

Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project

Environmental Statement – Appendix 7.7 Heritage assets setting assessment

VOLUME NUMBER: 6

PLANNING INSPECTORATE NUMBER: WA010002

APPLICATION DOCUMENT REFERENCE: 6.2

APFP REGULATION: 5(2)(a)

May 2026

Version 0



from
**Southern
Water** 

The Southern Water logo consists of three stylized, wavy blue lines of varying lengths, positioned to the right of the text 'Southern Water'.

Contents

- 1 Heritage assets setting assessment 1**
 - 1.1 Introduction..... 1
- 2 Relevant guidance 3**
- 3 Methodology 4**
 - 3.1 Setting scoping appraisal 4
 - 3.2 Setting assessment methodology 5
 - 3.3 Interrelated heritage assets 12
- 4 Assets and Assessment – steps 2 and 3 16**
 - 4.1 Water Recycling Plant 16
 - 4.2 Pipelines between the Water Recycling Plant site and Bedhampton Springs 18
 - 4.3 Section D: The Water Recycling Plant Site to Portsdown Hill..... 19
 - 4.4 Section E: Portsdown Hill to Boarhunt..... 20
 - 4.5 Section F: Boarhunt to Crockerhill 28
 - 4.6 Section G: Crockerhill to Wickham 33
 - 4.7 Section H: Wickham to Shedfield 36
 - 4.8 Section J: Shedfield to the River Hamble 37
 - 4.9 Section K: The River Hamble to Lower Upham 39
 - 4.10 Section L: Lower Upham to Brambridge..... 41
 - 4.11 Section M: Brambridge to Otterbourne Water Supply Works..... 45
 - 4.12 Above Ground Plant 48
 - 4.13 Decommissioning 52
- 5 Avoiding and Minimising Harm and Enhancement - Step 4 54**
- 6 Conclusions..... 55**
- References 57**

Tables

- Table 3-1 Heritage assets identified during step 1 7

1 Heritage assets setting assessment

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This report presents the results of an assessment of the predicted impacts which may result in a change of setting to heritage assets as a result of the construction, operation (where relevant) and decommissioning of the Hampshire Water Transfer and Water Recycling Project (hereafter referred to as the ‘Proposed Development’).
- 1.1.2 This assessment follows on from the appraisal exercise which has been undertaken (Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 7.6 Heritage assets setting scoping appraisal, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) which has initially identified those heritage assets which have the potential to be affected by construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development, including the Water Recycling Plant (WRP) site and associated Above Ground Plant (AGP) (Table 3-1). This appraisal was undertaken as per Step 1 of the methodology set out in the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice (GPA) in Planning: 3 (GPA3) [1].
- 1.1.3 The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report [2] committed to considering all non-designated heritage assets in a 500m study area from the Order Limits and all designated heritage assets within an extended study area defined as within 1km of the Order Limits or within 3km of the AGP locations and the WRP site (ES Appendix 7.7 Figure 1 Heritage assets considered in the assessment of change to setting, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6)). These have been undertaken in order to identify whether an effect may arise to the setting of heritage assets within these study areas. In response to section 3.2 of the adopted EIA Scoping Opinion [3], a review of designated heritage assets outwith this extended study area was undertaken and no heritage assets that are potentially subject to an adverse effect arising through change to setting have been identified.
- 1.1.4 There are a total of 650 heritage assets identified within the study area (ES Appendix 7.7 Figure 1 Heritage assets considered in the assessment of change to setting, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6)).
- 1.1.5 Of the 650 heritage assets, 77 were identified, in the appraisal exercise where change in their setting resulting from the Proposed Development could lead to harm to their heritage significance, comprising 48 designated heritage assets and 29 non-designated heritage assets (ES Appendix 7.7 Figure 1 Heritage assets considered in the assessment of change to setting, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6)).
- 1.1.6 These heritage assets have been taken forward for detailed assessment, set out below in Section 4.
- 1.1.7 This report reflects design has been iterated as part of the ES submission in 2025 (ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I, (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)) as the design elements of the Proposed Development Order Limits have been updated and undergone refinement. These have been consulted on during in Summer 2022, Summer 2024 and Spring 2025

consultations, which are outlined, along with engagement, in Section 7.3 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).

- 1.1.8 Following Summer 2024 consultation, it was agreed with Historic England (HE) that the setting assessment produced for the ES would incorporate the Scheduled Monument Moated Site at Marwell Manor (National Heritage List for England (NHLE) 1012196).
- 1.1.9 Following the design refinements, there would be no effects on heritage assets at Leigh Park that were considered likely to be affected by pipeline construction which were identified as potentially affected in the setting scoping appraisal (ES Appendix 7.7 Figure 1 Heritage assets considered in the assessment of change to setting, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6)). This resulted in the exclusion of the following assets from the scope of assessment:
1. Sir George Staunton Conservation Area
 2. Grade II* Registered Leigh Park (NHLE 1000112)
 3. Grade II* listed The Staunton Memorial (NHLE 1303476)
 4. Grade II listed Footbridge (NHLE 1339961)
 5. Grade II listed Pathway (to the South of the Staunton Memorial) (NHLE 1092133)
 6. Non-designated Icehouse at Leigh Park (NDHA 26737)
 7. Non-designated The Fort, Staunton Country Park (NDHA 69792)

2 Relevant guidance

- 2.1.1 A requirement for the assessment of impacts to heritage significance as a result of change in the setting of heritage assets is described in planning policy, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) [4] and associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG): Historic Environment.
- 2.1.2 The Overarching National Policy Statement for Water Resources Infrastructure (NPSWRI) [5], the primary decision-making policy associated with Water Resource projects also addresses the subject of the setting of heritage assets. These documents outline the importance of assessing heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, and the contribution to significance associated with an asset's setting, to better understand the potential impacts and effects (in EIA terms) and ultimately acceptability of development proposals in this regard.
- 2.1.3 Industry standard guidance recommended by HE, in Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets second edition (GPA3) [1], defines setting 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 take a positive or negative contribution to the heritage significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that heritage significance, or may be neutral.
- 2.1.4 Historic England's guidance also notes that the setting of heritage assets change over time. Understanding the history of change would help to determine how additional development within the asset's setting is likely to affect the contribution made by setting to the heritage significance of the heritage asset.
- 2.1.5 Conservation is an active process of maintenance and managing change, requiring a flexible and thoughtful approach. The neglect and decay of heritage assets is best addressed by ensuring that they have a viable use that is consistent with their conservation.
- 2.1.6 An important consideration should be whether development proposals adversely affect (harm) a heritage asset's heritage significance. Key elements of the guidance relate to assessing harm as 'substantial' or 'less than substantial' in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 200-202, which is cognate with NPSWRI (paragraphs 4.8.15 to 4.8.29 and Sections 7.2 and 7.8 ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)) Critically, it is the degree of harm to the heritage asset's heritage significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed and should be explicitly identified.
- 2.1.7 The level of substantial harm is stated to be a 'high test' so may not arise in many cases. Whether development proposals cause substantial harm would be a judgment in the decision-taking process, having regard to the circumstances of the case and by applying the relevant NPSWRI and NPPF paragraphs. The harm may arise directly from works to the heritage asset, or indirectly from development within its setting. A thorough assessment of the harm that development proposals would have on this setting needs to consider, and be proportionate to, the heritage asset's heritage significance and the degree to which any changes enhance or detract from that heritage significance, and the ability to appreciate and experience it.

3 Methodology

3.1 Setting scoping appraisal

- 3.1.1 A setting scoping appraisal of heritage assets across the Proposed Development has been undertaken, which is presented in Table 3-1. This constitutes step 1 of GPA 3 [1].
- 3.1.2 The screening assessment used the Zone of Theoretical Visibilities (ZTVs) to identify designated heritage assets within the extended study area and non-designated heritage assets within the 500m study area. This approach has been used with reference to site visits undertaken in November 2023, the ZTV contained within the landscape and visual chapter of the EIA Scoping Report (Chapter 13) to assist the identification of potentially affected heritage assets within the identified areas of search by reviewing provisional viewpoint locations identified within that Chapter to enable early engagement. This report has been updated in line with the latest ZTVs (as shown in ES Figure 13.18 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (construction, bare earth - whole Proposed Development), Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6); ES Figure 13.19 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (construction, with screening whole Proposed Development), Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6); ES Figure 13.20 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (operation, bare earth - Proposed Development, differentiating AGP), Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6); ES Figure 13.21 Zone of Theoretical Visibility (operation, with screening - Proposed Development), differentiating AGP), Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6))
- 3.1.3 A number of the provisional viewpoint locations have been identified as providing viewpoints of those heritage assets where visualisations may be helpful to support this assessment. These are identified at Table 3-1.
- 3.1.4 Table 3-1 sets out a list of all the heritage assets considered within the agreed scope, noting the potential for an effect to arise as a result of the construction, operation or decommissioning of an identified element of the Proposed Development.
- 3.1.5 Those heritage assets which are within 1km of the Eastney Transfer Tunnel and Eastney Long Sea Outfall but are not otherwise located within the relevant study area have not been considered further, in line with The Planning Inspectorate comment at ID 3.2.3 of the adopted EIA Scoping Opinion [3].
- 3.1.6 Perceptible elements of the Proposed Development that have the potential to give rise to harm as a result of change to setting comprise:
1. Construction of the Pipeline, primarily through visible or audible change – any effects arising from construction would reduce on completion of construction works and would be reversible through restoration of the site to its previous condition, with the exception of the short above-ground element of the Pipeline.
 2. Construction of shafts – any change would reduce on completion of construction works and would in most cases be reversible through restoration of the site to its previous condition.

3. AGP comprising the Intermediate Pumping Stations (IPS) and Break Pressure Tanks (BPT) which would present potential change during construction and operation as retained infrastructure.
4. WRP site which would present potential change during construction and operation as retained infrastructure.
5. Washout Valve(s) and Air Valve(s) would be provided along the route to allow for drainage and ventilation of sections of the Pipeline during commissioning and operation – these would be seen as part of the construction programme and are not considered likely to be sufficiently perceptible to give rise to change to setting, but Washout Valve(s) may result in occasional releases of water leading to localised ponding of released water for short periods.
6. Associated Streetworks at Botley Road and A334, which may present potential change during construction and operation.

3.1.7 Heritage assets located entirely outside the study area have been considered but have been screened out as have those where orientation, topography and/or vegetation (where appropriate) indicate that there would be no potential for impacts created by the Proposed Development.

3.2 Setting assessment methodology

3.2.1 This setting assessment is undertaken in accordance with the HE advice presented in Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets second edition [6]. This recommends a staged approach to the assessment of potential impacts on heritage significance, comprising the following five steps:

1. Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their setting are affected.
2. Step 2: Assess the degree to which these setting make a contribution to the heritage significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow heritage significance to be appreciated.
3. Step 3: Assess the effects of the Proposed Development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that heritage significance or on the ability to appreciate it.
4. Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or reduce harm.
5. Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

3.2.2 The scope of this setting assessment is intended to address Steps 1-4. As the Proposed Development has progressed and the design updated a re-evaluation of Step 3 and Step 4 has been undertaken as part of the ES.

3.2.3 These heritage assets have been grouped under the relevant element of the Proposed Development to allow for easier navigation; the assessments consider all relevant change to an asset from any elements of the Proposed Development that may contribute. This report should be read in conjunction with ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6), as well as section 4.2 of the scoping appraisal (ES Appendix 7.6 Heritage assets setting scoping appraisal, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

3.2.4 The rationale for inclusion of designated and non-designated heritage assets (NDHA) are outlined in section 3.2 of the scoping appraisal (ES Appendix 7.6

Heritage assets setting scoping appraisal, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6).

- 3.2.5 An initial scoping appraisal was undertaken to identify which heritage assets and their setting could be affected by the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development (paragraph 3.1.2). This represents Step 1 of the overall setting assessment.
- 3.2.6 Step 1 concluded that a total of 69 heritage assets, 50 designated assets and 19 NDHA, may be affected by the Proposed Development and therefore merited assessment in Steps 2 to 4.
- 3.2.7 The designated heritage assets comprised nine scheduled monuments (SM), 40 Listed Buildings (LB), and one Conservation Area (CA).
- 3.2.8 The NDHA comprised 16 non-designated buildings and three non-designated parks.
- 3.2.9 Heritage assets are referenced by their National Heritage List for England (NHLE) or the relevant County Historic Environment Records (HER) reference number. Some LB are also identified in County HER. To avoid duplication in these instances, only the NHLE number is cited.
- 3.2.10 In general, the nature of the landscape and the setting of individual heritage assets mean that any effects would primarily be expected to arise in relatively close proximity to the heritage assets involved, although some heritage assets have setting that may be expected to be sensitive at longer distances.
- 3.2.11 Consultation was undertaken via submission of the Heritage assets setting scoping appraisal (ES Appendix 7.6 Heritage assets setting scoping appraisal, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) to stakeholders in December 2023 and assets subject to setting assessment were selected and agreed in January 2024.
- 3.2.12 The heritage assets identified through Step 1 (see section 4.1 in ES Appendix 7.6 Heritage assets setting scoping appraisal, Volume II Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6) are presented in Table 3-1 by section of the Pipeline (ES Appendix 7.7 Figure 1 Heritage assets considered in the assessment of change to setting, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6).

Table 3-1 Heritage assets identified during step 1

Proposed Development Section	Asset Class	Reference	Name	Potential for effects from Pipeline Construction	Potential for effects from Shaft construction	Potential for effects from AGP	Potential for effects from WRP site	Potential for effects from Valve/Washout	Rationale	Viewpoint
Pipelines between the WRP site and Bedhampton Springs	CA	N/A	Old Bedhampton Conservation Area	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Effects of Pipeline on the Conservation Area, including on its historic character as a result of visibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure are considered as a direct physical effect as well as a change to setting.	VP009, VP009b
Pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir	LB II	1154418	Bidbury House	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure.	No
Pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir	LB II	1340186	Church of St Thomas	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure.	No
Pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir	NDHA	23432	Crossing Keeper's House	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure including potential visibility of the WRP site.	No
Pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir	NDHA	54954	Granary Building	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure including potential visibility of the WRP site.	No
Pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir	LB II	1303829	Stable Block to Old Rectory	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure.	No
Pipelines between the WRP site and Bedhampton Springs	LB II	1340188	The Old Mill House	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure, including potential visibility of the WRP site.	VP014
Pipelines between the WRP site and Havant Thicket Reservoir	LB II	1091648	The Old Rectory	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipelines construction and retained infrastructure.	No

Proposed Development Section	Asset Class	Reference	Name	Potential for effects from Pipeline Construction	Potential for effects from Shaft construction	Potential for effects from AGP	Potential for effects from WRP site	Potential for effects from Valve/Washout	Rationale	Viewpoint
Section D: The WRP site to Portsdown Hill	SM	1001842	Fort Purbrook	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction due to intermediate shaft.	No
Section D	LB II*	1092134	Fort Purbrook	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction due to intermediate shaft.	No
Section E: Portsdown Hill to Boarhunt	LB II	1350291	Barn 20m east of Offwell Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	No	Proposed Development would not appear with sufficient prominence to present any perceptual change in the setting of the asset	VP037
Section E	LB II	1167209	Barn 20m east of Offwell Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	VP037
Section E	LB II	1095590	Barn 20m West of Manor Farmhouse,	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	VP042, VP039, VP041
Section E	LB II	1350615	Barn 35m West of Manor Farmhouse,	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	VP042, VP039, VP041
Section E	LB II	1096246	Broomfield House	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section E	NDHA*	42503	Cattle Shed, Milking parlour and Dairy 110m north-west of Spurlings Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section E	LB I	1350616	Fort Nelson	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	VP038
Section E	SM	1001860	Fort Nelson	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	VP038
Section E	LB I	1167213	Fort Southwick	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section E	SM	1001808	Fort Southwick	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section E	LB II*	1387128	Fort Widley	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure including BPT/IPS-E.	VP136, VP023, VP024
Section E	SM	1001862	Fort Widley	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure including BPT/IPS-E.	VP136, VP023, VP024
Section E	LB II	1095589	Granary 20m South-West of Manor Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	VP042, VP039, VP041

Proposed Development Section	Asset Class	Reference	Name	Potential for effects from Pipeline Construction	Potential for effects from Shaft construction	Potential for effects from AGP	Potential for effects from WRP site	Potential for effects from Valve/Washout	Rationale	Viewpoint
Section E	LB II	1350614	Manor Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	VP042, VP039, VP041
Section E	NDHA	MWC4328	New Barns	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section E	NDHA	MWC4341	Pigeon House Farm	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section E	LB II*	1095592	The Nelson Monument	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section E	SM	1020960	World War II Heavy Anti-Aircraft gunsite (P12) at Monument Farm)	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure.	No
Section F: Boarhunt to Crockerhill	LB II	1233653	Boundary Oaks School Roche Court	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section F	LB II	1095637	Castle Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction. Proposed Development would not appear with sufficient prominence to present any perceptual change in the setting of the asset	No
Section F	LB I	1350613	Church of St Nicholas	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	VP042, VP039, VP041
Section F	NDHA	HCC 50684	Farm range at Albany Farm	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure including IPS-F and Air Valve(s).	No
Section F	LB II	1230002	House at Saw Mills (Pink and Company Limited)	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section F	NDHA	42506	Milking Parlour at Whitedell Farm	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section F	NDHA	HCC42496	Model Farm East of North Fareham Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section F	LB II	1232921	North Fareham Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section F	NDHA	11802	Nos 1 and 2 North Fareham Farm Cottages	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No

Proposed Development Section	Asset Class	Reference	Name	Potential for effects from Pipeline Construction	Potential for effects from Shaft construction	Potential for effects from AGP	Potential for effects from WRP site	Potential for effects from Valve/Washout	Rationale	Viewpoint
Section F	NDHA	42501	Spurlings Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section F	NDHA	HCC 42505	Whitedell Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section G: Crockerhill to Wickham	LB II	1268502	Mayles	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section G	LB II	1350592	Barn 25m North of Webbs Land Farmhouse	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction, Washout valves(s) and BPT-K.	LVIA
Section G	LB II	1095623	Granary 20m North of Webbs Land Farmhouse	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction, Washout valves(s) and BPT-K.	LVIA
Section G	LB II	1350591	Little Park Mansions	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction, Washout valves(s) and IPS-G.	No
Section G	LB II*	1095586	Park Place	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction, Washout valves(s) and IPS-G.	No
Section G	NDHA	N/A	Park Place, Wickham	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and retained infrastructure.	No
Section G	LB II	1166779	Webbs Land Farmhouse	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction, Washout valves(s) and BPT-K.	No
Section H: Wickham to Shedfield	NDHA	N/A	New Place	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section H/J	LB II	1350573	Sandy Hill House	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section J: Shedfield to the River Hamble	LB II	1095662	Spencer Place	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section J	LB II	1179414	Woodman's Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section K: The River Hamble to Lower Upham	NDHA	340	Wintershill Farm	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section K	NDHA	MWC5039	Wintershill Hall	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Effects to be considered as direct physical change as well as change to setting resulting from perceptibility of pipeline construction and BPT-K.	VP084
Section K	NDHA	N/A	Wintershill Hall	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Effects to be considered as direct physical change as well as change to setting resulting from perceptibility of pipeline construction and BPT-K.	VP084

Proposed Development Section	Asset Class	Reference	Name	Potential for effects from Pipeline Construction	Potential for effects from Shaft construction	Potential for effects from AGP	Potential for effects from WRP site	Potential for effects from Valve/Washout	Rationale	Viewpoint
Section K	LB II	1095629	Wool Street Farmhouse	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of pipeline construction and BPT-K.	No
Section L: Lower Upham to Brambridge	LB II	1350492	Hill Farm House	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s)/Air Valve(s).	No
Section L	LB II	1095822	Keeper's Cottage	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Air Valve(s).	No
Section L	LB II	1302822	Low Hill Farmhouse	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section L	SM	1012196	Moated site at Marwell Manor	Yes	No	No	No		Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction	No
Section L	SM	1012308	Park Pale at Marwell	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section L	SM	1012309	Park Pale at Marwell	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction	No
Section L	LB II	1095821	Woodcroft Lodge	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s)/Air Valve(s).	No
Section M: Brambridge to Otterbourne Water Supply Works	LB II	1095751	Barn NW of Otterbourne Manor House	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of pipeline construction and retained infrastructure.	VP106
Section M	LB II*	1350494	Brambridge House	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section M	NDHA	N/A	Brambridge Park	Yes	No	No	No	No	Effects to be considered as direct physical change as well as change to setting depending on detail of routing.	No
Section M	NDHA	MWC7574	Moat Cottage barn, Otterbourne Manor, Kiln Lane	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	LVIA
Section M	SM	1013055	Moated Site at Otterbourne Manor	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	LVIA
Section M	LB II	1350540	Otterbourne House	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	No
Section M	NDHA	N/A	Otterbourne House Park	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction and Washout valves(s).	No
Section M	LB II	1178879	Wall 5m NW of Manor House	Yes	No	No	No	No	Potential for change to setting arising from perceptibility of Pipeline construction.	LVIA

- 3.2.13 The assets identified in Table 3-1 may be affected by the Proposed Development and therefore merited assessment in Steps 2 to 4.
- 3.2.14 Step 2 (the degree to which setting contributes to the heritage significance of the asset) involved desk-based research, site visits and the viewpoints identified by the ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). In each case, written statements describe their heritage significance with a focus on the contribution made by their setting.
- 3.2.15 Step 3 (impact of the Proposed Development) has determined that changes in setting due to the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development would be of sufficient duration to merit assessment.
- 3.2.16 The presence of the Proposed Development has the potential to change the appearance and character of the setting, as well as changing specific views within these setting that contribute to the heritage significance of the assets. Understanding of the predicted changes in the setting of the 77 assets has been informed by the production of photomontages and viewpoints.
- 3.2.17 Conclusions in Step 3 regarding the effects of the Proposed Development has been expressed in terms of the magnitude of impact (harm) to the heritage significance of heritage assets, applying the magnitude criteria set out in ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). Magnitude of impact has also been expressed using the vocabulary of the Overarching NPSWRI and the NPPF (i.e. 'substantial' and 'less than substantial' harm) to permit direct application to the policy tests in these documents.
- 3.2.18 Step 4 (maximise enhancement, reduce harm) involved dialogue with other members of the project team and to ensure relevant assets were identified and sufficiently assessed.
- 3.2.19 As this document forms part of the EIA of the Proposed Development, the assessment of the potential effects on heritage assets also need to be considered in terms of whether a potential Likely Significant Effect would arise in the context of the EIA Regulations in addition to an assessment of harm to significance in the context of NPSWRI. For this purpose, the EIA significance assessment methodology presented at Section 7.5 of the ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). and at ES Chapter 5 EIA approach and methodology, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6). has been used to develop an assessment of likely significant effects. This assessment is stated in the assessments presented at Section 4 below.
- 3.2.20 Step 5 (decision-making and monitoring): Decision-making is primarily a matter for the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State, and where future monitoring is appropriate, proposals are presented in the ES.

3.3 Interrelated heritage assets

- 3.3.1 As identified above, 77 heritage assets have been identified where there is potential for harm to their heritage significance through changes to their setting resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed

Development. Several of the assets have been grouped as they are both SMs and LBs or are a set of heritage assets that are related to allow for common factors in the setting and interrelationships between heritage assets within the group to be discussed without undue repetition. These are also geographically linked by their relationship to the 'Sections' of the Pipeline.

3.3.2 These heritage assets are as follows:

Pipelines between the Water Recycling Plant site and Havant Thicket Reservoir

3.3.3 Heritage assets within and associated with the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area are:

1. Old Bedhampton Conservation Area
2. Grade II listed Bidbury House (NHLE 1154418)
3. Grade II listed Church of St Thomas (NHLE 1340186)
4. Crossing Keeper's House (NDHA 23432)
5. Grade II listed Stable Block to Old Rectory (NHLE 1303829)
6. Grade II listed The Old Mill House (NHLE 1340188)
7. Grade II listed The Old Rectory (NHLE 1091648)
8. Granary Building (NDHA 54954)

Section D: The Water Recycling Plant site to Portsdown Hill

3.3.4 This Section is predominantly urban/suburban and is densely developed.

1. Fort Purbrook (SM NHLE 1001842 and Grade II* listed NHLE 1092134/1387127) which is also on the National Heritage at Risk Register.

Section E: Portsdown Hill to Boarhunt

3.3.5 This Section is on the lower north-facing slopes of Portsdown Hill and is discernibly more open, with large arable fields:

1. Grade II LB at Offwell Farm
 - a. Grade II listed Barn 20m east of Offwell Farmhouse (NHLE 1350291)
 - b. Grade II listed Offwell Farmhouse (NHLE 1167209)
2. Grade I and II LB at Boarhunt
 - a. Grade II listed Barn 20m west of Manor Farmhouse (NHLE 1095590)
 - b. Grade II listed Barn 35m west of Manor Farmhouse (NHLE 1350615)
 - c. Grade II listed Granary 20m South-West of Manor Farmhouse (NHLE 1095589)
 - d. Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse (NHLE 1350614)
 - e. Grade I listed Church of St Nicholas (NHLE 1350613)
3. Broomfield Park
 - a. Grade II listed Broomfield House (NHLE 1096246)

- b. Broomfield Park (non-designated Park)
- 4. Scheduled monuments and LB at the Palmerston Forts
 - a. Fort Nelson (SM NHLE 1001860 and Grade I LB NHLE 1350616)
 - b. Fort Southwick (SM NHLE 1001808 and Grade I listed building 1167213/1104368), which is also on the National Heritage at Risk Register
 - c. Fort Widley (SM 1001862 and Grade II* listed building 1387128) which is also on the National Heritage at Risk Register

Section F: Boarhunt to Crockerhill

3.3.6 As with Section E of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW, this Section is also generally located low on the north-facing slope of Portsdown Hill and is relatively open:

- 1. Non-designated Buildings at Whitedell Farm
 - a. Milking Parlour at Whitedell Farm (42506)
 - b. Whitedell Farmhouse (42505)
- 2. Buildings at North Fareham Farm
 - a. Grade II listed North Fareham Farmhouse (NHLE 1232921)
 - b. Non-designated Model Farm East of North Fareham Farmhouse (42496)
 - c. Non-designated Nos 1 and 2 North Fareham Farm Cottages (11802)
- 3. Buildings at Spurlings Farm
 - a. Non-designated Cattle Shed, Milking parlour and Dairy 110m north-west of Spurlings Farmhouse (42503)
 - b. Non-designated Spurlings Farmhouse (42501)

Section G: Crockerhill to Wickham

3.3.7 This Section is more typical of the historic character of this part of Hampshire although some areas of historic parkland may survive:

- 1. Listed buildings at Webbs Land Farm
 - a. Grade II listed Barn 25m North of Webbs Land Farmhouse (NHLE 1350592)
 - b. Grade II listed Granary 20m North of Webbs Land Farmhouse (NHLE 1095623)
 - c. Grade II listed Webbs Land Farmhouse (NHLE 1166779)
- 2. Heritage assets within and associated with Park Place, Wickham
 - a. Grade II* listed Park Place (NHLE 1095586)
 - b. Grade II listed Little Park Mansions (NHLE 1350591)
 - c. Non-designated park at Park Place, Wickham

Section K: The River Hamble to Lower Upham

3.3.8 This Section retains the intimate historic character typical of this part of Hampshire, and includes Wintershill Hall:

1. Non-Designated Wintershill Hall (MWC5039)
2. Non-Designated Wintershill Hall Park

Section L: Lower Upham to Brambridge

3.3.9 This Section retains the intimate historic character typical of this part of Hampshire, and includes the substantial former deer park at Marwell:

1. Scheduled Parkland features at Marwell Park
 - a. Park Pale at Marwell (NHLE 1012308)
 - b. Park Pale at Marwell (NHLE 1012309)

Section M: Brambridge to Otterbourne Water Supply Works

3.3.10 This Section occupies low lying land crossed by the River Itchen and associated smaller streams and the Itchen Navigation:

1. Heritage assets associated with Otterbourne Manor
 - a. Scheduled Moated Site at Otterbourne Manor (NHLE 1013055)
 - b. Grade II listed The Manor House (NHLE 1095795)
 - c. Grade II listed Wall 5m NW of Manor House (NHLE 1178879)
 - d. Moat Cottage barn, Otterbourne Manor, Kiln Lane NDHA (MWC7574)
 - e. Grade II listed Barn NW of Otterbourne Manor House (NHLE 1095751 also MWC 3858)
2. Heritage Assets at Otterbourne House
 - a. Grade II listed Otterbourne House (NHLE 1350540)
 - b. Non-designated park at Otterbourne House
3. Heritage Assets at Brambridge Park
 - a. Grade II* listed Brambridge House (NHLE 1350494) which is also on the National Heritage at Risk Register
 - b. Non-designated Brambridge Park

3.3.11 The remaining assets identified in Table 3-1 have all been assessed individually.

3.3.12 In the assessment that follows, the assets are dealt with in order of their locations on the Pipeline from Section D-M. The locations of heritage assets are presented on (ES Appendix 7.7 Figure 1 Heritage assets considered in the assessment of change to setting, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 3)).

4 Assets and Assessment – steps 2 and 3

4.1 Water Recycling Plant

Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and associated listed structures including Old Mill House (NHLE 1340188) and non-designated built heritage

- 4.1.1 The WRP is positioned to the south of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. As such, this section considers the heritage assets associated with the Conservation Area which would be affected by the construction and operation of the WRP including any adverse effects arising on the Conservation Area resulting from the potential visibility of the WRP from the Conservation Area.
- 4.1.2 Old Bedhampton Conservation Area is bisected by the Portsmouth to London Railway, with the nucleus is identified as being centred around the Grade II listed Church of St Thomas (NHLE 1340186), Grade II listed Bidbury House (NHLE 1154418) and Grade II listed The Old Rectory (NHLE 1091648). The southern area extends to include Grade II listed The Old Mill House (NHLE 1340188) along with the millpond and millrace.
- 4.1.3 The Conservation Area is bounded on the western side by modern development from the 1960s and the Hermitage stream to the east.
- 4.1.4 The immediate setting of the Conservation Area, particularly areas such as Bidbury Mead, lands to the south of Bidbury Lane and farmlands to the south and south-west of Lower Road, provide a strong rural character and make an important contribution to the historic interest of the Conservation Area through the visible survival of the Old Mill and associated mill pond, mill race and water management features.
- 4.1.5 Alongside those already mentioned, built heritage assets at Old Bedhampton Conservation Area comprise a group of designated and non-designated assets within the historic village core which include, Keeper's House (NDHA 23432), Grade II listed Stable Block to Old Rectory (NHLE 1303829) and the Granary Building (NDHA 54954).
- 4.1.6 The core of the Conservation Area is concentrated around the Church of St Thomas which has a semi-circular chancel arch and lower walls dating to the 12th century, though much of the building was rebuilt and extended in the 13th and 14th century.
- 4.1.7 Much of the surrounding built heritage assets are from the 18th century such as The Old Rectory and associated stable block. The house is constructed of brick in Flemish bond with some applied rendering and a tiled roof. The main house is a two storeyed square block, with extensions on the west side. It has symmetrical south elevation of five windows and rubbed flat arches. The Stable Block, now a garage, is a rectangular block with a wide slightly projecting centrepiece, having a gable containing a quatrefoil above a lunette window which is irregularly placed below a carriage entrance and round headed stable door.
- 4.1.8 Bidbury House was also constructed during the 18th century. The house is fronted to the east and is of red brick Flemish bond with stone coping above a brick dentilled band and a parapet roof.

- 4.1.9 The Granary Building and Keeper's House were both built during the 19th century. The Keeper's House was constructed along with the Southampton to Dorchester line which had a large number of level crossings, each tended by a resident keeper and is a good example of this type of house built for their accommodation. The Granary Building has an ornate façade and is now converted into a house.
- 4.1.10 The Old Mill House was constructed in 18th century as a water mill to the south of Bidbury Lane and may have replaced an older mill. The building is constructed of red brick in Flemish bond which is now painted and sits on a small island between the Hermitage Stream to the east and its diverted course known as Old Mill Dam to the west which acted as the mill race.
- 4.1.11 The importance of Bedhampton is recognised by the designation of its historic core as a Conservation Area. Its significance derives predominantly from its historic and architectural interests which contribute to its character.
- 4.1.12 The village integrates into the surrounding countryside as a result of the gradual transition from countryside to built form. The village has the sense of openness with its dispersed buildings set back within boundaries, and areas of open land toward the mill race, although some areas are more intimate, with views blocked by high garden walls and dense planting.
- 4.1.13 The architectural and historic values of the Conservation Area are experienced as the viewer moves through the village, observing the changing fortuitous architectural compositions of different buildings seen together as well as the set-piece architectural interests of individual buildings, particularly the Elms and the Church of St Thomas. As the viewer moves to the south from the public spaces near Church of St Thomas, the character of the Conservation Area takes in the more open aspect of Mill Lane and around the Old Mill, in the Mill and environs character area. The surrounding agricultural landscape which offers views to the south and east defines the setting of the Conservation Area and contributes to the ability to appreciate the area's more rural character.
- 4.1.14 With the focus on the Conservation Area concentrating on the Church of St Thomas and surrounding designated heritage within the village in the northern section of the Conservation Area, the WRP is distanced from this central nucleus of the Conservation Area, and how it is experienced due to its location to the south, south-east of the Conservation Area on the opposite side of the A27.
- 4.1.15 The area of the Conservation Area away from the central focus of the village incorporates Old Mill House which lies approximately 199m north-east of the WRP on the northern side of the A27, the closest of the designated heritage assets within the Conservation Area. Any views of the WRP from this asset will be screened by foliage present on either side of the A27.
- 4.1.16 Due to the screening and distanced position of the Conservation Area from the WRP, any impact on the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and Old Mill House would be of negligible magnitude, and therefore a minor adverse effect that would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This would give rise to a negligible degree of less than substantial harm in the context of NPSWRI.

4.2 Pipelines between the Water Recycling Plant site and Bedhampton Springs

Old Bedhampton Conservation Area and associated listed structures and non-designated built heritage

- 4.2.1 Heritage assets within this Section comprise those associated with the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, as detailed in Section 4.1 which would be affected by pipeline construction and the connection to Bedhampton Springs waterworks and visibility of the above-ground pipework connection at Bedhampton Springs.
- 4.2.2 The Pipelines would emerge from a tunnel south of Bedhampton, and after a short section of trenchless construction below the Mill Lane railway bridge, would be inserted by open-cut through a section of relict water meadow before connecting into Bedhampton Springs by a combination of above ground pipeline on the eastern bank of Old Mill Dam connected by a pipebridge over Old Mill Dam which is within the Old Mill and Environs character area of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, a heritage asset of medium importance. This route would roughly parallel the existing railway line to the eastern end of the Mill Dam and would represent a direct physical effect on the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. This would affect a small area of the conservation area which is away from the historic core of the Conservation Area and adjacent to the modern passenger railway line and extant waterworks.
- 4.2.3 As a result, the direct impact, primarily arising from the perception of construction works on the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, would be of moderate magnitude to a medium importance heritage asset during construction. This would be a temporary moderate adverse effect which would be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This would comprise a limited magnitude of less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset in the context of NPSWRI. While there is very limited direct visibility between the Grade II listed Old Mill House and the Proposed Development, there may be some visibility of the Proposed Development in viewpoints from the house, gardens and the meadows to the north and east of the mill, coupled with the change in character of the area containing water management features associated with the historic use of the mill. Within the setting of the Old Mill House, a designated heritage asset of medium importance, would be seen against the backdrop of the railway and waterworks, and any adverse impact during construction would be of low adverse magnitude. This would result in a minor adverse effect that would not be significant.
- 4.2.4 Perceptibility of the construction works and completed development from other heritage assets in the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, which derive their significance primarily from relatively close views in which historic and architectural interests can be best appreciated, is not considered to be sufficient to give rise to any discernible adverse effects given the restricted visibility to the south and the perceptual separation of the assets from the Mill and Environs Character Area by the existing railway.
- 4.2.5 On completion of construction works at Bedhampton Springs, only the above-ground infrastructure crossing Old Mill Dam and within the Bedhampton Springs waterworks would remain visible in the setting of the Grade II listed Old Mill House

and Old Bedhampton Conservation Area. The magnitude of any lasting impact would be negligible, a neutral adverse effect that would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations as the existing topography of the Conservation Area and existing mature planting would provide a degree of screening of the above ground pipe where it crosses the Old Mill Dam. The working areas outside the conservation area would be restored and change to setting arising from these works would cease.

4.3 Section D: The Water Recycling Plant Site to Portsdown Hill

Fort Purbrook – Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1001842)

- 4.3.1 This Section is to be predominantly tunnelled, with a single shaft location near SM Fort Purbrook (NHLE 1001842) which is also Grade II* listed (NHLE 1092134 and 1387127) which may be subject to adverse effects arising from change to setting.
- 4.3.2 Fort Purbrook is the easternmost of a series of forts constructed from the 1860s which ring Portsmouth Harbour and Naval Base, which is between 5 to 8km to the south of the Fort line. The Forts were intended to stop attacks of Portsmouth from the north, with fields of fire to the north of the Forts looking down the northern scarp of Portsdown Hill, combining with intervisibility and overlapping fields of fire between all four Forts allowing them to support each other in case of attack. The remaining three Forts are discussed in paragraph 4.4.2.
- 4.3.3 Fort Purbrook is polygonal in form and has a deep ditch on the outer faces which is lined with brick walls. There are brick lined tunnels and staircase within the chalk, giving access to rifle parapets, gun emplacements, ammunition stores, and central assembly central triangular barrack block. These include two tiers of casemates on the outer faces, flanked by plain walling, with entrances on each side. The external face is red brickwork, with a series of narrow openings. The gateways have 'Norman' arches with roll mouldings, and two recessed columns with cushion caps, all in stone. It is approached from Portsdown Hill road by a steep access road that contributes to a sense of dominance over the surrounding area and forms an austere designed entrance typical of the period and of military architecture.
- 4.3.4 The Fort is connected to the 'Covered Way' a sunken trackway that extends from the north-eastern corner to the east, connecting to Farlington Redoubt. The trackway is overgrown and not readily discernible along its full length, in particular near the Fort.
- 4.3.5 The main structure is little altered and now forms part of an equestrian centre. Despite recent works to some elements of the fort, it generally appears to be in poor condition and the brick lined walls of the ditch show particular instability, with a large section on the eastern face having collapsed into the ditch, and this instability has led to its inclusion on the Heritage At Risk Register.
- 4.3.6 The importance of Fort Purbrook is recognised by its designation as a SM and Grade II* listed building. Its significance derives predominantly from its military history, as an example of the projection of military might of England and the strategic thinking of the mid-19th century. It forms a visible and monumental element of a wider tactical scheme intended to control or surveil the northern area

of Portsdown Hill, with strong associations with the wider military and strategic history of Portsmouth Harbour which are manifest in the views to the south from the fort.

- 4.3.7 The Fort has long range views across the northern face of Portsdown Hill, along with views towards Portsmouth to the south owing to its elevated position, although its proximity to Portsdown Hill Road introduces a degree of perceptible noise into its setting. The intervisibility with Fort Widley to the west is significantly restricted by recent tree and hedge growth, along with a rise in topography and modern development between these forts.
- 4.3.8 Construction of a shaft to the south-east of the Fort on Portsdown Hill Road would be perceptible during the construction works, principally affecting view of the asset as the viewer approaches from the south-east. This would represent a minor adverse impact on a high importance receptor during construction, resulting in a moderate adverse effect which would be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This would amount to a limited degree of harm of less than substantial magnitude to the significance of the Fort in the context of NPSWRI.
- 4.3.9 The adverse effect would be reversed at the completion of construction and there would be no lasting effect during the operational period.

4.4 Section E: Portsdown Hill to Boarhunt

- 4.4.1 This Section is on the lower north-facing slopes of Portsdown Hill and is discernibly more open, with large fields cleared to create open fields of fire for the Palmerston Forts along the ridge of Portsdown Hill.

The Palmerston Forts – Fort Nelson (Scheduled Monument NHLE 1001860), Fort Southwick (Scheduled Monument NHLE 1001808) and Fort Widley (Scheduled Monument NHLE 1001862)

- 4.4.2 The three remaining Palmerston Forts within Section E, Fort Nelson (SM NHLE 1001860 and Grade I listed NHLE 1350616), Fort Southwick (SM NHLE 1001808 and Grade I listed NHLE 1167213/1104368), and Fort Widley (SM NHLE 1001862 and Grade II* listed NHLE 1387128).
- 4.4.3 These forts were some of the largest built in Victorian Britain and are built in the same style, using brick walls of English bond with Norman style doorways, and to broadly equivalent plan forms to Fort Purbrook, with a polygonal plan with four vertical faces to a deep dry ditch, a fire step behind the parapet, and two-storeyed caponiers at the three corners to give raking fire along the ditches. Within this outer framework is an embankment with open gun emplacements at the top. Below the central parade ground there are brick-lined passageways and ammunition stores, and sunken embrasures for mortars. To the rear of the forts are sets of barracks.
- 4.4.4 Land was purchased from the Southwick Estate to construct the forts, and a firing line and clearance line were established to the north of the forts to enable their effective operation, along with intervisibility between the forts themselves. This resulted in major changes to how the land to the north of the forts was managed, with historic mapping identifying that almost all of the woodland within the section was cut down up to the clearance line to provide a clear line of sight for the forts. As the main gun armament of the forts would theoretically have been able to reach

well into the area where the woods were not cleared, the firing line is thought to relate primarily to close defence of the forts against infantry attack, rather than for the main gun batteries. Hedgerows extant at the time that these forts were built appear to have not been removed; this probably represented a practical compromise to retain the field boundaries necessary for farming.

- 4.4.5 During the First World War, several zig-zag trenches were dug across Portsdown Hill. These have been variously interpreted either as practice trenches for training soldiers in trench warfare, or as defensive trenches to defend and control access to key roads and the approaches to the forts. They may have served both purposes, with the latter, defensive, purpose being more likely given their location next to the major forts.
- 4.4.6 The Palmerston forts saw use during the Second World War. Fort Nelson was converted to an area anti-aircraft ammunition store, and ten large magazines were built on the parade ground. During the war, a secure and secret base, the Underground Headquarters, was constructed under Fort Southwick. Construction started in 1942 and was completed that same year.
- 4.4.7 Fort Nelson was abandoned in the 1950s. In 1979, it was sold to Hampshire County Council, and was restored with the assistance of volunteers from the Palmerston Forts Society. It opened to the public in 1994, becoming part of the Royal Armouries in 1995 where it houses their collection of artillery. Fort Widley is currently part of the Peter Ashley equestrian centre and Fort Southwick is now an NHS staff Park and Ride.
- 4.4.8 Like Fort Purbrook, Fort Southwick and Widley are in relative states of disrepair to their brick work and ground stability at the tops of the large ditches. This need for remedial work has led to both forts being entered on the Heritage at Risk Register.
- 4.4.9 The importance of the assets is recognised by their designation as a SM. Their significance derives predominantly from their historic and architectural interests. They are a well-preserved example of Victorian Forts, retaining the functional core of the Forts, the barracks, underground tunnel networks and gun emplacements. Views to the North allow this tactical function to be better understood, although recent tree and scrub growth on the counterscarps of Forts Widley and Southwick significantly reduce visibility into this area.
- 4.4.10 The assets are well documented in early modern and modern history and whilst never seeing the initial intended combat they had originally be designed for, did form a part of the air defence for Portsmouth in the Second World War, and views down to Portsmouth reinforce this historic association.
- 4.4.11 The intervisibility between the Forts is partially restricted by recent tree and hedge growth as well as the development of the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (DSTL) between Forts Nelson and Southwick, with its numerous radar masts and arrays. While this loss of intervisibility and the incongruous appearance of these radar arrays detracts to a degree, the presence of DSTL contributes to the wider military and strategic character of the area and is an intriguing reminder of the strategic value of Portsmouth.
- 4.4.12 These assets would primarily be subject to effects arising from perceptibility of construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW in the cleared zone to the north, although visibility of AGP, specifically BPT/IPS-E to the

east of Fort Widley may also contribute to a change in setting. This is assessed in Section 4.12.

- 4.4.13 Perceptibility of construction works to the north of Fort Widley (including vehicle movements) and associated compounds along the Pipeline route, would represent a relatively limited adverse impact. The fundamental character of the area would remain unchanged, and the open vista would be preserved. However, visibility of construction works would arguably form a detracting element in the setting of the fort. This would give rise to a minor adverse impact to a high significance heritage asset during construction. This would be a moderate adverse effect which would be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This would comprise a limited magnitude of less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset in the context of NPSWRI. This effect would be rapidly reversed on completion of construction works and there would be no lasting adverse effect during the operation of the Proposed Development.
- 4.4.14 Similarly, change in the setting of Fort Southwick would be restricted to visibility of construction works, which would form a detracting element in the setting of the fort. This would give rise to a minor adverse impact to a high significance heritage asset during construction. This would be a moderate adverse effect which would be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This would comprise a limited magnitude of less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset in the context of NPSWRI. This effect would be rapidly reversed on completion of construction works and there would be no lasting adverse effect during the operation of the Proposed Development.
- 4.4.15 Change in the setting of Fort Nelson would be restricted to visibility of construction works, which would form a detracting element in the setting of the fort. This would give rise to a minor adverse impact to a high significance heritage asset during construction. This would be a moderate adverse effect which would be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This would comprise a limited magnitude of less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset in the context of NPSWRI. This effect would be rapidly reversed on completion of construction works and there would be no lasting adverse effect during the operation of the Proposed Development.

Listed buildings at Boarhunt

- 4.4.16 The settlement of North Boarhunt was likely founded during the Early Medieval period and is referred to in Domesday in 1086 as containing two mills and two salterns, along with a church. Presently Boarhunt is a small rural farmstead with the remaining church, however it is possible it may represent a survival of a formerly much larger Medieval village and is noted as an 'Area of High Archaeological Potential' in the Hampshire Historic Settlements Survey [7].
- 4.4.17 The earliest fabric identified within Grade I listed Church of St Nicholas (NHLE 1350613) indicates a building date of at least 1064, along with some later additions and significant restoration of the east and west wall in approximately 1853.
- 4.4.18 The exterior of the church comprises flint walls with galletting to on the chancel and western nave. The chancel contains a single Saxon window (now filled) with deep exterior splay and cable decoration. There are 13th century lancets and one coupled 16th century window, as well as evidence of blocked north and south nave

doorways with pointed arches and a small, blocked priests' door. The roof is tiled and there is a stone bell turret atop the western end of the nave. The church is constructed from a mix of materials including flint, Bath and Quarr stone.

- 4.4.19 The church is surrounded by a churchyard which appears to have been more recently extended out to the west. The churchyard is heavily screened on its north, south and eastern sides by mature trees which reduce visibility from the church onto Boarhunt Road to glimpses. The western views from the church are noticeably more open, looking out onto agricultural fields separated by hedge. Outside the churchyard to the south are two cottages, known as 'Church Cottages', which restricts views to the south. The church has a rural character, and its churchyard forms a quiet and contemplative setting, with the sense of enclosure from the surrounding planting and the sharply rising ground to the north contributing to this sense of retreat.
- 4.4.20 The Church of St Nicolas is not widely visible within its setting, with dense planting around the churchyard and the topography combining with the absence of a tower making the church appear in a revealed view as the viewer approaches through the churchyard gates to the east and north. The importance of the heritage asset is recognised by its designation as a Grade I listed building, and it accrues historic interest through its considerable longevity as a parish church. It may be considered to have significant archaeological, historic and architectural interest and retains a significant amount of fabric from its Early Medieval ecclesiastical architecture, which adds to its significance.
- 4.4.21 The primary function of the church is as a place of worship, therefore views of the church condition how this function is perceived. Rather than a beacon visible far and wide, the church represents a quiet and intimate setting for reflection and worship. Views of and from the church are somewhat restricted due to the mature churchyard planting and views from the church into the wider landscape to the north are very limited and do not contribute to its setting and ability to appreciate its significance. This rural and contemplative setting, however, means that perceptual change in noise during construction has the potential to give rise to adverse effects, as work compounds are located to the south of this area across Boarhunt Road.
- 4.4.22 This audible change would combine with glimpsed visibility of the works in progress to represent a minor adverse impact resulting from a change to setting. This impact on a high importance receptor during construction would be a moderate adverse effect, which would be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. It would represent limited harm of less than substantial magnitude to the asset's significance in the context of NPSWRI. Any adverse effect would cease at the completion of construction.
- 4.4.23 To the north of the church are a series of listed structures associated with the Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse (NHLE 135061). The farmhouse dates from the 17th century with 18th century details and minor changes in the 19th and 20th centuries. It is comprised of red brick in English bond with plinths and rubbed flat arches. The central block is two storeyed with a single storeyed extension to the rear. The plan of the farmhouse suggests it has been rebuilt on the same footprint of an early structure, however none of the original materials of that building are incorporated into the extant building.

- 4.4.24 To the west of the Manor Farmhouse, is a Grade II listed Granary (NHLE 1095589) and two Grade II listed Barns (NHLE 1095590 and 1350615).
- 4.4.25 The Granary is an early 19th century timber framed structure on nine saddles, with boarded walls and a pyramid tile roof.
- 4.4.26 The Barn 20m west of Manor Farmhouse (NHLE 1095590) is an 18th century timber framed structure of five bays with a projecting central waggon entrance, with boarded walls and a half-hipped thatch roof. The Barn 35m west of Manor Farmhouse (NHLE 1350615) is of the same period and construction, however the thatched roof is replaced by a half-hipped corrugated iron roof.
- 4.4.27 The listed assets associated with Manor Farmhouse sit within an active farmstead with modern ancillary buildings to the south, back towards the church, and views across agricultural fields to the north, east and west.
- 4.4.28 The importance of these assets is recognised by the Grade II listing and is significant due to their architectural interest as examples of farm structures from these periods in Hampshire.
- 4.4.29 Construction of the Pipeline would not be visible in the fields to the south because of intervening planting and the lower lying topography of the assets in relation to the Proposed Development, and these heritage assets are not sensitive to what would be a negligible change in noise environment.
- 4.4.30 As there would be no discernible change to the setting of the assets, no adverse impact would arise to their significance.

Pigeon House Farm – non-designated heritage asset (MWC4341)

- 4.4.31 Pigeon House Farm is a non-designated 18th century farmhouse. The house is two storeys with an attic space and comprises red brick with three gabled dormers and a tiled roof.
- 4.4.32 It sits to the north of the farmstead, the central area comprising a yard with modern ancillary farm buildings to the south. From the farmhouse there are restricted views to the south up the northern face of Portsdown Hill, and to the north and east across modern agricultural fields.
- 4.4.33 The importance of the asset is low, in that it is a locally significant example of an early modern vernacular farmhouse within Hampshire which holds significance due to its historic interest.
- 4.4.34 Construction of the Pipeline would not be visible in views of or from the historic farmhouse, which sits within a discernibly modern agricultural setting and modern agricultural landscape. Consequently, no change to setting is anticipated and no adverse impact would arise to the significance of Pigeon House Farm.

The Nelson Monument – Grade II* listed (NHLE 1095592)

- 4.4.35 The Nelson Monument is a 37m high stone obelisk on a granite base which was erected on Portsdown Hill in 1807 to commemorate Nelson's victory and death at the Battle of Trafalgar. The monument was paid for by the navy and was erected to a design modelled on the Aksum Stele, Ethiopia, in a movement driven by officers and men who fought at Trafalgar.

- 4.4.36 The monument is in good condition and is well maintained, with plaques and information boards informing on its significance. It is fenced with approximately 0.8m high iron railings. It is set at the eastern end of the Fort Nelson visitor car park along a public right of way (PRoW).
- 4.4.37 The importance of the asset is high, recognised by the Grade II* listing derives from its historic interest and commemoration of the battle of Trafalgar and death of Horatio Nelson, as well as its wider association with the naval history of Portsmouth and the other military structures, historic and modern along the ridge of Portsdown Hill.
- 4.4.38 An appreciation of the monument is achieved from its setting and location on publicly accessible land, as well as its height adding to its prominence in the landscape; it is also clearly visible to a viewer who searches for it from the sea approach to Portsmouth harbour and points around Portsmouth and Gosport harbours.
- 4.4.39 Construction of the Pipeline to the north would not be visible from the base of the monument, nor from Portsmouth where it is intended to be observed and would not intrude on the intervisibility of the monument with Portsmouth harbour or associated features along Portsdown Hill. The Proposed Development would be visible in some views of the monument from the north but would not prevent visibility nor otherwise interact with its heritage interests. Therefore, no adverse impact would arise to the significance of the monument.

Offwell Farmhouse Grade II listed (NHLE 1167209) and Barn 20m east of Offwell Farmhouse Grade II listed (NHLE 1350291)

- 4.4.40 Offwell Farmhouse and Barn were constructed in the 18th century. The house is two storeys and comprises red brick in Flemish Garden Wall bond with cambered openings, with the south wing containing blue brick headers. The main block has a projecting east wing at the south side, from which the south wing extends, dropping to a single-storey which forms a Z- shape.
- 4.4.41 The barn is timber framed with brick walls and which forms five bays. The hipped roof has been replaced with corrugated iron.
- 4.4.42 The farmhouse sits to the east of the farmstead near Portchester Lane with the barn to the east. The western area of the farmstead comprising a yard with modern ancillary farm buildings, along with an additional modern farm building to the south of the main farmhouse. From the farmhouse there are restricted views to the south up the northern face of Portsdown Hill, and to the north and west across modern agricultural fields.
- 4.4.43 The importance of the assets is medium, reflected by their Grade II listing and they derive historic interest as good examples of an early modern vernacular farmhouse with barn within Hampshire.
- 4.4.44 Construction of the Pipeline would be visible in the field to the south of the farmhouse and barn and to the west of Portchester Lane. There, would, however, be no direct intervisibility with the historic farmhouse or barn, which sits within a discernibly modern farmstead and modern agricultural landscape. Visibility is limited to points on the southern edge of the farmstead because of the intervening modern farm sheds and the lower lying topography of Offwell Farm, although there

may be some visibility of the Pipeline construction works behind Offwell Barn in views from Portchester Lane to the North. The Proposed Development would be visible in sequential views in land that is spatially associated with the farmstead. Any change would cease on completion of construction and would be entirely reversible.

- 4.4.45 No adverse impact would arise to the significance of Offwell Farmhouse.
- 4.4.46 Any adverse impact arising to the significance of the listed Barn would be at most of minor magnitude, a minor impact and not significant in terms of EIA regulations. This would represent limited harm of less than substantial magnitude to the asset's significance in the context of NPSWRI. Any effect would be rapidly reversed on completion of construction works and there would be no lasting adverse effect during the operation of the Proposed Development.

New Barns – non-designated heritage asset (MWC4328)

- 4.4.47 New Barns is an L-shaped farmhouse with the rear of the building being 17th century or older and an 18th century frontage. The house is two storeyed brick building, with a stuccoed string course and tiled roof.
- 4.4.48 The farmhouse sits to the west of the former farmstead, with the eastern area comprising a yard with modern ancillary buildings which is now used as a gym space. From the farmhouse there are restricted views to the south up the northern face of Portsdown Hill, and to the north and west across modern agricultural fields.
- 4.4.49 The importance of the asset is low, as an example of an early modern vernacular farmhouse within Hampshire which is significant due to its historic interest.
- 4.4.50 Construction of the Pipeline would be visible in the field immediately to the south of New Barns. This visibility would slightly affect the perception of the house as in an agricultural landscape and as a result the effect on this heritage assets out be of a negligible impact. This would represent limited harm of less than substantial magnitude to the asset's significance in the context of NPSWRI. Any adverse effect would cease at the completion of construction.
- 4.4.51 No adverse impact would arise to the significance of New Barns.

Broomfield House Grade II listed (NHLE 1096246) and Broomfield Park non-designated park

- 4.4.52 Broomfield House is a 19th century country house located between Mill Lane and Purbrook Heath. The exterior walls are of stuccoed and painted brick with coping to parapet roof with simple cornice moulding, and a hipped slate roof.
- 4.4.53 The house sits within a large garden known as Broomfield Park, with open lawn to the south and smaller garden to the east. It is enclosed by woodland with the exception of some glimpsed views through tree planting of Mill Lane to the south-west.
- 4.4.54 The house was known to have been used as a residence by General Montgomery for a brief period leading up to the D. Day landings. During this time Winston Churchill and King George VI were entertained at the house by the General.

- 4.4.55 The importance of Broomfield House is recognised by the Grade II listing and is good examples of a modern country house with large garden, now non-designated park and garden within Hampshire, and holding strong historical associations with notable historic characters and events, which link the site to the military and strategic significance of the area.
- 4.4.56 Construction of the Pipeline would not be visible in the fields to the south because of the intervening woodland and the lower lying topography of the assets in relation to the Proposed Development.
- 4.4.57 As there would be no discernible change to the setting of the assets, no adverse impact would arise to their significance.

World War II Heavy Anti-Aircraft Gunsite (P12) at Monument Farm – Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1020960)

- 4.4.58 The SM, which includes a World War II Heavy Anti-aircraft (HAA) gunsite and its associated ancillary buildings, is situated at Monument Farm and protected in three separate areas.
- 4.4.59 The gunsite, known as Nelson or P12 (Portsmouth 12), formed part of a chain of batteries positioned to defend the industrial and military targets of Portsmouth and Southampton. It is situated on the crest of a hill with views to Portsmouth, Southampton and the hinterland and lies about 700m north-west of Fort Nelson, which was one of the key ammunition depots for anti-aircraft deployment in the area.
- 4.4.60 The gunsite was well established by 1941 and equipped with four 3.7-inch guns and a GL Mk II radar by 1942. As part of a larger building programme intended to allow air defences to deal with higher and faster-flying aircraft, the construction of four 5.25-inch gun emplacements at Monument Farm began in April 1944 with an expected completion date of February 1945. In January 1946 the battery was selected to form part of the reduced, post-War layout known as the Nucleus Force, and served as a Nucleus Force Battery Headquarters with its guns permanently mounted.
- 4.4.61 The earlier installation consists of a north-west facing semi-circular arrangement of four octagonal 3.7-inch gun emplacements, surrounding a central command post. The command post was mounded over after the war but survives as a largely buried feature with its roof just emerging. While the guns' concrete holdfasts survive with many of the securing bolts still in place, the surrounding blast walls and ammunition lockers have been removed. A second construction phase began in 1944, when four 5.25-inch gun emplacements facing south-west were built around the western part of the 3.7-inch gun formation. These brick and concrete gunpits and adjoining machinery rooms are mostly heavily overgrown but well preserved.
- 4.4.62 The battery is reached from the main gate at Swivelton Lane, via a concrete service road which loops around the central command post with offshoots leading to each of the 5.25-inch gun positions. The domestic camp lies east of the gun emplacements but is not included in the scheduling as none of the original buildings survive.

- 4.4.63 The importance of the asset is recognised by its designation as a SM. Its significance derives predominantly from its historic and architectural interests.
- 4.4.64 The HAA gunsite, is a preserved example of a mid-WWII gunsite, retaining the core of the station, the command post and gun emplacements. It is largely all above-ground with some sub-surface/below-ground aspects of the gunsite, those being recesses and duty shelters for the gun crew.
- 4.4.65 The asset is well documented in modern history and had a key role in the defence of Southampton and Portsmouth, as well as remaining in operation post-war in the Nucleus Force Battery Headquarters.
- 4.4.66 The site is one of 60 well-preserved examples of HAA gunsites and as such it is sufficiently rare to be considered of national importance.
- 4.4.67 It is situated within an open, agricultural landscape adjacent to Monument Farm, an active farm. While this asset is not functionally linked to any specific views in the landscape, the panoramic visibility and views of Portsmouth and Southampton contributes to an understanding of its role in protecting the skies above Portsmouth
- 4.4.68 The Scheduled Monument is accessed via its original track built during the 1940s, which enhances the historic interest of the asset.
- 4.4.69 The HAA gunsite is located to the south of the Pipeline route. The construction swathe of the Pipeline would not readily be visible because of the intervening modern farm sheds and mature hedgerows, but some taller plant may be intermittently visible. This potential change in the setting would be very limited and would not interact with any contributing elements of setting. As a result, no adverse effect would arise to the significance of the HAA gunsite.

Cattle Shed, Milking parlour and Dairy 110m north-west of Spurlings Farmhouse – non-designated heritage asset (42503)

- 4.4.70 The non-designated cattle shed, milking parlour and dairy building at Spurlings Farm, dates from the late 19th century with renovations from the late 20th century. It is constructed of brick with a pitched roof, originally of tile, but has been replaced with modern profile, steel sheeting.
- 4.4.71 The importance of the asset is that it is a good example of an early modern vernacular milking shed and dairy within Hampshire, which is significant due to its architectural interest.
- 4.4.72 Construction of the Pipeline would not be visible in the fields to the north of the asset because of the intervening modern buildings and hedge lines. As there would be no change to the setting of the asset, no adverse effect would arise to the significance of the Cattle Shed, Milking parlour and Dairy New Barns.

4.5 Section F: Boarhunt to Crockerhill

- 4.5.1 As with Section E, this Section is also generally located low on the north-facing slope of Portsdown Hill and is relatively open.

Boundary Oaks School, Roche Court Grade II (NHLE 1233653)

- 4.5.2 Roche Court is a Medieval building with a largely 17th century fabric which conceals a stone walled Medieval core accessed off of Pook Lane and Wickham Road. The original Medieval building, the core of which remains within the later structure, was built by Peter des Roches, the Bishop of Winchester, in approximately 1225.
- 4.5.3 The Medieval estate, which persisted into the early modern period, was a fenced rectangle with the house in the centre, likely indicating an area of fenced parkland. Historic mapping from 1841 tithe map (see ES Appendix 7.1 Historic environmental baseline study, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6). shows that parkland extended on each side of the entrance drive to its south and north, with a belt of trees providing privacy from the Fareham to Wickham Road on the west and northerly boundary and curved around to the east. This tree line is still extant on the western and northerly boundary, although has been removed from the eastern side.
- 4.5.4 During the Second World War, Roche Court was the Headquarters for D-Day Marshalling Area 'A', which comprised group of temporary camps around Portsmouth and Gosport.
- 4.5.5 Roche Court remained in military use until the end of the Second World War and beyond. After the war, Roche Court was used as a naval vehicle repair station and a victualling supply base, until it was sold in 1960 and became Boundary Oaks School in 1961.
- 4.5.6 The importance of the asset is recognised by its designation as a Grade II listed building. Its significance derives predominantly from its historic and architectural interests.
- 4.5.7 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW to the north-east would not be visible in the fields to the north of the asset because of the intervening modern buildings and hedge lines. As there would be no change to the setting of the asset, no adverse effect would arise to the significance of Roche Court.

North Fareham Farmhouse Grade II listed (NHLE 1232921) and associated non-designated assets.

- 4.5.8 North Fareham Farmhouse is an 18th century farmhouse. The house is two storeys and is comprised of red brick with grey headers, with a steeply pitched tiled roof with a half-hipped gable at the north end and large off centred chimney.
- 4.5.9 It sits to the north-west of the farmstead, the eastern area comprising a yard with modern ancillary farm buildings. From the farmhouse there are restricted views to the north toward the eastern extent of Pook Lane.
- 4.5.10 Two 19th century non-designated buildings, Model farm (42496) to the east and a pair of semi-detached farm cottages (42499) to the south of farmhouse complete the farmstead.
- 4.5.11 The importance of these assets is low in that they are locally significant examples of an early modern vernacular farm buildings within Hampshire and are significant due to their historic interest.

- 4.5.12 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW to the north-east would not be visible because of the intervening topography and hedge line.
- 4.5.13 As there would be no change to the setting of these assets, no adverse effect would arise to the significance.

Spurlings Farmhouse non-designated heritage asset (42501)

- 4.5.14 Spurlings Farmhouse is an 19th century farmhouse. The house is of two storeys in red brick with ground floor sash windows facing Pook Lane to the north-west, with its main frontage facing west.
- 4.5.15 The importance of the asset is low in that it is a locally significant example of an early modern vernacular farmhouse within Hampshire and is significant due to its historic interest.
- 4.5.16 Construction of the Pipeline would not be visible in the fields to the north of the asset because of the intervening topographic changes and hedge line.
- 4.5.17 As there would be no change to the setting of this asset, no adverse effect would arise to the significance.

Whitedell Farmhouse (42505) and Milking Parlour at Whitedell Farm (42506) non-designated assets

- 4.5.18 Whitedell Farmhouse is a 18th century farmhouse comprising two storeys and is in red brick. The farmhouse is the primary building within the farmstead, with the Milking Parlour located to the south.
- 4.5.19 The parlour was constructed in the late 19th century and is built of brick, with a pitched roof of corrugated iron.
- 4.5.20 The farm was not accessible during the site visits as it is located on private land.
- 4.5.21 The importance of these assets is low in that they are locally significant examples of an early modern vernacular farmhouse and milking parlour and are significant for their historic interest.
- 4.5.22 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW would be visible in the field immediately to the south of Whitedell Farm. There, would, however, be no intervisibility with the historic farmhouse, which sits within a discernibly modern agricultural setting and modern agricultural landscape. Visibility is limited to points on the southern edge of the farmstead because of the intervening modern farm sheds and planting.
- 4.5.23 No adverse effect would arise to the significance of Whitedell Farm and Milking Parlour.

Farm Range at Albany Farm (50684) non-designated assets

- 4.5.24 The Farm Range Albany farm is accessed to the east off Wickham Road and consists of 18th/19th century four rectangular single storeyed red brick barns arranged around a central quod. The main 18th/19th century farmhouse is located to the south of these buildings down a short driveway. These buildings are now in use as a business centre.

- 4.5.25 To the east of the range are three modern ancillary buildings and a concrete trackway in order to access the agricultural fields thereafter. From the range and farmhouse, there are views to the east looking along a gently sloping valley down to the River Wallington.
- 4.5.26 The importance of these assets is that they represent a locally significant, albeit sympathetically altered example of an early modern vernacular farmhouse and model farm range and are significant for their historic interest.
- 4.5.27 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW along with compounds and access roads from Wickham Road to the east would be discernible in the fields immediately to the north, south and east of the farmhouse and range. There may be some visibility of IPS-F, although this visibility would be very limited. These changes would result in the temporary change of the agricultural landscape immediately around the model farm range and loss of agricultural historic character during the construction period. Any changes that interact with setting would cease at the end of the construction period.
- 4.5.28 This change would represent a moderate adverse impact resulting from a change to setting to a low importance heritage asset, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would not be significant in terms of EIA regulations. This change would be greatly reduced on completion of the construction period with visibility of IPS-F, with a minor adverse effect persisting into the operational period, however as screening from planting and landscaping around IPS matures these effects would not persist beyond the short-term.

House at Saw Mills (Pink and Company Limited) Grade II listed building (NHLE 1230002)

- 4.5.29 Saw Mills is an early 18th century two-storeyed house comprised of red brick with grey headers and coved cornices, with a hipped tiled roof. The eastern façade has brick string course at the first-floor sill and an off-centre front porch, which like the rest of the structure is also two storeyed.
- 4.5.30 The area to the north, south and west of the building is a mix of residential and industrial buildings, however there are some views of pasture to the east although there is no clear association between the pasture and the building in terms of setting beyond this area providing a rural context for the asset.
- 4.5.31 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing and is significant for its historic interest as a good example of an early modern vernacular house with associations to specific local industries.
- 4.5.32 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW would be visible in the field immediately to the east of Saw Mills. However, the house sits within a discernibly modern setting and landscape, eroding the rural context in this view from the house. This change would represent a minor adverse impact resulting from a change to setting on a medium importance receptor that would be a minor adverse effect that would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This effect would represent a low magnitude of harm of less than substantial magnitude to the asset's significance during the construction period in the context of NPSWRI. The adverse effect would cease at the completion of

construction as fields are restored, and no adverse effect would arise following completion of these works.

Mission Room with Cottage Adjoining Grade II listed building (NHLE 1351248)

- 4.5.33 These structures were constructed in the early-19th century, the southern single storey Chapel consists of red brick with grey headers, brick eaves and a slate roof, with three Gothick arched windows. To the rear of the chapel is a rectangular garden bordered by hedgerows with views across agricultural fields to the south-east.
- 4.5.34 The northern gable porched cottage is a two-storey slate hung building, with a hipped slate roof and one Gothick arched window on each floor. To the rear of the cottage is an area of rough pasture bordered by hedgerows with views across agricultural fields to the south-east.
- 4.5.35 The building fronts onto Forest Lane to the north-west, where there is a steep bank on the opposite side of the lane which obscures views of agricultural fields from ground level. This field would be visible from the second storey of the cottage, although there is no clear association between this and the building in terms of setting beyond the surrounding land providing a generalised rural context for this asset.
- 4.5.36 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing as a good example of an early modern nonconformist religious building with attached house which holds significance for its historic and architectural interest.
- 4.5.37 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW would be visible in the field immediately to the north-west of the asset from the second storey of the cottage and would give rise to a change in its rural setting This would represent a minor change to setting which is assessed as of minor adverse magnitude on a medium importance receptor, and therefore a minor adverse effect that would be not significant in the context of the EIA regulations.
- 4.5.38 It would, however, represent a low magnitude of less than substantial harm to the asset's significance in the context of NPSWRI. The adverse effect would reduce at the completion of construction as fields are restored, and no adverse effect would persist following completion of these works.

Castle Farmhouse Grade II listed building (NHLE 1095637)

- 4.5.39 Castle Farmhouse is a 19th century two storeyed house built of red brick in Flemish Garden Wall bond with a hipped slate roof. It has a doorcase with an open pediment on a bracket with panelled pilasters.
- 4.5.40 The frontage of the house comprises of a driveway on the eastern side of the house, with a walled lawn directly in front of the house which stretches back toward Castle Farm Lane. To the west of the property is a short dirt trackway which accesses a modern L-shaped building to the rear of the house which restricts the houses views of agricultural fields to the north.

- 4.5.41 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing as a good example of an early modern vernacular farmhouse within Hampshire which is significant for its architectural and historic interests.
- 4.5.42 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW may be visible in the field immediately to the north of Castle Farmhouse in views from the historic farmhouse, although visibility to the west and north-west of the farmhouse are limited by the intervening modern farm sheds and planting.
- 4.5.43 This visibility of works in close proximity to the house in land historically associated with it would give rise to a minor adverse impact, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This would result in a low magnitude of less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset in the context of NPSWRI. This effect would cease on completion of construction works and no effects would persist into the operational period.

4.6 Section G: Crockerhill to Wickham

- 4.6.1 This Section is more typical of the historic character of this part of Hampshire, with extensive areas of woodland, dispersed settlements and relatively small enclosures combining with more subtle topography to present a more intimate historic character with very limited views.

Mayles Grade II listed building (NHLE 1268502)

- 4.6.2 Mayles is a 17th century two storey house with additions and extensions from the 18th to 20th centuries, built in brick laid in Flemish Garden Wall and stretcher bonds, much of which is colourwashed and rendered. It comprises three parallel ranges; the front range comprises the original two room plan house which has been extended to right by two bays in about 18th century and again to the right of that by one bay in the 20th century.
- 4.6.3 The frontage borders Mayles Lane and has views over modern agricultural fields to the south-east. The rear, to the north-west, has a garden with ponds which are filled and drained by diverted channels from the River Meon, whose wooded banks forms the boundary of the property to the north and west. It is possible this may be a relic and/or adaptation of the historic water meadow in this area.
- 4.6.4 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing and that it is a good example of a rural house within Hampshire which is significant for its historic interest as well as architectural interest for its design and use of the landscape within its garden.
- 4.6.5 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW including launch and reception pits for trenchless construction across the River Meon would not be visible in the fields to the south-east of the asset as a result of the restricted views from the winding nature of and hedge line along Mayles Lane. Views to the north-west are also not possible due to the thick woodland on the western bank of the River Meon.
- 4.6.6 No adverse effect would arise to the significance of Mayles.

Webbs Land Farmhouse Grade II listed building (NHLE 1166779) and associated listed buildings

- 4.6.7 Webbs Land Farmhouse is an 18th century house with stucco and painted brickwork, hipped dormer windows and tiled roof. It is located to the south of a large Grade II listed barn (NHLE 1350592) and a Grade II listed Granary building (NHLE 1095623).
- 4.6.8 The barn is a timber-framed nine-bayed structure, with boarded walls and a half hipped tiled roof. The granary is also timber framed on 4 x 3 saddles, with boarded walls and a hipped tile roof. Both structures were constructed in 18th century and together with the farmhouse form a range of buildings around a central area of lawn, separated by a wall that runs from the farmhouse in the south-west to a driveway to the north-east.
- 4.6.9 The farmhouse has views of a lawn to the west across a second area of driveway and to the south across land now in use as a vineyard, which is bordered by the River Meon and a public footpath.
- 4.6.10 The barn and granary have views to the east of a large pond with an island which is bordered on its eastern bank by a mature treeline and Wickham Golf Course. To the north there are several more modern residential properties which again bordered by trees and the golf course.
- 4.6.11 Overall, the farm range is very well screened on all sides, giving it a character of an enclosed private estate and gardens.
- 4.6.12 The importance of these assets is recognised by their Grade II listing as a good example of a rural farmhouse and associated structures which are significant for their historic and architectural interests.
- 4.6.13 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW including launch and reception pits for trenchless construction across the River Meon would not be visible in the fields to the south-east of the assets as a result of the restricted views from the winding nature of and tree lines along Tanfield Lane. Views to potential works within the golf course to the east are also not possible due to the thick woodland.
- 4.6.14 No adverse effect would arise to the significance of these assets.

Park Place Grade II* listed building (NHLE 1095586) and non-designated park at Park Place

- 4.6.15 Park Place was originally built as a mansion to the north-west of Wickham in the mid-18th century and had replaced an earlier stone mansion house which sat within parkland. It had additional wings added to the building during the 19th century and outward extensions in the late 20th century.
- 4.6.16 The three storeyed main block of the building is built of red brick with blue headers and red quoins on its frontage, at the rear some Flemish bond with blue headers and red rubbed flat arches. The two storeyed south wing is built of red brickwork and the similarly two storey north wing stuccoed. The main block and north wing have a hipped tile roof with the south wing having hipped slate roof to the south wing. At the south side of the main block there is a two-storey semi-circular bay of three windows. The north wing has a rear extension capped by a clock tower.

- 4.6.17 Whilst a private house for much of its existence, during the Second World War it was established into a small factory for assembly of parts used for Spitfires. In 1968 the Park Place Pastoral Centre was established within the house and provides accommodation and conference hall.
- 4.6.18 Park Place and its formal gardens, the non-designated Park at Park Place, are shown in 18th century historic mapping (ES Appendix 7.1 Historic environment baseline study, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)). as part of the Little Park Estate. The fields to the north and south of the extant Park Place, which include Wickham Golf Course and modern agricultural fields, are thought to be part of the former Medieval deer park, with a boundary to the north at Titchfield Lane and the remaining boundaries still discernible from the layout of extant field boundaries.
- 4.6.19 Due to the modern development of Park Place itself, a large modern agricultural field to the north of Park Place, as well as the increasing suburbanization in the form of residential housing, golf course and nearby garden centre, the parkland character of the park at Park Place is limited to specific surviving elements but is otherwise relatively intangible and does not survive as a coherent designed scheme in the current setting.
- 4.6.20 The importance of the Park Place is recognised by its Grade II* listing as a very well-preserved example of an early modern mansion house within Hampshire and is significant in terms of its historical and architectural interest.
- 4.6.21 The importance of the park at Park Place is that it once formed a possible medieval deer park, although much of the extents of this are conjectured based on extant field systems and modern development has obscured or removed features that might offer a more definite interpretation. The asset does still retain historical and archaeological interest which is of some significance, and it has been assessed as a heritage asset of low significance.
- 4.6.22 The adverse impact from the perceptibility of construction works specific to IPS-G to the north of Park Place is detailed in paragraph 4.12.15. However, the perceptibility of construction works (including construction noise, vehicle movements) is limited from Park Place due to mature tree screening to the north, but this may still give rise to glimpsed views as the viewer moves around the asset.
- 4.6.23 These views would represent a minor adverse impact resulting from a change to setting which is assessed as of negligible adverse magnitude and a neutral effect that would be not significant. The park at Park Place would similarly be subject to minimal impact during construction. The Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW would pass through the golf course and an arable field without affecting and key elements of the parkland and any impact on the historic character and significance of the park would be of negligible adverse magnitude and a neutral effect that would be not significant. Any visible disturbance could be readily restored, and it is not anticipated that any lasting adverse effect would arise.

Little Park Mansions Grade II listed building (NHLE 1350591)

- 4.6.24 Little Park Mansions is a three-storey house with a two-story northern L-shaped service wing which was constructed in the early 19th century and was added to in the 20th century. The house is built of stucco walls, with a hipped tile roof on the

main building and of slate on the northern wing. The main porch is comprised of two columns with full Doric Order and pediment. The house has now been subdivided and is used as flats.

- 4.6.25 The frontage of the house borders Titchfield Lane to the north-west with the rear of the house to the east and south-east containing a garden which is bordered by a tree and hedge line, restricting the view of modern agricultural fields to the south.
- 4.6.26 The importance of Little Park Mansions is recognised by its Grade II listing and that it is a good example of a mansion house within Hampshire and is significant in terms of its architectural interest.
- 4.6.27 The perceptibility of construction works (including construction noise, vehicle movements) and associated compounds and structures related to the AGP in the form of IPS-G to the south of Little Park Mansions are largely screened by mature tree screening to the south of the asset, but this may still permit glimpsed views.
- 4.6.28 This would represent a negligible adverse impact during the construction period resulting from a change to setting. This impact on a medium importance receptor during construction would represent a neutral effect, which would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. It would, however, give rise to a very low magnitude of less than substantial harm to the asset's significance in the context of NPSWRI.
- 4.6.29 The retention of permanent above-ground infrastructure (IPS-G) during operation means that the minor adverse effect on Little Park Mansions would persist and that that a very limited magnitude of less than substantial harm in the context of NPSWRI would remain.

4.7 Section H: Wickham to Shedfield

- 4.7.1 Similar to Section G, this Section is more typical of the historic character of this part of Hampshire, with areas of woodland and dispersed settlements to the south of the area which become gradually more suburbanised towards Shirrell Heath and Waltham Chase which limits views.

New Place, Shirrell Heath Grade I listed building (NHLE 1095660) and non-designated park at New Place

- 4.7.2 New Place was designed and built by architect Edwin L. Lutyens in 1906 and contains the internal timber and plasterwork from a demolished 17th century house in Bristol, which had been the home of the building's patron. The house was of a formal Jacobean style with Arts and Crafts elements, built of fine red brick in Flemish bond with symmetrical elevations, with the main house comprising three storeys and a single storey service wing to the north-east. The house is currently used as a hotel and conference centre.
- 4.7.3 The frontage of the house is orientated to the south-east toward High Street which is accessed via a short driveway with turning circle through ornate iron gates. To the south-west of the house is a three-tiered terrace garden, the non-designated Park at New Place. The gardens comprise a central formal Arts and Crafts style Garden, arranged symmetrically in line with the axis of the house, the terraces lined with brick walls and a central set of steps. In addition, a series of winding

paths radiate from the terraced area to the north and south, encouraging short ranged, restricted views of elements of the wider garden such as an orchard and areas of woodland. The lower terrace is currently used as a cricket oval with a small timber pavilion located to the east.

- 4.7.4 The importance of New Place and the non-designated garden is recognised by the buildings Grade I listing. It is a nationally important example of a modern mansion house with Arts and Crafts influence and is significant in terms of its historical and architectural interest through its reuse of older material in a new but consciously archaizing style and its association with Lutyens.
- 4.7.5 The setting of the house and garden are very much to be experienced holistically, with the main views to and from the house designed to be taken in conjunction with the garden.
- 4.7.6 Construction works would not be perceptible from either the house or garden, as they are primarily tunnelled in this area and are being undertaken north-east along High Street.
- 4.7.7 No adverse effect would arise to the significance of these assets.

4.8 Section J: Shedfield to the River Hamble

- 4.8.1 This Section is typical of the historic character of this part of Hampshire with dispersed farmsteads and relatively small enclosures with subtle topography to present a more intimate historic character.

Sandy Hill House Grade II listed building (NHLE 1350573)

- 4.8.2 Sandy Hill House is a late 18th century two-storey house and is comprised of red brick with blue headers, with a hipped tiled roof with dormer windows.
- 4.8.3 It sits to the north-west corner of its plot with a garden to the west and south and Winchester Road to the east. The garden is well enclosed by modern fencing and clump planted trees in the south.
- 4.8.4 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing, and it is a good example of an early modern vernacular house within Hampshire and is significant due to its historic interest.
- 4.8.5 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW and trenchless construction compound on the northern side of St Anne's Lane would be both visible and audible in the field immediately to the south of Sandy Hill House. Visibility is limited to points on the southern edge of the garden because of the intervening modern fencing and planting.
- 4.8.6 This change on a medium importance receptor would represent an adverse impact from a change to setting which is assessed as of minor impact, a minor effect which would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This effect represents a low magnitude of less than substantial harm to the asset's significance in the context of NPSWRI. This change would be reversed on completion of the construction period and the effect would not persist into the operational period.

Spencer Place Grade II listed building (NHLE 1095662)

- 4.8.7 Spencer Place is a late 15th to early 16th century exposed timber framed house with infilling of the walls with plaster and brickwork and has 19th century extensions.
- 4.8.8 The house sits to the south of Sandy Lane, accessed via a private driveway to the west and historic mapping indicates that it once sat within a cluster of buildings with a well.
- 4.8.9 The house is well screened from Sandy Lane by a mature hedge and treeline which wraps around the property to the east, providing screening from a trackway from Spencer Place Farm.
- 4.8.10 Sandy Lane is a very narrow lane with an ‘ancient character’ as identified within the Winchester Landscape Character Assessment. The lane is lined with mature hedges and trees on both sides which restrict views along it. The house along with its setting on the lane add to the appreciation of its rural character.
- 4.8.11 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing, and it is a good example of an early post medieval timber framed house within Hampshire and is significant due to its historic interest.
- 4.8.12 Construction of the Pipeline is intended to be undertaken in fields to the east of Spencer Place Farm and would not be perceptible from the asset.
- 4.8.13 No adverse effect would arise to the significance of Spencer Place.

Forest Farmhouse non-designated heritage asset (MWC6309)

- 4.8.14 Other than the listing of this asset within the Winchester HER, no details could be gathered on this asset.
- 4.8.15 The location cited by the HER is within an area of modern paddocks on the southern edge of Sandy Lane, however no structure is visible from aerial photography and during the site visit no asset was visible through the hedge line. Access to the paddocks was not possible as it was located on private land. It appears that this HER record has been incorrectly located and as such this asset has not been assessed.

Woodman’s Farmhouse Grade II listed building (NHLE 1179414)

- 4.8.16 Woodman’s Farmhouse is an early 17th century timber framed with brick infilling farmhouse. The original baffle entry to the building has been blocked off and is now a window and a T-shaped service wing has been added to the rear.
- 4.8.17 The farmhouse is to the north of Curdridge Lane, accessed by a private trackway and as such was not able to be visited during the site visit.
- 4.8.18 The farmhouse sits within an oval garden which is screened from all sides by mature trees and a hedge. To the north and east there is a modern industrial yard, which includes car repair and welding and fabricators, comprises of several modern sheds and to the west are modern agricultural fields.
- 4.8.19 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing, and it is a good example of a post medieval timber framed farmhouse within Hampshire and is significant due to its historic interest.

- 4.8.20 It appears that construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW would not be visible in views to or from the historic farmhouse, which sits within a discernibly modern industrial setting and modern agricultural landscape. Even if limited visibility of the construction works would be available, this would not present any loss of historic interest. Consequently, no change to setting is anticipated and no adverse effect would arise to the significance of Woodman's Farm.

4.9 Section K: The River Hamble to Lower Upham

- 4.9.1 This Section is typical of the historic character of this part of Hampshire with dispersed farmsteads and relatively small enclosures, along with non-designated parkland at Wintershill.

Wintershill Hall non-designated heritage asset (MWC 5039) and non-designated park at Wintershill.

- 4.9.2 Wintershill Hall is a 19th century Classical-style stone house and associated non-designated parkland to the north of Durley Street, which was purchased and designed by George Henry Stares following Enclosure of fields in 1858, much of which had been Common Land.
- 4.9.3 During the Second World War, the house was used from 1939 to 1941 as a school for children evacuated from Gosport, and later as accommodation for Jewish children who had survived Belsen concentration camp.
- 4.9.4 The house is accessed via a winding driveway from Scivier's Lane to the west, the front of the house facing south-east.
- 4.9.5 The main porch of the house is comprised of four columns which supports a first-floor balcony which gives views south-east across the driveway along a tree lined lawn culminating in a planted tree clump.
- 4.9.6 A series of later extensions and a kitchen garden are located to the north and a private lawn screened by mature trees is to the rear of the property to the north-west.
- 4.9.7 The parkland is located to the east of the house, aligned roughly north to south following the natural sloping topography from the high point to the north. The parkland comprises improved pasture and clump planting of mature trees, screened by treelines on all sides. The topography of the park and clump planting limits long range views.
- 4.9.8 The parkland is not publicly accessible and is instead more commonly experienced via a PRoW to the south and east. To the south the viewer is separated by a post and wire fence, so some views to the north can be appreciated, however to the east the mature treeline restricts views of the parkland to glimpses. The enclosed nature of the parkland affords a degree of rural privacy, along with a quiet and contemplative setting.
- 4.9.9 The importance of these assets is low, in that that they are a locally significant example of an early modern country house and much-altered improved parkland within Hampshire which holds significance due to its historic interest.

- 4.9.10 Works during construction of the Pipeline are intended to take place on the eastern side of the non-designated Wintershill Park, with trenchless construction to the south of the parkland and open-cut to the north. A temporary works compound and along with AGP in the form of BPT-K are to be located to the north of the kitchen garden, partially screened by a treeline. Therefore, the works and AGP would constitute a direct impact on the non-designated park although this has been considered here as this effect would arise primarily through loss of historic character. These impacts would arise only from the visible presence of BPT-K from the northern fringes of the park during the operational phase and would fall to a minor adverse impact. This would result in a minor effect that would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations and NPSWRI, on completion of construction works.
- 4.9.11 Perceptibility of construction works would also represent an adverse impact on Wintershill Hall, in the form of construction noise and changes to views. These effects would be greatest during the construction period, and on completion of construction would reduce significantly. Effects would persist while any required restoration planting matured but these effects would effectively be reversed within the operational period. This change would represent a moderate adverse impact from a change to setting on a heritage asset of low importance, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would not be significant.

Wintershill Farm non-designated heritage asset (MCW340)

- 4.9.12 Wintershill Farm is a two-storey 19th century farmhouse located outside of the Non-Designated Park at Wintershill to the east.
- 4.9.13 The farmhouse is located immediately to the south of a modern agricultural farmyard and is screened to the east by hedgerows and a small outbuilding, the south by a mature hedgerow and has open views over modern agricultural fields to the west.
- 4.9.14 Construction of the Pipeline would not be visible to the west of the asset because of the intervening existing planting.
- 4.9.15 As there would be no change to the setting of the asset, no adverse effect would arise to the significance of Wintershill Farm.

Wool Street Farmhouse Grade II listed building (NHLE 1095629)

- 4.9.16 Wool Street Farmhouse is a 17th century timber framed house with brick infill with low tiled eaves.
- 4.9.17 The farmhouse is located to the south-west of Winchester Road and is screened to the south-west by mature trees and a hedgerow and is bordered by a carpentry workshop to the north.
- 4.9.18 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing, and it is a good example of a post medieval timber framed farmhouse within Hampshire and is significant due to its historic interest.
- 4.9.19 Construction of the Pipeline would not be visible to the west of the asset because of the intervening planting and topography.

- 4.9.20 As there would be no change to the setting of the asset, no adverse effect would arise to its significance.

4.10 Section L: Lower Upham to Brambridge

- 4.10.1 This Section retains the intimate historic character typical of this part of Hampshire, and includes the substantial former deer park at Marwell, which has a high density of designated and non-designated heritage assets which present specific sensitivities to change to setting.

Moated Site at Marwell Manor (NHLE 1012196)

- 4.10.2 Marwell Manor is a moated site, which served as a major rural manor for the Bishops of Winchester from the middle of the 10th century until the late 16th century. The manor site was thought to have been built in the 10th century shortly after the Bishop of Winchester was granted land in the area by King Eadgar. From 1279 until the 17th century the manor also had an associated park.
- 4.10.3 The moat which has an average width of 20m is well-preserved and remains partly wet, though parts are now landscaped. The external bank of the moat is also roughly 20m wide along the southern arm and at the southern end of the eastern and western arms. The bank on the eastern arm extends beyond the southern end of the moat for roughly 100m and possibly represents part of the boundary of the park.
- 4.10.4 The moat surrounds an area measuring approximately 130m by 110m which houses several buildings including the Grade II Manor House and Grade II Moat House. A 30m by 20m fishpond lies in the south-west corner of the land surrounded by the moat.
- 4.10.5 Reflected in its designation as a Scheduled Monument, the Moated Site at Marwell Manor is of high importance. As outlined above, the cultural significance of this site lies in its survival as a well-preserved example of a moated site built in the early medieval period with the high importance of the site supported by being one of relatively few surviving examples of a moated site in Hampshire.
- 4.10.6 The Moated Site at Marwell Manor is situated within a landscape of arable and pastoral fields interspersed with farm and small industrial sites including a farm to the south of the monument in the intervening area between the site and Proposed Development. In relation to the Proposed Development the moated site is situated to the north, north-east of Section L. Given the proximity, there would be perceptibility of construction works to the south and west of the monument in the form of construction noise, vehicle movements, though this would not detract from how the monument is currently appreciated and would not significantly change the current setting of the monument.
- 4.10.7 The construction of the Pipeline would not be visible in views to or from the Scheduled Monument due to the relief of the landscape and areas of mature planting to the south of the moated site.
- 4.10.8 The perceptibility of construction noise would represent a temporary negligible adverse impact on the Moated Site at Marwell Manor (NHLE 1012196) resulting from a temporary change to setting during the construction of the pipeline which

would not be significant in EIA terms and would be reversed on the completion of construction.

Park Pale at Marwell Park Scheduled Monuments (NHLE 1012308 and 1012309)

- 4.10.9 Two extant Park Pales, one 400m west of Marwell Manor (1012308) and one south of Fishers Pond (1012309), are surviving above-ground parts of a larger network of earthworks which formed a boundary of Marwell Park, a medieval deer park that surround Marwell Manor.
- 4.10.10 The Park was established in the 12th century by the Bishop of Winchester and spanned an area of approximately 256 hectares (ha). The establishing of the park involved the creation of a Park Pale, a boundary manifesting as an earthen bank often with an external ditch, intended to keep deer within the park and predators out. The top of the bank was often fenced or planted with trees to reinforce this. A number of fishponds were also created at the same time both within and beyond the boundary of the park.
- 4.10.11 Preservation of the Pale is more complete in some areas than in others, and only the best-preserved elements are designated, although it is likely that there are subsurface archaeological remains, principally any elements of the boundary ditch, along much of the boundary.
- 4.10.12 The Park Pale 400m to the west of Marwell Manor survives as a bank 130m long, 6m wide and up to 0.8m high. The ditch to the west of the bank is no longer visible at this point having become silted up and no longer maintained.
- 4.10.13 The section of Pale surviving south of Fishers Pond is 213m long, 30m wide and up to 4m high in places. This section of Pale also formed a dam that was constructed between two fishponds, now known as Fisher's Pond. The bank and ditch of the Pale continue along the crest of the dam but are smaller in proportion to the rest of the boundary.
- 4.10.14 The high importance of these assets is recognised by their designation as SMs. Their heritage significance derives predominantly from their physical form as surviving above-ground medieval earthworks which have endured for centuries, and the archaeological interest they hold as examples of medieval land and parkland management, which evidence how this practice evolved from the early medieval and into the post medieval periods.
- 4.10.15 Additionally, the survival of the pale at Fisher's Pond is important as it allows for the understanding of medieval fishpond.
- 4.10.16 The immediate setting of these heritage assets, in which the pales can be appreciated, is not readily accessible as the earthworks and banks are obscured by dense woodland through the pales, and do not offer wide ranging views.
- 4.10.17 The pale 400m east of Marwell Manor has a small industrial area immediately to the west and the Portsmouth Road to the north which does detract from its historic character. Similarly, the Winchester Road to the west of the pale at Fishers Pond is audible and this pale is also crossed by large overhead lines with a pylon to the south-east of the pale.

- 4.10.18 There would be perceptibility of construction works to the south and west of the pale at Fishers Pond including construction noise, vehicle movements and associated compounds along the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW.
- 4.10.19 This would represent a minor adverse impact on the Park Pale at Marwell Park (NHLE 1012308) resulting from a change to setting and loss of associated non-designated archaeological deposits. This would be a moderate adverse effect, which would be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations but would reduce to a negligible impact magnitude and a minor adverse effect that would be not significant in the context of the EIA Regulations on the completion of construction. This would give rise to a limited magnitude of less than substantial harm in the context of NPSWR. Where loss of associated archaeological remains could be appropriately mitigated, would be entirely reversed during the operational period as restoration matured.

Low Hill Farmhouse Grade II listed building (NHLE 1302822)

- 4.10.20 Low Hill Farmhouse is late 16th century three bay building with a rear wing built of reused dressed stone in random chequerwork with knapped flint, stone quoins and brick dressings.
- 4.10.21 The house faces to the south-east and overlooks an ornamental garden. To the rear and south-west is a large complex of modern agricultural farm buildings, to the south is a mature clump of trees and to the north is a modern residential property.
- 4.10.22 The route of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW is intended to take place as a trenchless construction to the north of the asset, across the access track servicing both the farm and Low Hill, but these works would not be visible from the asset.
- 4.10.23 There may however been some perceptibility in terms of construction related noise during the works. This change would represent a minor adverse impact resulting from a change to setting on a medium importance receptor.
- 4.10.24 Consequently, though there will be a temporary change to the setting of Low Hill Farmhouse , this is not considered significant in EIA terms and will be reversed on completion of construction.

Hill Farm House Grade II listed building (NHLE 1350492)

- 4.10.25 Hill Farm House is a three-storey timber framed 17th century house with herringbone red brick infilling on its frontage, with the remaining sides encased in red brick.
- 4.10.26 To the rear of the house there is garden with segmented lawn, which is enclosed by mature trees around its extent, the western border of which follows the route of Bishopstoke Lane. The southern edge of the garden has some gaps within this tree line, which opens out to a shallow lawn, which itself then opens up to an enclosed area of pasture again to the south. The pasture is enclosed by a mature hedgerow.

- 4.10.27 Views from the house are limited to the initial segmented lawn, with the initial southern tree line creating a visual break further south.
- 4.10.28 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing, and it is a good example of a post medieval timber framed farmhouse within Hampshire and is significant due to its historic interest.
- 4.10.29 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW is intended to take place to the south of the enclosed pasture, which would not be visible from the asset.
- 4.10.30 Consequently, no change to setting is anticipated and no adverse effect would arise to the significance of Hill Farm House.

Woodcroft Lodge Grade II listed building (NHLE 1095821)

- 4.10.31 Woodcroft Lodge is a two-storey 17th century house with timber framed core encased in brick which has been pebbledashed and painted.
- 4.10.32 The house fronts onto Bishopstoke Lane to the east and has a driveway and single-storey detached outhouse on its south-eastern boundary. To the rear of the house is a lawn, which is divided by a roughly north to south brick wall with gate leading to a larger lawn to the west. This lawn is enclosed by a fence with a planted border.
- 4.10.33 There is a mature treeline to the south of the garden which screens the property from pasture fields.
- 4.10.34 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing, and it is a good example of a post medieval house within Hampshire and is significant due to its historic interest.
- 4.10.35 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW is intended to take place to the south within the pasture, which would not be visible from the asset.
- 4.10.36 Consequently, no change to setting is anticipated and no adverse effect would arise to the significance of Woodcroft Lodge.

Keeper's Cottage Grade II listed building (NHLE 1095822)

- 4.10.37 Keeper's Cottage is an early 19th century two-storey brick and stuccoed cottage, with the exterior first floor hung with fishscale tiles and distinctive lozenge pane windows.
- 4.10.38 The cottage fronts onto Church Lane, with restricted views of modern agricultural pasture to the south.
- 4.10.39 The importance of this asset is recognised by its Grade II listing, and it is a good example of a Victorian house within Hampshire and is significant due to its historic interest.
- 4.10.40 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW is intended to take place to the south within modern pasture, which would not be visible from the asset due to topography. However, the construction access route from Church Lane is located directly opposite the frontage of Keeper's Cottage.

- 4.10.41 Due to the proximity and direct view of the access route from the cottage, which will be visible due to the removal of some of the planting opposite the cottage during construction, this will temporarily change the setting of this asset whilst the access route is in place. However, the significance of this listed cottage derives from its historic, architectural interest presented in its Victorian architecture. The cottage lies amongst modern residential buildings along Church Lane, formerly named 'Dirty Lane' on 19th to early 20th century mapping. This positions this building within a more modern context to the setting in which the cottage was originally situated.
- 4.10.42 As such, though there will be perceptibility of the access route, this would not significantly alter the more modern setting in which this monument lies. Consequently, this change would represent a minor adverse impact resulting from a change to setting on a medium importance receptor that would be a minor adverse effect that would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations.
- 4.10.43 Consequently, though there will be a temporary change to the setting of Keeper's Cottage, this is not considered significant in EIA terms and will be reversed on completion of construction

4.11 Section M: Brambridge to Otterbourne Water Supply Works

- 4.11.1 This Section occupies low lying land crossed by the River Itchen and associated smaller streams and the Itchen Navigation and once again contains a large number of designated heritage assets. Works here include a trenchless construction where the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW passes under the River Itchen.

Brambridge House – Grade II* listed (NHLE 1350494) and non-designated Brambridge Park

- 4.11.2 Brambridge House, a Grade II* listed (1350494) large country house on the eastern side of the River Itchen was originally constructed in the 18th century and remodelled in the late 19th century following a fire. Its gardens now form the non-designated Brambridge Park, and the southern area now forms Brambridge Garden Centre, separated from Brambridge Park by Kiln Lane.
- 4.11.3 The house is three storey H-shape building with river front with single storey pavilions added in the 19th century. It is constructed with stuccoed brick, with a slate roof and has a largely unaltered 18th century front garden. The garden has a network of paths, as well as a terrace to the east which drops down to a ha-ha, where the lime avenue starts.
- 4.11.4 The importance of the house is recognised by its designation as Grade II* LB with associated non-designated garden. Their significance is largely deriving from their historic and architectural interest as a good example of an early modern country estate, albeit rebuilt in the 19th century.
- 4.11.5 The immediate setting comprises a key view along a long avenue affording views to the south-east towards Highbridge Road, with planted woodland screening the building from other directions, with some views of agricultural fields to the north-east and the River Itchen to the north. Brambridge Garden Centre is to the south

of Kiln Lane and is surrounded by woodland and bordered by the River Itchen to the west.

- 4.11.6 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW would not be perceptible from either the House nor non-designated gardens, and no adverse effect would arise to the significance of Brambridge House and non-designated Park.

Otterbourne Manor Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1013055) and associated listed and non-designated heritage assets

- 4.11.7 Otterbourne Manor is an oval moated SM on the western side of the River Itchen. The manor was granted to Merton College, Oxford in the mid-15th century and the manorial court was held in the manor house until the early 19th century.
- 4.11.8 The site is orientated approximately 80m north-south and 140m east-west with the moat surviving to a width of approximately 12m and a depth of around 4m, enclosing an area approximately 115m by 60m. The north and east arms of the moat are seasonally water-filled and well-preserved, but the south and west sides are overgrown and infilled. Three causeways cross the moat, to the north-west, the north and the south. Traces of an exterior bank survive along part of the south side of the monument although this may result from later clearance of the moat. It has a width of 3m and a height of between 0.5 and 0.7m.
- 4.11.9 The Grade II listed The Manor House (1095795), Wall 5m North of Manor House (1178879), barn north-west of Otterbourne Manor House (1095751 also MWC3858) and non-designated Moat Cottage Barn (MWC7574) whilst within the protected scheduled area are all excluded from the scheduling, though the ground beneath them is included.
- 4.11.10 The Manor House, built in the late 17th century and restored in the 20th century is a two-storey house with attic and a raised cellar, comprising chequered brickwork with some 20th century pebbledash and porch and a plain tile roof. The front of the house has high plinth cut by a door under a rubbed brick arch.
- 4.11.11 The wall is of early 18th century construction and runs from the Manor House toward the barn. The wall has several niches of different sizes with brick arches and tiled coping with ridge tiles.
- 4.11.12 The barn was constructed in the 18th century with alterations in the 19th century. It is a timber-framed building, consisting of two queen posts and principal rafters running to the top of the posts. The barn is formed of four aisled bays and lean-to shed at one end containing pump machinery. The walls consist of brick and there is a plain tile roof with a small hip-roofed addition to the two bays at on the lean-to side.
- 4.11.13 Moat Cottage barn was constructed in the early 18th century and later altered in 1899, it is now converted to domestic use. The barn is timber framed with low stock brick walls as foundations, with cedar cladding. The barn was refurbished in 2009, with the original timber framing retained but was set on new brick foundation piers and walls. An archaeological watching brief, on groundworks associated with the refurbishment of the barn, revealed only post-medieval make-up layers over natural gravels.

- 4.11.14 The importance of Otterbourne Manor is recognised by its designation as a SM. Its significance derives predominantly from its historic and architectural interest as it would retain information on its original form, function and duration of its usage. It also contributes to an understanding of the wider group of moated manors in the region of Hampshire. It may also be of archaeological interest as deposits may survive within the SM which also contribute to the understanding of developments on the site prior to the construction of the extant structure as well as now lost alterations to the asset and associated grounds.
- 4.11.15 The importance of The Manor House, wall north of the Manor House and barn north-west of Otterbourne Manor House is recognised by their designation as Grade II Listed Building. These along with the non-designated Manor House barn derive their significance from their architectural interest along with some historic interest as they developed alongside the Scheduled Monument.
- 4.11.16 The setting for these designated heritage assets is within a wider rural and agricultural landscape in which their historic interests can be appreciated, although noise resulting from the nearby proximity to the M3 motorway in the west and the embanked Itchen navigation railway to the east combine with visibility of trains to detract from the quiet rural character of the site.
- 4.11.17 Views of the wider landscape from the Scheduled Monument to the west and south across agricultural fields and toward a wooded common on Otterbourne Hill provide a sense of the wider landscape that may have been associated with the manorial site.
- 4.11.18 The perceptibility of construction works (including construction noise, vehicle movements, launch/reception pits) and associated compounds from trenchless works intended to take place to the south near the Itchen navigation, would erode the surviving rural character slightly, although views towards the works from the Scheduled Monument moated site are restricted by the topography and hedgerows.
- 4.11.19 This would not entirely remove this contribution to the character and significance of the assets but would represent an adverse impact resulting from a change to setting which is assessed as of minor magnitude, representing a limited magnitude of harm of less than substantial magnitude to the asset's significance. This impact on a high importance receptor during construction would be a moderate adverse effect, which would be significant.
- 4.11.20 Similarly, perceptibility of construction works would erode the remaining rural context of Otterbourne Manor House and would represent a minor adverse impact resulting from a change to setting. This impact on a medium importance receptor during construction would be a minor adverse effect, which would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations but would give rise to a limited magnitude of harm of less than substantial magnitude to the asset's significance in the context of NPSWRI.
- 4.11.21 These adverse effects would reduce at the completion of construction and would be completely reversed early in the operational period as restoration of hedgerows reaches maturity.

Otterbourne House – Grade II listed (NHLE 1350540) and non-designated park

- 4.11.22 Otterbourne House is a Grade II listed (1350540) small country house with its gardens forming a non-designated park, which backs onto a small area of woodland know as Dell Copse.
- 4.11.23 The house was initially constructed in the 18th century, with alterations in the 19th century and has now been converted into flats. The central area of the building is three storeys and is constructed of stuccoed brick with a parapet roofline and slate roof, and to both sides of the central building there are two storey wings. The gardens are now relatively enclosed area to the south-east of the house, which forms the frontages for later properties to the east and south-east.
- 4.11.24 The author Charlotte Yonge was born in the house in 1823, whose books helped to spread the influence of the Oxford movement and also wrote on matters of public health and sanitation.
- 4.11.25 The importance of the house is recognised by its designation as Grade II Listed Building with associated non-designated garden. Their significance is largely deriving from their historic and architectural interest as a good example of an early modern rural house, along with historic interest by its association with Charlotte Yonge.
- 4.11.26 The immediate setting comprises a frontage onto Main Road in Otterbourne along with views into the garden to the south-east. There has been significant modern development around the house which has altered its initial rural setting to that of a suburban area. Views to the south towards the River Itchen have been restricted by modern housing developments and planting of trees and hedge lines.
- 4.11.27 Construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW would not be visible from either the House nor non-designated gardens, and no adverse effect would arise to the significance of Otterbourne House and non-designated Park.

4.12 Above Ground Plant

- 4.12.1 The heritage assets where potential harm to heritage significance has been scoped in as a result of changes to setting resulting from the construction of the AGP are assessed by AGP location below.
- 4.12.2 Any effects that would be experienced during the operational period would arise as a result of the persistence of effects which arise during construction of the Proposed Development and have already been assessed in the construction phase assessment. Operational use of the Proposed Development would not present sufficient change to setting to present any increase on those effects identified as permanent construction effects. No adverse effects on heritage assets have been identified as arising during the operation of this element of the Proposed Development, although some effects that initially arose during the construction period would persist through operation and have been considered as permanent construction effects.

Break Pressure Tank and Intermediate Pumping Station E

Fort Purbrook (Scheduled Monument and Grade II* listed: NHLE 1001842)

- 4.12.3 In addition to the effects arising as a result of pipeline construction as detailed in paragraph 4.3.9, construction of BPT/IPS-E to the west of Fort Purbrook has the potential to harm the heritage significance of a high importance heritage asset.
- 4.12.4 Intervisibility of the fort and BPT/IPS-E is largely precluded by topography along with intervening woodland and hedgerow planting associated with Portsmouth Golf Club and housing development.
- 4.12.5 Visibility of any construction works on the AGP would be very limited and would not erode the viewers ability to appreciate the tactical and strategic role of the fort, and the architectural interest of the fort and its sense of dominance on the ridge would remain unchanged.
- 4.12.6 The existing sound environment is not considered to contribute toward the significance of the fort and any noise that would arise in the construction window would need to be perceptually intrusive or qualitatively change the nature of the setting. The entrance of the fort is located to the north of the B2177 and is not a quiet location, with existing background noise generated by road traffic. Therefore, construction derived noise, whilst representing a slight increase in modern noise would not discernibly affect the character of the setting.
- 4.12.7 Construction of the AGP would not be visible from the fort and no adverse effect would arise to the significance of Fort Purbrook.

Fort Widley (Scheduled Monument and Grade II* listed: NHLE 1001862)

- 4.12.8 Like Fort Purbrook, Fort Widley is another of the Palmerston Forts built from the 1860s increasing Portsmouth's defences in case of attack from the north. The importance of the fort is recognised by its designation as a SM with its significance deriving predominantly from its historic and architectural interest as detailed in full in section 4.4.
- 4.12.9 BPT/IPS-E is positioned to the east of Fort Widley, in an area across New Down Lane. Views from the fort are restricted due to a moderate drop in topography which combines with several lines of modern tree planting and hedgerows. The bunding and planting at this site would combine well with the existing planting to reduce any visibility of this Proposed Development element (detailed in ES Chapter 13 Landscape and visual, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6)). BPT/IPS-E would also be located adjacent to the existing service reservoir and protected telephone exchange and visibility would be over the car parking at Widley Walk and the existing Churchillian public house and Harbour Heights housing complex. Any additional visibility would be very limited and would not erode the viewers ability to appreciate the tactical and strategic role of the fort, and the architectural interest of the fort and its sense of dominance on the ridge would remain unchanged.
- 4.12.10 Perceptibility of construction works to the north of Fort Widley (including vehicle movements) and associated construction compounds along the Pipeline route, would represent a relatively minor adverse magnitude of impact. Intervisibility of the fort and BPT/IPS-E is largely precluded by woodland and hedgerow planting

as well as the presence of the Churchillian and Harbour Heights apartments, which are clearly visible in some views from the fort. It is possible that works in progress on the pipeline construction and BPT/IPS-E may be visible from isolated viewpoints on the fort ramparts (REF VP 136), but these would not be prominent elements of the sequential views from the fort experienced by a visitor. Similarly, some upper elements of the completed structures, which would be of a maximum building or structure height not exceeding 8m above a finished floor level of 86.6m above Ordnance Datum (AOD), may become visible in these isolated views

- 4.12.11 The fundamental character of the area would remain unchanged, and the existing woodland and scrub to the east of the fort would be retained, and strengthened by the proposed mitigation planting discussed at section 7.4, as indicated in viewpoint photography ES, ES Figure 7.5 Heritage Specific Viewpoint from Fort Widley looking East, Volume III (Document reference 6.3, DCO Volume 6). However, visibility of construction works in the open vista of the cleared field of fire on Portsdown Hill to the north would arguably form a detracting element in the setting of the fort. This would give rise to a minor adverse magnitude of impact to a high importance heritage asset during construction. This would be a moderate adverse effect which would be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This would comprise a limited magnitude of less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset in the context of NPSWRI. This effect would be largely reduced on completion of construction works and entirely reversed once reinstatement of the construction works was complete and as landscape planting at the BPT/IPS-E site matures. There would be no lasting adverse effect during the operation of the Proposed Development.

Intermediate Pumping Station G

Park Place (Grade II* listed building: NHLE 1095586)

- 4.12.12 As is detailed in paragraph 4.6.15, Park Place is a Grade II* listed, very well-preserved example of an early modern mansion house within Hampshire with its significance deriving from its historical and architectural interest.
- 4.12.13 The perceptibility of construction works (including construction noise, vehicle movements,) and associated compounds and structures related to the AGP in the form of IPS-G to the north, are limited from Park Place by mature tree screening to the north, but this may still give rise to glimpsed views as the viewer moves around the asset.
- 4.12.14 During construction, these views would represent a minor adverse impact resulting from a change to setting. This impact on a high importance receptor during construction would result in a moderate adverse effect, which would be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This effect represents a low magnitude of less than substantial harm to the asset's significance in the context of NPSWRI. This impact would reduce on completion of construction works and as landscaping around IPS-G matured.
- 4.12.15 The retention of permanent above-ground infrastructure of the AGP means that these effects would reduce to a negligible magnitude as a permanent adverse effect. This would be a minor adverse effect and not significant in the context of

the EIA Regulations. This would represent a very small magnitude of lasting harm in the context of NPSWRI that would persist throughout the operational period.

Little Park Mansions (Grade II listed building: NHLE 1350591)

- 4.12.16 The retention of permanent above-ground infrastructure (IPS-G) during operation on Little Park Mansions a heritage asset of medium importance would lead to a minor adverse magnitude of impact. This would result in a minor adverse effect on significance of the heritage asset and is not significant in the context of the EIA Regulations. This would represent a minor magnitude of lasting harm in the context of NPSWRI that would persist throughout the operational period.

Park at Park Place (Non-designated heritage asset)

- 4.12.17 The Park at Park Place is a non-designated asset of low importance with its historic significance lying in its historic and archaeological interest as a possible medieval deer park as noted in paragraph 4.6.21.
- 4.12.18 At the park at Park Place, the perceptibility of construction works (including construction noise and vehicle movements) and associated construction compounds and structures related to AGP in the form of IPS-G to the north, are limited due to mature tree screening to the north, but this may still give rise to glimpsed views as the viewer moves around the asset. These views would represent change to setting of a heritage asset of low importance, a negligible adverse magnitude of impact, resulting in a neutral effect that would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations.
- 4.12.19 This adverse effect would reduce at the completion of construction as fields are restored and as restoration and screening planting matures, but the retention of permanent above-ground infrastructure (IPS-G) means that these impacts on a heritage asset of low importance would persist throughout the operational period at a negligible magnitude of impact, and result in a neutral effect that would be not significant in terms of EIA Regulations (ES Appendix 7.7 Heritage assets setting assessment, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)).

Break Pressure Tank K

Wintershill Park

- 4.12.20 At Wintershill Park, works to BPT-K and the associated access would affect the periphery of the clump-planted field to the west of the house Wintershill Hall. These works would be well screened and would not affect the underlying grain of the parkland, following existing field boundaries. Effects would also arise from perceptibility of the construction of the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW would add to this effect. The non-designated park is a low importance heritage receptor, and when the access and the construction activities are taken together, these would present be subject to a moderate magnitude of impact, resulting in a temporary minor adverse effect that would not be significant in terms of EIA Regulations. This effect would persist through operation, but would continue to gradually reduce as planting matures.

4.12.21 After the completion of the construction phase, impacts would arise only from the visible presence of BPT-K from the northern fringes of the low importance park during the operational phase and would fall to a minor magnitude of impact. This would result in a neutral minor effect that would not be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations and NPSWRI on completion of construction works.

Wintershill Hall

4.12.22 Perceptibility of construction works at BPT K and the Pipeline would also represent an adverse impact on Wintershill Hall, in the form of construction noise and changes to views as the viewer moves around the asset. These effects would be greatest during the construction period, and on completion of construction would reduce significantly. This change on a low importance heritage receptor would represent a moderate adverse magnitude of impact from a change to setting, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would not be significant in terms of EIA Regulations.

4.12.23 This effect would persist for up to approximately 15 years while any required restoration planting matured but would largely be reversed within the operational period as a result of the maturing of the screening planting to BPT-K, falling to a negligible impact, a neutral change that would not be significant in terms of EIA Regulations.

Associated Streetworks at Botley Road and A334

4.12.24 As these street works were introduced to the Proposed Development after agreement of the settings scope (ES Appendix 7.6 Heritage assets setting scoping appraisal, Volume II (Document reference 6.2, DCO Volume 6)) a review has been carried out.

4.12.25 Streetworks required at the junction on Botley Road and the A334 have been considered as part of the assessment, however the nature of these works would not give rise to any effects on the setting of heritage assets.

4.12.26 The closest heritage asset is Botley Conservation Area to the west of these works and there would be no perceptibility of the works due to the intervening topography and current vegetation.

4.13 Decommissioning

4.13.1 Effects from decommissioning of the Proposed Development are considered to be no greater than those identified during the construction phase but would benefit from retention of mitigation planting and landscaping. Decommissioning would normally be expected to be of discernibly shorter duration and be perceived as the progressive removal of an adverse effect. Effects arising from change to setting are assessed as being the same as construction effects as a worst case scenario. The significance of effects resulting from decommissioning is therefore the same as reported as for the construction effects.

4.13.2 Where change to setting during construction would arise only from perceptibility of the construction of buried pipelines, however, no adverse effect would arise during decommissioning, as no decommissioning works would take place, and adverse

effects from decommissioning would be limited to works to above-ground pipelines, the WRP and AGP.

- 4.13.3 Where change to setting arises from the perceptibility of AGP in the settings of heritage assets, demolition and reinstatement would give rise to an effect, albeit temporary and short-lived. These sites would also benefit from screening from the landscaping and planting established during the operational period.
- 4.13.4 At Old Bedhampton Conservation Area, decommissioning of the above-ground pipeline at Bedhampton Springs would result in a limited and short-lived change that would be experienced in the context of the operational waterworks. This would be a negligible magnitude of temporary impact which would give rise to a temporary neutral effect which would not be significant in terms of the EIA regulations.
- 4.13.5 The decommissioning would, however, be almost entirely screened in views from the Old Mill House (NHLE 1340188) and no effect would arise.
- 4.13.6 Fort Widley (NHLE 1001862) was predicted as being subject to significant adverse effects during construction as a result of visibility of construction works at BPT/IPS-E and to the Pipeline across Portsdown Hill. By the time of decommissioning, the proposed screening planting would have reached maturity and in the absence of works to the Pipeline, any effect during decommissioning would be discernibly reduced from that experienced in construction. This is assessed as a temporary impact of negligible magnitude, resulting in a temporary minor effect that would not be significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
- 4.13.7 At Little Park Mansions (NHLE 1350591), decommissioning works would present a limited and short-lived change. This is assessed as a negligible magnitude of temporary impact which would give rise to a temporary neutral effect which would not be significant in terms of the EIA regulations.
- 4.13.8 At Park Place, (NHLE 1095586), decommissioning works would present a limited and short-lived change. This is assessed as a negligible magnitude of temporary impact which would give rise to a minor effect which would not be significant in terms of the EIA regulations.
- 4.13.9 At the park at Park Place decommissioning works would present a discernible but short-lived change. This is assessed as a minor magnitude of temporary impact which would give rise to a temporary minor effect which would not be significant in terms of the EIA regulations.
- 4.13.10 At Wintershill Hall, decommissioning works would present a limited and short lived change that would be largely screened in views of or from the house by the mature planting. This is assessed as a negligible magnitude of temporary impact which would give rise to a temporary neutral effect which would not be significant in terms of the EIA regulations.
- 4.13.11 At Wintershill Hall Park, decommissioning works would present a limited and short-lived change that would be largely screened in views of or from the house by the mature planting. This is assessed as a minor magnitude of temporary impact which would give rise to a temporary minor effect which would not be significant in terms of the EIA regulations.

5 Avoiding and Minimising Harm and Enhancement - Step 4

- 5.1.1 As described in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6) a range of measures have been embedded into the Proposed Development design to avoid or reduce environmental effects and harm. These embedded (primary) mitigation measures have taken account of the setting of heritage assets and are outlined within Section 7.4.1 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
- 5.1.2 Alongside these primary mitigation measures, good construction practices (tertiary mitigation) are set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Document reference 7.1, DCO Volume 7) which is secured by a requirement in the DCO which will manage the effects of construction. The mitigation measures outlined in the Outline CEMP are outlined within Section 7.4.3 of ES Chapter 7 Archaeology and cultural heritage, Volume I (Document reference 6.1, DCO Volume 6).
- 5.1.3 Opportunities to incorporate heritage enhancements have been identified through the design development process to date and are detailed in Section 9 of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (Document reference 7.6, DCO Volume 7) and the Indicative Environmental Masterplan (appended to the Design Approach Document) (Document reference 5.12, DCO Volume 5).

6 Conclusions

- 6.1.1 This setting assessment has established that assets within the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area would encounter perceptibility of construction works which would include construction noise, vehicle movements, launch/reception pits and associated compounds from open-cut, above-ground and trenchless works which would harm the character of the Old Bedhampton Conservation Area.
- 6.1.2 The change of setting due to perceptibility of works during construction would persist only during construction and is therefore considered to be a short-term impact that would be reversed on completion of construction, or shortly afterwards while restoration of hedgerows and earthworks matured. Retention of permanent above-ground infrastructure at Old Bedhampton Conservation Area means that these effects would, in the absence of mitigation remain as a permanent negligible magnitude of effect and would be not significant.
- 6.1.3 Along the Pipeline between the WRP site and Otterbourne WSW in Sections D-M eight designated assets are assessed to be subject to adverse effects during the construction period. These are:
1. Old Bedhampton Conservation Area – Pipeline between the Water Recycling Plant and Bedhampton Springs
 2. Fort Purbrook (NHLE 1001842) - Section D
 3. Fort Nelson (NHLE 1001860) - Section E
 4. Fort Southwick (NHLE 1001808) - Section E
 5. Fort Widley (NHLE 1001862) - Section E
 6. Church of St Nicholas, Boarhunt (NHLE 1350613) - Section E
 7. Park Pale at Marwell Park (NHLE 1012308) - Section L
 8. Otterbourne Manor (NHLE 1013055) - Section M
- 6.1.4 Seven designated heritage assets are assessed as subject to effects that would not reach the threshold for consideration as significant adverse effects, but would result in low magnitudes of less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset persisting through the construction period, and in some cases into the operational period before being reversed:
1. House at Saw Mills (Pink and Company Limited) (NHLE 1230002) – Section F
 2. Mission Room with Cottage Adjoining Grade II (NHLE 1351248) – Section F
 3. Castle Farmhouse (NHLE 1095637) – Section F
 4. Sandy Hill House (NHLE 1350573) – Section J
 5. Low Hill Farmhouse (NHLE 1302822) – Section L
 6. Keeper’s Cottage (NHLE 1095822) – Section L
 7. Otterbourne Manor House (NHLE 1095795) – Section M
- 6.1.5 Whilst the effects of construction would comprise a low magnitude of less than substantial harm to the significance of these heritage assets, they would be largely reversed on completion of construction works and there would be no permanent adverse effect in the long-term during the operation of the Proposed Development.

- 6.1.6 Some non-designated heritage assets at Albany Farm, New Barns Farm and Wintershill Hall would be subject to non-significant adverse effects during construction of the Proposed Development. With the exception of Wintershill Hall and Wintershill Park, these effects would cease on the completion of construction. Effects on Wintershill Hall would persist while screening planting matures and effects at Wintershill Park would fall to negligible on maturation of the screening planting.
- 6.1.7 Change to setting during decommissioning would in theory be of a similar magnitude to construction, but would benefit from retention of mitigation planting and landscaping, would normally be expected to be of discernibly shorter duration and would be perceived as the progressive removal of an adverse effect. Effects arising from change to setting are assessed as being the same as or lower than construction effects as a worst case scenario.
- 6.1.8 Where change to setting during construction would arise only from perceptibility of the construction of buried pipelines, however, no adverse effect would arise during decommissioning, as no decommissioning works would take place, and adverse effects from decommissioning would be limited to works to above-ground pipelines, the WRP and AGP.
- 6.1.9 Consequently, effects assessed as significant adverse during construction or would give rise to harm to significance of designated heritage assets that would not arise during decommissioning comprise:
1. Old Bedhampton Conservation Area
 2. Fort Purbrook (NHLE 1001842)
 3. Fort Nelson (NHLE 1001860)
 4. Fort Southwick (NHLE 1001808)
 5. Church of St Nicholas, Boarhunt (NHLE 1350613)
 6. Otterbourne Manor (NHLE 1013055)
 7. House at Saw Mills (Pink and Company Limited) (NHLE 1230002)
 8. Mission Room with Cottage Adjoining Grade II (NHLE 1351248)
 9. Castle Farmhouse (NHLE 1095637)
 10. Sandy Hill House (NHLE 1350573)
 11. Park Pale at Marwell Park (NHLE 1012308)
 12. Otterbourne Manor House (NHLE 1095795)
- 6.1.10 Fort Widley (NHLE 1001862) was predicted as being subject to significant adverse effects during construction as a result of visibility of construction works at BPT/IPS-E and to the pipeline across Portsdown Hill. By the time of decommissioning, the proposed screening planting would have reached maturity and in the absence of works to the pipeline, any effect during decommissioning would be discernibly reduced from that experienced in construction. This is assessed as an impact of negligible magnitude, a minor effect that would be not significant.

References

- [1] Historic England, “The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3,” 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/>. [Accessed 6 February 2024].
- [2] Southern Water Services Limited, “Hampshire Water Transfer & Water Recycling Project: EIA Scoping Report,” July 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/WA010002/documents?date-from-day=&date-from-month=&date-from-year=&date-to-day=&date-to-month=&date-to-year=&searchTerm=scoping&itemsPerPage=25>. [Accessed 6 February 2024].
- [3] Planning Inspectorate, *Scoping Opinion for Proposed Hampshire Water Transfer & Water Recycling Project*, 2023.
- [4] Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, “National Planning Policy Framework,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>. [Accessed April 2025].
- [5] Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, “National Policy Statement for water resources infrastructure,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-water-resources-infrastructure>.
- [6] Historic England, “The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3,” 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/>. [Accessed 6 February 2024].
- [7] Hampshire County Council, “Hampshire Historic Settlements Survey: Boarhunt,” No date. [Online]. Available: <https://documents.hants.gov.uk/landscape/historic-settlement/BoarhuntHistoricRuralSettlementpublication.pdf>. [Accessed April 2024].



from
Southern
Water. 

The Southern Water logo graphic consists of three white, stylized wavy lines that resemble water waves, positioned to the right of the word "Water".