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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Land east of Ashingdon Road, Rochford, Essex, SS4 1TE has been reviewed for its below ground archaeological potential.

There are no relevant designated archaeological heritage assets contained within or in close proximity to the study site (as defined in the NPFF).

The study site is not located within any Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP) or Conservation Areas, as defined by Rochford District Council.

This assessment has considered the potential for any yet to be discovered archaeological assets within the study site. A moderate archaeological potential has been determined for the Roman period and a low archaeological potential for all other past archaeological periods. Should archaeological remains exist, they would be of local significance.

Agricultural and horticultural use over the past centuries can be seen to have had a widespread moderate negative impact on any sub-surface archaeological remains should they exist.

Proposals are understood to involve the redevelopment of the site for residential units.

As the site has a moderate archaeological potential for the Roman period and as the site has seen no development, it is considered likely that further archaeological mitigation measures will be required. It is suggested that any such mitigation measures could follow planning consent secured by an appropriately worded archaeological planning condition.
INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

1.1 This below ground archaeological desk-based assessment has been prepared by George Stewart-Phillips and edited by Duncan Hawkins of CgMs Heritage (part of the RPS Group) on behalf of Bloor Homes Limited.

1.2 The subject of this assessment, also known as the study site extending approximately 26 hectares, is the site of Land east of Ashingdon Road, Rochford, Essex, SS4 1TE.

1.3 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, as defined in Section 2 and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefields or Historic Wrecks lie on the study site or within the 1.5km search area.

1.4 The study site does not lie within any Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP) or Conservation Areas, as defined by Rochford District Council.

1.5 Bloor Homes Limited have therefore commissioned CgMs Consulting to establish the archaeological potential of the study site, and to provide guidance on ways to accommodate any archaeological constraints identified.

1.6 In accordance with relevant policy and guidance on archaeology and planning, and in accordance with the ‘Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments’ (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists January 2017), this assessment draws together the available archaeological, topographic and land-use information in order to clarify the archaeological potential of the study site.

1.7 This desk-based assessment comprises an examination of evidence in the Essex Historic Environment Record (HER) and other sources. The report also includes the results of a comprehensive map regression exercise charting the development of the study site from the 18th Century until present day.

1.8 This Assessment thus enables relevant parties to assess the archaeological potential of various parts of the site and to consider the need for design, civil engineering, and archaeological solutions to the archaeological potential identified.
2.0 **PLANNING BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK**

2.1 National legislation regarding archaeology, including scheduled monuments, is contained in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002, and updated in April 2014.

2.2 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which was later revised in July 2018. The NPPF is supported by the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), which was published online 6th March 2014 and last updated 28 July 2017 (http://planning guidance.planningportal.gov.uk).

2.3 The NPPF and NPPG are additionally supported by three Good Practice Advice (GPA) documents published by Historic England: GPA 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans; GPA 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (both published March 2015). The second edition of GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets was published in December 2017.

**National Planning Policy**

2.4 Section 16 of the NPPF, entitled Conserving and enhancing the historic environment provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 16 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:

- Delivery of sustainable development;

- Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment;

- Conservation of England’s heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; and

- Recognition that heritage makes to our knowledge and understanding of the past.

2.5 Section 16 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 189 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset and that level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.
2.6 *Heritage Assets* are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process.

2.7 Annex 2 also defines *Archaeological Interest* as a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.

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

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

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

2.11 In short, government policy provides a framework which:

- Protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets;
- Protects the settings of such designations;
- In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk-based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions;
- Provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not significant enough to merit *in-situ* preservation.

2.12 The NPPG reiterates that the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance is a core planning principle, requiring a flexible and thoughtful approach. Furthermore, it highlights that neglect and decay of heritage assets is best addressed through ensuring they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation. Importantly, the guidance states that if complete, or partial loss of a
heritage asset is justified, the aim should then be to capture and record the evidence of the asset’s significance and make the interpretation publicly available. Key elements of the guidance relate to assessing harm. An important consideration should be whether the proposed works adversely affect a key element of the heritage asset’s special architectural or historic interest. Additionally, it is the degree of harm, rather than the scale of development, that is to be assessed. The level of ‘substantial harm’ is considered to be a high bar that may not arise in many cases. Essentially, whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the NPPF. Importantly, harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting. Setting is defined as the surroundings in which an asset is experienced and may be more extensive than the curtilage. A thorough assessment of the impact of proposals upon setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

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

**Local Planning Policy**

2.14 The site is located within the District of Rochford which is administered by Rochford District Council, who have adopted The Rochford District Core Strategy on the 13th December 2011 and the Rochford District Development Management Plan on the 16th December 2014.

2.15 The Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan, which will set the strategy for the future development of the District beyond 2025 – the current plan period. The new Local Plan will replace a number of the adopted policy documents which form the local development plan for the District. The new Local Plan is not intended for adoption before summer 2021.

2.16 The Rochford District Core Strategy contains the following policy relating to the historic environment:

**POLICY ENV1 – PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATURAL LANDSCAPE AND HABITATS AND THE PROTECTION OF HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES**

THE COUNCIL WILL MAINTAIN, RESTORE AND ENHANCE SITES OF INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL AND LOCAL NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE. THESE WILL INCLUDE SPECIAL AREAS OF CONSERVATION
THE COUNCIL WILL ALSO PROTECT LANDSCAPES OF HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST.

2.17 The Rochford District Development Management Plan contains the following policy relating to the historic environment:

POLICY DM1 – DESIGN OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS

THE DESIGN OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS SHOULD PROMOTE THE CHARACTER OF THE LOCALITY TO ENSURE THAT THE DEVELOPMENT POSITIVELY CONTRIBUTES TO THE SURROUNDING NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY, WITHOUT DISCOURAGING ORIGINALITY, INNOVATION OR INITIATIVE. THE DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS MUST DEMONSTRATE THAT THE FOLLOWING HAVE BEEN CAREFULLY CONSIDERED AND ADDRESSED WITHIN THE PROPOSAL:

(I) ACCESSIBILITY, PARTICULARLY PROMOTING ALTERNATIVES TO THE PRIVATE CAR;

(II) INTEGRATION OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY;

(III) ADEQUATE BOUNDARY TREATMENT AND LANDSCAPING WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT;

(IV) RETENTION OF TREES, WOODLAND AND OTHER IMPORTANT LANDSCAPE FEATURES IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICIES DM25 AND DM26;

(V) SUFFICIENT CAR PARKING IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY DM30;

(VI) SUITABLE DENSITY FOR THE LOCALITY IN LINE WITH POLICY DM2;

(VII) LOCAL OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS INCLUDING THE PROVISION OF GREENSPACE, PLAY SPACE, PRIVATE AND COMMUNAL GARDENS, ALLOTMENTS AND OTHER TYPES OF OPEN SPACE, BASED ON THE MOST UP-TO-DATE OPEN SPACE STUDY;

(VIII) IMPACT ON THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT INCLUDING SITES OF NATURE CONSERVATION IMPORTANCE, AND ON THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT INCLUDING CONSERVATION AREAS AND LISTED BUILDINGS, ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES AND THE WIDER HISTORIC LANDSCAPE;

(IX) AVOIDING OVERLOOKING, ENSURING PRIVACY AND PROMOTING VISUAL AMENITY;

(X) A POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH EXISTING AND NEARBY BUILDINGS IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY DM3;

(XI) A SCALE AND FORM APPROPRIATE TO THE LOCALITY IN LINE WITH POLICY DM3;

(XII) COMPLIANCE WITH TEXTUAL CONCEPT STATEMENTS; AND

(XIII) VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENTS AND PARISH PLANS, WHERE APPLICABLE.
DESIGN BRIEFS FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS MUST SHOW THAT THEY CONSIDER AND REFLECT THE IDENTITY OF THE SURROUNDING AREA AND MUST ALLOW FOR THE EFFECTIVE RUNNING OF THE COUNCIL’S WASTE MANAGEMENT AND RECYCLING SCHEME.

PROPOSALS SHOULD HAVE REGARD TO THE DETAILED ADVICE AND GUIDANCE ON THE DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF NEW DEVELOPMENTS AS SET OUT IN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT 2 – HOUSING DESIGN, AS WELL AS TO GUIDANCE IN THE ESSEX DESIGN GUIDE FOR RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED-USE AREAS

2.18 In terms of relevant nationally designated heritage assets, as defined above and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites have been identified on the study site or within its immediate vicinity.

2.19 In terms of relevant local designations, the site does not lie within an Area of Archaeological Priority as designated by Rochford District Council.

2.20 In line with relevant planning policy and guidance, this desk-based assessment seeks to clarify the site’s archaeological potential and the need or otherwise for additional archaeological mitigation measures.
3.0 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

Geology

3.1 The British Geological Survey (BGS Online 2018) records the bedrock geology as London Clay Formation – Clay, Silt, and Sand. This is overlain by River Terrace Deposits 1-3 Clay and Silt.

3.2 No geotechnical data is currently available for the study site.

Topography

3.3 The study site is generally flat, sloping gradually from its highest point at 12m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) at the north west of the study site, before plateauing at 9m AOD.

3.4 The nearest water course is a small stream located c.678m west of the study site. The site is also bisected by a small ditch, and a small lake is located c.260m to the east. A pond was formerly located within the study site.
4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND WITH ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Timescales used in this report:

Prehistoric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>12,000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>4,000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,800 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>600 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon/Early Medieval</td>
<td>AD 410</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1066</td>
<td>1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1486</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>AD 1800</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

4.1 This chapter reviews the available archaeological evidence for the study site and the archaeological/historical background of the general area, and, in accordance with NPPF, considers the potential for any as yet to be discovered archaeological evidence on the study site.

4.2 What follows comprises a review of known archaeological assets within a 1.5km radius of the study site (Figs. 1 & 2a), also referred to as the study area, held on the Essex Historic Environment Record (HER), together with a historic map regression exercise charting the development of the study area from the 18th century onwards until the present day.

4.3 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, as defined above in paragraph 2.8 and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites lie within the study site or its immediate vicinity.

4.4 In terms of relevant local designations, the study site does not lie within any Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP) or Conservation Areas, as defined by Rochford District Council.
4.5 The LiDAR plot (Fig. 2c) does not show anything of archaeological significance within the study site.

4.6 In terms of Historic Landscape Characterisation Data (Fig. 2b) the study site comprises 20th Century Enclosures (HEX31734 & HEX27657).

4.7 Chapter 5 subsequently considers the site conditions and whether the proposed development will impact the theoretical archaeological potential identified below.

**Previous Archaeological Work**

4.8 The HER does not record any archaeological work having previously taken place within the study site, however, a number of archaeological investigations have been recorded nearby.

4.9 To the south of Brays Lane, approximately 290m north of the study site, an archaeological evaluation and excavation (EEX56562) revealed multi-period remains, largely from the Roman period.

4.10 Similarly, archaeological evaluation and excavation (EEX56764) at Hall Road, approximately 622m south west of the study site, revealed multi-period remains predominately from the prehistoric and medieval periods.

**Early Prehistoric**

4.11 No Early Prehistoric sites or finds have been identified within the study site, however, several have been identified within the 1.5km search area.

4.12 At Doggetts Close, approximately 590m south east of the study site, a Palaeolithic hand axe (MEX31197, TQ 88 91) was recovered.

4.13 During archaeological excavations (EEX56562) at Brays Lane in advance of a housing development, approximately 290m north of the study site, a number of late Mesolithic flints (MEX10413, TQ 8719 9224) were recovered.

4.14 A number of Mesolithic finds (MEX10399, TQ 8849 9058) were recovered from Coombes Farm, approximately 890m south east of the study site. These included a backed bladelet and a flint point.

4.15 At Hall Road, approximately 622m south west of the study site, a Neolithic pit (MEX10422, TQ 865 907) was identified.
4.16 A Neolithic polished axe head (MEX37140, TQ 8767 9020) was recovered from a garden near Orchard Farm, approximately 1.2km south of the study site.

4.17 Based on the above a generally low archaeological potential can be determined for these periods.

**Bronze Age**

4.18 No Bronze Age sites or finds have been found within the study site, however, a number of records have been identified within the 1.5km search area.

4.19 During archaeological excavations (EEX56562) at Brays Lane in advance of a housing development, approximately 290m north of the study site, a Middle Bronze Age token, burial pit and a scatter of artefacts were recovered (MEX1041317, TQ 8719 9224).

4.20 A Late Bronze Age field system (MEX1042224, TQ 865 907) was recorded during several phases of archaeological evaluation at Hall Road (EEX56764 & EEX59091), approximately 622m south west of the study site.

4.21 At Combes Farm, approximately 890m south east of the study site, a number of Late Bronze Age and Early Bronze Age features (MEX1039966, TQ 8849 9058) were identified during several phases of archaeological evaluation (EEX55689 & EEX55690). Middle Bronze Age – Late Bronze Age pottery was also recovered.

4.22 At 37 North Street, approximately 921m south of the study site, a Late Bronze Age pit (MEX1042223, TQ 8761 9064) was discovered.

4.23 A Late Bronze Age socketed axe (MEX37134, TQ 8612 9224) was found near Devon Gardens, approximately 998m north west of the study site.

4.24 Based on the above, a low archaeological potential can be determined for the study site for this period.

**Iron Age & Roman**

4.25 No Iron Age sites have been found within the study site, however, one Roman record has been identified within the study site. A number of records from both periods have also been identified within the 1.5km search area.

4.26 At Hall Road, approximately 622m south west of the study site, a number of Middle Iron Age features and Middle Iron Age pottery (MEX1042224, TQ 865 907) were identified during several phases or archaeological evaluation (EEX56764 & EEX59091).
4.27 During an archaeological evaluation at Combes Farm (EEX55690), approximately 890m south east of the study site, a number of Early Iron Age features (MEX1039966, TQ 8849 9058) were identified.

4.28 Several fragments of Roman pottery (MEX37135, TQ 8756 9169) were identified within the study site while ditch clearance was taking place.

4.29 During archaeological excavations (EEX56562) at Brays Lane, 290m north of the study site, a Roman rectilinear enclosure system, cremation cemetery and refuse pits were identified (MEX1041317, TQ 8719 9224).

4.30 An Early Roman bronze coin of Sestertius (MEX37133, TQ 8672 9139) was recovered from Haunault Drive, approximately 573m west of the study site.

4.31 During an archaeological evaluation at East Street, approximately 889m south of the study site, a Roman trackway and a spread of Roman pottery and tile was recovered (MEX41217, TQ 8774 9053). Local residents also speak of a major Roman building being destroyed by the construction of the hospital 200m north west.

4.32 At Combes Farm, approximately 890m south east of the study site, a small amount of Roman pottery (MEX1039966, TQ 8849 9058) was recovered.

4.33 In the north area of Rochford Hall, a stone building with a course of reused Roman tiles (MEX41112, TQ 8703 9033) has been identified, approximately 980m south of the study site.

4.34 A coin of Constantine II (MEX37605, TQ 8665 9284) was found in a garden off Ashingdon Main Road, approximately 1.02km north west of the study site.

4.35 Based on the above, especially due to the presence of some Roman pottery within the study site, a moderate archaeological potential can be determined for this period.

**Saxon/Early Medieval**

4.36 No Saxon/Early Medieval sites or finds have been identified within the study site, however, a number have been identified within the 1.5km search area.

4.37 During works near Rochford Archery Ltd, approximately 813m south of the study site, a number of Saxon burials were discovered (MEX43251, TQ 876 906).

4.38 At Combes Farm, approximately 890m south east of the study site, a single fragment of Saxon pottery was identified (MEX10399, TQ 8849 9058).
4.39 St. Mary’s Church, approximately 911m west of the study site, is considered to contain several sections of Saxon walls (MEX37454, TQ 860 918).

4.40 Several Saxon double banks and ditches (MEX37130, TQ 882 923) have been identified north west of Little Stambridge Hall, approximately 916m north east of the study site.

4.41 The settlement of Ashingdon is first recorded in this period in 1066 as very small with one household. The historic settlement of Ashingdon (MEX1035689, TQ 862 937) is located 1.24km north of the study site. This is also thought to be the possible site of the battle of Assendune in 1020AD.

4.42 During this period, the study site is likely to have lain within agricultural land outside the historical settlement of Ashingdon. Based on this, a low archaeological potential can be determined for this period.

**Medieval**

4.43 No Medieval sites or finds have been identified within the study site, however, a number of records have been identified within the 1.5km search area.

4.44 During archaeological excavations (EEX56562) at Brays Lane, 290m north of the study site, evidence of Medieval (MEX1042224, TQ 865 907) occupation was identified. This consisted of a ditch, a field system and a pit along with Medieval pottery.

4.45 Rochford Medieval core (MEX37648, TQ 8762 9051) is located approximately 700m south of the study site.

4.46 A number of possible Medieval features (MEX1039962, TQ 8756 9063) were identified at Market Square, approximately 752m south of the study site. These include cultivation marks, a refuse disposal site and a sandstone quarry.

4.47 The site of the Medieval Rochford Lawless Court (MEX10345, TQ 8774 9061) is located 794m south of the study site.

4.48 At the Former British Legion Hall, approximately 817m south of the study site, a late Medieval layer (MEX1034337, TQ 8783 9062) was identified.

4.49 During an archaeological evaluation at North/East street (EEX56856), a Medieval pit (MEX1049143, TQ 8768 9055) was discovered
4.50 Several Medieval features (MEX41215, TQ 8773 9053) were identified during an archaeological evaluation (EEX412160) at East Street, approximately 889m south of the study site.

4.51 St. Mary’s Church (MEX37454, TQ 860 918), located approximately 911m west of the study site, saw continued use throughout the Medieval period.

4.52 Rochford Hall (MEX41113, TQ 8703 9033) is located approximately 984m south of the study site. The Hall is thought to date from between the 12th and 13th centuries.

4.53 The possible site of Hawkwell Hall and moat (MEX37453, TQ 859 916) is located approximately 1.04km west of the study site.

4.54 A Medieval Moat (MEX37769, TQ 8854 9082) has been identified at Coombs, approximately 1.05km south east of the study site.

4.55 A Medieval Church (MEX37760, TQ 8871 9200) is known to have been present 1.17km east of the study site at Little Stambridge Hall.

4.56 At Rochford Hundred Golf Course, approximately 1.18km south west of the study site, a possible 15th century brick kiln (MEX27495, TQ 870 902) was identified after trees were blown over.

4.57 At the Rectory, approximately 1.23km north east of the study site, evidence for a possible moat (MEX37755, TQ 885 925) has been identified.

4.58 Several Medieval features and sites have been identified at Ashingdon historic settlement (MEX1035689, TQ 862 937), located approximately 1.24km north of the study site. These consist of ridge and furrow, a vicarage, a manor house and a parish church.

4.59 During this period the study site was located outside the historical cores of Ashingdon and Rochford, probably within agricultural land. As such, the study site can be determined to have a low archaeological potential for this period.

**Post Medieval & Modern (including map regression exercise)**

4.60 No Post-Medieval and Modern sites or finds have been recorded within the study site. Several records have been identified within the 1.5km search area, however, as they do not relate to the study site, they are not discussed below. Moreover, our understanding of land use and management can be enhanced by cartographic evidence.
The 1777 Andrews and Dury Map (Fig. 3) shows the study site within open land to the north of Rochford.

By the 1799 Ordnance Survey Drawing (Fig. 4) the study site has become more defined and is split between several agricultural plots of land.

The 1840 Rochford Tithe Map (Fig. 5) shows the study site occupied by 11 plots of land. There are all described as arable, pasture and woodland within the accompanying Award.

The 1873 Ordnance Survey Map (Fig. 6) shows little change occurring at the study site.

By the 1923 Ordnance Survey Map (Fig. 7) a small change occurs within the study site. A small stream has been dug across the centre of the study site.

By the 1939 Ordnance Survey Map (Fig. 8), little change occurs within the study site, apart from the erection of several electric pylons bisecting the study site. A dog kennels has been constructed to the south and residential development has commenced to the north.

The 1960-61 Ordnance Survey Map (Fig. 9), shows no change occurring at the study site, however, a large residential scheme has emerged to the south of the study site, and development has continued to the north and east.

The study site has remained unchanged since (Fig. 10 – 14).

For all of its recorded history, the study site has been occupied by agricultural land and has seen little development. Based on this the study site can be determined to have a low archaeological potential for these periods.

Assessment of Significance (Designated Assets)

Existing national policy guidance for archaeology (the NPPF as referenced in section 2) enshrines the concept of the ‘significance’ of heritage assets. Significance as defined in the NPPF centres on the value of an archaeological or historic asset for its ‘heritage interest’ to this or future generations.

In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, as defined above in paragraph 2.8 and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites lie within the study site or its immediate vicinity.
4.72 In terms of relevant local designations, the study site does not lie within any Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP) or Conservation Areas, as defined by Rochford District Council.

**Assessment of Significance (Non-Designated Assets)**

4.73 As identified by desk-based work, archaeological potential by period and the likely significance of any archaeological remains which may be present is summarised in table form below and mapped where possible on Figure 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period:</th>
<th>Identified Archaeological Potential and Significance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Prehistoric</td>
<td>Low potential, local significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Low potential, local significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age &amp; Roman</td>
<td>Moderate potential, local significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon/Early Medieval</td>
<td>Low potential, local significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Low potential, local significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Low potential, local significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Low potential, local significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.74 On this basis, any remains, should they occur on the study site, would in the context of the Secretary of State’s non-statutory criteria for Scheduled Monuments (DCMS2013) be of likely local significance.
5.0 SITE CONDITIONS, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW OF POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSETS

Site Conditions

5.1 The study site is currently occupied by arable agricultural land and is bisected by a small ditch.

5.2 For all of its recorded history, the study site has been located within agricultural land and has seen little development.

5.3 The LiDAR plot (Fig. 2c) does not show anything of archaeological significance within the study site.

5.4 In terms of Historic Landscape Characterisation Data (Fig. 2b) the study site comprises 20th Century Enclosures (HEX31734 & HEX27657).

Proposed Development

5.5 Proposals are understood to involve the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes.

Review of Potential Development Impacts on Designated Archaeological Assets

5.6 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, as defined above in paragraph 2.8 and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites lie within the study site or its immediate vicinity.

5.7 As such, the proposed development will not impact any designated heritage assets.

Review of Potential Development Impacts on Non-Designated Assets

5.8 In terms of relevant local designations, the study site does not lie within any Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP) or Conservation Areas, as defined by Rochford District Council.

5.9 As set out above in section 4, the overall archaeological potential for the study site can be considered low for all periods apart from the Roman period. The potential for the Roman period can be considered moderate, as Roman pottery has been found within the study site. Should archaeological remains be present, they are considered likely to be local significance.
6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 The study site Land at Ashingdon Road, Rochford, Essex, SS4 1TE has been assessed for its below ground archaeological potential.

6.2 In accordance with relevant government planning policy and guidance, a desk-based assessment has been undertaken to clarify the archaeological potential of the study area.

6.3 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, as defined above in paragraph 2.8 and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites lie within the study site or its immediate vicinity.

6.4 In terms of relevant local designations, the study site does not lie within any Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP) or Conservation Areas, as defined by Rochford District Council.

6.5 The study site can be determined to have a moderate archaeological potential for the Roman period, with a low archaeological potential for all other archaeological periods.

6.6 Agricultural use of the study site can be seen to have had a moderate and widespread negative impact on any potential archaeological remains.

6.7 Proposals are understood to involve the redevelopment of the site into a residential unit.

6.8 As the site has a moderate archaeological potential for the Roman period and as the site has seen no development, it is considered likely that further archaeological mitigation measures will be required. It is suggested that any such mitigation measures could follow planning consent secured by an appropriately worded archaeological condition.
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