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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Land west of Hullbridge, Essex, has been considered for its below ground archaeological potential.

While the archaeological potential of the study site has been categorised as generally low for most identifiable past periods of human activity, evidence on the Essex Historic Environment Record indicates the presence of two undated banked enclosures southwest and northeast of the centrally located farm buildings, together with a possible Medieval moat to the east and a World War Two floodlight position within the northwestern boundary.

The bulk of the site has remained undeveloped farmland throughout its documented history. The farm buildings towards the centre appear from map evidence to be present by the late eighteenth century.

Proposals include the phased residential development of the site, with associated infrastructure.

In view of the sites perceived archaeological potential together with its undeveloped nature, further archaeological mitigation measures are anticipated in advance of development.

In view of the results of the hedgerow assessment it is recommended that the orientation and preservation of historic boundaries should be encouraged within the detail of the development proposals.
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

1.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment has been researched by Sophie Hudson and Isabelle Ryan, and prepared by Richard Meager of CgMs Consulting on behalf of Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.

1.2 The assessment considers the site of land to the west of Hullbridge Essex, comprising open fields with the Malyons Farm buildings to the centre. The site is approximately 21.79 hectares in extent, and is centred at National Grid Reference TQ8070 9460 (see Figures 1 and 2).

1.3 In accordance with central, regional and local government policy and guidance on archaeology and planning, and in accordance with the ‘Standard and Guidance for Heritage Environment Desk-Based Assessments’ (Institute for Archaeologists August 2014), this assessment draws together the available archaeological, topographic and land-use information in order to clarify the archaeological potential of the site.

1.4 The assessment comprises an examination of evidence in the Essex Historic Environment Record (EHER), considers the results of nearby archaeological investigations, incorporates published and unpublished material and charts historic land-use through a map regression exercise (see Section 4). The assessment also incorporates a comprehensive review of relevant designations from the Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project (2006), together with a historic hedgerow assessment (see Section 5). A comprehensive walkover site visit was undertaken in September 2014 (see plates 3-7).

1.5 As a result, the assessment enables relevant parties to assess the archaeological potential of the site and to consider the need for design, civil engineering, and/or archaeological solutions to the potential identified.
2.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK

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

2.2 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which replaced previous national policy relating to heritage and archaeology (PPS5: Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment). The NPPF Planning Practice Guidance was published online 6th March 2014 (http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk). The Practice Guide issued in support of PPS5 is still valid however, and English Heritage have provided documentation translating former PPS5 policy into its NPPF counterpart.

2.3 Section 12 of the NPPF, entitled Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:

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

2.4 Section 12 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 128 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that 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.

2.5 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.
2.6 Annex 2 also defines *Archaeological Interest* as a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.

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

2.8 *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.

2.9 In short, government policy provides a framework which:

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

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

2.11 The Rochford District Council Replacement Local Plan, adopted 2006, contains the following policies relevant to archaeology at the site:

**POLICY BC5 – DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES**

Applications for development that would affect sites of known archaeological importance must be accompanied by sufficient information (this will consist of an archaeological field evaluation, unless advised otherwise by the local planning authority) to allow the local planning authority to assess the importance of the site, the likely impact of the development proposal and, on the basis of these findings, to determine the appropriate course of action.
POLICY BC6 – DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING REGIONAL, COUNTY & LOCAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

In cases where archaeological sites and monuments of regional, county or local importance, and/or their settings, will be affected by a proposed development, they should be preserved in situ if at all possible, and conditions will be imposed on any permission granted to this end. In cases where preservation in situ is not possible or merited, conditions will be imposed to ensure that a programme of archaeological investigations and recording takes place prior to the commencement of the development.

2.12 In terms of designated heritage assets, as defined above and as shown on Figure 2, no Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites lie within the 1.5km study area search radius.

2.13 In terms of local designations the Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project (March 2006) defines the site as lying within Rochford Archaeological Character Area 1: Land north of Rayleigh, Hockley and Rochford:

Description:
- A large area of generally flat clay plain south of the upper Crouch Estuary rising to the south to the Hockley/Rayleigh ridge.
- The relatively low density of early material within the area reflects a lack of work rather than a lack of archaeology.
- There are regular find spots of Roman, prehistoric and early medieval material.
- The Saxon and medieval settlement of Ashingdon is of particular note and archaeological interest and has been the subject of a historic settlement assessment.
- Medieval moated sites are relatively common across the area and represent a pattern of dispersed settlement common to the period and region.
- There are pockets of development in the area and these are likely to have damaged/truncated archaeological deposits.

2.14 In line with existing national, strategic and local planning policy and guidance, this desk based assessment seeks to clarify the sites archaeological potential and the need or otherwise for additional mitigation measures.
3.0 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

3.1 Geology

3.1.1 As shown on British Geological Survey Sheet 258/259 (Southend & Foulness: 1976) the geology underlying the study site comprises deposits of London Clay.

3.1.2 Site specific geotechnical information is currently unavailable.

3.2 Topography

3.2.1 The general topography of the study site comprises a drop in height from north of south between 20m and 10m AOD [DETAIL TO COME FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY].

3.2.2 No watercourses or naturally occurring bodies of water are present within the study site or its immediate vicinity.
4.0 **ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, WITH ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**
(Including Historic Map Regression Exercise)

4.1 Timescales used in this report:

**Prehistoric**
- Palaeolithic: 450,000 - 12,000 BC
- Mesolithic: 12,000 - 4,000 BC
- Neolithic: 4,000 - 1,800 BC
- Bronze Age: 1,800 - 600 BC
- Iron Age: 600 - AD 43

**Historic**
- Roman: AD 43 - 410
- Anglo Saxon/Early Medieval: AD 410 - 1066
- Medieval: AD 1066 - 1485
- Post Medieval: AD 1486 - 1749
- Modern: AD 1750 - Present

4.2 **Introduction**

4.2.1 What follows is a consideration of findspots within a 1.5km radius, also referred to as the study area, held on the Essex Historic Environment Record (EHER), together with a map regression exercise charting the history of the site from the eighteenth century until the present day.

4.2.2 In terms of designated heritage assets, as defined above in Section 2 and as shown on Figure 2, no Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Historic Battlefields or Historic Wreck sites have been identified within the study area search radius.

4.2.3 In general the HER entries within the 1.5km study area concentrate on finds of early prehistoric material found along the north bank of the River Crouch to the north of the site, identified in the early 1980s as part of the Hullbridge Survey Project.

4.2.4 Within the study site itself, the Essex HER identifies an undated monument comprising a banked enclosure to the south of Malyons Farm, within the southern part of the study site (13486, TQ805 945), with another to the north of the farm buildings (13487, TQ806 948). No further information is available for either HER entry, and neither
feature were noted during the site visit made in September 2014. Conjectural evidence exists for a Medieval moat at Little Malyons within the central/eastern part of the site, although the HER entry suggests this is doubtful (13861, TQ8090 9470), and again, the site visit did not identify this feature. The remains of a World War Two floodlight battery has been identified within the northwestern boundary of the site.

4.2.5 The map sequence demonstrates that the bulk of the site has remained undeveloped farmland throughout its documented history. The farm buildings and the field boundaries appear to be present by the later eighteenth century.

4.2.6 Section 5 below reviews the historic boundaries of the site in conjunction with the Hedgerow Regulations, while Section 6 goes onto evaluate likely post depositional impacts and necessary mitigation measures.

4.3 Prehistoric: Palaeolithic and Mesolithic

4.3.1 No finds of Palaeolithic material have been identified within the 1.5km radius study area search radius.

4.3.2 The below evidence, sourced from the banks of the River Crouch c.500m north of the northern site boundary during the 1980s and 1990s, has been derived from a former land surface on sandy soil and the brickearth/gravel terraces, adjacent to fresh water sources. The British Geological Survey identifies the geology of this area as Marine or Estuarine Alluvium, differing from the London Clay beneath the study site itself. The lower peat identified above the Mesolithic deposits has been radiocarbon dated to 2245+70 BC (Rochford DC 2006: 15-16).

4.3.3 Mesolithic flintwork including blades, flakes, microblades, cores, scrapers, gravers, microliths and axes were found within an old land surface within a bed of peat to the west of the confluence of the Fenn Creek and the River Crouch, to the north of the study site (13529, TQ8026 9561). Additional Mesolithic material was identified to the east of the confluence of the Fenn Creek and the River Crouch (13566, TQ805 957). A further find of Mesolithic material had been made in 1910 on the River Crouch to the northeast of the study site (13530, TQ818 958). In addition, quantities of flintwork has been gathered along the banks of the Crouch (47299, TQ809 958; 7578, TQ7936 9565; 7675, TQ7956 9581; 7677, TQ791 948).

4.3.4 Observations on the south bank of the River Crouch to the northwest of the study site revealed additional finds and features, including two hearths containing clay, carbonised
wood and burnt flint; microliths, a tranchet axe, scrapers, segments, retouched flakes/blades, utilised flakes, waste flakes and blades and waste flint. Quartzite hones and a rubbing tool were also identified (13570, TQ802 954).

4.3.5 Given the conclusions of the Historic Environment Characterisation report (see section 5.5 below), it is considered that the finds concentrated along the River Crouch are not directly relevant to the study site itself. The presence of the underlying clay geology and the distance from the nearest watercourse would therefore suggest a relatively low archaeological potential for the early prehistoric periods at the study site itself.

4.4 Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age

4.4.1 From around 4000 BC the mobile hunter-gathering economy of the Mesolithic gradually gave way to a more settled agriculture-based subsistence. The pace of woodland clearance to create arable and pasture-based agricultural land varied regionally and locally, depending on a wide variety of climatic, topographic, social and other factors. The trend was one of a slow, but gradually increasing pace of forest clearance.

4.4.2 By the 1st millennium, i.e. 1000 BC, the landscape was probably a mix of extensive tracts of open farmland, punctuated by earthwork burial and ceremonial monuments from distant generations, with settlements, ritual areas and defended locations reflecting an increasingly hierarchical society.

4.4.3 Neolithic material derived from the Rochford area is typified by flint artefacts, concentrated within the gravel terraces (Rochford DC 2006: 16).

4.4.4 Archaeological work in 1911 on the north bank of the River Crouch to the north of the study site revealed possible Neolithic occupation levels. Pottery including pierced lugs, flint including an axe, scrapers, chisels and knives were found in peaty layers sealed by river silts and clays (13473, TQ810 957). Undiagnostic pottery has also been found further up the Fenn Creek to the north of the site (13668, TQ8034 9607), and a flint tool has been found on the south bank of the Crouch to the north (13713, TQ8006 9551).

4.4.5 Evidence dating to the Bronze Age from the Rochford area has included a spread of early period flint artefacts and cremation burials; middle Bronze Age activity at North Shoebury, Barling and Great Wakering continued into the Late Bronze Age and early Iron Age, increasing in intensity across the region into the Iron Age (Rochford DC 2006: 18-21).
4.4.6 A Bronze spearhead was derived from the north bank of the River Crouch, the Essex HER provides the same grid reference as for the 1911 finds (13474, TQ810 957). Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age pottery has also been derived from the north bank of the Crouch (13475, TQ8096 9560). An area of fired wood and clay, a ditch and flint tempered pottery were identified to the north of the site on the east side of the confluence with the Fenn Creek and the River Crouch (13714, TQ8057 9555).

4.4.7 The site of a cropmark ringditch has been identified on the north side of the River Crouch (17126, TQ7973 9600).

4.4.8 As with the early prehistoric periods, the underlying clay geology and the distance from the nearest watercourse are not typically conducive to intensive later prehistoric activity. However, the identification of the two undated banked enclosures within the site (see paragraph 4.2.4 above) may be an indication of later prehistoric activity within the site.

4.5 **Roman**

4.5.1 Finds within the Rochford district indicate an agricultural economy concentrating upon cereal production with coastal marsh areas exploited for sheep grazing and salt making (Rochford DC 2006: 22).

4.5.2 Finds of Roman date within the 1.5 kilometre study area search radius include a stone coffin, identified as Roman, found northwest of Little Hayes to the northwest of the site (7513, TQ7931 9600). Other artefacts include a two handled flagon of possible 3rd-4th century date, thought to be North African in origin, found at Trindehays Brickfield, Rawreth, Southend, to the southwest of the site (13363, TQ8012 9325; 7519, TQ799 934). Roman pottery has been identified between Goldsmith Drive and McClamont Drive to the south of the site (13535, TQ802 934). A fragment of Romano-British pot was identified to the northwest of the site (13571, TQ802 954), and a large sherd of Roman pot was found next to the Fenn Creek, north of the site (13669, TQ8034 9607).

4.5.3 The evidence from the study area does not suggest intensive activity during the Roman period, save for the identification of the two undated banked enclosures within the site (see paragraph 4.2.4 above) which may suggest Roman activity within the site.
4.6 **Anglo Saxon & Medieval**

4.6.1 Evidence of early Saxon activity (AD410-700) has been more plentiful than for the later Saxon period (AD700-1066) within the Rochford area, and has comprised occupation evidence at Great Wakering, Barling, Rayleigh and Prittlewell/Southend (Rochford DC 2006: 23-26).

4.6.2 Within the 1.5km study area search radius, a brushwood trackway or platform, radiocarbon dated to 567-664 AD, was identified within peat deposits along the northern riverbank of the Crouch to the north of the site (13696, TQ799 9564). East of Walfords Farm, to the southeast of the study site, metal detecting has identified a number of artefacts including a sceat (coin), a brooch and a stud or mount (13714, TQ810 935).

4.6.3 During the Medieval period the area was characterised by an agricultural economy with dispersed settlement comprising churches, halls, nucleated settlement and moated sites (Rochford DC 2006: 26-30).

4.6.4 The site of Medieval saltworking has been identified on the north side of the River Crouch near Hawbush Creek, some distance to the northeast of the study site. This area is now a designated Scheduled Ancient Monument (13497, TQ824 963; 13498, TQ824 962; 48431, TQ8235 9626; [http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/](http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/)).

4.6.5 Late Medieval pottery, a layer of compressed ash, animal bones and a metal knife has been identified at Kingsman Farm to the northeast of the site (13498, TQ820 956; 13544, TQ822 956).

4.6.6 A Medieval moated site has been identified at Shepherds Farm to the southeast of the study site (13604, TQ818 940), and at Tryndehayes (7520, TQ799 934) and Rawreth Hall (7524, TQ792 930) to the southwest. Conjectural evidence exists for a Medieval moat at Little Malyons within the central part of the site, although the HER entry suggests this is doubtful, and the site visit undertaken in September 2014 did not identify this feature (13861, TQ8090 9470).

4.6.7 The archaeological potential for the bulk of the study site for the Anglo Saxon and Medieval periods can be identified as likely to comprise evidence of agricultural activity and land division, save for the identification of the two undated banked enclosures within the site (see paragraph 4.2.4 above). The presence of a moat beneath Little Malyons to the east appears uncertain on the basis of existing information.
4.7 Post Medieval and Modern (including map regression exercise)

4.7.1 The Chapman & Andre Map of Essex (Fig 3: 1777) shows the site to lie in open land c.500m south of the historic core of Hullbridge which led from the south bank of the River Crouch. The site lies to the west of High Elms Farm.

4.7.2 Figure 4 reproduces a survey of Hockley Elm Farm, dated 1780, which comprises the study site. The farm buildings lie towards the centre with the named fields to the north and south. The field system boundaries remain largely intact from this map onwards.

4.7.3 The Hockley Tithe Map (Fig 5: 1840) together with the associated Award shows the bulk of the site under arable cultivation, save for two pasture fields to the east. The farm buildings in the centre of the site are now named ‘Marrions’. No change is shown to the field boundaries within the site on this map.

4.7.4 The First Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig 6: 1873) shows the site largely as on the Tithe Map, with identical field boundaries. The farm name has now changed to ‘Marions’. A field boundary formerly running north from the farm buildings through the northwestern part of the site as shown on previous maps has been removed. No changes are shown on the 1921 Ordnance Survey (Fig 7), save that the name has now changed to ‘Malyons’.

4.7.5 The depressed agricultural economy of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century saw large scale abandonment of farmland in Essex, particularly on the heavy clay soils present in the Hullbridge area. Following the arrival of the railways, the land was divided up and sold principally to people from the East End of London. These areas became known as the Plotlands, which reached a peak of popularity between the World Wars (Rochford DC 2006: 32).

4.7.6 The 1937 Ordnance Survey (Fig 8) shows residential development to the east and north of the site which itself has no changes shown.

4.7.7 The site of a World War Two floodlight position is known within the northern site boundary, towards the centre, immediately south of Windermere Avenue. The feature comprised a grid of fixed searchlights housed in a 50 foot (c.15m) diameter steel grid with reflecting mirrors and a separate generator. There were c.50 of these installations built across Essex, and another is known at North Fambridge some distance to the northeast of the site. The installations were discontinued once it became apparent that
the light reflected off cloud cover providing a navigational aid for enemy aircraft. Its position was recorded on aerial photographs of 1946 and 1960, and in c.2002 the concrete base of the floodlight and the generator was still extant: the presence of the former was confirmed during the site visit undertaken in September 2014 (20661, TQ8056 9496; Nash 2002 p61-2; see Plates 1-2).

4.7.8 No changes are shown on the 1953 Ordnance Survey (Fig 9); the 1961-1974 Ordnance Survey (Fig 10) shows the addition of farm buildings within the centre of the site and the presence of ‘Little Malyons’ to the east of the main farm complex. No substantial changes appear on the 1982-89 Ordnance Survey (Fig 11); the 2013 aerial photograph (Fig 12) shows further alterations within the central farm complex.

4.7.9 The archaeological and historical potential of the study site is concentrated in the buildings of Malyons Farm within the centre, which through map evidence appear to have been present by the late eighteenth century. Additionally, the field boundaries remain intact with one change from the late eighteenth century onwards. Surviving remains of the World War Two floodlight emplacement within the northern part of the site can also be deemed to be of archaeological interest.

4.8 Negative/Neutral Evidence

4.8.1 Archaeological evaluation at The Yard, Trenders Avenue Rayleigh to the south of the site revealed no archaeological remains (EEX55893, TQ800 932; 47351, TQ8003 9321). An adjacent evaluation at the Crouch Valley Fish Farm, McCalmont Drive Rayleigh did not reveal any archaeological remains either (EEX56282, TQ8010 9320; 47351, TQ8040 9326).

4.9 Assessment of Significance

4.9.1 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.

4.9.2 No designated heritage assets as defined in the NPPF are recorded on or in close proximity to the study site.
4.9.3 While it is possible that while previously unknown archaeological remains may be present within the study site boundary, the balance of probability is that these are likely to be of local significance.
5.0 **HISTORIC HEDGEROW ASSESSMENT**

5.1 **Hedgerow Regulations**

5.1.1 The Hedgerow Regulations dated 1997, created under Section 97 of the 1995 Environment Act, provide a system which protects important hedgerows in the countryside by controlling their removal through a system of notifications.

5.1.2 The Regulations set out a number of criteria that must be used in determining which hedgerows are important. These relate to the value of a hedgerow from an archaeological, historical, landscape and wildlife perspective.

5.1.3 This section of the desk based assessment therefore examines relevant historical and archaeological evidence in order to establish which hedgerows within the study site, if any, can be deemed to be of importance.

5.2 **Relevant Legislative Framework**

5.2.1 The Regulations set out in criteria that must be used in determining which hedgerows are important. Regulation 8(4) indicates that a hedgerow is important if:
1. it has been in existence for 30 years or more, and
2. it satisfies at least one of the criteria set out in Part II of Schedule 1 to the Regulations.

5.2.2 Hedgerows of archaeological and historic importance are identified by the criteria in Paragraphs 1 to 5 of Part II of Schedule 1 of the Regulations.

5.2.3 Schedule 1, Part II, Criterion 1 states that:

**Schedule 1: additional criteria for Determining 'Important' Hedgerows**

**Part II Criteria**

**Archaeology and History**

Paragraph 1. The hedgerow marks the boundary, or part of the boundary, of at least one historic parish or township; and for this purpose “historic” means existing before 1850.

Paragraph 2. The hedgerow incorporates an archaeological feature which is:
(a) Included in the schedule of monuments compiled by the Secretary of State under Section 1 (schedule of monuments) of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979; or
(b) Recorded at the relevant date in a Sites and Monuments Record.

Paragraph 3. The hedgerow:

(a) is situated wholly or partly within an archaeological site included or recorded as mentioned in paragraph 2 or on land adjacent to and associated with such a site; and
(b) is associated with any monument or feature on that site.

Paragraph 4. The hedgerow:

(a) marks the boundary of a pre-1600 AD estate or manor recorded at the relevant date in a Sites and Monuments Record or in a document held at that date at a Record Office; or
(b) is visibly related to any building or feature of such an estate or manor.

Paragraph 5. The hedgerow:

(a) is recorded in a document held at the relevant date at a Record Office as an integral part of a field system pre-dating the Inclosure Acts; or
(b) is part of, or visibly related to, any building or other feature associated with such a system, and that system:
   (i) is substantially complete; or
   (ii) is of a pattern which is recorded in a document prepared before the relevant date by a local planning authority, within the meaning of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act, for the purposes of development control within the authority's area, as a key landscape characteristic.

5.2.4 Several of the criteria refer to records made before ‘the relevant date’, that is before the Regulations were made 24 March 1997.

5.2.5 Further detail and guidance relation to the identification and documentation of archaeologically and historically important hedgerows is provided by ‘The Hedgerow Regulations 1997: A Guide to the Law and Good Practice’ (DoE).
5.3 **The Archaeological and Historical Evidence**

5.3.1 This section examines in turn the five criteria relating to the identification of archaeologically and historically important hedgerows in relation to the boundaries at the study site.

1. *The hedgerow marks the boundary, or part of the boundary, of at least one historic parish or township; and for this purpose “historic” means existing before 1850*

5.3.2 The study site occupies land within the historic parish of Hockley in Essex. None of the hedgerows at the study site mark the boundary of a historic parish or township (see Figure 5: 1840 Hockley Tithe Map).

2. *The hedgerow incorporates an archaeological feature which is:*
   (a) *Included in the schedule of monuments compiled by the Secretary of State under section 1 (schedule of monuments) of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979; or*
   (b) *Recorded at the relevant Sites and Monuments Record*

5.3.3 None of the hedgerows at the study site incorporate an archaeological feature which is included either in the schedule of monuments or recorded on the Essex Historic Environment Record (EHER). Of the two undated enclosures identified within the study site (see paragraph 4.2.7 above) neither were noted during the site visit made in September 2014. Accordingly, it is considered that no hedgerows meet criteria 2a or 2b.

3. *The hedgerow:*
   (a) *Is situated wholly or partly within an archaeological site included or recorded as mentioned in paragraph 2 or on any land adjacent to and associated with such a site; and*
   (b) *Is associated with any monument or feature on that site.*

5.3.4 None of the hedgerows on the study site are situated wholly or partly within a known archaeological site or Scheduled Monument. Accordingly, no hedgerows at the site meet criteria 3a or 3b.

4. *The hedgerow:
(a) Marks the boundary of a pre-1600AD estate or manor recorded at the relevant date in a Sites and Monuments Record or in a document held at that date at a Record Office; or
(b) Is visibly related to any building or feature of such an estate or manor.

5.3.5 There is no evidence to suggest that any of the hedgerows within the site lie on a pre-1600 AD estate or manor boundary. Accordingly, no hedgerows are considered to meet criteria 4a. None of the hedgerows within the study site area are visibly related to any building or feature associated with a pre-1600 estate or manor, and therefore no hedgerows meet criteria 4b.

5. The hedgerow:
(a) Is recorded in a document held at the relevant date at a Records Office as an integral part of a field system pre-dating the Inclosure Acts; or
(b) Is part of, or visibly related to, any building or other feature associated with such a system, and that system:
   (i) Is substantially complete; or
   (ii) Is of a pattern which is recorded in a document prepared before the relevant date by a local planning authority, within the meaning of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act, for the purposes of development control within the authority’s area, as a key landscape characteristic.

5.3.5 The 1780 map of Hockley Farm (reproduced at Figure 4) shows the presence of a field system which was modified slightly by the time of the 1840 Hockley Tithe Map (Fig 5), and again at the time of the 1873 First Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig 6), with no apparent subsequent changes. The location of extant hedgerows within the site is shown on Figure 2, concentrated around the northwestern boundary of the site, with further hedgerows to the west and east of the Malyons Farm buildings (Plates 1-7).

5.3.6 The surviving boundaries therefore appear to meet criteria 5a. The buildings of Malyons Farm lie at the centre of the study site within the existing field system, visibly related to field boundaries immediately around the farm, and so parts 5(b) and (b)i are relevant here too.

5.3.7 There is no evidence that the existing field system was recorded in a document prepared for the purposes of development control, and so the site does not meet 5(b)ii.
5.4  **Summary**

5.4.1 In summary, historic field boundaries identified as present through cartographic survey by 1780 remain largely extant across the study site. Hedgerows remain along the field boundaries as shown on Figure 2. A review of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 indicates that the field boundaries fulfil Regulation 8(4)(i) and in addition they fulfil criteria 5(a) and 5(b)(i) of Schedule 1, Part 2.

5.4.2 The historic field boundaries within the site therefore comprise undesignated heritage assets of local significance. It is therefore concluded that the orientation and preservation of historic boundaries should be encouraged within the detail of the development proposals.

5.5  **Historic Landscape Characterisation**

5.5.1 In the Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project (March 2006) the site lies within Historic Environment Character Area (HECA) 11 – Land around Hullbridge. HECA11 is defined as an area of mixed landscape character, including regular and irregular fields, woodland, plotlands and scattered housing, with little archaeological work undertaken to date in the area.

5.5.2 Within HECA11 the site lies within Historic Environment Character Zone (HECZ) 35: Hullbridge, and HECZ36: Area to the West of Hullbridge. Both designations acknowledge the ancient field systems and the scale of twentieth century development of the area. The archaeological potential of the area is concentrated to the north associated with the River Crouch and is acknowledged to be rare elsewhere (Rochford DC 2006: 104-106).

5.5.3 Additionally, the site lies within Rochford Historic Landscape Character Area 2: Upper Crouch Estuary, within which historic settlement has largely been preserved. The site borders Historic Urban Character Area (HUCA 1): Hullbridge, which developed from plotlands development after World War Two. The site also lies within Rochford Archaeological Character Area 1: Land north of Rayleigh, Hockley and Rochford (see paragraph 2.13 above).
6.0 **SITE CONDITIONS AND THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**  
(Likely Impact upon Heritage Assets)

6.1 **Site Conditions**

6.1.1 The study site currently comprises open agricultural fields with the buildings of Malyons Farm towards the centre. The available cartographic evidence indicates that the farm was created during the later eighteenth century (Figure 12 and Plates 1-7).

6.1.2 Impacts associated with the construction and alteration of the farm buildings in the centre of the site can be considered likely to have had a negative archaeological impact through the cutting of foundations and services.

6.1.3 Agricultural and horticultural use of the study site, particularly ploughing, can be considered likely to have had a widespread, moderate negative archaeological impact.

6.2 **The Proposed Development**

6.2.1 Proposals comprise the phased residential development of the study site with associated access roads, play areas, sports pitches, amenity provision, carparking and attenuation (Fig 13).

6.3 **Review of potential development upon Heritage Assets**

6.3.1 As set out in Section 4 above, the available evidence suggests an archaeological potential at the study site. If hitherto unknown remains were to be present, they can be considered likely to be of local significance.

6.3.2 In addition, the bulk of the site has remained largely unaffected by previous development throughout its documented history.

6.3.3 It is therefore anticipated that the local planning authority’s archaeological advisor at Essex County Council will require archaeological mitigation measures in advance of development impacts occurring.

6.3.4 The hedgerow assessment (see Section 5 above) has concluded that the historic field boundaries within the site comprise undesignated heritage assets of local significance. It is recommended that the orientation and preservation of historic boundaries should be encouraged within the detail of the development proposals.
7.0 **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

7.1 Land to the west of Hullbridge, Essex, has been reviewed for its below ground archaeological potential.

7.2 In accordance with central, regional and local government planning policy and guidance, a desk based assessment has been undertaken to clarify the archaeological potential of the study area.

7.3 Evidence from the Essex HER indicates the presence of two undated banked enclosures within the site, together with a possible Medieval moat on the site of the building known as Little Malyons, and the site of a World War Two floodlight emplacement.

7.4 The bulk of the study site has remained undeveloped farmland throughout its documented history.

7.5 Proposals include the phased residential development of the site.

7.6 On the basis of the available information we recommend the following mitigation measures:
   1. Appropriate non-intrusive geophysical survey;
   2. Trial trench evaluation, guided by the results of item 2;
   3. Further intrusive archaeological works guided by the results of item 3.

7.7 In view of the results of the hedgerow assessment (see Section 5 above) it is recommended that the orientation and preservation of historic boundaries should be encouraged within the detail of the development proposals.
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Plate 1: 2013 aerial photograph
Plate 2: 2013 aerial photograph - detail of WW2 floodlight base
Plate 3: 2014 hedgerow along northwestern boundary

Plate 4: 2014 hedgerow along northwestern boundary
Plate 5: 2014 hedgerow north of Malyons farm buildings
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Plate 7: 2014 hedgerows southeast of Malyons farm buildings