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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Land at Rose Farm, north of Norwich Road, Dereham has been assessed to consider the impact of potential development on archaeological heritage assets.

There are no designated archaeological assets on or close to the site.

Based on the HER evidence together with other sources, the site is considered to have a moderate to high archaeological potential for as yet to be discovered archaeological evidence from the early prehistoric periods, a moderate potential for evidence from the Medieval period and a low to moderate potential for all other periods of human activity.

Across the site, current and past ploughing will have had a cumulative widespread below ground damaging impact.

The development of the site has the potential to impact on artefacts of a local significance.

Owing to the potential of the site and the previously undeveloped condition of the site, it is likely the local planning authorities’ archaeological advisors will require further archaeological information from evaluation in advance of any development taking place.

As the development has the potential to impact previously unknown remains of local significance, it is considered that any further mitigation measures could following the granting of planning consent, secured by a suitably worded archaeological planning condition.
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

1.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment has been researched by James Archer and prepared by Sophie Hudson and Matthew Smith of CgMs Consulting on behalf of Taylor Wimpey.

1.2 The assessment considers land at Rose Farm, north of Norwich Road, Dereham, Norfolk. The site, also referred to as the study site, is approximately 3.7ha in extent and is bounded to the north and east by agricultural fields, to the west by woodland on Neatherd Moor and to the south by Rose Farm. The site is centred at National Grid Reference TG 0042 1352 and is currently in use as agricultural fields (Fig 1).

1.3 CgMs Consulting have been commissioned to establish the nature of any below ground heritage assets at the site, both known and unknown, and to provide guidance on ways to accommodate any archaeological constraints identified.

1.4 In accordance with government policy (NPPF), this assessment draws together the available information from the Norfolk Historic Environment Record (HER) as well as historic, topographic and land-use information in order to identify any heritage assets and understand the archaeological potential of the site.

1.5 Additionally, in accordance with the 'Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments' (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014), the assessment includes the results of an examination of published and unpublished material and charts historic land-use through a map regression exercise.

1.6 The 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 any constraints identified.
2.0 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND 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 Government policy in relation to the historic environment is outlined in section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), entitled Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. This 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.

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

2.4 Heritage Assets are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

2.5 Annex 2 also defines Archaeological Interest as a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.
2.6 A **Designated Heritage Asset** comprises a: World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.

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

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

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 Breckland District Council Core Strategy was adopted in December 2009 and contains the following relevant Policy:

**POLICY DC 17**

**HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**

*ANY DEVELOPMENT THAT WILL AFFECT A LISTED BUILDING OR A CONSERVATION AREA WILL BE SUBJECT TO COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT. NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL BE EXPECTED TO PRESERVE AND ENHANCE THE CHARACTER, APPEARANCE AND SETTING OF CONSERVATION AREAS, SCHEDULED MONUMENTS, HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS AND OTHER AREAS OF HISTORIC INTEREST. WHERE A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL AFFECT THE CHARACTER OR SETTING OF A LISTED BUILDING, PARTICULAR REGARD WILL NEED TO BE GIVEN TO THE PROTECTION, PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF ANY FEATURES OF HISTORIC OR ARCHITECTURAL INTEREST.*
THE CONVERSION OF BUILDINGS OF PARTICULAR ARCHITECTURAL OR HISTORIC MERIT FOR ECONOMIC OR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES IN LOCATIONS THAT WOULD OTHERWISE BE UNACCEPTABLE WILL BE CONSIDERED WHERE THIS WOULD ENSURE THE RETENTION OF THE BUILDING. PROPOSALS WILL BE CONSIDERED AGAINST RELEVANT GUIDANCE INCLUDING NATIONAL POLICY ADVICE (CURRENTLY PPS7 & PPG15) AND SPECIALIST PUBLICATIONS SUCH AS ‘ENABLING DEVELOPMENT AND THE CONSERVATION OF SIGNIFICANT PLACES’ PRODUCED BY ENGLISH HERITAGE.

SITES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST AND THEIR SETTINGS WILL BE PROTECTED, ENHANCED AND PRESERVED; DEVELOPMENT WHICH HAS AN UNACCEPTABLE IMPACT UPON A SITE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST WILL NOT BE PERMITTED. WHERE IT IS CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE IN CASES WHERE DEVELOPMENT COINCIDES WITH THE LOCATION OF A KNOWN OR SUSPECTED ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTEREST AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD EVALUATION WILL BE REQUIRED. WHERE THE BENEFITS OF A PARTICULAR DEVELOPMENT ARE CONSIDERED TO OUTWEIGH THE IMPORTANCE OF RETAINING ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS IN SITU SATISFACTORY EXCAVATION AND RECORDING OF REMAINS WILL BE REQUIRED BEFORE DEVELOPMENT IS BEGUN.

REPLACEMENT OF DWELLINGS
IN THE CASE OF TRADITIONAL DWELLINGS (11) WHICH POSITIVELY CONTRIBUTE TO THE CHARACTER OF BRECKLAND, REPLACEMENT WILL ONLY BE ACCEPTABLE WHERE THE APPLICATION IS ACCOMPANIED BY A DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT WHICH INCLUDES A STRUCTURAL SURVEY THAT DEMONSTRATES THAT THE DEMOLITION IS NECESSARY AND THAT THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE AND VIABLE SOLUTION OF RENOVATION TO PROVIDE AN ACCEPTABLE STANDARD OF ACCOMMODATION.

2.12 In accordance with national and local planning policy, this desk-based assessment seeks to clarify the site’s archaeological potential and identify the need or otherwise for mitigation measures.

2.13 In terms of designated archaeological heritage assets, there are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens or Historic Battlefields on the study site or in its immediate vicinity. The site is not situated within an Area of Archaeological and Historical Interest as designated by Breckland Council. This assessment considers any archaeological non-designated assets and the potential for as yet to be discovered assets on the site.
3.0 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

3.1 Geology

3.1.1 The British Geological Survey (BGS website, 2015) records the underlying bedrock geology of the site as Lewes Nodular, Seaford, Newhaven and Culver Chalk Formation. The site is generally overlain with superficial deposits of Lowestoft Formation (Diamicton). Superficial deposits of alluvium (clay, silt, sand and gravel) are recorded in the north-eastern corner of the site.

3.2 Topography

3.2.1 The site lies in a gently undulating landscape that locally slopes gently towards the River Tudd which flows approximately 2.5km to the south of the study site.

3.2.2 The site itself gently slopes down from a high of c.54m AOD at the south-west boundary to a low of c.52m AOD north-east boundary.
4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND INCLUDING ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Timescales used in this report.

**Prehistoric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>450,000 - 12,000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>12,000 - 4,000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>4,000 - 1,800 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>1,800 - 600 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>600 - AD 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>AD 43 - 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Saxon/Early Medieval</td>
<td>AD 410 - 1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1066 - 1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1486 - 1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>AD 1750 - Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Examination of data in the Norfolk Historic Environment Record (HER) was undertaken for a 1km radius of the study site together with available cartographic and aerial photographic sources. It is noted that the majority of archaeological evidence recorded on the HER relates to scattered artefacts found during metal detecting surveys.

4.1.1 This chapter reviews existing archaeological evidence for the site and the archaeological/historical background of the general area, and considers the potential for as yet undiscovered archaeological evidence on the site.

4.1.2 Chapter 5 subsequently considers the site conditions and whether the theoretical potential identified in this chapter is likely to survive.

4.2 Early Prehistoric (Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic)

4.2.1 A metal detecting survey in 2013 on the western part of the study site produced an early Neolithic polished axehead (28321, TG00360 13517). An archaeological evaluation immediately east of the site also revealed a small assemblage of worked flint including a scraper and blade dated to the Late Mesolithic/Early Neolithic period (58091, TG0072 1356).
4.2.2 There are a considerable number of other records on the HER for the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic periods within the wider study area. The majority of these records relate to struck/burned flints, flakes, axeheads, blades, lithic working sites and residual pottery (2875, TF999 138; 2866, TF998 140; 25485, TG0022 1362; 22245, TG0146 1343; 21732, TG01 13; 19306, TG01 12; 32832, TF9979 1298; 2867, TF9978 1410; 2836, TF9982 1411; 11379, TF9986 1411; 10832, TG007 129; 33034, TG01156 13776; 41008, TG008 144; 50275, TG99632 14600).

4.2.3 Based on the amount and type of finds recorded within the study site and across the wider vicinity of the site, it is apparent that the site generally lay within a landscape which from the late Palaeolithic period was being used for hunting and slowly being cleared for settlement and farming. Accordingly, the study site can be considered to have a moderate to high archaeological potential for as yet unidentified early Prehistoric artefactual evidence. Any potential finds would be likely to comprise isolated lithics, similar to other examples from the surrounding landscape.

4.3 Late Prehistoric (Bronze Age and Iron Age)

4.3.1 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.

4.3.2 Bronze Age activity was recorded during an archaeological evaluation within the fields adjacent to the eastern study site boundary. This activity was in the form of an Early Bronze Age pit containing a beaker, scraper tool and two flint flakes (58091, TG0072 1356). On Neatherd Moor, a short distance north-west of the site evidence of a possible Bronze Age hearth and cooking hole containing burnt flint and charcoal were identified (2843, TG0008 1364; 2844, TG0012 1362).

4.3.3 Further evidence of Bronze Age activity within the wider study area include another hearth site (2842, TF9967 1360) flint tools (32832, TF9979 1298; 41008, TG008 144) and a copper alloy hammer (50007, TF99806 14648).

4.3.4 Records from the Iron Age are relatively sparse in the wider study area around the site. Typical finds include coins (25595, TG01166 13834), pottery (19306, TG01576 12887) and flints (41008, TG008 144).

4.3.5 Based on the available evidence, it appears there was continued Prehistoric activity throughout the Bronze Age and Iron Age within the study area. Whilst there is no recorded evidence for the Late Prehistoric currently on the study site, Bronze to Iron Age activity is present in close proximity and within the wider landscape respectively.
Accordingly, the study site can be considered to have a moderate archaeological potential for the Bronze Age, and a low archaeological potential for the Iron Age.

4.4 **Roman to Anglo Saxon**

4.4.1 No evidence of in-situ settlement activity for the Roman period has been found within a 1km radius of the study site, but the number of dispersed finds recorded suggests settlement activity somewhere closeby.

4.4.2 A hoard of over 1000 Roman coins have been recorded c.900m north-east of the site, together with pots, a key, furniture fittings, a copper alloy vessel, a rove, a reaping hook and a steelyard weight (41008, TG008 144). Other dispersed finds across the landscape include Roman pottery (19306, TG01 12; 37541, TG01 13; 50275, TF99 14), coins (24879, TG01 13; 33034, TG01 13; 36635, TF99 14; 44363, no grid ref; 50275, TF99 14; 56132, TF99 14), brooches (25592, TG01 13; 56920, TG00 14), a copper alloy figurine of a duck (42555, TF99 13), a key (50007, TF99 14) and furniture fittings (50275, TF99 14).

4.4.3 A late Saxon lead brooch was found during metal detecting just north of the study site (25593, TG00 13).

4.4.4 Saxon finds in the wider study area comprise pottery (19306, TG01 12; 37541, TG01 13; 50007, TF99 14), a brooch (25593, TG00 13), a sceatta (28969, no grid ref), a silver ingot (28969, no grid ref), strap ends (30949, TG00 12; 44363, no grid ref; 50275, TF99 14), stirrups (44363, no grid ref; 50275, TF99 14; 50428, TG00 14), coins (44363, no grid ref) and a spindle whorl (56920, TG00 14).

4.3.3 It is likely that during the Roman and Anglo Saxon/Early Medieval period the study site was situated in agricultural land. The archaeological potential of the site for these periods is considered to be low to moderate, where any potential finds are likely to be residual scattered artefacts.

4.5 **Medieval**

4.5.1 (East) Dereham was recorded in the Domesday Survey of 1086 AD as comprising a very large settlement of 74 households held by the Abbey of St Etheldreda, Ely. The town had considerable ploughland, meadow and woodland (Domesday Online, 2015).

4.5.2 The study site lay some distance from the core of the Medieval settlement of Dereham within a rural landscape. A single isolated enamelled harness stud is recorded within the study site (28321, TG00 13). Immediately north of the site, a small hoard of
Medieval coins as well as a harness mount, spindle whorl, lead weight, furniture fitting, skillet, rivet, copper alloy vessel, purse, apothecary weight and strap end were found during metal detecting (25593, TG00 13). Further metal detecting a short distance to the east of the site revealed a shield shaped enamelled harness stud and a double looped buckle (25594, TG00 13).

4.5.3 A Medieval deer park from the mid 13th century AD is located c.700m north-east of the site (25469, TG013 147). A flint and brick well has also been discovered in the wider study area (15659, TG0135 1364).

4.5.4 Metal detecting in the wider vicinity has recorded a large number of finds dating to the Medieval period, largely characterised by pottery (19306, TG01 12; 32832, TF9979 1298; 33034, TG01 13; 37541, TG01 13; 40292, TF99 14; 41008, no grid ref; 44363, no grid ref; 50275, TF99 14) copper alloy and lead vessels (21732, TG01 13; 24879, TG01 13; 28322, TG01 13; 37541, TG01 13; 41008, no grid ref; 44363, no grid ref; 50007, TF99 14; 50275, TF99 14), weights (21732, TG01 13; 44363, no grid ref; 50007, TF99 14; 50275, TF99 14; 50428, TG00 14), jettons (21732, TG01 13; 28323, TG01 13; 52700, TG00 14), strap end and fittings (24879, TG01 13; 25595, no grid ref; 37541, TG01 13; 44363, no grid ref; 50373, TG01 13; 56920, TG00 14), coins (56899, TF99 14; 24879, TG01 13; 33034, TG01 13; 40292, TF99 14; 41008, no grid ref; 44363, no grid ref; 50007, TF99 14; 50275, TF99 14; 50428, TG00 14; 52875, TG00 14; 56132, TF9990 1355; 56920, TG00 14), buckles (24879, TG01 13; 44363, no grid ref; 50007, TF99 14), harness mounts and pendants (36635, TF99 14; 44363, no grid ref; 50007, TF99 14; 50275, TF99 14; 50428, TG00 14), lead ampullae (44363, no grid ref; 50275, TF99 14; 52700, TG00 14), swords, a dagger and scabbard (50275, TF99 14; 50373, TG01 13; 52700, TG00 14).

4.5.5 It is likely that during the Medieval period the study site was situated in agricultural land. The archaeological potential of the site for these periods is considered to be moderate, where any potential finds are likely to be residual scattered artefacts consistent with finds in the wider landscape.

4.6 **Post-Medieval and Modern**

4.6.1 During the Post-Medieval and Modern periods, cartographic and documentary sources can provide further information on the land use of the site. The Norfolk Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) shows the site situated within parcels HNF50349 and HNF50350: 20th century enclosure and agriculture.
4.6.2 During the Post-Medieval period, the site comprised agricultural land outside the core of settlement of East Dereham, on the edge of 'Lettice More Common', as shown on the 1797 Faden Map of Norfolk (Fig. 3). Post Medieval finds from the study site include a copper alloy jews harp (28321, TG00 13), a strap fitting, buckle, silver button and lead weight (37542, TG00 13).

4.6.3 The 1826 Bryant Map of Norfolk (Fig. 4) shows the site still situated within open land to the east of the common, now named 'Neatherd Moor'. The Dereham Workhouse is shown a short distance away to the west of the common (15923, TG0016 1338).

4.6.4 The East Dereham Tithe Map of 1838 is the first detailed record of the study site (Fig. 5). The Tithe award records the fields within the study site as of arable cultivation, surrounding the farmhouse and gardens. The north-western corner covers a small section of the common. The site is bounded to the north by a road, to the east by agricultural fields, to the south by the farmhouse and fields, and to the west by the common.

4.6.5 Little had changed on the study site by 1884 (Fig. 6). The north-western corner of the site, previously within the common has become part of the adjoining arable field on site. A slight field boundary change is apparent between the two southern most fields. There are no major changes shown on the 1906 Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 7). A small outbuilding adjacent to the farmhouse is shown on the southern part of the study site.

4.6.6 This outbuilding is not shown on the following 1928 Ordnance Survey Map (Fig. 8). A small track is shown in the north-western corner of the site in the 1958 Ordnance Survey Map (Fig. 9).

4.6.7 By 1985 (Fig. 10), the two southern fields have had the field boundary removed and merged into one larger field. Within this field, close to the farm house of Rose Farm, a few small outbuildings can be seen clustered together. Residential housing can be seen adjoining the southern boundary of the site.

4.6.8 By 1999 (Fig. 11) the field boundary between the eastern field and southern field has been removed to create one large field. There is no subsequent change on the 2006 Google Earth Image (Fig. 12) or to the present day (Fig. 13).

4.6.9 The study site has remained undeveloped throughout its documented history. Therefore, the archaeological potential of the study site for Post-Medieval and Modern evidence is considered to be low to moderate. Any potential finds and features are likely to be evidence of Post-Medieval field boundaries and residual scattered artefacts consistent with finds in the wider landscape.
4.7 Assessment of Significance

4.7.1 There are no Scheduled Monuments or other designated archaeological assets on or close to the site.

4.7.2 The site has a moderate to high archaeological potential for as yet to be discovered archaeological artefacts from the early prehistoric periods, a moderate potential for artefacts from the Medieval period and a low to moderate potential for all other periods of human activity.

4.7.3 It is considered that if present, archaeological remains may comprise scattered artefacts and evidence of Post Medieval field boundaries and agriculture. It is likely that any undiscovered assets would on balance be of no more than local significance.
5.0  SITE CONDITIONS, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSETS

5.1  Site Conditions

5.1.1  The site currently comprises agricultural fields with derelict farming outhouses within the southern part of the site.

5.1.2  Across the site, current and past ploughing will have a cumulative widespread below ground impact.

5.2  The Proposed Development

5.2.1  No development plan is currently available for the study site. A plan of the constraints and opportunities at the site is included with this report (Fig. 14).

5.3  Impacts on the significance of heritage assets

5.3.1  As identified above, there are no designated heritage assets on or close to the site. Therefore, development will not impact on any designated assets.

5.3.2  The development has the potential to impact on archaeological remains considered of local significance.

5.3.3  The combination of the potential of the site with the previously undeveloped condition of the site, it is the recommendation of this assessment that the limited archaeological interest of the site can be mitigated against by an archaeological evaluation, to better ascertain the below ground conditions and the presence or absence of archaeological remains.

5.3.4  Should the local planning authority then require further archaeological works at the site it is recommended that these could following the granting of planning consent, secured by a suitably worded archaeological planning condition.
6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Land at Rose Farm, north of Norwich Road, Dereham has been assessed to consider the impact of potential development on archaeological heritage assets.

6.2 There are no designated archaeological assets on or close to the site.

6.3 Based on the HER evidence together with other sources, the site is considered to have a moderate to high archaeological potential for as yet to be discovered archaeological evidence from the early prehistoric periods, a moderate potential for evidence from the Medieval period and a low to moderate potential for all other periods of human activity.

6.4 Across the site, current and past ploughing will have had a cumulative widespread below ground damaging impact.

6.5 The development of the site has the potential to impact on artefacts of a local significance.

6.6 Owing to the potential of the site and the previously undeveloped condition of the site, it is likely the local planning authorities’ archaeological advisors will require further archaeological information from evaluation in advance of any development taking place.

6.7 As the development has the potential to impact previously unknown remains of local significance, it is considered that any further mitigation measures could following the granting of planning consent, secured by a suitably worded archaeological planning condition.
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Figure 14: Constraints and Opportunities Plan

- Dense line of tree planting, comprising English oak, hawthorn, ash, blackthorn and hazel. Providing suitable habitat for bats and birds.
- Views from the north are generally screened by the existing northern boundary vegetation.
- Field boundary hedgerow bisecting site and providing habitat for nesting birds.
- Arable field providing suitable habitat for ground nesting birds (e.g. skylarks).
- Disused out-buildings with evidence of use by owls and swallows.
- Ponds and surrounding area providing suitable aquatic and terrestrial habitat for great crested newts.
- Existing hedgerow and trees separating proposed and existing development site providing roosting opportunities to bats. Potentially classed as 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.
- Existing public right of way (PROW).
- Existing ditch.
- Existing building.
- Existing pond.
- Open views.
- Filtered views.
- Ecological/green corridor.
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