

LINDHURST
MANSFIELD

7. ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

CONTENTS

7.1	Introduction
7.2	Assessment objective
7.3	Assumptions
7.4	Methodology
7.5	Planning Policies
7.6	Baseline Conditions
7.7	Walkover survey
7.8	Historic landscapes
7.9	Design and Mitigation
7.10	Assessment of Effects

FIGURES (REFER TO ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT VOLUME 2)

7.1	Detail of Sanderson's map 'Twenty Miles round Mansfield'.
7.2	Detail of western part of 1855 Mansfield enclosure map
7.3	Detail of middle section of 1855 Mansfield enclosure map
7.4	Detail of eastern part of 1855 Mansfield enclosure map
7.5	Detail of 1889 1st edition Ordnance Survey map of Mansfield area. Proposed development area outlined
7.6	Detail of 1900 2nd edition OS map of Mansfield area, with Proposed development area outlined
7.7	Detail of 1920 OS map of Mansfield area, with Proposed development area outlined
7.8	Detail of 1955 OS map of Mansfield area, with Proposed development area outlined
7.9	Detail of 1966 OS map of Mansfield area, with Proposed development area outlined
7.10	Detail of 1989 OS map of Mansfield area, with Proposed development area outlined
7.11	Map of the area showing Historic Landscape Characterisation
7.12	Location plan for field locations described in text
7.13	Archaeological sites and Historic Buildings listed on the Historic Environment Record for Nottinghamshire
7.14	Plan of field numbers derived from enclosure map of Mansfield

APPENDICES (REFER TO ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT VOLUME 2)

- 7.1 Significance of Effects Tables
- 7.2 Archaeological Sites in the vicinity of the site Listed on the Historic Environment Record for Nottinghamshire
- 7.3 Historic Buildings Listed on the Historic Environment Record for Nottinghamshire
- 7.5 Land Ownership details for fields numbered on enclosure map

CHAPTER 7: ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 University of Leicester Archaeological Services has been commissioned to undertake an assessment of the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage potential within the site. The contents of this chapter are based on an initial desk based assessment which has been undertaken to assess the likely effect of the development on the archaeology and cultural heritage (Hunt 2008). The desk-based assessment is an initial stage in characterising the archaeological and cultural heritage resource of the site in order to assess the effect of the proposed work on known and potential archaeological deposits and historic structures within the area. In addition recommendations are made for further archaeological evaluation that might be required prior to any construction. This will provide further information on known and unknown archaeological resources in order to assess the likely effects of the work and enable a robust mitigation strategy to be formulated.

7.2 Assessment Objective

7.2.1 The specific objective of this Chapter is to assess the nature and significance of the potential cultural heritage resource and define the likely areas of survival in order to assess the likely effect of the development upon the historic and archaeological resource and to provide a mitigation strategy, where necessary.

7.3 Assumptions

7.3.1 All work has been carried out based on drawings supplied by the applicant (see Figure 2.1).

7.3.2 The archaeological resource is by its nature an incomplete record. Where there are significant alluvial/colluvial deposits, made ground or lack of archaeological fieldwork, archaeological remains can remain undetected. Local knowledge has been utilised to assess the resources within the site and to identify and assess areas of potential archaeology (e.g. alluvial deposits close to known archaeological remains).

7.4 Methodology

7.4.1 In this chapter the guidelines and methodology on environmental assessment outlined in the *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges* (DMRB) Vol. 11, Section 3, Part 2 (HA 208/07) have been followed. While these guidelines were formulated for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and Environmental Statements (ES) of highway projects; they are deemed as best practice guidelines for other development EIA and ES. The guidelines conform to the Planarch2 best practice models for cultural heritage coverage.

7.4.2 This Chapter considers three types of Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Resources

- Archaeological Remains: these can include artefacts, field monuments, structures, landscape features and can be visible or buried.
- Historic Buildings: these are architectural or designed structures with a significant historical value and can be of any date.
- Historical Landscapes: these can include countryside, townscapes, industrial landscapes and designed landscapes such as parks and gardens. Chapter 10 of this ES also considers landscape and the effects of the development in detail.

7.4.3 The methodology to assess the effect of the scheme on the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage involves:

- Assessment of the significance/value of the identified and potential Cultural Heritage Assets as identified by the desk-based assessment.
- Assessment on the effect of the scheme on the Cultural Heritage Assets.
- Mitigation Strategies for known and potential cultural heritage assets.
- Significance of Effects (using professional judgement and checked using the formula that the significance is a function of the Value of the resource and the residual effect after mitigation).
- Consultation with relevant local and national authorities.
- Consultation with other relevant authors of Chapters in this ES (e.g. noise and vibration, landscape/townscape).

7.4.4 Following *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges* (DMRB) Vol. 11, Section 3, Part 2 (HA 208/07) three stages to assessment have been followed

1. Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Resource

This involves assigning values to the sites identified in each of the subtopics. The value of an archaeological or historic resource can be assessed using a scale of criteria from *Negligible* to *Very High*. As historic and archaeological remains can be difficult to determine and assess without intrusive fieldwork there is also the option for them to be categorised as *Unknown*. Table 1 (Appendix 7.1) can be used to help identify this, but it's mainly based on local knowledge and can change as more work is done.

2. Assessing the Magnitude of Effect

The effect is defined as a change resulting from the scheme that affects the cultural heritage. Effects can be either adverse (e.g. removal of a resource) or beneficial (e.g. improvement of public access or setting). Most of the effect will be physical as a direct consequence of the construction works and mainly confined to the area of land take. This may also include pre-construction works such as boreholes, trial pits, auguring and the setting up of compounds, haul roads and borrow pits as well as construction works such as demolition, piling and excavation. Effects may also be indirect such as those caused by changes in drainage and from long term effects such as compaction of remains beneath embankments. In some cases work at a distance from the site may also have an effect on the context (the perception and understanding of the site in relation to its landscape) or setting (the surroundings in which a place is experienced).

The magnitude of effect is first assessed without taking into account any agreed mitigation and enhancement measures. The magnitude of effect does not take into account the value of the resource (e.g. the destruction of a Low Value site is the same magnitude of effect as that of a High Value site). Effects on the cultural heritage can be positive (Beneficial) or negative (Adverse) and can be assessed on a scale from Major Beneficial to Major Adverse (Table 2; Appendix 7.1).

3. Evaluation of the Significance of Environmental Effects

Significance is considered to be the product of the value of the environmental resource likely to be affected and the magnitude of the effect, whether positive or negative upon it. The significance is assessed using judgements regarding value, magnitude of effect and significance of effect that are reasonable and balanced. However, the matrix set out in Table 4 is used as a check to ensure that these judgements are reasonable and balanced. Descriptions of the results obtained are listed in Table 3 (Appendix 7.1).

7.4.5 The following sources of information have been consulted to assess previous land use and archaeological potential:

- Archaeological records (Nottinghamshire County Council; Historic Environment Record; Transactions of the Thoroton Society).
- Previous Ordnance Survey maps of the area (Nottinghamshire Record).
- Geological maps (University of Leicester Geology Dept - Map Library).
- Historical background material (ULAS Reference Library and University of Leicester Library).

7.4.6 A walkover survey was undertaken on 8 August 2008 to examine the area. Particular attention was paid to the current land use of all parts of the site and the likely effect on the

condition of any buried archaeological remains.

7.5 Planning Policies

- 7.5.1 The national policy for the historic environment is currently subject to possible legislative change in the form of the draft Heritage Protection Bill. The following outlines the situation in November 2008. The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, provides statutory protection for monuments of national importance (Scheduled Monuments or SMs). Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 (PPG16) Archaeology and Planning (1990) sets out the Secretary of State's policy on archaeological remains on land and how they should be preserved and recorded. It provides planning authorities with a staged approach to the consideration of archaeological remains that may survive on a proposed development site and states that where there are 'nationally important archaeological remains... that are affected by a proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation' (DoE, 1990 A8).
- 7.5.2 The principal legislation affecting built heritage is the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which provides statutory protection for buildings on a list compiled by the Secretary of State. Conservation Areas are identified by the Local Planning Authority as areas of special architectural or historic interest, where it is important to preserve or enhance their character or appearance. Designating a Conservation Area provides a focus for Council and private efforts to improve the environment with the following main objectives:-
- to control demolition of any building, whether it is listed or not
 - to protect trees
 - to strengthen control over new development, so that it must positively preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area.
- 7.5.3 Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) Planning and the historic environment (1994) sets out the Secretary of State's policy for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment and how they should be preserved and recorded. It provides planning authorities with a staged approach to the consideration of such remains.
- 7.5.4 The *East Midlands Integrated Regional Strategy (IRS)* framework for the East Midlands includes provisions for the protection and enhancement of the Historic Environment. Its Regional Environment Strategy and Action plan (2002 - 2003) states sustainable development objectives as:

'EN1: To protect, improve and manage the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environmental and archaeological assets of the region.'

7.5.5 The Nottinghamshire Joint Structure Plan Adopted 2006 Policy 2/11 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Other Sites of Archaeological Interest:

‘There will be a presumption in favour of the physical preservation of Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other nationally important archaeological remains. Development proposals affecting archaeological sites or their settings will only be permitted where the need for development in that location outweighs the relative importance of the remains and/or their setting.

‘If development is permitted, priority will be given to preserving the remains in-situ. Where preservation in-situ is not feasible or justified, conditions will be imposed to ensure that full surveys, excavation and recording of the remains is undertaken.’

7.5.6 Mansfield District Council has included the following relevant policies in the Mansfield District Local Plan adopted in 1998:

BE2 Planning and related applications for listed building consent will not be granted for development proposals which involve demolition of a listed building other than in exceptional circumstances. Applications will be judged against the following criteria:- 1) the importance of the building, its intrinsic architectural and historic interest and rarity, in both national and local terms; 2) the particular physical features of the building which justify its inclusion on the statutory or local lists; 3) the building’s setting and its contribution to the local scene; 4) the extent to which the proposed works will bring substantial benefits to the community, in particular by contributing to the economic regeneration of the area or the enhancement of its environment.

BE4 Planning permission will not be granted for developments which would have an adverse effect on the setting of a listed building. Applications will be judged against the following criteria:- 1) whether the setting of the listed building would be preserved or enhanced; 2) whether the design of the proposed development would be in keeping with the setting of the listed building; 3) whether existing landscape features which contribute to the setting of the building would be retained or enhanced;

BE11 Planning permission will not be granted for developments which would damage or adversely affect scheduled ancient monuments and their settings.

Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their setting, are affected by proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. There are four scheduled ancient monuments within the District as shown on the Proposals Map at Kings Mill Viaduct; Roman Villa off Common Lane, Mansfield Woodhouse; Village Cross, Mansfield Woodhouse; Beeston Lodge, Mansfield Woodhouse. Such monuments have statutory protection and certain defined works which affect them require the consent of the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport. The District Council will seek the preservation in situ of all nationally important archaeological remains and

planning permission will not normally be granted for developments which would adversely affect them or their setting.

BE12 Where planning applications are submitted which may affect sites of known or possible archaeological interest the district council may require an archaeological assessment of the site, comprising a desktop evaluation and, where appropriate, a field evaluation to determine the extent and level of such interest and the effect of the proposed development. The district council may also require a scheme of treatment for the archaeological remains prior to determining the application.

7.6 Baseline Conditions

- 7.6.1 According to the Historic Environment Record (HER) of Nottinghamshire there is one archaeological site within the proposed development area, which is the findspot of a Bronze Age spearhead (L2744; Fig 7.13). The 'Forest Stone' also lies within the vicinity, which is a standing stone derived from the central pillar of the Old Market House in Mansfield (L5314: Grade II Listed Building 3.51.1).
- 7.6.2 Towards the south-western edge of the site is the findspot of a Bronze Age spearhead (2300 B.C-700 B.C) (**L2744**).
- 7.6.3 A Neolithic axe has been located 600m to the north-west of the site near Gravelhill Plantation (**L2743**). A further group of prehistoric finds are known from a site just to the south east of Lindhurst Farm (**L5320**).
- 7.6.4 There are no known Roman sites in the vicinity of the site.
- 7.6.5 There are a number of medieval sites in the vicinity, but they are some distance away from the proposed development area. These include a medieval hunting lodge (**M2560**) near Fountain Dale at SK 5667 5688, around 1km to the south of Lindhurst Farm, where there is also a pond (**L9074**) and a moat (**L2560**) dating to the medieval period.
- 7.6.6 A medieval key, dated to the 13th - 14th century (**L5315**) was found at a site near Parkland Close, 500m to the north of the site.
- 7.6.7 An undated ditch and a hollow way (**L2575**), possibly of medieval date, are located in Thieves' Wood, 650m south west of the proposed development area. Nearby are further undated earthworks, including a ditch and a mound (**L2558**).
- 7.6.8 The only listed building within the proposed development area is the 18th century 'Forest Stone' (L5314:Grade II Listed Building 3.51.1) at the southern edge of the site. The Forest Stone, was the central pillar of the Old Market House in Mansfield where the court of Swainmote was held before the Verderers of Sherwood Forest. The pillar was placed at the spot on the north side of Harlow Wood where the participants in the Swainmote Court met,

before the court, to hear those matters affecting the forest which were to come before the court when it sat in Mansfield (see summary, Appendix 7.1)

- 7.6.9 Other than the 'Forest Stone' there are no listed buildings in the close vicinity of the site. Around 1km south-east of the site are the Grade II listed 19th century 'Friar Tuck's well' (Listed Building **3.9.1**) and the stables at Fountain Dale (**3.9.14**). Rushley Farm (**4.7.20**) that lies just to the west of the proposed development is of significance as it is shown on Sanderson's map of the area (Figure 7.1). High Oakham House (**2.1.255**), also on the Sanderson's map, is located around 700m to the north-west of the site. Berry Hill Hall (**2.1.8**) and associated farm buildings (**2.1.9**), dated to the 18th century, lie 800m to the north. Both are Grade II listed. Nearby is an 18th century sundial, which is also listed (**2.1.114**). The cemetery chapel and the gateway at Mansfield Cemetery (**2.1.148 & 2.1.149**) lie 650m to the north-west of the site. The cemetery also contains a 19th century monument (**2.1.151**) and a similarly dated mausoleum (**2.1.150**). These are all Grade II listed. Further listed buildings within the cemetery are a 19th century tomb (**2.1.152**), a 20th century war memorial (**2.1.153**) and the 19th century 'Wildman' memorial (**2.1.154**). Berry Hill School that lies 800m to the north of the site (**2.1.246**) and Three Thorn Hollow Farm (**2.1.190**) that lies just to the east of the proposed development area are also locally significant.
- 7.6.10 No cropmarks, scheduled monuments, world heritage sites, historic battlefields, historic parks or gardens, conservation areas or national /ancient woodlands are present within the site.
- 7.6.11 Mansfield (*Mamesfelde*) appears in the Domesday Book in Broxtowe Wapentake. The entry says:
- In MANSFIELD and the outliers SKEGBY and SUTTON (-in-Ashfield)*
- King Edward had 3 c(arucates) and 6 b(ovates) of land taxable.*
- Land for 9 ploughs. The king has 2 ploughs in lordship.*
- 5 Freeman with 6 b(ovates) of this land;*
- 35 villagers and 20 smallholders with 19 1/2 ploughs.*
- 1 mill and 1 fishery, 21 s(hillings); meadow, 24 acres; woodland*
- pasture 2 leagues long and 2 wide; 2 churches and 2 priests*
- Additional references to Mansfield also occur for an Outlier in Grimston, waste land in Perlethorpe and waste lands in Carlton, Scofton, Rayton and Perlethorpe.
- 7.6.12 The name Mansfield means 'open land by the River Maun' (Mills 2003). Henry VIII granted a Market Charter for Mansfield in 1227, and in 1337 a grant of fair was awarded. These events concreted Mansfield's status as a market town, which continues today as one of the countries largest open-air markets is still held there (MDC Website 2006).
- 7.6.13 Lindhurst or 'Lime Tree Wood', was part of Sherwood Forest that lay between Mansfield and Blidworth. Despite its name the area appears to have been largely covered in oak. The earliest

reference to Lindhurst is from 1274 where the illicit killing of a buck is recorded (Crook 1981). The woodland, along with nearby No Man's Wood are historically part of Sherwood Forest and have always been associated with the Manor of Mansfield but were royal demesne lands and separately administered. Despite their royal ownership at various times the wood of Lindhurst was leased to third parties and passed down the line of private individuals.

- 7.6.14 Large amounts of timber were taken from Lindhurst and other parts of Sherwood during the major building works at Nottingham Castle from 1358-1368; the timber was later largely used for local building repairs. From 1304 it is recorded that a 'keeper of Lindhurst' resided close to the wood, possibly in the moated site that lies on the southern fringes.
- 7.6.15 During the later part of the reign of Elizabeth I many crown lands were sold off and created rivalries between local aristocratic families. By the 1630s the Earl of Newcastle, William Cavendish had acquired all the royal lands around Mansfield, which he later lost during the Civil War. These were later returned during the Reformation, although there still seems to have been a contention over whether the Crown still had sole rights to the timber.
- 7.6.16 Early maps show Lindhurst as an 'Extra Parochial Parish' that is, outside the parish, due to its association with the Crown and therefore exempt from liability to parish obligations. From the late 1850's onwards, particularly in 1858, the civil functions were removed either by making extra parochial parishes into a separate Civil Parish or by including it within an adjacent Civil Parish. By 1728 Lindhurst was a matter of negotiation between local landowners, despite the fact that it still officially belonged to the Crown. The area was granted parish status in 1858 with the aim of improving the Poor Law. At this time Lindhurst is recorded as covering 885 acres, as opposed to 200 acres in 1591 (Crook 1981).
- 7.6.17 The earliest map of the area is Sanderson's map of 1835 (Figure 7.1). This shows the main part of the area, close to Mansfield as open land crossed by footpaths. The north western part of the area appears to have been split into small plots and is labelled 'encroachments'; presumably where the local people had started to divide the land up into plots. The area to the south in the Rainworth parish appears to have been enclosed by this time. The Lindhurst area, which includes part of the assessment area, also appears to have been enclosed. This early map also shows that a building existed at this time at the site of the current Lindhurst Farm.
- 7.6.18 There is no enclosure map for Lindhurst as a parish. Most of the area is contained within the parish of Mansfield itself. The 1855 enclosure map and award for Mansfield is extant and is illustrated over Figures 7.2-4 due to its size. The enclosure map shows the area in some detail and the accompanying award provides ownership details for most of the land at this time. The field boundaries are similar to those of the present day; only the smaller sub-divisions of the north western part of the area are notably different (Figure 7.2). Paradoxically, the central area has been sub-divided more recently (Figure 7.3). The full index of the known ownership details of the enclosure map is shown in Appendix 7.4.

- 7.6.19 The 1st edition OS map of 1889 (Figure 7.5) has a similar boundary layout to the enclosure map from 30 years previously. The north-western area still retains most of its smaller boundary sub-divisions, but the large central area has had further boundaries added. Lindhurst Farm appears to have been well-established by this time and Firs Farm is shown for the first time. To the west of the centre part of the site is a small wooded plantation (Taylor's Plantation).
- 7.6.20 The 2nd edition OS map (Figure 7.6) is similar to the previous edition. The only notable change is that part of the central area, close to Walker's Pond is shown as being marshy ground. Presumably this feature is down to prolonged flooding associated with the pond.
- 7.6.21 The 1920 edition of the Ordnance Survey map (Figure 7.7) is very similar to the 1900 edition. The 1938 edition is virtually identical and is not illustrated.
- 7.6.22 The next available map of the area is the 1955 OS maps (Figure 7.8). The layout in both is again similar to previous editions. The most notable change is that part of the field that adjoins the Foul Evil Brook is annotated as marshy ground like the area close to Walker's Pond.
- 7.6.23 The 1966 OS map (Figure 7.9) shows a few changes to the area. Some hedge lines are no longer present and both the areas marked as marshy on the earlier maps are annotated thus no longer. The area previously marked as 'Taylor's Plantation' has also gone from this edition of the map.
- 7.6.24 The 1989 OS map (Figure 7.10) shows the area as it existed before the new A617 was constructed. Apart from the fields affected by the road, the layout of the field boundaries is as it currently exists.

7.7 Walkover Survey

- 7.7.1 The site was visited on 15th August 2008 in order to assess the current state of the proposed development area. (Figure 7.12). The site is fully accessible via the A617, bridleways and smaller roads to the north and Harlow Wood and footpaths to the south. The land undulates considerably so that it was often difficult to see one end of a field from the other.
- 7.7.2 At the time of the visit most of the land was under crop, had recently been harvested or was in the process of being harvested. Part of the field to the south-west of Lindhurst Farm was under pasture and contained horses. The fields are mostly enclosed by low trimmed mature hedgerows, a few number of which have grown out in places into trees. The western edge of the site, close to Nottingham Road is bordered by fencing and where the new A617 has crossed the site and divided the fields there are large noise attenuation fences. The small parcels of land close to the road have been used as easement and had been recently planted with young trees. There were no obvious signs of ridge and furrow, although much of the land

was obscured by crops. There were no visible signs of archaeology apart from the standing stone ('Forest Stone' **L5314**) just within field number 21.

7.8 Historic Landscapes

- 7.8.1 Rural settlement patterns have been mapped by English Heritage (Roberts and Wrathmell 2000). The site falls within the 'Central Province' which is characterized by large concentrations of nucleated settlement (*ibid*, 45). Within this province it lies within the Trent Valley Vale of Trent sub-province (CTRNT) which is dominated by villages and hamlets with some local regional variations. It is again rich in nucleated settlements and deserted villages, particularly in the southern and western parts of the province (*ibid*, 48).
- 7.8.2 The site lies within the Nottinghamshire *Historic Landscape Characterisation* area (see Chapter 5). The data collection phase of the Historic Landscape Characterisation, one of English Heritage's historic landscape characterisation projects was carried out between 1998 and 2000 by Environment Department of Nottinghamshire County Council with funding from English Heritage. The site comprises 'Modern Modified Fields'. These are areas in which many of the 19th century field patterns are no longer present or have been radically reorganised. This is not necessarily an absolute criterion for the category. In the case of the proposed development area there is some comparison with the field systems shown of the enclosure map of 1855 (Figures 7.2-4). Many of the smaller boundaries have been lost, but the area does retain its basic 19th century shape.

7.9 Design and mitigation

- 7.9.1 The specific objective of the scheme is to reduce the effect of the development upon the potential archaeological resource by providing a robust and suitable mitigation strategy. It is intended that the mitigation measures proposed for the scheme, will contribute to the value, understanding and dissemination of the cultural heritage. The mitigation strategy provides a comprehensive programme which will provide an appropriate record of archaeological features effected by the development.
- 7.9.2 Wherever possible the design has taken into account potential effects on the archaeology and cultural heritage. This includes the incorporation of the historic field pattern into the layout of the new development, wherever appropriate, the use historic names as road names and protection of the Forest Stone Grade II Listed building from development within an enhanced setting. During the detailed design phase of the project, consideration will be given to the need to modify the design in order to mitigate the potential effect on the cultural heritage.
- 7.9.3 Archaeological and cultural heritage resources are non-renewable and the primary goal of cultural resource management is physical preservation. Current government planning guidance is that, in the case of nationally important remains, regardless of any designation,

the presumption should be towards preservation of the remains and their setting (DMRB 2009). Where there are overriding factors or where preservation in situ is not feasible, appropriate investigation to achieve preservation by record may be an acceptable alternative (DMRB 2009, 5.11.2).

- 7.9.4 Although all known design details have been included, there are likely to be areas of groundworks not yet assessed by this report (e.g. compounds, haul roads, storage areas, etc.). Mitigation for these areas should be considered once the final details are available.
- 7.9.5 Mitigation strategies will be discussed with the planning archaeologists for Nottinghamshire as advisors for Mansfield District Council. All mitigation work will be considered in the light of the East Midlands Research Framework (Cooper ed. 2006).
- 7.9.6 Although few remains are known from the area and it was likely to have been forested during the medieval period, the absence of records may be the result of a lack of previous fieldwork. In view of this geophysical survey has been commissioned for the area and is in progress. This will further refine our understanding of the presence, extent and quality of the potential archaeological deposits. Based on the results of these stages further appropriate mitigation strategies, including trial trenching, strip, plan and sample excavate or full archaeological excavation, may be implemented as appropriate. The remaining mitigation strategies will involve appropriate levels of watching brief during construction.
- 7.9.7 Trial trenching will involve the excavation of slit trenches targeting results from the surveys to establish the presence, extent and significance of any archaeological remains.
- 7.9.8 Strip, plan and sample excavate is a flexible approach that involves topsoil over an area being stripped under archaeological control to expose archaeological remains. The features are then characterised and the scope of work, time and resources required agreed on site with the planning archaeologist and immediately implemented. This work would be completed before construction commences in that area.
- 7.9.9 Full excavation involves the targeted excavation of an area of identified archaeology. The excavation would be designed to excavate and record archaeological remains within the defined area to achieve specific archaeological objectives. This work will be completed prior to the start of construction.
- 7.9.10 An archaeological watching brief during the construction will be undertaken where there is a risk of archaeological deposits being present. If archaeological remains are identified, an agreed contingency will be used to sample excavate and record the deposits. Although this will take place during construction and is not designed to hold up the construction process, enough time will need to be allowed in the programme to deal with any unforeseen archaeological discoveries.

7.9.11 All work will be undertaken in accordance with the Institute for Archaeologists' *Code of Conduct*, and appropriate *Standards and Guidance*.

7.9.12 Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) will be produced in advance for each phase of work and sent to the Planning Archaeologist for approval. The archaeological objectives and strategy will be continuously reviewed in the light of the archaeological remains uncovered. All work will be monitored internally by the archaeological contractor and by the Nottinghamshire County Council, Planning Archaeologist as advisor to Mansfield District Council.

7.10 Assessment of Effects

7.10.1 There will be no direct effect on any Listed Buildings from the development. Although there will be an effect on the setting of the Forest Stone, the effect will be a beneficial one by its incorporation into proposed green infrastructure, and improved access.

7.10.2 Some hedgerows can be defined as Ancient Hedgerows following the 1997 Hedgerows Regulations. These will be retained wherever possible and integrated into the development framework.

7.10.3 Although there can be no positive effects where there is a direct effect on archaeological remains the increase in knowledge and understanding that occurs through recording, can be offset against the loss of information that would occur if a site was to be destroyed unrecorded. The choice of an area for development with a low potential for the presence of archaeological deposits and a minimal effects on Listed Buildings can also be seen as a positive effect.

7.10.4 Cultural Heritage is a finite resource which once altered or removed cannot be replaced. The scheme would have negative effects wherever there are direct effects on archaeological remains. However there will be positive effects where there will be an improvement of public access or setting.

7.10.5 The significance of the effects of the scheme combines the value of the resource and the magnitude of the effect (incorporating the mitigation strategy) for each cultural heritage asset. The significance is assessed using judgements regarding value, magnitude of effect and significance of effect that are reasonable and balanced. A matrix is used as a check to ensure that these judgements are reasonable and balanced.

7.10.6 At present there are no known archaeological sites within the proposed development area. As the area was part of the Sherwood Forest any archaeological deposits that are present within the site are likely to be of an earlier date. Based on the size of the area and results from comparable areas it is likely that there will be some archaeological deposits present. Consideration will be given to the need to modify the design in order to mitigate the potential

effect on such deposits. If this is not possible appropriate mitigation measures will be undertaken, as detailed above. In this eventuality, after mitigation, there is likely to be a *Moderate Adverse* effect on such archaeological remains.

- 7.10.7 The Forest Stone Grade II Listed building will be retained and its setting will be enhanced by its integration into the green infrastructure. Public access to the Forest Stone will be improved by new green links. In view of this there will be a *Moderate Beneficial* effect on the setting of the Listed building within the development area. There will be a *Neutral* effect on the setting of other Listed buildings in the vicinity of the development.
- 7.10.8 The existing hedgerows that can be defined as Ancient Hedgerows following the 1997 Hedgerow regulations will be retained and improved wherever possible. The historic field pattern will also be used to dictate the layout of the development. In addition new woodland and heathland areas based on those found historically in the area will be provided. Balanced against the effect from the development there will, therefore, be a *Neutral* effect on the historic landscape.

References

Crook, D., 1981 Lindhurst, No Man's Wood and the Manor of Mansfield in *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* **135**, pp 78-87.

DMRB 2009, *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges* Volume 11, Section 1, 2 and 3, Part 2 HA208/07. Cultural Heritage. Highways Agency
<http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmr/vol11/index.htm>.

Hunt, L., 2008 *An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment for Land at Lindhurst, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire (SK 558 580)*. ULAS Report 2008-122.

Mills, A. D. 2003 "Mansfield" A Dictionary of British Place-Names. Oxford University Press. Oxford Reference Online. Oxford University Press.

Morris, J., (ed.) 1977 *Domesday Book: Leicestershire*. Phillimore, Chichester.

Roberts, B.K. and Wrathmell, S., 2000 *An Atlas of Rural Settlement in England*. English Heritage.

Sanderson, G., 1835 *Twenty miles around Mansfield, 1835* (Reprinted by Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils, 2001).

Sources Consulted

CUCAP Cambridge University Committee for Aerial photography

East Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA) Website <http://www.emra.gov.uk/what-we-do/regional-communities-policy/irs-framework/east-midlands-integrated-toolkit>

Geological Survey Sheet 113

HER Historic Environment Record for Nottinghamshire (Nottinghamshire County Council)

Historic Landscape Characterisation Project for Nottinghamshire

Mansfield District Council (MDC) website: http://www.mansfield.gov.uk/leimenu/prabout_historic.htm

Nottinghamshire Archives and Southwell Diocesan Record Office, County House,
Nottingham.

Natural England website <http://www.countryside.gov.uk/LAR/Landscape/CC/jca.asp>.

NMR National Monuments Record, English Heritage, Swindon

OS MAPS: SK55 NW & SK55NE: 1st Edition, 2nd Edition. 1920 Edition, 1938 Edition, 1955 Edition, 1966 Edition, 1989-92 Edition.