

Iminster SA Compendium of Further Evidence

1.0 Additional Historic Environment Evidence

SSDC Local Plan Proposed Modifications – Iminster

SA Objective 10 concerns the historic environment which is defined in the NPPF as ‘*All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.*’¹

In making an assessment of the potential impact of development it is therefore necessary to consider all these elements and aspects. The Turley report and Steve Membery’s review focus upon the archaeological assets and do not extend to the other categories that need consideration.

I suggest that the relevant types of asset here, in addition to the archaeological already considered, are the buildings and structures within the urban area both nationally designated (listed) and of local interest and the designated Iminster Conservation Area which also encompasses most of the built assets. Indeed because the Conservation Area and the listed building are formally designated they are of greater significance than the archaeological, all of which (currently known) are undesignated and of a significance that does not make them the equivalent of scheduled monuments.

Both development options would impact upon the conservation area and listed buildings. Although neither would be physically impacted upon, their settings would be affected. It is important to bear in mind that the issue of setting is given considerable weight in the NPPF. Para.132 states: - *Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.*

The setting issues arise through the topography of the town, elevated above the valley of the Shudrick stream on its south side so that the setting of many buildings and some of the conservation area is formed by the valley to the south and particularly the rising open land beyond reaching up to Herne Hill and Pretwood Hill.

Option 1

There are two listed buildings outside the Conservation Area in close proximity to the Option 1 area, one within 30m and one 75m. There are several LBs within the CA on Bay Hill and Townsend, including a Grade 2* listing, which are further away from the area but more elevated. All these possess a clear and extensive prospect across the Shudrick valley to Pretwood Hill which therefore, indisputably, forms a key part of their individual settings. Development both on the more level valley bottom and especially on the rising ground beyond would radically alter this setting from a rural one to a substantially urban one which, I consider, would result in such a significant change as to cause substantial harm to the settings. The CA extends west of Bay Hill in a linear form and widens to take in both East Street and Butts. Its setting, certainly as far as Love Lane along East Street and to Butts Castle on Butts is the Shudrick valley up to the skyline of Pretwood Hill. Butts Castle is within the CA and these elevated buildings, some 3 storey, command an especially wide prospect across the Option 1 land. This is the setting of the CA and it would be harmed by a change of character from rural to urbanised. The landform would result in a massing of built form of considerable impact particularly on the steeper southern part of the area. Landscape buffering can relieve the impact of development upon the setting of a heritage asset where the land is flat and wider views are not part of the asset’s setting but in this case the topography would prevent any buffering being effective in separating and hiding adjacent

¹ NPPF Annex 2

development. My conclusion is that development at Option 1 would have a harmful affect upon the setting of designated heritage assets.

Option 2

The Option 2 land is also a valley with land rising behind forming the skyline (Herne Hill) when seen from the western extent of the conservation area along Station Road which here contains a high proportion of listed buildings. The option land is more distant; at least 150m and the likely most heavily built area probably twice this distance. Furthermore the valley is a less significant part of the setting of these assets with less inter-visibility because of distance and the gentler topography. Existing Canal Way development also intervenes and forms part of the existing setting which as a result will be less changed by further building within the valley. Particular harm would only occur if development encroached higher up the slopes of Herne Hill.

Conclusion

While the impact upon archaeological assets is deemed low, as stated by Steve Membery, and of broadly equal impact on the two options, the impact that would result at option 1 upon the settings of significant **designated** heritage assets would be far greater than at Option 2.

Adron Duckworth
Conservation Manager
22.1.14

2.0 Additional Archaeology Evidence

SSDC Local Plan Proposed Modifications - Ilminster

Introduction

In response to Turley Associates submission SCC HES were requested to assess the document. The submission concluded that the impacts on the historic environment were incorrectly scored within the revised Sustainability Assessment (November 2013). Turley's conclude that both Options (Canal Way and Shudrick Lane) should have a similar scoring (neutral or Unknown). In order to assess the archaeological issues associated with the two areas a scoring system based on Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB August 2007) is used.

Prehistoric and Roman

Canal Way

A recent archaeological investigation has revealed Bronze Age and Roman period buried archaeology at Canal Way. These remains are of local significance (Low Value) and development is likely to remove these types of asset (Major Magnitude of Impact)

Shudrick Lane

Archaeological evaluation at Walnut Place recovered Bronze Age artefacts of Local significance (low Value) and development is likely to remove assets of this nature (Major Magnitude of Impact).

In terms of as of yet undiscovered buried archaeology both Shudrick Lane and Canal Way have very similar potential in terms of Prehistoric and Romano-British activity. It is not possible to state with certainty the significance, or the impact on these assets without further assessment.

Canal Way

Low Value

Major Magnitude of Impact

Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect

Shudrick Lane

Low Value

Major Magnitude of Impact

Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect

Medieval

Canal Way

The area is within part of a medieval deer park of which there are 83 (source Somerset Historic Environment Record) in Somerset. There is no evidence of any surviving landscape features associated with the park within the proposal area. The significance of this asset is considered to be local so equating with DMRB Low Value. The impact on the park is considered to be Minor (slight alteration to asset).

Shudrick Lane

The area includes medieval lynchets (SHER has 110 records). These will be impacted by development possibly leading to complete removal of this asset. The lynchets are of Local significance (so Low Value) with complete removal potentially leading to a Major impact.

Canal Way

Low Value

Minor Magnitude of Impact

Neutral/Slight Significance of Effect

Shudrick Lane

Low Value

Major Magnitude of Impact

Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect

Post Medieval

Canal Way

Within the area are earthworks representing a golf course that was used as a WWII base. This asset is of Local Significance (low Value) but could be subject to some removal (as only part of the asset lies within the proposal area) so a Minor magnitude of Impact.

Shudrick Lane

There is an anti-tank scarp with associated anti-tank posts within the area. This asset is considered locally important (Low Value). It is not possible to assess any direct impacts as the asset is on the boundary of the area but its setting will be very minor change (Negligible Magnitude of Impact).

Canal Way

Low Value

Minor Magnitude of Impact

Neutral/Slight Significance of Effect

Shudrick Lane

Low Value

Negligible Magnitude of Impact

Neutral/Slight Significance of Effect

Cumulative Score

Canal Way

Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect

Shudrick Lane

Slight/Moderate Significance of Effect

In Conclusion in terms of archaeology both sites have equal scoring.

APPENDIX

Tables from DMRB

| SIGNIFICANCE (VALUE) | | FACTORS FOR ASSESSING THE SIGNIFICANCE (VALUE) OF HERITAGE ASSETS |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---|
| A | Very High | <ul style="list-style-type: none">World Heritage Sites (including nominated sites);Assets of acknowledged international importance; andAssets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives. |
| B | High | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Scheduled Monuments (including proposed sites);Grade I and II* Listed Buildings;Undesignated heritage assets of schedulable or exceptional quality and importance;Conservation Areas containing very important buildings; andAssets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives. |
| C | Medium | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Designated or undesignated assets that have exceptional qualities or |

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| | | contribute to regional research objectives; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade II Listed Buildings. |
| D | Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated and undesignated heritage assets of local importance; Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations; and Assets of limited value, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives. |
| E | Negligible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest. |
| F | Unknown | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The importance of the resource has not been ascertained. |

Table 5.1 – Significance of Effects Matrix

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| VALUE | Very High | Neutral | Slight | Moderate/ Large | Large or Very Large | Very Large |
| | High | Neutral | Slight | Moderate/ Slight | Moderate/ Large | Large/ Very Large |
| | Medium | Neutral | Neutral/ Slight | Slight | Moderate | Moderate/ Large |
| | Low | Neutral | Neutral/ Slight | Neutral/ Slight | Slight | Slight/ Moderate |
| | Negligible | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral/ Slight | Neutral/ Slight | Slight |
| | | No change | Negligible | Minor | Moderate | Major |
| MAGNITUDE OF IMPACT | | | | | | |

3.0 Additional Highways Evidence

SCC work undertaken at the request of SSDC to enable the Highways Agency to take an informed view on the potential impact of development to the south west of the town on Southfields roundabout (27.02.14)

Calculations

The Shudrick Lane proposal originally included in the Local Plan consisted of 340 dwellings to the east of Ilminster. The Atkins Highway Capacity Assessment undertaken estimated two-way trip generation at a total of 136 Movements in the AM Peak and 162 in the PM Peak (rates of 0.400 and 0.476 respectively).

Of those, Atkins assumed that 21.2% of traffic would use the A303 Southfields Roundabout. These are mainly trips to/from Taunton Deane, Sedgemoor and Devon. It is reasonable to assume that eastbound traffic (e.g. to Yeovil) would use the B3168 Bay Hill assuming that suitable access was provided. This would result in around 29 AM movements and 34 PM movements at Southfields.

The new proposal (Proposed Main Modification 3) is for a development to the southwest of Ilminster, south of Canal Way. From this location traffic heading east on the A303 are more likely to use the Southfields Roundabout, and the majority of car trips not remaining within Ilminster are likely to travel in that direction. Based on 340 dwellings and 39.3% of car trips, this equates to 53 (AM)/64 (PM) movements through Southfields.

However it is implied by the Proposed Main Modification that the development size would be smaller – of the order of 305 dwellings. This would mean 48 AM and 57 PM movements through Southfields.

These assumptions and results are summarised in Table 1, below.

Table 1: Summary of assumptions and resultant movements through Southfields Roundabout

| Site | Peak | Two-way Trip Rate | Development Size (Dwellings) | % vehicles through Southfields | Movements through Southfields |
|-------------------------------|------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Shudrick Lane (340) | AM | 0.400 | 340 | 21% | 29 |
| | PM | 0.476 | 340 | 21% | 34 |
| SW Ilminster (340) | AM | 0.400 | 340 | 39% | 53 |
| | PM | 0.476 | 340 | 39% | 64 |
| SW Ilminster (Reduced to 305) | AM | 0.400 | 305 | 39% | 48 |
| | PM | 0.476 | 305 | 39% | 57 |

Conclusion

A site to the southwest of Ilminster is likely to make trips to/from the east (Yeovil, for example) more likely to pass through the Southfields Roundabout rather than use the B3168. Assuming trip generation and distribution are similar, and assuming that the size of

the site is reduced from 340 dwellings to 305, around 20 additional movements could be expected to pass through the roundabout during each peak. It should be noted however that many of these would still have joined/left the A303 further east.”