

9 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

9.1 Introduction

- 9.1.1 This chapter assesses the likely effects of the implementation of the proposed Recycling Recovery and Renewable Energy (3Rs) Facility at Langhurstwood Road, Horsham, West Sussex on cultural heritage in terms of archaeology, built heritage and the historic landscape. The likely effects are assessed during the construction and operational phases of the proposed development. Details of the proposed development are presented in Chapter 2 and accompanying figures, which set the basis against which this assessment has been conducted.
- 9.1.2 An Environmental Statement (ES) was produced in support of the application for the consented Waste Transfer Facility at the site. This contained a chapter (Chapter 12) on archaeology, which has been reviewed and taken into consideration in connection with the proposed 3Rs Facility.
- 9.1.3 A report on building recording within the site was produced by SLR Consulting in 2015 (SLR, 2015) as required under condition 13 of the Waste Transfer Station permission. This has also been taken into account in this assessment.

Scope of Study

- 9.1.4 This chapter:
- Presents the existing environmental baseline established from desk studies, dedicated surveys and consultation undertaken;
 - Identifies and assesses the relative importance of heritage assets likely to be affected by the proposed 3Rs Facility;
 - Identifies any assumptions and limitations encountered in compiling the environmental information;
 - Presents the likely environmental effects on the historic environment, based on the information gathered and the analysis and assessments undertaken to date; and
 - Identifies any necessary monitoring and/or mitigation measures which could prevent, minimise, reduce or offset the possible environmental effects identified.
- 9.1.5 The effect, if any, of the proposed development on below ground archaeological remains within and immediately surrounding the site has been considered. In addition, consideration has been given to information on scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens and registered battlefields, conservation areas, listed buildings and historic landscapes from a wider area so that the effect, if any, of the proposed development on their setting could be considered.

Study Area

- 9.1.6 The study area for the assessment has been based upon recent experience of similar developments, the site visit and consideration of the landscape assessment, including the zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) that has been defined in Chapter 5. The assessment set out in this chapter, for the purpose of the settings of heritage assets, has focused on the following study area:
- Designated heritage assets of the highest significance (World Heritage Sites, scheduled monuments, Grade I and II* listed buildings, Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens) – a circle of 5 km radius centred on the proposed site. These radii may be subdivided into distances of 1.5 km, 1.5 to 3 km and 3 to 5 km from the site for greater clarity; and

- Other designated heritage assets (e.g. Grade II listed buildings, conservation areas, locally listed buildings) – a circle of 3 km radius centred on the site.

9.1.7 With respect to the settings of heritage assets, only those assets which lie within the ZTV are assessed, using that the guidance prepared by Historic England in their document “Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets” (Historic England 2017) along with “Conservation Principles” (Historic England, 2008).

9.1.8 For buried archaeological remains that are recorded on the Historic Environment Record but not designated, the study area comprised a circle of 1 km radius centred on the site. Whilst there is no potential for direct effects on heritage assets outside the site, it is considered that information from this study area may inform the evaluation of the sensitivity of the site and the archaeological resources within it.

9.2 Legislation and Policy Context

9.2.1 This section summarises relevant legislation and policies that are relevant to archaeology and cultural heritage issues.

Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990)

9.2.2 Listed buildings are protected under the provisions of 54(i) of the Town and Country Planning Act (1971), as amended by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990), which empowers the Secretary of State for the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to maintain a list of built structures of historic or architectural significance.

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979)

9.2.3 Scheduled monuments are protected through the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979), which has been updated by the National Heritage Act (1983). Scheduled monuments are maintained on a list held by the Secretary of State for DCMS. Any alterations or works to a scheduled monument (including archaeological investigation) require scheduled monument consent (SMC).

Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 (as amended)

9.2.4 Historic Battlefields have received recognition under the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 (as amended). Such sites are described on a register maintained by Historic England for DCMS, but such designation does not afford statutory protection.

National Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

9.2.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DCLG, 2012) sets out the governments planning policies for England regarding the protection of heritage assets and indicates how these policies should be applied. The NPPF takes an integrated approach to the historic environment and 'heritage assets', including buildings, landscapes and archaeological remains.

9.2.6 Section 12, entitled Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment provides policy on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. The objectives of Section 12 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.

- 9.2.7 The NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 128 notes that in determining applications, local planning authorities *'should require an applicant to provide a description of the significance of any heritage assets affected and the contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance'*.
- 9.2.8 A heritage asset is defined in the NPPF at page 52 as *'a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).'*
- 9.2.9 Setting is defined in the NPPF at page 56 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.'*
- 9.2.10 Paragraph 131 of the NPPF notes that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- 9.2.11 Paragraph 132 notes that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
- 9.2.12 Paragraph 135 notes that *'the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'*.
- Planning Practice Guidance*
- 9.2.13 The NPPF is supported by the web-based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (DCLG, 2014). With regard to the section that deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment, this was last updated on 10th April 2014. The NPPG provides advice on specific issues such as 'What is 'significance'' (paragraph 008) and 'What is the setting of a heritage asset and how should it be taken into account?' (paragraph 013).
- 9.2.14 On the 25th March 2015 Historic England (formerly English Heritage) withdrew the PPS5 Practice Guide. The document was replaced by three Good Practice Advice in Planning Notes (GPAs), 'GPA1: Local Plan Making' (Historic England, 2015a), 'GPA2: Managing significance in Decision-Taking in the historic Environment' (Historic England, 2015b) and 'GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2017).
- 9.2.15 The GPAs provide supporting guidance relating to good conservation practice. The documents particularly focus on the how good practice can be achieved through the principles included within national policy and guidance. As such, the GPAs provide information on good practice to assist local planning authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties when implementing policy found within the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance relating to the historic environment.

Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (English Heritage, 2008)

- 9.2.16 'Conservation Principles' outlines Historic England's approach to the sustainable management of the historic environment. While primarily intended to ensure consistency in English Heritage's own advice and guidance through the planning process, the document is commended to local authorities to ensure that all decisions about change affecting the historic environment are informed and sustainable.
- 9.2.17 This document remains relevant to the current policy regime in the emphasis placed upon the importance of understanding significance as a means to properly assess the effects of change to heritage assets. The guidance describes a range of heritage values that enable the significance of assets to be established systematically, with the four main 'heritage values' being: evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal. The document emphasises that '*considered change offers the potential to enhance and add value to places...it is the means by which each generation aspires to enrich the historic environment*' (paragraph 25).

Development Plan Policy

- 9.2.18 The development plan for the site comprises the West Sussex Waste Local Plan, developed in partnership with the South Downs National Park Authority, and formally adopted by both authorities in April 2014 and the Horsham District Planning Framework (Horsham District Council, 2015). The site is allocated in the West Sussex Waste Local Plan, shown in Policy Map 4, for waste management development.

West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014)

- 9.2.19 The relevant policy from the West Sussex Waste Local Plan is as follows:

Policy W15, Historic Environment

'Proposals for waste development will be permitted provided that:

(a) known features of historic or archaeological importance are conserved and, where possible, enhanced unless there are no alternative solutions and there are overriding reasons which outweigh the need to safeguard the value of sites or features;

(b) it would not adversely affect currently unknown heritage assets with significant archaeological interest; and

(c) where appropriate, the further investigation and recording of any heritage assets to be lost (in whole or in part) is undertaken and the results made publicly available. '

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

- 9.2.20 The relevant policy from the Horsham District Planning Framework is as follows:

Policy 34: Cultural and Heritage Assets

'The Council recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and as such the Council will sustain and enhance its historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage assets. Applications for such development will be required to:

1. Make reference to the significance of the asset, including drawing from research and documentation such as the West Sussex Historic Environment Record;

2. Reflect the current best practice guidance produced by English Heritage and Conservation Area Character Statements;

3. Reinforce the special character of the district's historic environment through appropriate siting, scale, form and design; including the use of traditional materials and techniques;
4. Make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area, and ensuring that development in conservation areas is consistent with the special character of those areas;
5. Preserve, and ensure clear legibility of, locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric and materials;
6. Secure the viable and sustainable future of heritage assets through continued preservation by uses that are consistent with the significance of the heritage asset;
7. Retain and improves the setting of heritage assets, including views, public rights of way, trees and landscape features, including historic public realm features; and
8. Ensure appropriate archaeological research, investigation, recording and reporting of both above and below-ground archaeology, and retention where required, with any assessment provided as appropriate.'

9.3 Assessment Methodology

- 9.3.1 A draft desk assessment was produced in 2016 and updated in 2018 (Appendix 9.1). The study area was as indicated in paragraph 9.1.6 *et seq*, above. The desk assessment comprised, in the first instance, consultation with the West Sussex Archaeology Advisory Service and their Historic Environment Record (HER). Data on World Heritage Sites, scheduled monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and registered were was obtained from Historic England. Data on conservation areas and locally listed buildings were obtained from the local planning authority and/or the HER as appropriate. A review of relevant documentary and archival material held in libraries and archives was undertaken. An iterative approach was adopted during this process to determine the scope of the above consultations/searches.
- 9.3.2 A site visit was undertaken in June 2016 to establish the presence of above ground archaeology, whether or not previously recorded. The site visit also provided an indication of the suitability of any further survey techniques and an indication of the settings of nearby designated assets. Given that there has been no significant change in the footprint of the proposed 3Rs Facility since that time, no further site visit has been considered necessary.
- 9.3.3 Further details of the baseline methodology are included in Appendix 9.1.

Relevant Guidance

- 9.3.4 The assessment methodology has been informed by guidance contained within the following documents:
- Good Practice Guidance (Historic England 2015a, 2015b and 2017); and
 - Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (English Heritage, 2008)

Consultation

- 9.3.5 In carrying out the archaeology and cultural heritage assessment consultation has included:
- A formal request for a Scoping Opinion;
 - Informal scoping including:

- Initial consultation with the West Sussex Historic Environment Record.
 - Post application advice from heritage consultees; and
 - Consultation on the revised scheme.
- 9.3.6 The issues raised through the consultation outlined above that are relevant to archaeology and cultural heritage are summarised in Table 9.1 below.
- 9.3.7 A full copy of the Scoping Opinion is contained in Appendix 4.2.

Table 9.1: Consultation Responses Relevant to Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Date/Source	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
October 2015/Formal Scoping Opinion for previous application	The County Archaeologist raised the following issue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consideration should be given of the visual impact of the development on heritage assets. The approach set out is considered acceptable. 	The effect, if any, of the development on the settings of heritage assets is considered throughout the chapter and in particular in Section 9.7 Assessment of Construction Effects
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recordings have been made of the existing buildings on the site in response to conditions attached to the 2014 permission. The approved documents should be included in the submission and referred to in this ES chapter in relation to mitigation on existing buildings 	The approved documents are included as Appendix 9.2 and are referred to as appropriate within the text.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● With the erection of new built development on the site, ground excavation is likely to be undertaken so consideration should be given to impacts on buried archaeology including former brickworks structures. The need for proportionate further assessment and mitigation works should be identified in the ES chapter. This may include the need for intrusive archaeological surveys. 	The effect, if any, of the development on the buried heritage assets is considered throughout the chapter and in particular in Section 9.7 Assessment of Construction Effects.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Given the potential height of the stack, the impact on the setting of the Graylands Copse Moated Site' scheduled monument (set within a historic parkscape) should be considered. 	The effect, if any, of the development on the setting of Graylands Copse Moated Site' scheduled monument is considered in Section 9.7 Assessment of Construction Effects and in particular at paragraph 9.7.12 <i>et seq.</i>
Consultee responses to previous application January 2017	The County Archaeologist raised the following issue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Further information is required, in the form of visual evidence (existing and proposed views), to show how the applicant has concluded that the impact of development upon the setting of the nearby Scheduled Ancient Monument would be minor (referring to the medieval moat west of Graylands Copse). Refer NPPF Policies 128, 129, 132, 133; West Sussex Waste Local Plan Policy W15 (b) (Historic Environment); Horsham District Planning Framework, Policy 34(7) (Cultural and Heritage Assets). 	A series of photographs and visualisations has been provided as part of this chapter.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Referring to the cited paragraphs of the NPPF above, in order to be able to grant planning permission, the County Planning Authority must first be satisfied, from the evidence supplied, that the proposals will not cause substantial harm to the significance of the scheduled moat (including 	A detailed assessment of the effect of the proposed development on designated assets, including the scheduled monument, has been included as part of the chapter. This has concluded that harm would be

Date/Source	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
	<p>its setting).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there would be substantial harm, there must also be clear evidence that such harm would be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals. • Therefore, clear visual evidence of the expected impact of the proposals upon the setting of the scheduled moat is essential. This should take the form of existing views towards the application area from the moat itself, with photomontages showing the proposed views, in the same form as the submitted existing views and proposed views, submitted in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. • Without such evidence, the County Planning Authority cannot make a reliable assessment of the visual impact of the proposals upon the setting of the moat, which both the applicant and the County Planning Authority have agreed is a heritage asset of the highest significance. 	<p>very limited. The assessment and conclusion is supported by a series of photographs and visualisations also provided as part of this chapter.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site visit was made on 18th January 2017 by this Council's Senior Archaeologist and Principal Landscape Architect. • The taller trees along the edges of Langhurstwood Road, between the moat and application area, are mostly deciduous. Using existing and proposed levels information, our preliminary assessment is that the upper parts of the buildings would be clearly visible through the bare branches at this time of year, and the tall stack would be prominently visible, well above the above the tree tops. • A thin screen of trees along the western edge of the moat would not prevent a viewer at three of the moat's corners from seeing the new buildings and stack as a marked visual intrusion into the monument's still rural setting. 	<p>The proposed development has been subject to significant redesign to reduce visibility from designated assets.</p>
	<p>The applicant should make the strongest endeavours to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required: photomontages of existing and proposed views of the application area, taken from a minimum of three viewpoints around the moat, just outside its north-west, north-east and south-west corners. • Recommended: photomontage of existing and proposed views of the moat and the application area from the locally high ground at the north-eastern corner of the field immediately to the moat's north (understood to be farmed by the same landowner), adjoining the driveway of Graylands House. • From visual media from these viewpoints, and with existing and proposed views, it is expected that sufficient information should be available to provide the absent but necessary evidence of visual impact upon the scheduled moat. 	<p>The effect of the proposed development on designated assets, including the scheduled monument, is assessed in this chapter. The assessment and conclusion is supported by a series of photographs and visualisations also provided as part of this chapter.</p>
	<p>Historic England raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our comments concern the Graylands Copse Moated Site, which is a scheduled monument very 	<p>The proposed development has been subject to significant redesign to reduce visibility from designated</p>

Date/Source	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
	<p>close to the proposed development site. Many other heritage assets have been assessed in the Cultural Heritage Chapter of the Environmental Impact Assessment but, with respect to these, we will defer to your local conservation advisors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have concerns that the effect of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the Graylands Copse Moat scheduled monument has not been assessed adequately. We also think that the development is likely to cause harm to this scheduled monument by creating a very large and incongruous industrial building within its rural setting. It also seems likely that the proposed development will cause cumulative harm in combination with the proposed "Land North of Horsham" development to the east of the scheduled monument. • We recommend that further assessment is undertaken of the effect of the proposed development on the setting of the Graylands Copse scheduled monument before planning permission is determined and action should be taken to reduce the harmful effects of the development on this heritage asset. 	<p>assets.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the effect of the proposed development on designated assets, including the scheduled monument, has been included as part of the chapter. This has concluded that harm would be very limited. The assessment and conclusion is supported by a series of photographs and visualisations also provided as part of this chapter.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We think that the development is likely to cause harm to the Graylands Copse Moat scheduled monument by creating a very large and incongruous industrial building within its rural setting, which is an important aspect of its heritage significance. It also seems likely that the proposed development will cause cumulative harm in combination with the proposed "Land North of Horsham" development to the east of the Graylands Moat scheduled monument. 	<p>The proposed development has been subject to significant redesign to reduce visibility from designated assets.</p>
<p>W/B 24th July 2017: Meeting between Keith Riley, Cris Foss, Jane Moseley and Tim Dyer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions for the colour palette of the new building were made by West Sussex County Council. 	<p>The design of the revised facility has used the 'Western High Weald Woodland and Heath Sub Palette', set out in the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) <i>Guidance on the selection and use of colour in development</i> (High Weald AONB, 2017) document.</p>
<p>10th January 2018: Meeting between Jane Moseley, Tim Dyer, Keith Riley Cris Foss, Richard Foss, Dan Smyth, Mark Hilton and Corinna Demmar</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roof height of the proposed building has been reduced through working with different suppliers and going sub ground level. • Two options, a curvilinear form and rectilinear form, were presented, both of which are designed to break up the building mass. Both options are the same height, which has been reduced to 35.92 m above ordnance datum, at the highest point of the roof. Dan Smyth noted the input of the whole team in the evolution of the design, including technical advisers and specialists, the architectural team and the landscape team to achieve this outcome. It was acknowledged that both designs were valid approaches. Tim Dyer expressed a preference for the curvilinear option. 	<p>A new ZTV has been generated using the new, reduced height.</p>

Assessment Criteria and Assignment of Significance

- 9.3.8 In order to reach an understanding of the likely effect that a project may have on a heritage asset, it is necessary to understand the significance and importance of that asset. Establishing the importance of a heritage asset is principally a means of identifying the extent to which the asset should be valued, for example, whether an asset is important on a national or local level.
- 9.3.9 Significance can primarily be understood through examination of why a structure, site or area should be considered as a heritage asset. In the NPPF the significance of an asset is defined as *'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.'* (DCLG 2012, Annex 2)
- 9.3.10 These levels of interest broadly tie in with previous guidance from English Heritage expressed in the document Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (English Heritage, 2008). This provides guidance on understanding heritage values and also includes a section (Section 6) advising on how to assess heritage significance.
- 9.3.11 According to the guidance published by English Heritage (2008), heritage values fall into the following four inter-related groups.
- Evidential value – the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.
 - Historical value – this derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. This value tends to be illustrative (providing insights into past communities and their activities) or associative (association with a notable family, person, event or movement).
 - Aesthetic value – this derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
 - Communal value – this derives from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

Assessment of Asset Importance – Archaeological Assets

- 9.3.12 There are no national government guidelines for evaluating the importance of heritage assets. For archaeological assets, the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) has adopted a series of recommended (i.e. non-statutory) criteria for use in the determination of national importance when scheduling ancient monuments. These are expressed in the document Scheduled Monuments (DCMS, 2013). The criteria include period, rarity, documentation, group value, survival/condition, fragility/vulnerability, diversity and potential, and can be used as a basis for the assessment of the importance of historic remains and archaeological sites. However, the document also states that these criteria *'should not be regarded as definitive; but as indicators which contribute to a wider judgement based on the individual circumstances of a case.'*
- 9.3.13 The criteria described above may also be used as a basis for the assessment of the importance of archaeological assets of less than national importance. However, the categories of regional and district/local importance are less clearly established than those for national importance and implicitly relate to local, district and regional priorities, which themselves vary within and between regions. Where available, local, district and regional research agenda, and local or structure plans may assist in this process.
- 9.3.14 It is noted that a high degree of professional judgement is required in the identification of importance for archaeological assets and that approach has been applied to this assessment, guided by acknowledged standards, designations and priorities. It is also important to recognise that buried archaeological remains may not always be well-understood at the time of assessment and can therefore be of uncertain importance.

- 9.3.15 The most recent guidance from any national agency regarding cultural heritage and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is from the Highways Agency and is expressed in Guidance Note 208/07 (August 2007) that now forms part of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2 (HA 208/7) (Highways Agency *et al.*, 2007).
- 9.3.16 The following table is primarily based on HA 208/07 and has been used to inform the assessment.

Table 9.2: Assessing the Importance of Archaeological Assets

Sensitivity	Typical descriptors
Assets of the highest significance	World Heritage Sites. Assets of acknowledged international importance. Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives. Scheduled monuments. Undesignated assets of schedulable quality and importance.
High	Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives.
Medium	Designated or undesignated heritage assets that contribute to regional research objectives.
Low	Undesignated heritage assets of local importance. Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations. Assets of limited value, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives.
Negligible	Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest.
Unknown	The importance of the resource cannot be ascertained.

Assessment of Asset Importance – Historic Buildings

- 9.3.17 For historic buildings, assessment of importance is usually based on the designations used in the Listed Building process. Where historic buildings are not listed or where the listing grade may be in need of updating, professional judgement has been used.
- 9.3.18 The criteria used in establishing the importance of historic buildings within the listed building process include architectural interest, historic interest, close historic association (with nationally important people or events) and group value. Age and rarity are also taken into account. In general (where surviving in original or near-original condition), all buildings of pre-1700 date are listed, most of 1700 to 1840 date are listed, those of 1840 to 1914 date are more selectively listed, and thereafter even more selectively. Specific criteria have been developed for buildings of 20th century date. At a local level, buildings may be valued for their association with local events and people or for their role in the community.
- 9.3.19 HA 208/07 provides a basis for the following table as a guide for establishing the importance of historic buildings. This has been used to inform the current assessment.

Table 9.3: Definition of Terms for Establishing the Importance of Historic Buildings

Sensitivity	Typical descriptors
Assets of the highest significance	Standing buildings inscribed as of universal importance as World Heritage Sites. Other buildings of recognised international importance. Scheduled monuments with standing remains. Grade I and II* listed buildings. Other listed buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association not adequately reflected in the listing grade. Conservation areas containing very important buildings. Undesignated structures of clear national importance.
High	Grade II listed buildings. Historic (unlisted) buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association. Conservation areas containing important buildings.
Medium	Historic townscape or built-up areas with historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures).

Sensitivity	Typical descriptors
Low	'Locally listed' buildings. Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association. Historic townscape or built-up areas of limited historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures).
Negligible	Buildings of no architectural or historic note; buildings of an intrusive character.

Assessment of Asset Importance – Historic Landscapes

- 9.3.20 The sub-topic of Historic Landscape is recognised as having significant overlaps with other topics, such as landscape and townscape and therefore a multi-disciplinary approach to assessment has been adopted. This is to avoid double counting and duplication of effort. Impacts and effects on landscape and townscape character are reported in Chapter 5 of the ES.
- 9.3.21 There are also significant overlaps with the other cultural heritage sub-topics of archaeological remains and historic buildings. The elements that are considered within those two sub-topics can make significant contributions to the historic landscape. This latter sub-topic has therefore concentrated on the overall Historic Landscape Character (HLC) and its value, rather than the individual elements within it.
- 9.3.22 All landscapes have some level of historic significance, as all of the present appearance of the urban and rural parts of England is the result of human or human-influenced activities overlain on the physical parameters of climate, geography and geology.
- 9.3.23 A number of designations can apply to historic landscapes, including World Heritage Sites (inscribed for their historic landscape value), registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields and conservation areas. Some local plans include locally designated historic landscape areas and historic parks and gardens (or similar). Those in Horsham district are within the town.
- 9.3.24 A model has been produced by the Council for British Archaeology (Rippon, 2004), whereby the historic landscape can be divided up into units that are scaled from smallest to largest, as follows:
- Elements – individual features such as earthworks, structures, hedges, woods etc.;
 - Parcels – elements combined to produce, for example farmsteads or fields;
 - Components – larger agglomerations of parcels, such as dispersed settlements or straight-sided field systems;
 - Types – distinctive and repeated combinations of components defining generic historic landscapes such as ancient woodlands or parliamentary enclosure;
 - Zones – characteristic combinations of types, such as Anciently Enclosed Land or Moorland and Rough Grazing;
 - Sub-regions – distinguished on the basis of their unique combination of interrelated components, types and zones; and
 - Regions – areas sharing an overall consistency over large geographical tracts.
- 9.3.25 The model described above can be used as the principal part of the overall assessment usually known as Historic Landscape Characterisation. However, although characterisation has been undertaken for much of England, there is no specific guidance or advice regarding the attribution of importance or significance to identified character types.
- 9.3.26 The following table is based on the guidance provided in HA 208/07 with regard to evaluating the importance of historic landscape character units and has been used to inform the current assessment.

Table 9.4: Definition of Terms for Evaluating Historic Landscape Character Units

Sensitivity	Typical descriptors
Assets of the highest significance	World Heritage Sites inscribed for their historic landscape qualities. Historic landscape of international sensitivity, whether designated or not. Extremely well-preserved historic landscapes with exceptional coherence, time-depth, or other critical factor(s).
High	Designated historic landscapes of outstanding interest. Undesignated landscapes of outstanding interest. Undesignated landscapes of high quality and importance, and of demonstrable national sensitivity. Well-preserved historic landscapes exhibiting exceptional coherence, time-depth, or other critical factor(s).
Medium	Designated special historic landscapes. Undesignated historic landscapes that would justify special historic landscape designation, landscapes of regional sensitivity. Averagely well preserved historic landscapes with reasonable coherence, time-depth, or other critical factor(s).
Low	Robust undesignated historic landscapes. Historic landscapes with specific and substantial importance to local interest groups, but with limited sensitivity. Historic landscapes whose sensitivity is limited by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations.
Negligible	Landscapes with little or no significant historical interest.

Assessment of Impact Magnitude – Archaeological Assets

- 9.3.27 The magnitude of an impact is assessed without regard to the value of the heritage asset. In considering the magnitude of impact, the principle established in section 12 of the NPPF that preservation of the asset is preferred, and that total physical loss of the asset is least preferred, has been taken into account.
- 9.3.28 It is not always possible to assess the physical impact in terms of percentage loss and therefore it can be important in such cases to try to assess the capacity of the heritage asset to retain its character and significance following any impact. Similarly, impacts resulting from changes within the settings of buried archaeological assets may also be more difficult to assess as they do not involve physical loss of the resource and may be reversible.
- 9.3.29 The magnitude of the predicted impact is assessed using the criteria expressed in the table below. These are primarily based on the guidance provided in HA 208/07.

Table 9.5: Definition of Terms for Assessment of Magnitude of Impact on Archaeological Assets

Magnitude	Typical criteria descriptors
High	Change to most or all key archaeological elements, such that the asset is totally altered and much of its significance is lost. Substantial change within the setting leading to considerable loss of significance of the asset.
Medium	Changes to many key archaeological elements, such that the asset is clearly modified and there is some loss of significance. Change within the setting leading to some loss of significance of the asset.
Low	Changes to key archaeological elements, such that the asset is slightly altered and there is a slight loss of significance. Slight change within the setting leading to a slight loss of significance of the asset.
Negligible	Very minor changes to key archaeological elements or within the setting that hardly affect the significance of the asset.
None	No substantive change to key archaeological elements or within the setting.

Assessment of Impact Magnitude – Historic Buildings

- 9.3.30 As for archaeological assets, the magnitude of impact in relation to historic buildings is assessed without regard to the importance of the asset, so the total destruction of an insignificant historic building has the same degree of magnitude of impact as the total loss of a high value historic building. Determination of the magnitude of impact is based on the principle that preservation of the asset and its setting is preferred and that total physical loss of the asset and/or its setting is the least preferred.
- 9.3.31 Changes within the settings of historic buildings may result from vibration, noise and lighting issues as well as visual impacts, and may be reversible. Additional methodology regarding the assessment of effects resulting from changes within settings is provided below.
- 9.3.32 The magnitude of the predicted impact is assessed using the criteria expressed in the table below. These are primarily based on the guidance provided in HA 208/07.

Table 9.6: Definition of Terms for Assessment of Magnitude of Impact on Historic Buildings

Magnitude	Typical criteria descriptors
High	Change to key historic building elements, such that the asset is totally altered and much of its significance is lost. Substantial change within the setting of an historic building leading to considerable loss of significance of the asset.
Medium	Change to many key historic building elements, such that the asset is clearly modified and there is some loss of significance. Change within the setting of an historic building leading to some loss of significance of the asset.
Low	Changes to key historic building elements, such that the asset is slightly altered and there is some loss of significance. Change within the setting of an historic building leading to a slight loss of significance of the asset.
Negligible	Slight changes to historic building elements or within its setting that hardly affect the significance of the asset.
None	No substantive change to fabric or within the setting.

Assessment of Impact Magnitude – Historic Landscapes

- 9.3.33 Historic landscapes cannot be destroyed or damaged but impacts on them can change their character. Impacts are assessed using evaluated HLC units, not the elements/parcels/components that contribute towards the character. There may be impacts resulting from changes within the settings of identified units, especially with regard to designated historic landscapes. Additional methodology regarding the assessment of effects resulting from changes within settings is provided at paragraph 9.3.42 et seq below.
- 9.3.34 The magnitude of the predicted impact is assessed using the criteria expressed in the table below. These are primarily based on the guidance provided in HA 208/07.

Table 9.7: Definition of Terms for Assessment of Magnitude of Impact on Historic Landscapes

Magnitude	Typical criteria descriptors
High	Change to most or all key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; extreme visual effects; gross change of noise or change to sound quality; fundamental changes to use or access; resulting in total change to HLC unit and complete loss of significance.
Medium	Changes to many key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; visual change to many key aspects of the historic landscape; noticeable differences in noise or sound quality; considerable changes to use or access; resulting in moderate changes to HLC and some loss of significance.
Low	Changes to few key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; slight visual changes to few key aspects of historic landscape; limited changes to noise levels or sound quality; slight changes to use or access; resulting in limited changes to HLC and slight loss of significance.
Negligible	Very minor changes to key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; virtually unchanged visual effects; very slight changes in noise levels or sound quality; very slight changes to use or access; resulting in a very small change to HLC and very little loss of significance.

Significance of Effects

- 9.3.35 The significance of an effect is a combination of the importance of the heritage asset and the magnitude of impact on that asset.
- 9.3.36 Effects can be adverse or beneficial. Beneficial effects are those that mitigate existing impacts and help to restore or enhance heritage assets, therefore allowing for greater understanding and appreciation. Based on the approach in HA 208/07, the following matrix has been used for the assessment of archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes.

Table 9.8: Significance of Effect Assessment Matrix

Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact				
	None	Negligible	Low	Medium	High
Negligible	Neutral	Negligible	Negligible or minor	Negligible or minor	Minor
Low	Neutral	Negligible or minor	Negligible or minor	Minor	Minor or moderate
Medium	Neutral	Negligible or minor	Minor	Moderate	Moderate or major
High	Neutral	Minor	Minor or moderate	Moderate or major	Major or substantial
Very high	Neutral	Minor	Moderate or major	Major or substantial	Substantial

- 9.3.37 Effects can be either favourable or adverse; however, to avoid confusion; the default position of any effect recorded in this chapter is understood to be adverse unless stated otherwise.
- 9.3.38 Where the matrix provides a split in the level of effects, e.g. moderate/minor, the assessor has exercised professional judgement in determining which of the levels is more appropriate.
- 9.3.39 For the purposes of this assessment, any effect that is moderate, major or substantial is considered to be significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.3.40 The duration of the effect is indicated where known using the following terminology.
- **Short term:** a period of months, up to one year;
 - **Medium term:** a period of between one and five years; and
 - **Long term:** a period of five years or more.

9.3.41 The significance of any effect on a heritage asset is clearly different from the significance of the asset itself.

Settings

9.3.42 In 2017, Historic England published the second edition of 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice' in 'Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets' (Historic England, 2017). This guidance provides further advice on the definition of setting and the general principles of setting in the context of strategic planning and development control.

9.3.43 Paragraph 2 of the advice document in particular deals with the issue of setting and development control. It advises applicants that the information required in support of applications for planning permission and listed building consents should be no more than is necessary to reach an informed decision, and that activities to conserve or invest need to be proportionate to the significance of the heritage assets affected and the impact on the significance of those heritage assets.

9.3.44 Paragraph 19 of the advice document provides the following broad approach to assessment, undertaken as a series of steps that apply proportionately to complex or more straightforward cases.

- Step 1: identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected.
- Step 2: assess the degree to which these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated.
- Step 3: assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance or the ability to appreciate it.
- Step 4: explore the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm.
- Step 5: make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

9.3.45 To this end the ZTV is a useful tool in assessing in general terms the assets which are likely to be impacted by the proposed development (Historic England, 2017: paragraph 21).

9.3.46 An assessment of visual impacts on the heritage assets and their settings needs to take into account a wide variety of factors. These include the location of the asset within the physical landscape, its relationship with contemporary and non-contemporary features within that landscape and the location, size and character of the project in relation to these factors. The assessment then needs to balance the impact of these various considerations on the basis of informed professional judgment.

9.3.47 Assessment of the visual effects of the project has been undertaken in accordance with the procedures expressed in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (The Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013). The findings of the landscape and visual assessment are presented in Chapter 5 of this ES. These findings have been taken into account in considering the impact on settings in this chapter. Where there is the potential for changes within the setting of heritage assets due to noise or other impacts, these have been considered within this chapter using appropriate procedures.

9.3.48 Paragraph 17 of the Historic England advice document indicates that there should also be consideration of the sensitivity to change of the setting of a heritage asset. In practice this requires examination of the current setting with regard to identifying elements that contribute to the significance of the asset, elements that make a neutral contribution to the significance of the asset and elements that make a negative contribution (i.e. detract from) the significance of the asset.

9.3.49 Once the impact on the heritage asset has been examined, this has been related to the impact scales defined above for each type of heritage asset. The level of impact has been considered against the importance of the heritage asset in the matrix provided in Table 9.8 to reach a conclusion regarding the overall significance of effect. The effects on heritage assets resulting from change within their settings may be adverse or beneficial.

9.4 Limitations of the Assessment

- 9.4.1 A comprehensive desk assessment has been undertaken using all available relevant sources. On this basis there are no major data limitations.

9.5 Baseline Conditions

- 9.5.1 Figure 9.1 shows heritage assets located within 1 km of the site, while Figure 9.2 shows the designated assets within 1.5 km of the site. Figure 9.3 shows designated assets between 1.5 km and 3 km of the site, Figure 9.4 shows designated assets of the highest significance between 3 km and 5 km of the site and Figure 9.5 shows historic landscape characterisation.

- 9.5.2 Recorded archaeological remains in the wider area range in date from the Roman to the post medieval period.

Prehistoric and Roman

- 9.5.3 While there is relatively little evidence for prehistoric activity in the wider area, the Roman period is reasonably well represented.

- 9.5.4 Evidence for Roman activity in the wider area includes tile kilns at Itchingfield (Porteous & Henderson, 2009: 3), while iron working has been recorded at Broadfield, in Crawley, some 9 km east of the site (Pine, 2013).

- 9.5.5 Stane Street Roman road passes some 4 km west of the site at its nearest point. A section of Stane Street, some 275 metres in length located in Roman Woods, some 4.9 km west of the site is a scheduled monument (list entry number 1005837). At Alfoldean, some 5.3 km west of the site, a bridge carried the road over the River Arun. A roadside settlement was established to the south of the bridge. This included a *mansio*, a substantial building providing facilities, including accommodation and stabling, for travellers associated with the provincial postal service of Roman Britain. The *mansio* is a scheduled monument (list entry number 1005838).

- 9.5.6 There are no recorded remains of confirmed prehistoric or Roman date within or in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Medieval

- 9.5.7 There is little material evidence for Anglo Saxon activity in the area and few of the local place names, are recorded in the Domesday Book of 1086 (Williams and Martin, 1992). Horsham is first mentioned in documents in 947 (Baggs *et al.*, 1986a: 131). Horsham was called a borough in 1235 (Baggs *et al.*, 1986a: 131).

- 9.5.8 Baggs *et al.* (1986b: 204) notes that '*medieval settlement in Warnham evidently originated, as in neighbouring parishes, in outlying swine pastures or dennis of manors elsewhere.....A tithing of Warnham was mentioned in 1166, but despite evidence for a 12th century church probably on the site of the present one there is no certainty that a nucleated village existed in the Middle Ages.*'

- 9.5.9 Much of the parish of Warnham was wooded during the medieval period. (Baggs *et al.*, 1986b: 203). The medieval parish church of St Margaret, Warnham, is located some 1.25 km south west of the site. The building is listed at Grade I (list entry number 1026877).

- 9.5.10 Several further medieval buildings and sites are recorded in the wider area. Cox Farmhouse is located in fields on the east side of the A24 road, some 400 metres north west of the site. The farmhouse is a listed building, listed at Grade II (HER number MWS9936, list entry number 1026892). Lower Chickens

Farmhouse, located on the west side of the A24, some 750 metres west of the site, is also listed at Grade II (HER number MWS12214, list entry number 1181419), as is Weston Place, located some 680 metres south west of the site (list entry number 1026885).

- 9.5.11 A medieval moated site is located some 60 metres east of Langhurstwood Road at the access point to the proposal site and some 100 metres north of Graylands Farm. The list entry notes that *'all four arms of the moat are water-filled...No indication of buildings survive on the island although brick foundations were visible until recently on the western side. These are likely to be associated with the re-use of the monument as a landscape feature, adapted as part of the grounds of Graylands, probably in the mid-19th century when the island was planted with exotic species of trees and shrubs. A bridge was also constructed in this period, the brick foundations of which are situated on either side of the northern part of the east arm of the moat.'* The moated site is a scheduled monument (list entry number 1010500, HER number MWS3534).
- 9.5.12 The evidence of later mapping indicates that the site and wider area was probably formed into fields from woodland and used for pasture during the later medieval period. There is no evidence for medieval settlement activity within the site.

Post-medieval and Modern

- 9.5.13 The picture of settlement and activity in the wider area during the early post medieval period was presumably similar to that of the later medieval period.
- 9.5.14 Baggs *et al.* (1986b: 204) notes that *'Warnham village grew up as a roadside settlement on a valley site presumably chosen for access to water'*.
- 9.5.15 There is a number of surviving post medieval buildings in the wider area. Durfold Manor is located west of the A24 road some 870 metres north west of the site. The building is listed at Grade II (list entry number 1181432). Geerings, located some 900 metres north west of the site, is similarly listed at Grade II (list entry number 1354260), as is Little Daux, (list entry number 1026886), Great Daux (list entry number 1181304, HER number MWS10949) and Weston Cottages (list entry number 1354254), the latter three all located along the A24 road, between 700 and 900 metres south west of the site.
- 9.5.16 Warnham Court and its surrounding parkland, located some 1.1 km south west of the site forms a registered park and garden (list entry number 1001413).
- 9.5.17 Early maps of the wider area show it as being largely rural in nature, with enclosed fields. Warnham, approximately a kilometre to the south west of the site, is shown as a linear settlement along the main road leading towards Dorking to the north. The Horsham tithe map of 1844 shows the site and surrounding area in use as arable land.
- 9.5.18 The railway from Horsham to Dorking, which passes immediately west of the proposal site was opened in 1867. (Baggs *et al.*, 1986a: 204). The first edition Ordnance Survey (OS) 6 inch to the mile map of 1874 shows the railway having been constructed and severing the fields immediately west of the site. Fields shown within or adjacent to the site on the tithe map of 30 years previously had been amalgamated by this time.
- 9.5.19 Parkland is shown on the first edition OS 6 inch to the mile map of 1874 at Holbrook Park, some 300 metres east of the site. An ice house has been recorded within the parkland (HER number MWS3957). The house, Holbrook Park, located approximately a kilometre from the nearest part of the proposal site is a mid-19th century two storey building, cement faced with a balustraded parapet and a projecting Italianate tower at north-east corner with wide eaves cornice on console brackets. The building is listed at Grade II (list entry number 1193406).
- 9.5.20 A number of 19th century farmsteads recorded on the HER, including Andrews Farm (HER number MWS9285) and Graylands Farm (HER number MWS10841), are broadly extant. Several others, including

the site of Gun Barn, (HER number MWS11046), the site of Haybarn, Billingshurst, (HER number MWS11203) and the site of an Outfarm, (HER number MWS12823) are now all totally demolished/lost.

- 9.5.21 Graylands, located some 540 metres north east of the site, is a 19th century regular courtyard farmstead with a detached farmhouse attached to the agricultural range. It is apparently extant with no apparent alteration (HER number MWS10840). The second edition OS of 1897 shows parkland around Graylands, extending as far as the eastern side of Langhurstwood Road (HER number MWS61). The parkland is shown as incorporating the moated site described above at paragraph 9.5.11.
- 9.5.22 The OS edition of 1897 indicates that a brick works had been established on the west side of the railway and north of Station Road, to the south of the site by this time. The brickworks were developed during the late 19th century by the Peter's family (HER numbers MWS5146, MWS5335 and MWS10177).
- 9.5.23 The ES produced as part of the application for a waste transfer and materials recycling facility on the site (WSCC/018/14/NH) in 1024 (SLR, 2014 chapter 12: 11-12) notes that:

"clay extraction and brick manufacture commenced within the application site at the turn of the 20th century, appearing between the publication of the 1897 and 1912 OS maps. The operation included clay extraction across the northern half of the site, with a tramway connecting the working clay pit to the processing buildings and kilns in the northwest. A water tank and engine shed were present towards the centre of the site on rough ground, and a site access was gained by the creation of tracks in the south west corner of the site to cross the railway line and also eastward onto Langhurstwood Road. The site was initially developed by the Peters' family, following which it successively merged with the Sussex Brick Co. Ltd, Sussex and Dorking United Brick Companies and the Redland Group.

The brick works complex had expanded to encompass the full extent of the application site, with an extensive clay pit to the north east and buildings complex extending northwards along the line of the adjacent railway. The expansion correlates with the installation of automatic moulding machinery in the early 1960s which would have facilitated a rapid increase in production capacity.

In the latter part of the 20th century the brick works complex continued to expand. Within the application site these changes were primarily associated with alterations to the building stock. In 1974-76 this included the creation of a large open-sided shed in the centre of the site, a complex of smaller buildings to the east and a kiln in the south east corner. By 1980 the south-westernmost kiln had been removed, and by 1991 the kilns had all been removed, to be replaced by the existing large shed covering the western side of the site. The single-storey brick building which is still present to the east had been retained, and a small building in the south west corner also. Brick production at the site ceased in the 1990s. "

- 9.5.24 The site apparently contains the remains of one of the last surviving Hoffman-type kilns still extant in Sussex (HER numbers MWS5146, MWS5335, MWS10177).
- 9.5.25 The 1912 edition of the OS marks three kilns adjacent to the railway line, apparently Hoffman type kilns, with further processing buildings to their east and north. Of these buildings, the southernmost of the kilns lies within the site, the northern two outside it.
- 9.5.26 The site visit has indicated that the site has largely been cleared of buildings associated with the brickworks. The site is largely covered in concrete hardstanding. The waste transfer/materials recycling facility building is partly of recent construction, but incorporates elements of an earlier steel portal type building (built after 1980, according to cartographic evidence) associated with the brickworks. A small brick built gatehouse or similar survives in the south western part of the site, first shown on the OS in 1962 and a single storey brick structure, formerly an office, survives in the centre of the proposal site. This is rectangular in plan, approximately 20 metres in length and dates from between 1962 and 1974 according to the OS.
- 9.5.27 No other archaeological features were observed or finds made during the site visit.

- 9.5.28 There is limited evidence for prehistoric and Roman activity in the area. The site itself seems to have been woodland and then agricultural land from antiquity onwards. There is no recorded evidence for activity, other than use as agricultural land over the site until the development of the brickworks.
- 9.5.29 Most of the structures associated with the brickworks have been cleared. Those remaining within the site are part of the waste transfer station/materials recycling facility building, which incorporates elements of an earlier steel portal type building associated with the brickworks, small brick built gatehouse or similar surviving in the southwestern part of the site and a single storey brick structure surviving in the centre of the site.
- 9.5.30 The historic landscape characterisation indicates that the proposed development area lies within the *Industrial Processing* character type (HWS5104).

Designated Assets

- 9.5.31 The site itself does not contain any designated assets.

Designated Assets within 1.5 km of the Site

- 9.5.32 There is one scheduled monument located within 1.5 km of the site. This is the moated site 200 metres west of Graylands Copse (list entry number 1010500). The designated asset itself lies partly within the ZTV.
- 9.5.33 There is one registered park and garden located within 1 km of the site. This is Warnham Court, registered at Grade II (list entry number 1001413). Most of this designated asset lies between 1 and 2 km from the site. The designated asset lies partly within the ZTV.
- 9.5.34 There are 36 listed buildings within 1.5 km of the site. Of these, 35 are listed at Grade II and one, the Parish Church of St Margaret (list entry number 1026877), is listed at Grade I. Of the Grade II listed buildings, three (list entry numbers 1027065, 1027066 and 1193397) are located within the built development of Horsham and 13 (list entry numbers 1026878, 1026879, 1026880, 1026881, 1026882, 1026895, 1026896, 1181495, 1181501, 1284967, 1285086, 1354222 and 1354232), as well as the Grade I listed Parish Church of St Margaret, are located within the built development of Warnham and outside the ZTV.
- 9.5.35 The Warnham Conservation Area lies within 1.5 km of the site at its nearest point. Most of the designated asset lies outside the stack and building ZTV, with only the field in the north at the junction of Church Street and Threestile Road being largely within it.

Designated Assets between 1.5 and 3 km of the Site

- 9.5.36 There are two scheduled monuments located between 1.5 and 3km of the site. These are The 'Castle' moated site, 500 metres east south east of Hawkesbourne Farm (list entry number 1008050) and Motte and bailey castle north of Chennells Brook Farm (list entry number 1014389). Although both assets are nominally located within both the stack and building ZTV, the former is located in woodland which forms its setting and provides screening and the latter is located within the built development of Horsham, which comprises its setting.
- 9.5.37 There are 57 listed buildings located between 1.5 and 3 km of the site. Of these, two are listed at Grade II* and the remainder at Grade II. Of the latter 14 (list entry numbers 1026883, 1026887, 1026888, 1026889, 1026918, 1181334, 1181352, 1181357, 1181361, 1181374, 1354223, 1354253, 1354256 and 1354257) are located within or immediately adjacent to the built development of Warnham and lie outside the ZTV.
- 9.5.38 A further 18 listed buildings (list entry numbers 1026890, 1026891, 1026941, 1026942, 1026943, 1026945, 1027072, 1181160, 1181262, 1181378, 1181536, 1193597, 1354187, 1354234, 1354258, 1354258, 1026955 and 1027071) lie outside the ZTV.

- 9.5.39 In addition, a total of 17 listed buildings (list entry numbers 1027485, 1027486, 1027490, 1027496, 1027512, 1027523, 1027549, 1192066, 1192076, 1286755, 1286787, 1353931, 1353937, 1353940, 1353959, 1354150 and 1354275) are located within the built development of Horsham.
- 9.5.40 There are eight listed buildings located between 1.5 and 3 km of the proposed development area and within or immediately adjacent to the registered park and garden at Warnham Court. Of these, one (list entry number 1354221) is listed at Grade II* and the remainder (list entry numbers 1026894, 1026914, 1026915, 1181160, 1181178, 1285140, and 1354231) at Grade II.

Designated Assets between 3 and 5 km of the Site

- 9.5.41 There are three scheduled monuments located between 3 and 5 km of the site. Stane Street Roman Road (list entry number 1005837) is located some 5 km west of the site.
- 9.5.42 In addition, there are two medieval sites located between 3 and 5 km of the site. These are the medieval moated site, north of Oakdale Farm (list entry number 1012782) and moated site and fishponds 15m south of Chesworth House (list entry number 1021446). The former scheduled monument lies partly within the stack ZTV, but is tree covered.
- 9.5.43 The latter scheduled monument is located to the south of Horsham, lies partly within the ZTV and is largely surrounded by trees. The adjacent Chesworth House comprises the remaining part of a mansion which then became a farmhouse. The north east range dates from the late 15th century, while the south east range was probably built between 1514 and 1524. The building is listed at Grade II* (list entry number 1027063).
- 9.5.44 There are 13 Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings located between 3 and 5 km of the site. Of these, three are listed at Grade I and the remainder at Grade II*. Of the above listed buildings, seven, list entry number 1353908, listed at Grade I and list entry numbers 1027542, 1027571, 1192026, 1286838, 1286966 and 1353938, listed at Grade II* are located within the built development of Horsham.
- 9.5.45 Of the remaining six listed buildings, list entry number 1026916, listed at Grade I lies outside the ZTV. List entry number 1027063, listed at Grade II* is Chesworth House, is associated with the adjacent moated site (a scheduled monument, list entry number 1021446, see paragraph 9.5.41, above).
- 9.5.46 Bonnetts, located some 3.35 km just west of north of the site is listed at Grade II* (list entry number 1378124). Taylors, located some 4.4 km just east of north of the site is listed at Grade II* (list entry number 1378127). The parish church of St Mary Magdalene is located some 4.45 km north east of the site and is listed at Grade I (list entry number 1026946). Leonards, located some 4.3 km south east of the site is listed at Grade II* (list entry number 13254200).

9.6 Incorporated Enhancement and Mitigation

- 9.6.1 Chapter 2 of this ES details the mitigation measures proposed as part of the 3Rs Facility design. In relation to archaeology and cultural heritage these include:
- The location (on previously developed land), nature and design (i.e. an industrial development of appropriate scale and massing) of the proposed development seeks to minimise or remove effects on the settings of designated assets; and
 - The remaining boundary alignments around the proposed development site would be preserved *in situ* and the landscape pattern would remain unchanged.

9.7 Assessment of Construction Effects

On Site Assets

- 9.7.1 The site apparently contains the remains of one of the last surviving Hoffman-type kilns still extant in Sussex (HER numbers MWS5146, MWS5335, MWS10177).
- 9.7.2 Although no above ground remains are visible, there may be below ground remains of the southernmost of three Hoffman kilns formerly standing in the brickworks, the northern two being located outside the boundary of the site. Although there are several examples of Hoffman kilns which have received statutory protection, these are, apparently without exception, standing structures.
- 9.7.3 The heritage values of the heritage asset are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The value derives primarily from the buried remains of the kiln. Given that the kiln has been demolished, remains are likely to represent foundations and buried deposits and the evidential value is now low. The historical value is largely illustrative, although there are associations with documented organisations and individuals;
 - Aesthetic – Given that the kiln has been demolished and that any remains are buried, any aesthetic value is now very low; and
 - Communal – The value of the kiln derives from its symbolic and economic value as part of the local community. Given that the kiln has been demolished and that any remains are buried, any communal value is now very low.
- 9.7.4 The kiln and many of the structures of the brickworks have been demolished and setting makes a contribution to the significance of the kiln mainly in the deterministic sense that the kiln is located at a convenient point in relation to the clay resource. The significance of the kiln is compromised by both poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations, and is now of limited value, but with the potential to contribute to local research objectives. The kiln is of low significance.
- 9.7.5 The development would result in major changes and the asset would be largely or totally removed, with much of its significance lost and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being high. The effect of the proposed development on the kiln is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.6 The other remaining buildings within the site are part of the waste transfer/materials recycling facility building, which incorporates elements of an earlier steel portal type building associated with the brickworks, a small brick built gatehouse or similar surviving in the southwestern part of the site and a single storey brick structure surviving in the centre of the site. Cartographic and architectural evidence indicates that all these structures are of post-war origin, with none dating to before 1962.
- 9.7.7 The heritage values of these heritage assets are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The value derives primarily from the standing remains of the buildings. The largest of these, the steel portal type building has been extensively rebuilt and contains no internal features of archaeological interest. The others are of at most minor significance in the brick making process and the evidential value is now low. The historical value is largely illustrative, although there are associations with documented organisations and individuals;
 - Aesthetic – The value derives from the architectural expression of structures of the post war brick making industry; and
 - Communal – The value of the buildings derives from their symbolic and economic value as part of the local community.

- 9.7.8 Many of the structures of the brickworks have been demolished and setting makes a contribution to the significance of these surviving assets mainly in the deterministic sense that they are located at a convenient point in relation to the clay resource. The significance of the buildings is compromised by both poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations, and there is now very little or no surviving archaeological interest. The remaining buildings within the site are of negligible significance.
- 9.7.9 The development would result in major changes and the assets would be largely or totally removed, with much of their significance lost and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being high. The effect of the proposed development on these buildings is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.10 The historic landscape characterisation indicates that the proposed development lies within the *Industrial Processing* character type, (HWS5104). The character type is of low significance and would have a high ability to withstand change. The proposed development would be constructed within existing boundaries and the landscape pattern would remain unchanged. The impact of the proposed development on the historic landscape is assessed as being low. The effect of the proposed development on the asset is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.

On Site Designated Assets

- 9.7.11 The proposal site does not contain any designated assets.

Designated Assets within 1.5 km of the Site

- 9.7.12 There is one scheduled monument located within 1.5 km of the site. This is moated site 200 metres west of Graylands Copse (list entry number 1010500). The designated asset itself lies partly within the ZTV, mostly that of the stack. The list entry notes that *'all four arms of the moat are water-filled...No indication of buildings survive on the island although brick foundations were visible until recently on the western side. These are likely to be associated with the re-use of the monument as a landscape feature, adapted as part of the grounds of Graylands, probably in the mid-19th century when the island was planted with exotic species of trees and shrubs. A bridge was also constructed in this period, the brick foundations of which are situated on either side of the northern part of the east arm of the moat.'* The moated site is a scheduled monument (list entry number 1010500, HER number MWS3534).
- 9.7.13 The heritage values of the scheduled monument are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The value derives from the fabric and upstanding remains of the scheduled monument itself and from the likelihood of the survival of buried remains relating to the monument. The historical value is largely illustrative;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the earthwork remains of the scheduled monument; and
 - Communal - This value derives from its symbolic value as part of the local community.
- 9.7.14 There would be no physical impact on the scheduled monument. Any impact would be on its setting. On the basis of consultation during the previous application, a number of visualisations and viewpoint photographs have been provided, to further illustrate the visual impact of the proposal development on the scheduled monument. These are considered below
- Viewpoint Location 1 North West Corner of Moated Site 200 Metres West of Graylands Copse*
- 9.7.15 This view looks west from the north west corner of the scheduled monument. No part of the Graylands Copse Moated Site is visible, it being behind the photographer. The view is of the field gate to Langhurstwood Road and the trees forming the sinuous woodland between the field and the road.
- 9.7.16 Neither the proposed 3Rs building nor the associated stack would be visible from this viewpoint in summer. Winter views would be filtered by trees and the proposed view indicates that it would be very difficult to see

the proposed 3Rs even at this time of year. The design of the structure, in particular the curved roof and muted colours would further reduce the visibility of the building.

Viewpoint Location 2: North East Corner of Moated Site 200 Metres West of Graylands Copse

- 9.7.17 This view looks slightly north west from the north east corner of the scheduled monument. The northern boundary of the moated site 200 metres west of Graylands Copse is visible as a group of trees in the far left of the photograph. Numerous further trees, both singles and in hedgerows are visible. The scheduled monument forms part of this larger group, making it difficult to discern.
- 9.7.18 The stack associated with the proposed 3Rs Facility would be visible as a skyline feature. It would not compete with the scheduled monument, which is represented by a mature hedgerow and is not prominent in the view. The proposed 3Rs building would not be visible from this viewpoint in summer.
- 9.7.19 It would not be possible to fully mitigate for the effects of the stack in views, although existing mature trees obscure the building in summer and assist in filtering the view in winter.

Viewpoint Location 3: South East Corner of Moated Site 200 Metres West of Graylands Copse

- 9.7.20 This view looks north west from the south west corner of the scheduled monument. The moat of the Graylands Copse Moated Site is visible to the right of the photograph. The view is of the trees forming the sinuous woodland between the field and Langhurstwood Road.
- 9.7.21 Neither the 3Rs building nor the associated stack would be visible from this viewpoint in summer. Winter views, if any, would be filtered by trees. The design of the structure, in particular the curved roof and muted colours would further reduce the visibility of the building.

Viewpoint Location 4: Field South of Graylands

- 9.7.22 This view looks south west from the field to the south of Graylands. The moated site 200 metres west of Graylands Copse is visible as a group of trees below the skyline in the far left of the photograph. Numerous further trees are visible and the scheduled monument forms part of this larger group, making it difficult to discern.
- 9.7.23 The proposed view indicates that the stack associated with the proposed 3Rs facility would be visible as a skyline feature. It would not compete with the scheduled monument, which is not prominent in the view.
- 9.7.24 It would not be possible to fully mitigate for the effects of the stack in views, although existing mature trees assist in filtering the view.
- 9.7.25 The proposed 3Rs building would not be visible from this viewpoint. It is noted that in practice the design of the structure, in particular the curved roof and muted colours would further reduce the visibility of the building from the surrounding area.

Effect on Moated Site

- 9.7.26 There is no public access to the scheduled monument itself, although it is visible from the field gate on Langhurstwood Road from the road some 50 metres north west off the scheduled monument's north westernmost point. The original main function of the scheduled monument as a moated site would have been as a high status domestic dwelling and/or an administrative centre. It is noteworthy that the scheduled monument is located towards the bottom of the slope below the later Graylands, above the stream. This is likely to be to prevent flooding rather than to create views to or from the scheduled monument. Generally, moated sites are not intended to be seen from a distance.
- 9.7.27 The scheduled monument is of highest significance. The setting of the scheduled monument largely comprises the surrounding fields and parkland. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the scheduled monument in that it retains its rural location and forms a parkland feature. It is noted that there

are no designed views to or from the scheduled monument. Within the field containing the scheduled monument as one gets further away to the east the scheduled monument begins to merge with the general landscape (see Viewpoint 1).

- 9.7.28 The impact of the proposed development on the scheduled monument would be entirely visual. Other elements which may affect the settings of heritage assets, such as noise dust etc. are not considered to impact on the setting of the scheduled monument in this instance.
- 9.7.29 In practice, surrounding vegetation would limit or remove views from the designated asset towards the proposed development.
- 9.7.30 Although the proposed 3Rs stack (and in some cases a small part of the building) would be visible in combination with the scheduled monument in the views available, the proposed development would not dominate views. Neither would it draw the eye way from the scheduled monument, which blends into the landscape and which is not visually prominent.
- 9.7.31 There would be no direct impacts on the scheduled monument. Any impacts would be to the setting of the scheduled monument. There would be very minor changes to the setting of scheduled monument. The rural parkland setting of the scheduled monument would be able to be understood in the same way as the baseline position and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible.
- 9.7.32 The scheduled monument is a designated heritage asset of the highest significance. There would be very minor changes to the setting of the scheduled monument and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the SM is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.

Other Assets

- 9.7.33 There is one registered park and garden located within 1 km of the site. This is Warnham Court, registered at Grade II (list entry number 1001413). Most of this designated asset lies between 1 and 2 km from the site.
- 9.7.34 The registered park and garden comprises a mostly 19th century park, laid out from the early 1830s around a country house (Warnham Court, part of which listed at Grade II, list entry number 1181160). There are several other designated assets within and adjacent to the registered park and garden.
- 9.7.35 The heritage values of the registered park and garden are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The value derives from the fabric of the designed landscape. The historical value is partly illustrative, but there are associations with architects and garden designers as well as patrons;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the layout of the designed landscape, largely planned; and
 - Communal - This value derives from its symbolic value as part of the local community.
- 9.7.36 The registered park and garden is of high significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the registered park and garden. The designated asset lies partly within both the stack and building ZTV, with views towards the site from some parts of it, but with screening provided by trees in many areas.
- 9.7.37 The list entry notes that there are views from the western park boundary southwards over the park and to the distant South Downs National Park. The principal building faces south and the park seems to have been designed so that there are formal views to the lake to the south west of the main house. These views are in the opposite direction of the proposed 3Rs site. To the north of the principal building, woodland provides screening to the north of the registered park and garden. Landscape Viewpoint 7 (Figure 5.15) provides an indication of the existing and proposed view from the north eastern part of the registered park and garden.

While the stack would be visible from this viewpoint, it would form a small part of the view when looking in this direction.

- 9.7.38 There would be minor changes to the setting of the registered park and garden and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being low. The effect of the proposed development on the registered landscape is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.39 There are 36 listed buildings within 1.5 km of the site. Of these, 35 are listed at Grade II and one, the Parish Church of St Margaret (list entry number 1026877), is listed at Grade I.
- 9.7.40 Of the Grade II listed buildings, three (list entry numbers 1027065, 1027066 and 1193397) are located within the built development of Horsham, which forms their setting and on this basis are not considered further.
- 9.7.41 A total of 13 Grade II listed buildings (list entry numbers 1026878, 1026879, 1026880, 1026881, 1026882, 1026895, 1026896, 1181495, 1181501, 1284967, 1285086, 1354222 and 1354232) are located within the built development of Warnham, outside the ZTV and are not considered further.
- 9.7.42 The Warnham Conservation Area lies within 1.5 km of the site at its nearest point. Most of the designated asset lies outside the ZTV, with only the field in the north at the junction of Church Street and Threestile Road being largely within it. The Grade I listed Parish Church of St Margaret (list entry number 1026877), is located at the edge of the conservation area. No conservation area appraisal has been undertaken. The conservation area largely comprises the historic core of the settlement.
- 9.7.43 The heritage values of the conservation area are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the buildings, listed and otherwise, structures and streetscape within the conservation area and the potential for below ground remains. The historical value is largely illustrative;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the conservation area in terms of its expression of settlement architecture; and
 - Communal – The value of the conservation area derives from its symbolic value as part of the local community, primarily in Warnham and Horsham.
- 9.7.44 The conservation area is of high significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the conservation area.
- 9.7.45 The setting of the conservation area primarily comprises the surrounding fields. A visualisation (Viewpoint Location 5) has been produced from a viewpoint within the churchyard of the Parish Church of St Margaret (list entry number 1026877). This shows the existing and proposed views looking towards the proposed development.
- 9.7.46 The stack associated with the proposed 3Rs Facility would be visible as a skyline feature. The proposed 3Rs building would not be visible from this viewpoint. It would not be possible to fully mitigate for the effects of the stack in views although existing mature trees assist in filtering the view. Views to or from the proposed 3Rs Facility would be difficult to obtain in relation to most if not all of the conservation area.
- 9.7.47 There would be slight changes to the setting of the conservation area and the listed buildings therein that would hardly affect it and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the conservation area is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.48 A group of listed buildings is clustered to the south west of the site. Weston Place and the timber framed outbuilding to its north (list entry numbers 1026884 and 1026885, Little Daux (list entry number 1026886), Great Daux (list entry number 1181304, HER number MWS10949) and Weston Cottages (list entry number 1354254) are all located along the A264 road, between 65 and 900 metres south west of the site. The

buildings are each listed at Grade II. They represent a group of houses, of the medieval and post medieval period.

9.7.49 The heritage values of the listed buildings are as follows:

- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed buildings and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is largely illustrative;
- Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed buildings in terms of their expression of the local vernacular and more polite forms of architecture; and
- Communal – The value of the listed buildings derives from their symbolic value as part of the local village and farming community.

9.7.50 The listed buildings are of high significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed buildings.

9.7.51 The setting of the listed buildings is primarily each other and the road along which they are located. The A264 road, along which the listed buildings are arranged, runs roughly south east to north west and views towards the proposed development to the north east of the listed buildings would be screened by development and would be difficult to obtain. In any event, the proposed development would form a small part of the view from the listed buildings when looking in its direction.

9.7.52 There would be slight changes to the setting of the listed buildings that would hardly affect them and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed buildings is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.

9.7.53 A small cluster of listed buildings including The Old Manor House (list entry number 1285037), Barn to North east of the Old Manor House (list entry number 1181415) and Cider Mill Farm Cottages (list entry number 1354259) are all located to the west of Knob Hill road, between 1.1 and 1.4 km west of the site. The buildings are each listed at Grade II. They represent a group of houses, of the medieval and post medieval periods.

9.7.54 The heritage values of the listed buildings are as follows:

- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed buildings and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is largely illustrative;
- Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed buildings in terms of their expression of the local vernacular and more polite forms of architecture; and
- Communal – The value of the listed buildings derives from their symbolic value as part of the local village and farming community.

9.7.55 The listed buildings are of high significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed buildings.

9.7.56 The setting of the listed buildings is primarily each other and the road along which they are located. The A264 road, along which the listed buildings are arranged, runs roughly north to south and views towards the proposed development to the north east of the listed buildings would be screened by development and would be difficult to obtain. In any event, the proposed development would form a small part of the view from the listed buildings when looking in its direction.

9.7.57 There would be slight changes to the setting of the listed buildings that would hardly affect them and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed buildings is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.

- 9.7.58 A group of medieval and post medieval buildings are located along the A24 road between 400 and 900 metres to the west and north west of the site. These include Cox's Farmhouse, a 16th century timber framed building located in fields on the east side of the A24 road (HER number MWS9936, list entry number 1026892), Lower Chickens Farmhouse, a 17th century or earlier timber framed (but mostly refaced) building located on the west side of the A24 (HER number MWS12214, list entry number 1181419), Durfold Manor, a 16th century timber framed house which has been altered and enlarged, located west of the A24 road (and some 400 metres north of the location given by Historic England, list entry number 1181432), Geerings, a 16th century restored timber framed building located some 250 metres west of the A24 road (list entry number 1285015) and Geerings Cottages, a 16th century timber framed cottage located on the west side of the A24 road (list entry number 1354260).
- 9.7.59 The buildings are each listed at Grade II. They represent a group of vernacular houses of the end of the medieval and or early post medieval period.
- 9.7.60 The heritage values of the listed buildings are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed buildings and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is largely illustrative;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed buildings primarily in terms of their expression of the local vernacular architecture; and
 - Communal – The value of the listed buildings derives from their symbolic value as part of the local village and farming community.
- 9.7.61 The listed buildings are of high significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed buildings. Cox's Farmhouse and Durfold Manor are located within the ZTV, while Lower Chickens Farmhouse, Geerings and Geerings Cottages are located at the edge of the ZTV.
- 9.7.62 The setting of the listed buildings is primarily each other, the road along which they are located and the fields in which the farmhouses stand. The A264 road, along which the listed buildings are arranged, runs roughly north to south and views from here towards the site to the east of the listed buildings would be partly or entirely screened by development and difficult to obtain. Cox's Farmhouse, Lower Chickens Farmhouse, Durfold Manor, Geerings and Geerings Cottages are largely or entirely screened by vegetation.
- 9.7.63 There would be slight changes to the setting of the listed buildings that would hardly affect them and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed buildings is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.64 Burcombe Cottage (list entry number 1026893) is located some 1.05 km north west of the site. The building is listed at Grade II and comprises a restored 17th century timber-framed cottage with plaster infilling.
- 9.7.65 The heritage values of the listed building are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed building and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is largely illustrative;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed building in terms of its expression of the local vernacular; and
 - Communal – The value of the listed building derives from its symbolic value as part of the local community.
- 9.7.66 The listed building is of high significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed building in the sense of its roadside location.

- 9.7.67 The setting of the listed building is primarily the nearby dwellings and the road along which they are located. The A264 road, along which the listed building lies, runs roughly north to south and views towards the proposal to the north east of the listed buildings would be screened by hedgerows and difficult to obtain.
- 9.7.68 There would be at most slight changes to the setting of the listed building that would hardly affect it and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed building is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.69 Northlands Farmhouse (list entry number 1193425) is located on the west side of Northlands Road, some 1.48 km north east of the site. The building is listed at Grade II and comprises a house, probably of the 17th century, refaced with roughcast, with a tiled roof. There is a 19th century gabled red brick porch.
- 9.7.70 The heritage values of the listed building are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed building and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is largely illustrative;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed building in terms of its expression of the local vernacular; and
 - Communal – The value of the listed building derives from its symbolic value as part of the local community.
- 9.7.71 The listed building is of high significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed building in the sense that the farmhouse retains its rural, agricultural location. The listed building lies at the edge of the ZTV.
- 9.7.72 The setting of the listed building is primarily the yard and gardens in which it is located, the adjacent farm buildings, the road along which they are located and the surrounding fields. The listed building faces east, away from the proposed development. The proposed development would form a small part of the view from the vicinity of the listed building when looking in its direction.
- 9.7.73 There would be slight changes to the setting of the listed building that would hardly affect it and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed building is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.74 A group of listed buildings is clustered around the minor Northlands Road, approximately 1.1 km east of the nearest part of the site including Hollywick Farmhouse (list entry number 1027067), Holbrook Park (list entry number 1193406), The Moated House (list entry number 1286109) and Holbrook House (list entry number 1354147).
- 9.7.75 The buildings are each listed at Grade II. They represent a group of houses, of the post medieval period (although in the case of the Moated House with earlier origins at least in terms of its site), into the mid-19th century.
- 9.7.76 The heritage values of the listed buildings are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed buildings and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is largely illustrative;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed buildings in terms of their expression of the local vernacular and more polite forms of architecture; and
 - Communal – The value of the listed buildings derives from their symbolic value as part of the local village and farming community.

- 9.7.77 The listed buildings are of high significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed buildings. The listed buildings lie at the edge of the ZTV.
- 9.7.78 The setting of the listed buildings is primarily each other and the road along which they are located. Northlands Road, along which the listed buildings are arranged, runs roughly north to south and views towards the proposed 3Rs Facility to the north east of the listed buildings would be screened by hedgerows and planting and would be difficult to obtain.
- 9.7.79 There would be slight changes to the setting of the listed buildings that would hardly affect them and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed buildings is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.

Designated Assets between 1.5 and 3 km of the Site

- 9.7.80 There are two scheduled monuments located between 1.5 and 3 km of the site. These are The 'Castle' moated site, 500 metres east south east of Hawkesbourne Farm (list entry number 1008050) and the Motte and bailey castle north of Chennells Brook Farm (list entry number 1014389). Although both assets are nominally located within both the stack and building ZTV, the former is located in woodland which forms its setting and provides screening and the latter is located within the built development of Horsham, which comprises its setting. On this basis no further assessment is made of either asset.
- 9.7.81 There are 57 listed buildings located between 1.5 and 3 km of the site. Of these, two are listed at Grade II* and the remainder at Grade II. Of the latter 14 (list entry numbers 1026883, 1026887, 1026888, 1026889, 1026918, 1181334, 1181352, 1181357, 1181361, 1181374, 1354223, 1354253, 1354256 and 1354257) are located within or immediately adjacent to the built development of Warnham, lie outside the ZTV and are not considered further.
- 9.7.82 A further 18 listed buildings (list entry numbers 1026890, 1026891, 1026941, 1026942, 1026943, 1026945, 1027072, 1181160, 1181262, 1181378, 1181536, 1193597, 1354187, 1354234, 1354258, 1354258, 1026955 and 1027071) lie outside the ZTV and are not considered further here.
- 9.7.83 In addition, a total of 17 listed buildings (list entry numbers 1027485, 1027486, 1027490, 1027496, 1027512, 1027523, 1027549, 1192066, 1192076, 1286755, 1286787, 1353931, 1353937, 1353940, 1353959, 1354150 and 1354275) are located within the built development of Horsham. The settings of these listed buildings comprise the built development of the town and they are not considered further here.
- 9.7.84 There are eight listed buildings located between 1.5 and 3 km of the site and within or immediately adjacent to the registered park and garden at Warnham Court. Of these, one (list entry number 1354221) is listed at Grade II* and the remainder (list entry numbers 1026894, 1026914, 1026915, 1181160, 1181178, 1285140, and 1354231) at Grade II. These listed buildings are considered with the registered park and garden and are not considered further here.
- 9.7.85 On the basis of the above, no further assessment of the effect of the proposed development on those designated assets located between 1.5 and 3 km of the site is necessary.

Designated Assets between 3 and 5 km of the Site

- 9.7.86 There are three scheduled monuments located between 3 and 5 km of the site. Stane Street Roman Road (list entry number 1005837) is located some 5 km west of the site. Although nominally within the ZTV, the scheduled monument is tree covered and the scheduled monument itself is unlikely to have views to the proposed development. On this basis the effect, if any, of the proposed development on the scheduled monument is not considered further here.
- 9.7.87 In addition, there are two medieval sites located within 3 and 5 km of the site. These are the medieval moated site, north of Oakdale Farm (list entry number 1012782) and moated site and fishponds 15 metres

south of Chesworth House (list entry number 1021446). The former scheduled monument lies partly within the stack ZTV, but is tree covered and the scheduled monument itself is unlikely to have views to the proposed development. On this basis the effect, if any, of the proposed development on the scheduled monument is not considered further here.

- 9.7.88 The latter scheduled monument is located to the south of Horsham, lies partly within the ZTV and is largely surrounded by trees. The scheduled monument itself is unlikely to have views to the proposed development. The adjacent Chesworth House comprises the remaining part of a mansion which then became a farmhouse. The north east range dates from the late 15th century, while the south east range was probably built between 1514 and 1524. The list entry notes that the earlier medieval manor house would have occupied the moated site to the south of the current house. The building was altered at the end of the 1920s and is listed at Grade II* (list entry number 1027063).
- 9.7.89 The heritage values of the listed building are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed building and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is partly illustrative, but there are associations with a number of significant families, including the Dukes of Norfolk and the Earls of Arundel;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed building in terms of its expression of polite architecture from the end of the medieval period onwards; and
 - Communal – The value of the listed building derives from its symbolic value as part of the local community.
- 9.7.90 The listed building is of the highest significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed building in the sense that it retains a semi-rural location in fields on the southern edge of Horsham as well as its spatial association with the adjacent moated site. The listed building lies at the edge of the stack ZTV.
- 9.7.91 The setting of the listed building primarily comprises the gardens and grounds in which it is located, the adjacent moated site and ponds to the south and the farm and other buildings to the north with which it is associated. The surrounding fields form a significant part of the setting of the designated asset. Views towards the site to the north of the listed building would be screened by existing buildings and vegetation and difficult to obtain.
- 9.7.92 There would be at most slight changes to the setting of the listed building that would hardly affect it and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed building is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.93 There are 13 Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings located between 3 and 5 km of the site. Of these, three are listed at grade I and the remainder at Grade II*. Of the above listed buildings seven, list entry number 1353908, listed at Grade I and list entry numbers 1027542, 1027571, 1192026, 1286838, 1286966 and 1353938, listed at Grade II* are located within the built development of Horsham. The settings of these listed buildings comprise the built development of the town and they are not considered further here.
- 9.7.94 Of the remaining six listed buildings, list entry number 1026916, listed at Grade I, lies outside the ZTV. List entry number 1027063, listed at Grade II* is Chesworth House, is associated with the adjacent moated site (a scheduled monument, list entry number 1021446, see paragraphs 9.5.41 and 9.7.88 *et seq*, above).
- 9.7.95 Bonnetts, located some 3.35 km just west of north of the site is listed at Grade II* (list entry number 1378124 II*). The building comprises a house of the late 16th to early 17th century, which had its roofed raised and extended during the 17th century. The building is timber framed on a sandstone rubble plinth.
- 9.7.96 The heritage values of the listed building are as follows:

- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed building and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is largely illustrative;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed building in terms of its expression of the local vernacular architecture of the early post medieval period; and
 - Communal – The value of the listed building derives primarily from its symbolic value as part of the local farming community.
- 9.7.97 The listed building is of the highest significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed building in that it retains its rural, agricultural setting. The listed building lies at the edge of the stack ZTV.
- 9.7.98 The setting of the listed building is primarily the gardens and grounds, the adjacent farm buildings, most of which are shown on the OS first edition map of the area of 1874 and the surrounding fields. Views towards the site to the south of the listed building would be screened by hedgerows and planting and would be difficult to obtain and, in any event, the stack would form a small part of the view when looking in this direction.
- 9.7.99 There would be slight changes to the setting of the listed building that would hardly affect it and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed building is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.100 Taylors, located some 4.4 km just east of north of the site is listed at Grade II* (list entry number 1378127). The building comprises a hall house of the 14th century, which was developed into larger hall during the 15th century and floored during the 16th century. The building was altered during the 17th and 19th centuries.
- 9.7.101 The heritage values of the listed building are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed building and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is largely illustrative;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed building in terms of its expression of the vernacular architecture of the medieval period and later; and
 - Communal – The value of the listed building derives primarily from its symbolic value as part of the local farming community.
- 9.7.102 The listed building is of the highest significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed building in the sense that it remains in a rural locality with associated, if later, ancillary buildings. The listed building lies at the edge of the ZTV.
- 9.7.103 The setting of the listed building is primarily its gardens and grounds, the adjacent farm buildings, most of which are shown along with the pond and orchard to the north and north west on the OS first edition map of the area of 1874 and the surrounding fields. Views towards the site would be screened by adjacent buildings and planting and would be difficult to obtain and, in any event, the site would form a small part of the view when looking in this direction.
- 9.7.104 There would be slight changes to the setting of the listed building that would hardly affect it and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed building is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.105 The parish church of St Mary Magdalene is located on the west side of Rusper High Street, some 4.45 km north east of the site and is listed at Grade I (list entry number 1026946). The building comprises a west tower of the 15th century. The remainder of the church originally dated from the 14th century and was rebuilt in 1855.

- 9.7.106 The heritage values of the listed building are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed building and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The historical value is largely illustrative, although there are associations with known individuals through the survival of monumental brasses of the medieval period within the church;
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed building in terms of its expression of the ecclesiastical architecture of the late medieval period; and
 - Communal – The value of the listed building derives primarily from its symbolic value as part of the local village community.
- 9.7.107 The listed building is of the highest significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed building in that it is located at the heart of the village. The listed building lies at the edge of the ZTV.
- 9.7.108 The setting of the listed building comprises primarily the surrounding churchyard and built development of the village of Rusper, including a number of historic buildings. Views towards the site to the south west of the listed building would be screened by vegetation and difficult to obtain and in any event, the proposed development would form a small part of the view when looking in this direction.
- 9.7.109 There would be slight changes to the setting of the listed building that would hardly affect it and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed building is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 9.7.110 St Leonards, located in countryside on the south east side of Horsham, some 4.3 km south east of the site is listed at Grade II* (list entry number 1354200). The building comprises an early 19th century mansion with elements of the classical style, including a pediment. Pevsner notes that the house dates from c. 1840 with an earlier 18th century centre. This may have been designed by John Johnson.
- 9.7.111 The heritage values of the listed building are as follows:
- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the fabric of the listed building and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains, particularly within the parkland. The historical value is largely illustrative, although there are associations with known individuals including architects, patrons, landowners etc.
 - Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the listed building in terms of its expression of the formal architecture of the enlightenment.
 - Communal – The value of the listed building derives primarily from its symbolic value as part of the local community.
- 9.7.112 The listed building is of the highest significance. Setting makes a significant contribution to the significance of the listed building in that it retains at least some of its parkland setting, although this has been subdivided. The listed building lies at the edge of the ZTV.
- 9.7.113 The setting of the listed building comprises primarily the surrounding parkland, which is shown on the first edition OS six-inch map of 1879. The parkland is now subdivided and there has been a degree of built development. Designed views from the listed building are slightly north of the east/ west axis and not towards the proposal site. Views in this direction would be screened by vegetation and difficult to obtain. The proposed development would form a small part of the view when looking in this direction.
- 9.7.114 There would be slight changes to the setting of the listed building that would hardly affect it and the magnitude of impact is assessed as being negligible. The effect of the proposed development on the listed building is assessed as being minor adverse, which is not significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.

9.8 Assessment of Operational Effects

- 9.8.1 All effects would be at their maximum at the end of the construction phase and no additional operational effects on heritage assets beyond those assessed in Section 9.6 above are likely.

9.9 Assessment of Decommissioning Effects

- 9.9.1 It is assumed that, in the event of decommissioning, all below ground archaeological assets within the site would be removed in their entirety.
- 9.9.2 Effects during the decommissioning phase would be limited to those resulting from changes to the settings of heritage assets during the decommissioning process. Such effects would be short-term and fully reversible. On this basis no significant decommissioning effects on these assets are predicted.

9.10 Further Mitigation Measures

- 9.10.1 The site of the Hoffman kiln, within the north west corner of the site comprises demolished underground remains only. These are currently underneath the existing building. On this basis, no work on the remains can safely or reasonably take place until the superstructure of the building is removed.
- 9.10.2 Following an appropriate level of demolition of the existing building, mitigation of the effect of the development on the Hoffman kiln is proposed through a programme of excavation and recording of the asset prior to construction of the proposed development.
- 9.10.3 Following the works on the site of the Hoffman kiln described above, no further mitigation would be required.

9.11 Monitoring and Management Strategies

- 9.11.1 Mitigation would be complete following the construction phase and no future monitoring would be required.

9.12 Residual Effects

- 9.12.1 Table 9.9 summarises the significance of effects for the construction and the operational phase for the project taking into account the mitigation measures. It is noted that at the end of the construction phase effects would reach their maximum extent and that there would be no additional effects on below ground archaeology during the operational phase.

Table 9.9: Summary of Likely Environmental Effects on Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Parameter (e.g. Receptor No 1)	Sensitivity of receptor	Likely impact	Duration	Magnitude of impact	Significance of effect	Mitigation	Magnitude of Residual Impact	Significance of Residual Effect	Significant
Construction Phase									
Below ground archaeology within the site	Low	Removal of archaeological remains	Long Term	High	Minor adverse	Recording of remains	Low	Minor adverse	No
Historic Landscape	Low	Damage to elements of historic landscape	Long Term	Low	Minor adverse	Designed in	Low	Minor adverse	No
Designated assets	High to Very High	Effect on setting	Long Term	Low	Minor adverse	Designed in	Low	Minor adverse	No
Operational Phase									
Historic Landscape	Low	Damage to elements of historic landscape	Long Term	Low	Minor adverse	Designed in	Low	Minor adverse	No
Designated assets	High to Very High	Effect on setting	Long Term	Low	Minor adverse	Designed in	Low	Minor adverse	No

9.13 Assessment of Cumulative Effects

- 9.13.1 A review of proposed or possible future third party projects that may have a cumulative impact with the proposed 3Rs Facility has been undertaken and used to inform this ES. The projects identified are summarised in Appendix 4.4.
- 9.13.2 In relation to archaeology and cultural heritage impacts, the following developments have been identified as having the potential to impact cumulatively with the proposal and have therefore been examined as part of the assessment:
- Brookhurst Wood Landfill Site and adjacent land, Langhurstwood Road, Horsham (Construction and operation of a materials recycling facility (Application Ref: DC/2919/06/NH) and Erection of 2 no. carbon vessel systems and associated infrastructure (Planning Ref NC/16/0026).
- 9.13.3 The above are located within a group of existing structures to the north of the site, would have no cumulative impact with the proposed development and are not considered further here.
- 9.13.4 The Land North of Horsham Scheme comprises an outline planning application for a mixed use strategic development. (Application ref: DC/16/1677). The cumulative development site lies immediately to the east of Langhurstwood Road.
- 9.13.5 The cumulative development site includes the moated site 200 metres west of Graylands Copse (a scheduled monument, list entry number 1010500). Effects on the scheduled monument from the proposed development are considered at paragraph 9.7.12 *et seq*, above. The scheduled monument is shown on the illustrative masterplan for the cumulative development as being located within an area reserved for Green Infrastructure. The ES for the cumulative scheme assesses the effect of the cumulative development with the proposed development on the scheduled monument as being negligible and not significant.

9.14 Inter-relationships

- 9.14.1 The chief inter-relationship with heritage is landscape. This has been considered during the assessment. Further details of the findings of the landscape assessment are provided in Chapter 5 of this ES.

9.15 Conclusions

- 9.15.1 The assessment has found that there are no designated sites (e.g. scheduled monuments, listed buildings) within the proposed development site.
- 9.15.2 There are a number of designated assets in the wider area. A comparison of these against the ZTV has been undertaken and a detailed assessment has been carried out to assess the effects, if any, on these assets as a consequence of the proposed development.
- 9.15.3 There is one scheduled monument located within 1.5 km of the site. This is moated site 200 metres west of Graylands Copse. There is one registered park and garden located within 1 km of the site. This is Warnham Court, registered at Grade II. Most of this designated asset lies between 1 and 2 km from the site.
- 9.15.4 There are 36 listed buildings within 1.5 km of the site. Of these, 35 are listed at Grade III and one, the Parish Church of St Margaret, is listed at Grade I. Of the Grade II listed buildings, three are located within the built development of Horsham and 13, as well as the Grade I listed Parish Church of St Margaret, are located within the built development of Warnham. The Warnham Conservation Area lies within 1.5 km of the site at its nearest point.

- 9.15.5 There are two scheduled monuments located between 1 and 2 km of the site. These are the 'Castle' moated site, 500 metres east south east of Hawkesbourne Farm and the Motte and bailey castle north of Chennells Brook Farm.
- 9.15.6 There are 57 listed buildings located between 1.5 and 3 km of the site. Of these, two are listed at Grade II* and the remainder at Grade II.
- 9.15.7 There are three scheduled monuments located between 3 and 5 km of the site. These are Stane Street Roman Road, the medieval moated site, north of Oakdale Farm and moated site and fishponds 15 metres south of Chesworth House.
- 9.15.8 There are 13 Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings located between 3 and 5 km of the site. Of these, three are listed at grade I and the remainder at Grade II*.
- 9.15.9 There is limited evidence for prehistoric and Roman activity in the area. The site itself seems to have been woodland and then agricultural land from antiquity onwards. There is no recorded evidence for activity, other than use as agricultural land over the proposal site until the development of the brickworks.
- 9.15.10 Most of the structures associated with the brickworks have been cleared. Those remaining within the site are part of the waste transfer station/materials recycling facility building, which incorporates elements of an earlier steel portal type building associated with the brickworks, small brick built gatehouse or similar surviving in the southwestern part of the proposal site and a single storey brick structure surviving in the centre of the proposal site. Cartographic and architectural evidence indicates that all these structures are of post-war origin. Although no above ground remains are visible, there may be below ground remains of the southernmost Hoffman kiln formerly standing in the brickworks in the north western part of the site. Although there are several examples of Hoffman kilns which have received statutory protection, these are, apparently without exception, standing structures. Below ground remains of the on in this location are likely to be of local significance.
- 9.15.11 There is no evidence for the site to contain below ground remains of the highest significance, or of sufficient significance to warrant preservation *in situ*. Appropriate mitigation measures for the proposed development have been incorporated into the assessment of residual effects. They comprise mitigation of the effect of the development on the Hoffman kiln within the site through a programme of excavation and recording of the asset prior to construction of proposed development.
- 9.15.12 No mitigation measures for effects on the settings of designated assets, other than those built into the design of the proposed development, are considered necessary.
- 9.15.13 There are predicted to be no significant effects on buried archaeological remains, the historic landscape, or any designated heritage assets.

9.16 References

Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (1990 SI No 9)

Town and Country Planning Act (1971 SI No 78),

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979 SI No 46)

National Heritage Act (1983 SI No 47)

Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 (as amended) (1953 SI No 49)

Published Documents

A P Baggs, C R J Currie, C R Elrington, S M Keeling and A M Rowland, 'Horsham: General history of the Town', in Hudson, T.P. e) (1986a) A History of the County of Sussex: Volume 6 Part 2, Bramber Rape (North-Western Part) Including Horsham pp. 131-156.

A P Baggs, C R J Currie, C R Elrington, S M Keeling and A M Rowland, 'Warnham: General history of the Town', in Hudson, T.P. e) (1986b) A History of the County of Sussex: Volume 6 Part 2, Bramber Rape (North-Western Part) Including Horsham pp. 203-207.

Brabner, J.H.F. ed. (c.1893). The Comprehensive Gazetteer of England and Wales. London: William Mackenzie.

Cantor, L. (1983) The Medieval Parks of England: A Gazetteer. Loughborough: Loughborough University of Technology.

Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2012) National Planning Policy Framework.

Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2014) Planning Practice Guidance: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. Last updated 10 April 2014.
<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment/>

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) (2013) Scheduled Monuments and Nationally Important but Non-scheduled Monuments, Policy Statement, October 2013.

Ekwall, E. (1960) The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place Names. Oxford.

English Heritage (2008) Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance

High Weald AONB (2017) High Weald AONB Guidance on the Selection and Use of Colour in Development.

Highways Agency, Transport Scotland, Welsh Assembly Government and the Department for Regional Development (2007) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2: HA 208/07, Cultural Heritage.

Historic England (2008) Conservation Principles.

Historic England (2015a) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans, July 2015.

Historic England (2015b) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment, March 2015.

Historic England (2017) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets.

Horsham District Council (2015) Horsham District Planning Framework (excluding South Downs National Park).

Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3).

Lewis, S 1845 Topographical Dictionary of England London

Meaney, A. (1964) A Gazetteer of Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Pine, J. (2013) 'Roman iron production, and Saxon activity, at Rathlin Road, Crawley' in Sussex Archaeological Collections 151 (2013), 13–25

Rippon (2004) Historic Landscape Analysis Deciphering the Countryside.

Sawyer, P.H. (1968) Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography. London: Royal Historical Society.

Tate, W.E. and Turner, M.E. (1978) A Domesday of English Enclosure Acts and Awards. Reading: University of Reading.

West Sussex County Council and South Downs National Park Authority (2014) West Sussex Waste Local Plan. April 2014.

Williams, A. and Martin, G.H. (eds) (1992) Domesday Book. London: Penguin.

Unpublished Documents

Butler, K. (2013) A Standing Building Survey of Two Buildings at Warnham Brickworks, (Site Ha) Horsham, West Sussex Chris Butler Archaeological Services Project No. CBAS 0382

Porteous, S and Henderson, M 2009 An Archaeological Watching Brief at St Peter's Church, Slinfold, West Sussex Archaeology South East unpublished client report No. 2009107

SLR Consulting (2014) Britannia Crest Recycling Wealden Brickworks Environmental Statement (WSSC/018/14/NH)

SLR (2015) Historic Building Record for Stock belonging to The Wealden Brickworks, Langhurstwood Road, Horsham, West Sussex SLR unpublished client report Ref: 416.01256.00002 Version No: 2

Horsham Tithe Map and Award 1844

Published Maps

Ordnance Survey County Series mapping supplied by Landmark Mapping

Historical Map and Guide Roman Britain 1994