photogrammetry survey has been undertaken for this site, and the results are pending. The results of this survey will be analysed and the results used to inform and guide further archaeological fieldwork. A programme of geophysical survey followed by trial trenching where necessary should be undertaken as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development area. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI. This will be undertaken in areas where there has been relatively low previous development.

8.7.12 ***SPTA Complex Manoeuvre Environment - Copehill Down***

Design and Layout Recommendations

No changes are recommended at this stage.

Evaluation

A programme of photogrammetry survey⁵⁴ has been undertaken for this site, and the results are pending. The results of this survey will be analysed and the results used to inform and guide further archaeological fieldwork. A programme of geophysical survey followed by trial trenching where necessary should be undertaken as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development area. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI. This will be undertaken in areas where there has been relatively low previous development.

8.7.13 ***Imber***

Design and Layout Recommendations

No development should be considered within the pasture grounds extending north from the church yard to the road and west to American Road (formerly Bungay Lane).

No development should take place within or in very close proximity to the Baptist Cemetery to preserve the sanctity of this space and to avoid the disturbance of burials.

Evaluation

A programme of photogrammetry survey has been undertaken for this site, and the results are pending. The results of this survey will be analysed and the results used to inform and guide further archaeological fieldwork. A programme of geophysical survey followed by trial trenching where necessary should be undertaken as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development area. The archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI. This will be undertaken in areas where there has been relatively low previous development.

8.7.14 ***Berril Valley***

Design and Layout Recommendations

No changes are recommended at this stage.

Evaluation

A programme of photogrammetry survey has been undertaken for this site, and the results are pending. The results of this survey will be analysed and the results used to inform and guide further archaeological fieldwork. A programme of geophysical survey followed by trial trenching where necessary should be undertaken as part of the next stage of works. This will help to establish the archaeological potential of the proposed development area. The

⁵⁴ Photogrammetry feeds the measurements from remote sensing and the results of imagery analysis into computational models in an attempt to successively estimate 3-D relative position.

archaeological evaluation will be guided by a WSI. This will be undertaken in areas where there has been relatively low previous development.

8.8 Residual effects

8.8.1 *Bulford garrison*

Assets of very high value

The two round barrows at Rawlinson Road (**1009964**) will experience a very low impact upon their setting resulting in a **negligible** residual effect.

Assets of medium value

The following assets will experience a very high impact:

- Site of a round barrow (**MWI12158**);
- Site of three round barrows (**219407**);
- Site of a Bronze Age pit (**MWI11923**).

The residual effect will be **moderate adverse**.

The following assets will experience a medium impact.

- Site of Iron Age/Roman field system (**219141**);
- Military slit trenches and air raid shelters (**1358981**).

The residual effect is judged to be minor adverse.

Assets of low value

The following assets will experience a very high impact:

- findspot of Beaker pottery and the possible associated deposits **MWI11920/219177**;
- findspot of Bronze Age pottery (**915424**) and Bronze Age axe (**219357**);

The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

The asset of the former Old Sandhurst Barracks would experience a high impact. This would result in a **minor adverse** residual effect.

Assets of uncertain value

Further assessment of the Old Bakery building is required to establish its historic value before a residual effect can be determined.

Further assessment of the unidentified historic buildings within the garrison is required to establish value before the residual effect can be determined.

Further archaeological evaluation is required to establish value before the residual effect in the unknown archaeological deposits in the garrison can be determined.

8.8.2 **Bulford SFAs**

Assets of very high value

The following assets will experience a high to medium impact (following maturation of the landscape proposals)

- bowl barrow, one of a group of barrows south of Bulford (**1009602**);
- bowl barrow, one of a group of barrows south of Bulford (**1009604**);
- bowl barrow, one of a group of barrows south of Bulford (**1009605**);
- bowl barrow, one of a group of barrows south of Bulford (**1009564**); and
- bowl barrow, one of a group of barrows south of Bulford (**1009969**)

The residual effect is judged to be **moderate adverse**.

The following assets will experience a low impact from the development:

- bowl barrow, north-west of New Barn (**1015216**);
- bowl barrow, one of a group of barrows south of Bulford (**1009933**);
- bowl barrow, one of a group of barrows south of Bulford (**1009545**); and
- bowl barrow, one of a group of barrows south of Bulford (**1009931**).

The residual effect is judged to be **minor adverse**.

The Beacon Hill monuments (**1009903**) will experience a very low impact from the development of the northern SFA. The residual effect is judged to be **negligible**.

Assets of high value

The group of small circular features, possible barrow sites (**219316**) will experience a low to very low impact from the development of the southern SFA site. The residual effect is judged to be **minor adverse**.

Assets of medium value

The following assets will experience a very high impact:

- Circular feature possible barrow/gunpost (**219332/MWI12246**); and
- Circular feature possible barrow/gunpost (**914483/MWI12246**).

The residual effect will be **moderate adverse**.

Area of trenches and fieldwork

The following assets will experience a medium impact:

- Area of slit trenches and air raid shelters (**1358981**);

- 20th century military features (**1358978**);
- Area of military practice trenches (**1358974**);
- Area of trenches and fieldwork (**1360410**);
- Bulford Camp military trenches (**MWI12077**); and
- Iron Age/Roman field system and trackway (**219141/MWI12268**).

This will result in a **minor adverse** residual effect.

Assets of low value

The assets of a former railway station (**502630**) will experience a high impact from the development of the northern SFA. The residual effect is judged to be **minor adverse**.

The asset of the Old Sandhurst block will experience a medium impact from development. The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

Assets of uncertain value

Further archaeological evaluation is required to establish value before the residual effect in the unknown archaeological deposits in the SFA can be determined.

8.8.3 *Larkhill garrison*

Assets of very high value

There will be a medium impact on the following assets:

- Long Barrow at Larkhill camp (**1012167**); and
- Knighton Long Barrow (**1010052**).

The residual effect is judge to be **moderate adverse**. If mitigation in the form of reducing development in area 11 and area 1 is followed, this effect could be reduced.

There will be a very low impact on the World Heritage Site of Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated sites. The residual effect will be **negligible**.

Assets of medium value

There will be a potential medium impact on the following assets:

- Military earthworks of possible WWI date (**MWI11749/1363128**);
- Prehistoric field system (**MWI12780**);
- Prehistoric field system to the north of the site (**MWI11808**).

The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

There will be a low impact on the early 20th century military railway (**MWI12603/1363632**). The residual effect is judged to be **minor adverse**.

Assets of uncertain value

The residual effect on assets WA120 cannot yet be determined. Further assessment is required to establish the heritage value of these assets.

Further assessment of the unidentified historic buildings within the garrison is required to establish value before the residual effect can be determined.

Further archaeological evaluation is required to establish value before the residual effect in the unknown archaeological deposits in the garrison can be determined.

8.8.4 *Larkhill SFA*

Assets of very high value

The residual effect will be **moderate adverse**.

There will be a low impact on the Durrington Walls (**1009133**). The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

There will be a very low impact on the following assets:

- Group of Barrows on Silk Hill (**1009473, 1009730, 1009501, 1009650, 1009498, 1009691, 1009648, 1009482**).

- Stonehenge World Heritage Site Outstanding Universal Value (Setting impact of views northward out of the WHS across open landscape).

The residual effect is judged to be **negligible**.

Assets of medium value

There will be a medium impact upon the following assets

- modern military earthworks (**MWI 126051/363071**)
- rectangular enclosure (**1363078**)

The residual impact would be **minor adverse**.

Assets of low value

There will be a very high impact upon the remains associated with four, former rectangular concrete structures (**1363083**). The residual impact would be **minor adverse**.

Assets of uncertain value

There will be a high impact upon the linear feature (**MWI 12344**). The residual impact cannot yet be ascertained.

Further archaeological evaluation is required to establish value before the residual effect in the unknown archaeological deposits in the SFA can be determined.

8.8.5 *Perham Down garrison*

Assets of high value

There will be a medium impact on the portion of the boundary earthwork on Lamb Down (1009883/MWI17640). The residual impact will be **moderate adverse**.

Assets of medium value

The field system **MWI17648** will experience a high impact from the development of Perham Down garrison. The residual effect is judged to be **minor adverse**.

Assets of uncertain value

Unknown archaeological deposits in the north-west portion of the garrison will experience a very high impact from the development. The residual effect cannot yet be ascertained.

8.8.6 *Perham Down SFA*

Assets of very high value

The scheduled monument of Ludgershall Castle (1009912) will experience a very low impact from the development of the SFA site. The residual effect is judged to be **negligible**.

The scheduled monument of Sidbury Hillfort (1010138) will experience a very low impact from the development of the SFA site. The residual effect is judged to be **negligible**.

Assets of medium value

The following assets will experience a very high impact:

- vehicle waterproofing test tank; and
- Armoured Vehicle Depot (1336429)

The residual effect is judged to be **moderate adverse**.

Assets of uncertain value

Unknown archaeological deposits within Corunna Barrack experience a very high impact from the SFA development proposals. The residual effect cannot yet be ascertained.

The WWII vehicle sheds within the barracks will experience a very high impact from the development. As no internal inspection was available, the residual effect cannot yet be ascertained.

8.8.7 *Tidworth garrison*

Assets of very high value

The scheduled monument of Seven Barrows (**1015491**) will experience a low impact from the development. The residual effect is considered to be **minor adverse**.

Assets of medium value

The site of the former Delhi Hospital (**1056368**) within the barrack would experience a high impact from development. The residual effect would be **moderate adverse**.

The following assets would experience a medium impact:

- The continuation of a linear earthwork (**929256**);
- Site of an area of military practice trenches (**MWI17722**);
- Site of an area of military practice trenches (**MWI17725**).

The residual effect would be **minor adverse**.

Assets of uncertain value

Unknown archaeological deposits within the garrison footprint would experience a high impact from the development. The residual effect cannot yet be ascertained.

Non-designated historic buildings may be impact by the proposed development. The residual effect cannot yet be ascertained.

8.8.8 *Upavon*

Assets of very high value

The scheduled monument of a round barrow in the grounds of RAF Upavon (**1010667**) will experience a low impact from the Upavon design proposals. With mitigation, the residual effect is judged to be **minor adverse**.

The Grade II* Officers mess building (**1365554**) will experience a low impact from the development. The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

Assets of high value

The Grade II listed Avon Club (**1299342**) will experience a very high impact from the development. The residual effect will be **major adverse**. If the recommendations put forward for this asset are followed, the residual effect would be reduced.

The Grade II listed York Cottage (**1393045**) will experience a low impact from the development. The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

Assets of medium value

The non-designated asset of an area of military trenching (**MWI13736**) will experience a medium impact from the construction of a car park south of the A342. With mitigation, the residual effect is judged to be **minor adverse**.

Assets of low value

The ditch on Upavon Down (**MWI10127/918906**) will experience a medium impact from development. With mitigation, the residual effect is judged to be **minor adverse**.

Assets of uncertain value

Unknown archaeological deposits within the garrison site will potentially experience a very high impact from the Upavon design proposals. Mitigation has been proposed in the form of archaeological evaluation during the further assessment phase. The residual effect cannot be ascertained.

8.8.9 **Bulford ETR**

Assets of very high value

There will be high impact on the following assets:

- Sixteen round barrows on Bulford Down (**Group 1009609 (MWI12140)**); and
- Barrow (**1009508**).

The residual effect will be **major adverse**.

There will be a medium impact on the following assets:

- Bowl Barrows (**1009476, 1009500, 1009470**); and
- Six disc barrows (**1009972, 1010239, 1010237, 1010235, 1009968, and 1009966**).

The resulting residual impact is likely to be **moderate adverse**.

There will be low impact on the bowl barrows (**1009611, 1009567**). The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

There will be very low impact on the following assets:

- Bowl barrow (**1017929**);
- Bowl barrows located on Milston-Bulford Down (**1009476, 1009517, 1009538, 1009484, 1009640**).

The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

There will be a very low impact on the long barrow and disc barrow in Brigmerston Field (**1009482**). The residual effect will be **negligible**.

Assets of medium value

There will be high impact on the complex of 20th century practice trenches and slit trenches (**MWI12068/915450**). The residual effect will be **moderate adverse**.

8.8.10 **Individual Battle Shooting Range (IBSR)**

Assets of very high value

There will be a low impact on the following assets

- Thornham Down prehistoric and medieval landscape (**1010219**); and
- Barrow (**1009533**).

The residual effect is **minor adverse**

Assets of high value

There will be a medium impact on the following assets:

- Field boundaries (**MWI11809/218952**).

The residual effect is **moderate adverse**.

Assets of medium value

There will be a low impact on the following assets:

- Medieval enclosure (**MWI11747**);
- Medieval enclosure (**MWI11754**); and
- Sheep fold (**21904**).

The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

8.8.11 *Nine Mile River Crossing*

Assets of very high value

There will be a low impact on the round barrows (**1009567** and **109611**). The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

There will be a very low impact on the bowl barrows on Bulford Down (**1009609**). The residual effect will be **negligible**.

Assets of medium value

There may be a medium impact on the military features of possible WWI date (**MWI12079/1360635**). The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

8.8.12 *Copehill Down*

Assets of very high value

There will be a low impact on the long barrow and Old Ditch linear earthwork on Tilshead Down (**1009297**). The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

Assets of medium value

There will be a low impact upon assets related to the Pit and ditch of Neolithic date (**MWI16795/931571**). The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

Assets of low value

There will be a low impact upon assets related to un-stratified finds (**MW16837**). The residual effect will be **negligible**.

8.8.13 *Imber*

Assets of very high value

There may be a low impact on the following assets:

- Long barrow (**1010027**) located to the south of the village may experience a low impact;
- Romano-British enclosure group (**1010024**);
- bowl barrow (**MWI3460/762845**);
- bowl barrow (**MWI3462/762851**);
- bowl barrow (**MWI3463/762863**) and
- Church of St Giles (**1036472**).

The residual effect would be **minor adverse**.

Assets of high value

There may be a high impact on the Roman inhumation cemetery (**211095**). The residual effect would be **moderate adverse**.

Assets of medium value

There will be a medium impact on the following assets:

- park situated to the north of Imber Court (**1266896**); and
- Baptist Cemetery.

The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

There will be a low impact on the following assets:

- Field systems (**MWI3494, MWI3488, MWI3499**); and

- Linear feature (**MWI3495**).

The residual effect will be **negligible**.

8.8.14 ***Berril Valley***

Assets of very high value

There will be low impact on the assets of:

- Chapperton Down Prehistoric and Romano-British Landscape (**1009301**);
- Barrow (**1009589**);
- Two bowl barrows (**211064**);
- Three round barrows are located on Breach Hill (**214922**); and
- bowl barrow (**867812**).

The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

There will be very low impact on the assets of:

- A field system and settlement north of Chapperton Down (**1010018**); and
- A field system on West Lavington Down (**1009976**).

The residual effect will be **negligible**.

Assets of high value

There will be a low impact on the bowl barrow (**MWI3456**) located at the southern end of the valley. The residual effect will be **minor adverse**.

Assets of medium value

There will be a low impact on the following assets:

- Field system located just east of Imber village (**MWI3468**);
- Field system is located to the north of Chapperton Down (**MWI3469**);
- Field system located towards the centre of the Berril Valley, eastern side (**MWI3470**); and
- Field system east of Imber (**MWI3494**).

The residual effect upon the setting of these assets will be **minor adverse**.

Assets of low value

There will be a low impact on the following assets:

- Pit located on the south side at the south end of the Berril Valley (**MWI3510**);

- Ditch - military construction (**211119**) is located towards the northern end of the Berril Valley;
- Oval features of possible military origin (**884268**);
- Boundary ditch (**211130**);
- Boundary ditch (**884083**);
- Ditch located towards the northern end of the Berril Valley (**MWI3473**);
- Ditch south of Berril Down (**MWI3502**); and
- Post hole (**MWI3511**).

The residual effect upon these assets is expected to be **negligible**.

8.9 Cumulative effects

It is clear that some heritage assets will experience impacts from a number of the proposed development sites.

A large scale asset of very high value comprises the group of remains on Chapperton Down (**1009301**) which is located to the north-east of Berril Valley and Imber within the 1km buffer zone. Chapperton Down Prehistoric and Romano-British Landscape is an area of well preserved, prehistoric and Romano-British landscape including an unexcavated settlement, field systems and associated contemporary and non-contemporary features. It is also designated an Important and Fragile Site by DIO. Developments to the east of Imber towards Berril Valley may have a cumulative impact upon the very high value asset group.

1358981 – This is an asset recording military slit trenches observed from aerial photographs and which covers an extensive area. Impacts have been identified upon this asset from a number of the development areas. Although only small portions are being removed in each individual development, if all the developments were to proceed, this would result in a fairly significant amount of the asset being removed. The cumulative impact upon this asset would be **moderate adverse**.

219141 – There will be impacts on this asset from the development of the Bulford SFA sites and the garrison. Although the asset covers a large area and each individual site which impacts upon this will only remove a small portion, there is the potential that the development of all of the sites will remove a more substantial area. The cumulative impact of this asset would be **moderate adverse**.

8.10 Summary

This chapter has presented the likely significant cultural heritage effects of the Salisbury Plain Masterplan. The appraisal has identified possible impacts and residual effects for the proposals as they stand. It has also made recommendations where further work is required, including alterations to the Masterplan.

If the recommended mitigation proposals for a number of the sites are followed, this would reduce the impacts and residual effects on a number of the identified heritage assets. This would become apparent in the detailed assessment undertaken for each development proposal.



With regards to the recommendations for archaeological fieldwork, prior to the commencement of works, a programme of investigations will be agreed with the DIO Archaeologist, English Heritage and the county archaeologist for Wiltshire. For the built heritage requirements, consultation will be undertaken with the DIO Historic Buildings Advisor, English Heritage and the Conservation Officer for Wiltshire Council.

There are likely to be significant effects on the identified heritage resource from a number of the proposed developments. Recommendations have been put forward for consideration which, if followed, would go towards reducing the number of significant impacts upon the heritage assets.



Table 8.32: Summary of residual significance of effects

Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1009964	Two round barrows at Rawlinson Road	Very high	The value of this asset will not change	Bulford Garrison	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
1358981	Area of slit trenches and air raid shelters	Medium	Physical and permanent impacts from the development of the garrison	Bulford Garrison	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
n/a	Unidentified historic buildings within the garrison	Uncertain	Potential physical and setting impacts	Bulford Garrison	Very High	Detailed site walkover including internal access	n/a
n/a	The Old Bakery building	Uncertain	Permanent and physical impacts from demolition of structure	Bulford Garrison	Very High	Building recording of structure prior to demolition	n/a
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits within the garrison	Uncertain	Permanent and physical impacts from the Bulford Garrison design proposals	Bulford Garrison	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	n/a



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
MWI11920/219177	Findspot of Beaker Bronze Age pottery	Low	Permanent and physical impacts on deposits associated with this findspot from development in NW portion of garrison	Bulford Garrison	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
219357 and 915424	Findspot of Bronze Age axe and pottery	Low	Permanent and physical impacts on deposits associated with this findspot from development of garrison	Bulford Garrison	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
MWI12158	Site of a round barrow	Medium	Permanent and physical impacts on this asset and associated deposits from development of garrison	Bulford Garrison	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Moderate Adverse
219407	Site of 3 round barrows	Medium	Permanent and physical impacts on this asset and associated deposits from development of garrison	Bulford Garrison	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Moderate Adverse
MWI11923	Bronze Age pit	Medium	Permanent and physical impacts on this asset and associated deposits from development of garrison	Bulford Garrison	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Moderate Adverse
n/a	Site of Old Sandhurst	Low	Permanent physical impacts from construction of 6xJunior Ranks	Bulford	High	Further assessment including programme	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
	Block		SLA	Garrison		of archaeological fieldwork	
219141	Iron Age/Roman field system and trackway	Medium	Permanent physical impact from construction of buildings at southern edge of garrison	Bulford Garrison	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
1015216	Bowl barrow 770m northwest of New Barn	Very high	Permanent setting impacts from the development of the SFA	Bulford SFA	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse
1009933	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	Permanent setting impacts from the development of the SFA	Bulford SFA	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse
1009545	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	Permanent setting impacts from the development of the SFA	Bulford SFA	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1009602	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	Permanent setting impacts from the development of the SFA	Bulford SFA	High to Medium	Potential reduction in development density, establishment of appropriate landscaping	Moderate Adverse
1009604	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	Permanent setting impacts from the development of the SFA	Bulford SFA	High	Potential reduction in development density, establishment of appropriate landscaping	Moderate Adverse
1009605	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	Permanent setting impacts from the development of the SFA	Bulford SFA	High	Potential reduction in development density, establishment of appropriate landscaping	Moderate Adverse
1009564	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	Permanent setting impacts from the development of the SFA	Bulford SFA	High	Potential reduction in development density, establishment of appropriate landscaping	Moderate Adverse
1009969	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows	Very high	Permanent setting impacts from the development of the SFA	Bulford SFA	High	Potential reduction in development density, establishment of	Moderate Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
	south of Bulford					appropriate landscaping	
1009931	Bowl barrow one of a group of barrows south of Bulford	Very high	Permanent setting impacts from the development of the SFA	Bulford SFA	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse
219316	A group of small circular objects possible barrows	High	Permanent setting impact upon the setting of the assets	Bulford SFA	Low to Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse
1009903	Beacon Hill monuments	Very high	Permanent setting and visual impacts from the development of northern SFA	Bulford SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
502630	Site of railway station on the Newton Tony Bulford branch line	Low	Permanent physical impacts on the asset from development of northern SFA	Bulford SFA	High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
1360410	Extensive area of trenches	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on a portion of the asset from	Bulford SFA	Medium	Further assessment including programme	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
	and fieldwork		development			of archaeological fieldwork	
MWI12077	Bulford Camp military trenches	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on a portion of the asset from development	Bulford SFA	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
1358981	Area of slit trenches and air raid shelters	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on a portion of the asset	Bulford SFA	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
1358978	20 th century military features including gunposts and trenches	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on a portion of this asset	Bulford SFA	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
1358974	Area of military practice trenches	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on a portion of this asset	Bulford SFA	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
219141/MWI12268	Iron Age/Roman	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on a portion of the assets	Bulford SFA	Medium	Further assessment including programme	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
	field system and trackway					of archaeological fieldwork	
MWI12246/219332	Circular feature identified from APs.	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on this asset from development of the SFA.	Bulford SFA	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Moderate Adverse
MWI12246/914483	Circular feature identified from APs.	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on this asset from development of the SFA.	Bulford SFA	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Moderate Adverse
n/a	Site of Old Sandhurst Block	Low	Permanent physical impacts on this asset from development of the SFA.	Bulford SFA	Medium	Archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits within the SFA sites	Uncertain	Permanent physical impacts from the development of the SFA sites	Bulford SFA	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Yet to be determined



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
n/a	Stonehenge WHS	Very High	No significant change in setting	Larkhill Garrison	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
1012167	Long Barrow at Larkhill Camp	Very high	Permanent setting impact from proposed development with two land parcels	Larkhill Garrison	Medium	Review living accommodation in area 1	Moderate Adverse
1010052	Knighton Long Barrow	Very high	Permanent setting impact from proposed development with two land parcels	Larkhill Garrison	Medium	Review living accommodation in area 11	Moderate Adverse
MWI11749/1363128	Military earthworks	Medium	Permanent setting impact from proposed development with two land parcels	Larkhill Garrison	Medium	Programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
MWI2603/1363632	Military railway	Low	Permanent setting impact from proposed development with two land parcels	Larkhill Garrison	Low	Programme of archaeological fieldwork	Negligible
MWI12780	Prehistoric Field System	Medium	Permanent setting impact from proposed development with two land parcels	Larkhill Garrison	Medium	Programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
MWI11808	Prehistoric Field System	Medium	Permanent setting impact from proposed development with two land parcels	Larkhill Garrison	Medium	Programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
n/a	Non-designated asset (WA20)	Uncertain	Permanent and physical impacts from demolition of structure	Larkhill Garrison	Very High	Detailed site walkover including internal access	n/a
n/a	Non-designated buildings of historic interest within the garrison	Uncertain	Permanent and physical impacts from demolition of structures	Larkhill Garrison	Very High	Detailed site walkover including internal access	n/a
n/a	World Heritage Site	Very high	No change in setting	Larkhill SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
1009133	Durrington Walls	Very high	Permanent setting impact from proposed development	Larkhill SFA	Low	No mitigation proposed other than sympathetic landscaping	Minor Adverse
1009473	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	Unlikely to have setting impact due to the intervening village of Durrington	Larkhill SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1009730	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	Unlikely to have setting impact due to the intervening village of Durrington	Larkhill SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
1009501	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	Unlikely to have setting impact due to the intervening village of Durrington	Larkhill SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
1009650	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	Unlikely to have setting impact due to the intervening village of Durrington	Larkhill SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
1009498	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	Unlikely to have setting impact due to the intervening village of Durrington	Larkhill SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
1009691	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	Unlikely to have setting impact due to the intervening village of Durrington	Larkhill SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
1009648	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	Unlikely to have setting impact due to the intervening village of Durrington	Larkhill SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1009482	Group of Scheduled Barrows	Very high	Unlikely to have setting impact due to the intervening village of Durrington	Larkhill SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
MWI 12605 / 1363071, 1363078	Military Earthworks	Medium	Permanent impact from the proposed development	Larkhill SFA	High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Moderate/Minor Adverse
MWI 12344	Undated Linear Feature	Low	Permanent impact from the proposed development	Larkhill SFA	High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor adverse
1363083	Former location of four rectangular concrete structures	Low	Permanent impact from the proposed development	Larkhill SFA	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor adverse
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits	Uncertain	Permanent impacts from the proposed development	Larkhill SFA	Very High	Further assessment required	n/a



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1009883/M W117640	Portion of the boundary earthwork on Lamb Down	High	Permanent removal of a portion of the asset through construction of area 2	Perham Down Garrison	Medium	Further assessment and programme of archaeological fieldwork	Moderate Adverse
MW117648	Field system	Medium	Permanent removal through construction of area 6	Perham Down Garrison	High	Further assessment and programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
n/a	Unknown archaeological deposits in Perham Down Garrison	Uncertain	Permanent physical impact through construction of development areas	Perham Down Garrison	Very High	Further assessment and programme of archaeological fieldwork	n/a
n/a	Unknown archaeological assets within the garrison	Uncertain	Permanent physical impacts	Perham Down SFA	Very high	Archaeological fieldwork	n/a
1009912	Ludgershall Castle	Very high	The value of this asset will not change	Perham Down SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1336429	Armoured Vehicle Depot	Medium	Demolition of all buildings within Corunna Barracks	Perham Down SFA	Very High	Further assessment and building recording including further research	Moderate Adverse
1010138	Sidbury Hillfort	Very high	The value of this asset will not change	Perham Down SFA	Very Low	No mitigation proposed	Negligible
n/a	Vehicle waterproofing tank	Medium	Demolition of this asset, permanent physical impact	Perham Down SFA	Very High	Recording of structure prior to removal	Moderate Adverse
n/a	WWII vehicle sheds	Uncertain	Demolition, permanent, physical impact	Perham Down SFA	Very High	Further internal inspection required	n/a
1015481	Seven Barrows cemetery	Very high	Possible setting impacts from new buildings	Tidworth Garrison	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse
n/a	Non-designated historic buildings within the garrison	Uncertain	Permanent physical impacts arising from the development of the SFA	Tidworth Garrison	Very High	Detailed walkover and internal inspection	n/a



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
929256	Continuation of the scheduled boundary earthwork 1015482	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on a portion of this asset through construction of REME Stores	Tidworth Garrison	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
MWI17722	Area of military practice trenches	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on a portion of this asset from construction of REME Stores	Tidworth Garrison	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
1056368	Site of the Delhi military hospital	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on this asset through construction of Transit Bed blocks	Tidworth Garrison	High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Moderate Adverse
MWI17725	Area of military practice trenches	Medium	Permanent physical impacts on a portion of this asset through construction of a Store for 1RRF	Tidworth Garrison	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
n/a	Unknown archaeological potential within the garrison	Uncertain	Permanent physical impacts from construction within the garrison	Tidworth Garrison	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	n/a



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1010667	Round barrow located in Upavon Garrison	Very high	Permanent setting impact from proposed construction of area 1	Upavon Garrison	Low	Considerate design of area 1 buildings	Minor Adverse
n/a	Unknown archaeological potential at Upavon Garrison	Uncertain	Permanent physical impact on unidentified archaeological deposits	Upavon Garrison	Very High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	n/a
MWI13736	Area of military trenching	Medium	Permanent physical impact on additional sections of practice trench	Upavon Garrison	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
MWI10127/9 18906	Undated ditch on Upavon Down	Low	Permanent physical impacts on portion of the asset	Upavon Garrison	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor Adverse
1365554	Officers Mess building 21	Very high	Setting impacts from construction of area 1	Upavon Garrison	Low	Further assessment	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1393045	York Cottage	High	Setting impacts from construction of area 1 and 2	Upavon Garrison	Low	Further assessment	Minor Adverse
1299342	Avon Club building 110	High	Setting impacts from construction of are 2	Upavon Garrison	Very High	Consider removal or movement of these buildings from this location	Major Adverse
1009609/M WI 12140	Group of Round Barrows	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	High	Considerate design	Major Adverse
1009508	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	High	Considerate design	Major Adverse
1009476	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Medium	Considerate design	Moderate Adverse
1009500	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Medium	Considerate design	Moderate Adverse
1009470	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Medium	Considerate design	Moderate Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1009972	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Medium	Considerate design	Moderate Adverse
1010239	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Medium	Considerate design	Moderate Adverse
1010237	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Medium	Considerate design	Moderate Adverse
1010235	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Medium	Considerate design	Moderate Adverse
1009968	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Medium	Considerate design	Moderate Adverse
1009966	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Medium	Considerate design	Moderate Adverse
1009611	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Low	Considerate design	Minor Adverse
1009567	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Low	Considerate design	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1017929	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Low	Considerate design	Minor Adverse
1009517	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Low	Considerate design	Minor Adverse
1009538	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Low	Considerate design	Minor Adverse
1009484	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Low	Considerate design	Minor Adverse
1009640	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Low	Considerate design	Minor Adverse
1009482	Long Barrow and Disc Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Bulford ETR	Very Low	Considerate design	Negligible
MWI12068/9 15450	Military practice Trenches	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposits	Bulford ETR	High	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Moderate Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1010219	Thornham Down prehistoric and medieval landscape	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	IBSR	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
1009533	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	IBSR	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
MWI11809/2 18952	Field System	High	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	IBSR	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Moderate Adverse
MWI11747	Enclosure	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	IBSR	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
MWI11754	Enclosure	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	IBSR	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
						works	
219014	Sheep Fold	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	IBSR	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
1009567	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Nine Mile River Crossing	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
1009611	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Nine Mile River Crossing	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
1009609	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Nine Mile River Crossing	Very Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
MWI12079/1 360635	Military feature of possible	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Nine Mile River Crossing	Medium	Further assessment including programme	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
	WWI date					of archaeological works	
1009297	Long Barrow and Old Ditch linear earthwork on Tilshead Down	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Copehill Down	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
MWI16795/931571	Neolithic Pit	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Copehill Down	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
MW16837	Unstratified finds	Low	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Copehill Down	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
1000002	Long Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Imber	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1010024	Romano-British Enclosure	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Imber	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse
MWI3460/762845	Bowl Barrow	Very high	Possible temporary impact upon setting of monument	Imber	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse
MWI3462/762851	Bowl Barrow	Very high	Possible temporary impact upon setting of monument	Imber	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse
MWI3463/762853	Bowl Barrow	Very high	Possible temporary impact upon setting of monument	Imber	Low	No mitigation proposed	Minor Adverse
1036472	Church of St Giles	Very high	Possible temporary impact upon setting of Church	Imber	Medium	No mitigation proposed	Moderate Adverse
211095	Roman Inhumation Cemetery?	High	Possible impact to archaeological deposits	Imber	Medium	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Moderate Adverse
1266896	Park	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposits	Imber	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
MWA 13494	Field Systems	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposits	Imber	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
MWA 13488	Field Systems	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposits	Imber	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
MWA 13499	Field Systems	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposits	Imber	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
MWA 13495	Field Systems	Medium	Possible impact to archaeological deposits	Imber	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor/Negligible
n/a	Baptist Cemetery	Medium	Possible setting impact and physical impacts	Imber	Medium	Avoid development within close proximity to the cemetery	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1009301	Chapperton Down Prehistoric and Romano-British Landscape	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
1009589	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
211064	Two Barrows	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
214922	Three Barrows	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
867812	Barrow	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
1010018	Field System	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Very Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
1009976	Field System	Very high	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Very Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
MWI3456	Barrow	High	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
MWI3468	Field System	Medium	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
MWI3469	Field System	Medium	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
MWI3470	Field System	Medium	Possible impact upon setting of	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme	Minor Adverse



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
			monument			of archaeological works	
MWI3494	Field System	Medium	Possible impact upon setting of monument	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Minor Adverse
MWI3510	Pit	Low	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
211119	Ditch	Low	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
884268	Oval Feature	Low	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
211130	Ditch	Low	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible



Asset No.	Name	Value	Description of impact physical, setting, temporary or permanent	Development area identified	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation/ Recommendations	Significance of Effects
884083	Ditch	Low	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
MWI3473	Ditch	Low	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
MWI3502	Ditch	Low	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible
MWI3511	Post Hole	Low	Possible impact to archaeological deposit	Berril Valley	Low	Further assessment including programme of archaeological works	Negligible



[Blank Page]