

Site Specific Impacts of Development on the Historic Environment

Sites 1A and 2A Waldringfield

English Heritage (EH) have raised concerns that *'Sites 1A and 2A are in the vicinity of at least 10 prehistoric burial mounds some scheduled and some unscheduled. There should be a full archaeological mitigation strategy for any known monuments and, prior to any development decision these suggested sites should be assessed and evaluated for known monuments and any unknown archaeological sites. The settings safeguards should be clearly explained, ie why the buffering boundaries have been located where they are and the de-watering impacts should be considered..'*

In response to this concern and the others raised by EH regarding Brett sites, Andrew Josephs, Heritage Consultant, has studied the issues raised and prepared site specific response reports. His reports have been circulated to both Suffolk County Council (SCC) and EH, and were discussed at two separate site visits attended by SCC & EH on the 12th and 27th Feb (the latter was in relation to Shrubland only). The report's conclusions in relation to Waldringfield are summarised below.

One scheduled monument lies within site 2A. This has been recognised as a primary constraint and it is excluded from the future extraction area. Recent trial trenching carried out at the site shows that there is little archaeology contemporary to the barrows in either area, and surprisingly little archaeology of any date.

Twelve scheduled monuments lie within 1.5km of the two proposed areas, of these two lie 40 and 60m respectively from the boundary of the potential extraction. This is an indicative buffer which would be refined during the EIA process. Boundary screening and existing woodland will help to reduce the effect on the setting. To some extent their setting has already been affected by buildings and installations associated with the BT facility at Adastral Park. This is evident from the photos attached.

The remaining scheduled monuments fall into two groups, ie those that are more than 100m away from the extraction areas and are separated from them by built development and those that lie to the west of the A12 dual carriage-way and are therefore separated from the site by both a major road and urban development. The setting of these monuments is already compromised and there would be no adverse impact upon their setting from the mineral extraction and restoration operations.

Mineral extraction will be relatively shallow, typically removing the upper 3 to 4m of Glacial Sand and Gravels. All workings will be well above groundwater levels and so there will not be any dewatering operations necessary. The sites will be restored to either agricultural use or (subject to the approval of a further application, in keeping with its local plan designation) to built development.

Site 3. Coddendam (Shrubland)

EH stated that the site is *'contiguous to the boundary of the Grade 1 registered park, Shrublands. Any impact on the setting of the park should, according to PPG15, be a material consideration in your decisions. As a Grade 1 park, Shrublands is in the top 10% of designated landscapes nationally. We would object to any application for planning permission on this site.....'*

Andrew Joseph's report on this site has shown that the site allocation area was not the property of the owners of Shrubland Estate until after 1868 by which time the

majority of the registered Park had been laid out. The proposed mineral extraction area has been variously in agricultural use and woodland, most recently as commercial woodland, the majority of which was replanted in the mid 20th century.

A green ride separates the site allocation area from the Registered Park. This forms a physical break between the two and the Park boundary has intentionally followed this line. The Park landscape in Middleton Wood makes use of the west facing escarpment which forms a steep natural barrier to the landscape to the east (within which the existing quarry and site allocation area are situated). The exclusion of the site allocation area from the Registered Park area is totally consistent with historic land use, pattern of land-ownership and the design of the historic Park. The proposed development would have no impact upon the Registered Park as all development is outside the designated boundary and lies above it over the crest of the ridge.

The density of the woodland on the boundary of the Registered Park and the marked reduction in levels towards the drive from the lodge substantially preclude overlooking from or impact upon park users. There will be no significant impact upon the park from the quarry extension.

The use of profiled 2.5m high, assymetrical soil bunds (which are grass seeded to avoid weed growth), around the periphery of the site, in particular on the southern boundary will aid mitigation of the operations. There is considerable scope to enhance the landscape and ecological value of the area on restoration, creating a combination of open fields bordered by hedgerows (as is being implemented in the existing quarry areas) with woodland incorporating the re-creation of rides over part of the site.

Site 5B Barham

EH raised concerns that *'this site could increase the impact of the existing quarry on the Grade 1 church to the south...there was no indication that the setting of this building has yet been given proper consideration'*.

The proposed operation here is 'low key' with no processing plant on site. All mineral extraction will take place from the base of the deposit (5-6m below original ground levels). The Church is 400m away, visibility is restricted by woody vegetation and the slight rise in the intervening land creates a visual cut off which precludes direct views to the proposed extensions. This is evident from the drawing BAR/09 and photos attached.

Due to topography and vegetation there will be no views from sensitive receptors within the listed building curtilage, such as the southern entrance to the church and churchyard. Mitigation could include the gapping up of hedgerows and the creation of grassed, profiled soil bunds along the southern boundary. Both of these measures could further reduce any views from the environs of the church. Upon completion of extraction, restoration would return the fields to agriculture which would recreate the current setting of the church in its broader landscape.

Conclusions

In order to address the concerns raised by EH (and those mentioned later in the site meetings), we agree to the minor modifications made to the Minerals Specific Site Allocations (regarding these 3 sites) shown as track changes in the attachment sent from SCC to Katherine Fletcher of EH on 02/3/2008, relating to the WW2 radar installation at Waldringfield, ensuring that there is no significant impact on Shrubland Historic Park and protection of the WW2 pillbox at Barham.