

Winchester District Local Plan Part 2: Site Assessments

THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MTRA2 Settlement: **WALTHAM CHASE**

Key	
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Arch	Archaeology
Cons	Conservation
CA	Conservation Area
LB	Listed Building
SM	Scheduled Monument

SHLAA site ref.	HE category	Heritage Assets affecting the site					Flag level: Red / Amber / Green Grey - unknown	Draft Statement
		CA	LB	SM	Other Undesignated Heritage Asset	Other Undesignated Heritage Asset - description		
379	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
1753	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
1837	Arch	No	No	No	No		?	Given the size of the site, previously unrecognised archaeological remains could survive <i>in situ</i> across this area. Further assessment will be required.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
1890	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
1891	Arch	No	No	No	No	Site is adjacent to medieval deer park boundary (Park Lug). See 2406 below for further details.	Amber/Red	Any upstanding or sub-surface remains of the deer park pale that survive within the site may form a constraint. A sufficient area around the surviving park pale earthwork should be retained to prevent disturbance during development.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
1892	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
1893	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.

1894	Arch	No	No	No	No		?	Given the size of the site, previously unrecognised archaeological remains could survive <i>in situ</i> across this area. Further assessment will be required.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2012	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2065	Arch	No	No	No	Yes	Site occupied by Forest Potteries and several other buildings on 2nd Ed. OS map (1st Ed. and earlier mapping not available).	Amber	Archaeological remains of this small scale industrial site may survive within the site, which has seen little development subsequently.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2288	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2388	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2405	Arch	No	No	No	No		?	Given the size of the site, previously unrecognised archaeological remains could survive <i>in situ</i> across this area. Further assessment will be required.
	Cons	No	Yes	No	None known	Site lies immediately south of the grade II listed Forest Farm.	Amber/Green	Potential issues around the setting of the listed Forest Farm.
2406	Arch	No	No	No	Yes	The site lies within the medieval deer park of Bishop's Waltham, demarcated by the extant park pale (boundary), the Park Lug, which coincides with part of the boundary of this site. The deer park is recorded in the Domesday Survey as a hunting park, but documentary sources suggest it may have originated as a Saxon land holding. The pale comprises a wide bank and ditch and may originally have had a fence or hedge on top of the bank. This boundary has not been designated as a Scheduled Monument, although other deer park boundaries have been protected as such. Additionally, a large pot containing Roman gold, silver and bronze coins was found in a field opposite Forest Farm in the early part of the 19th century (MWC25). Only antiquarian records exist for this find, so it is unclear whether it might relate to any features of archaeological interest within the site.	Amber/Red	Any upstanding or sub-surface remains of the deer park pale that survive within the site may form a constraint. However, there are unlikely to be internal park features within the site. A sufficient area around the surviving park pale earthwork should be retained to prevent disturbance during development. Given the size of the site, it is also possible that previously unrecognised archaeological remains could survive <i>in situ</i> across this area. Further assessment will be required.
	Cons	No	Yes	No	None known	Part of the site on the west side of Winchester Road lies directly opposite the grade II listed Forest Farm.	Amber/Green	Potential issues around the setting of the listed Forest Farm.

2432	Arch	No	No	No	No		?	Given the size of the site, it is possible that previously unrecognised archaeological remains could survive in situ across this area. Further assessment will be required.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2466	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2491	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2516	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2517	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2518	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2528	Arch	No	No	No	Yes	A curvilinear feature, 57m by 49m, is visible as a cropmark on aerial photographs (MWC7749). The feature may be a banked enclosure of archaeological significance, although a modern agricultural origin is most likely. Further evaluation of this feature would be required to ascertain its date and/or function.	Amber	Further evaluation of the site identified from aerial photographs may be required in order to ascertain its date/function/significance.
	Cons	No	No	No	Yes	The Black Dog PH adjoins the site to the east.	Amber/Green	Issues concerning the potential setting of an undesignated heritage asset (Black Dog PH).
2529	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	No	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2530	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	Yes	Yew Tree Cottage has potential as an undesignated heritage asset. Needs further investigation.	?	Potential impact on an undesignated heritage asset (Yew Tree Cottage).
2562	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2564	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2566	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2567	Arch	No	No	No	No		Green	Low archaeological potential.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.

2568	Arch	No	No	No	No		?	Given the size of the site, previously unrecognised archaeological remains could survive <i>in situ</i> across this area. Further assessment will be required.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.
2573	Arch	No	No	No	No		?	Given the size of the site, previously unrecognised archaeological remains could survive <i>in situ</i> across this area. Further assessment will be required.
	Cons	No	No	No	None known	n/a	Green	No known historic building issues.