

Area is composed predominantly of the following HCC Landscape Types:

- River Valley
- Mixed Farmland and Woodland
- Pasture and Woodland: Heath Associated
- Chalk and Clay
- Open Arable
- Scarps: Downland
- Enclosed Coastal Plain
- Open Coastal Plain
- Urban Area

3.133 The proportions of grouped Historic Landscape Types occurring within the Character Area are shown in Figure 3.5, and show a similarly wide diversity of types.

Description

3.134 On the whole, with the obvious exception of valley floor types, the occurrence and proportions of Historic Landscape Types occurring in this Character Area mainly reflects the character of the wider areas through which the rivers flow.

3.135 The main exception to this is the Avon valley west of the New Forest, which displays a distinctive river terrace landscape, characterised by an extensive area of irregular rectilinear small-scale parliamentary type fields (HLT 1.7) and gravel workings (HLT 12.2).

3.136 Other areas of HLT 1.7 occur in riverside locations on the boundary of this Character Area at the head of the Meon valley, and also in small areas, similarly at riverside locations, in Character Area 5 west of Yateley, and in Character Area 6 at Kingsley.

3.137 The following description seeks to draw out further particular points of comparison, in which these areas differ from their surroundings.

3.138 The valley floor types make up 21% of the Character Area. Of the total HLT valley floor category occurring in the Character Area, 58% is accounted for by the miscellaneous valley floor category; 14% and 14.5% by unimproved grassland and water meadows; 5% and 6% by wet woodland and marsh; and 0.7% each for watercress beds and features associated with mills.

3.139 The occurrence of woodland within the Character Area as a whole is notably low at 7%, a significantly lower proportion of woodland than most of the Character Areas traversed by the river valleys, except for Character Area 2 and the very limited coastal plain areas. The 1% valley floor woodland noted above adds little to the total.

3.140 The relative proportions of different field patterns (other than valley floor types), are similar to those for the whole of Hampshire, and do not merit any particular comment.

3.141 However, the occurrence of old settlements at 7% is exceptionally high both compared with the county as a whole, and with the other Landscape Character Areas (1% or less, except Character Area 10 at 2%). This is more generally evident from the strong preference for riverside locations for settlement where there are significant watercourses, especially on the chalk.

3.142 The occurrence of Parks within the valley Character Area (6%) is also relatively high compared with the county as a whole (3%), and is only equalled by Character Area

5 (North Hampshire), all other Character
Areas having no more than 3% parkland.

3.143 Defence, Industry and other
categories are more typical of the county as a
whole.

Chapter 4

Commentary on the Historic Landscape Character of Hampshire

Introduction	1
Landscape Character and Historic Character	3
The Chalk	3
North Hampshire	6
Western Weald	6
South Hampshire Lowlands and the New Forest	7
The River Valleys	10

Introduction

4.1 This chapter provides a commentary on the distribution of historic landscape characteristics, both in general (Figures 4.1-4.6), and in relation to the HCC Landscape Character Areas (Figure 3.1-3.2; 4.10).

4.2 While the broad categorisation of Historic Landscape Categories and Types presented in Figure 3.3 is of some interest for Hampshire as a whole, these categories do not really reflect the spatial variation in the historic character of the Hampshire landscape, since all areas reflect a mixture of landuses. A more interesting exercise is to look at rather different combinations of the individual Historic Landscape Types. One way of doing this is given below and illustrated in Figures 4.1-4.6. In this analysis each Historic Landscape Type appears in only one grouping.

4.3 Using this approach, at the broadest level, Hampshire can be divided into six very general groupings of Historic Landscape Types which indicate areas more or less coherently dominated by particular mixtures of Types which may indicate distinct historic characteristics. These particular combinations of types are illustrative: there is no single definitive way of portraying this.

Heathland (Figure 4.1)

4.4 This grouping consists principally of three clearly defined areas, of which much the largest and most significant is the New Forest. The other two areas represent parts of the former Royal Forests of Wolmer, and of Eversley and Bagshot. A

fourth small area on the northern edge of the county at Silchester represents part of the former Royal Forest of Pamber

Woodland, Parks and Assarts (Figure 4.2)

4.5 This grouping includes the following main areas:

- most of the scarp-foot strip of north Hampshire, (representing parts of the former Royal Forests of Eversley, Pamber and Freemantle)
- an area north of Portsmouth and Fareham either side of the River Meon (representing part of the former Royal Forest of Bere (Portchester) and Waltham Chase)
- Beaulieu and other areas on the periphery of the New Forest;
- areas either side of the lower Test valley (corresponding to the former Royal Forests of Bere (Ashley) and Buckholt);
- an area of the north west corner of the chalk (representing part of the former Royal Forest of Chute)
- areas around Petersfield; and at Alice Holt (the latter part of Wolmer Forest)

4.6 In addition, scattered woodland is very characteristic of parts of the chalk, especially in areas of clay-with-flints, including large blocks of woodland at Harewood Forest, Preshute and Micheldever Woods.

4.7 Not surprisingly, there is in general good spatial correlation between woodland and clay soils (cf Figure 1.1).

4.8 As might be expected, there also appears to be a significant correlation in the distribution of areas of woodland and

areas of assart field patterns, which are assumed to reflect the clearance of woodland.

4.9 Wooded commons may in some cases have once been open grazing pasture, but several are well documented as being woodland grazing of ancient origin, including some mapped as wood pasture on Figure 4.1, notably at Binswood, East Worldham and around the New Forest. Other well documented wooded commons include Hurstbourne Tarrant in the north west of the county, and Odiham east of Basingstoke (Colebourn 1983, 18).

4.10 Parkland is also included in this grouping as it appears to correlate more with areas of woodland than with areas of smaller or large fields (cf Figures 4.3 and 4.4). Again this is not unexpected, especially in respect to deer parks.

Open Small Fields and Horticulture (Figure 4.3)

4.11 These areas of small fields are characterised by both older, wavy edged fields (HLT 1.16) and straight sided parliamentary types (HLT 1.7 and 1.9). They may reflect rationalisation of earlier assarts, or late encroachment into heath or woodland, as appears to be the case with parliamentary enclosure of parts of the Forests of Bere and Pamber.

4.12 This broad grouping typifies the lower Avon valley, the New Forest coastal plain, southern Hampshire between Eastleigh and Waltham Chase, and more generally round the Forest of Bere. These small scale field patterns are also characteristic of significant parts of the eastern chalk, often in those areas of clay-

with-flints not characterised by the woodland associations.

4.13 Off the chalk, in the northern and southern parts of the county, these small-scale field patterns are strongly complementary with the woodland associated grouping (compares Figures 4.2 and 4.3).

Downland and Large Fields (Figure 3.5)

4.14 This includes the vast majority of the central Hampshire chalk and the eastern edge of Cranborne Chase around Martin. Areas of large, wavy edged fields, probably representing older enclosures, cover significant areas on the northern, eastern and southern parts of the chalk. Irregular large fields bounded by roads and tracks, thought to represent former open downland, broadly occur in the same areas, but are especially characteristic of the north-eastern and south-eastern corners of the chalk, extending west from the North and South Downs. 'Ladder' fields, which are also related to tracks leading into the downs, are more typical of the central and western chalk, which is more generally dominated by the parliamentary enclosures.

Valley Floor (Figure 4.5)

4.15 This grouping mainly typifies the valleys of the Rivers Avon, Test, Itchen and Meon.

4.16 There are also several smaller areas, especially around the headwaters of small rivers rising at various points along the strong springline at foot of the chalk in north and east Hampshire. Such rivers have only very narrow floodplains below the

confluence of the headwater tributary streams.

Coastal Strip (Figure 4.5)

4.17 This grouping typifies the intertidal area and narrow strip of coastal edge types along the English Channel, The Solent, Southampton Water and Portsmouth and Langstone Harbours.

Settlement, Recreation, Defence, Industry and Communications (Figure 4.6)

4.18 The main urban and industrial areas are along the southern fringe of the former county, now Unitary Authorities in their own right. This main area stretches from Eastleigh, through Southampton eastward to Fareham, Gosport, Portsmouth, Waterlooville, Havant and Hayling Island; westward to Totton; and south, across Southampton Water to Fawley. Another major conurbation occupies the north-east corner of the county at Farnborough, Aldershot, Fleet, Blackwater and Yateley.

4.19 A significant number of defence sites also occur within or close to urban areas, especially at Portsmouth and Gosport, and near Aldershot.

Landscape Character and Historic Character

4.20 The following sections present a review of how far the existing HCC Landscape Character Areas reflect the distribution of Historic Landscape Types. For this purpose the county is divided into a number of large areas sharing broad geographical characteristics, that are then

divided into sub-zones. These are illustrated in diagrammatic form in Figure 4.10, to indicate the geographical location of the areas that are being discussed. These areas and sub-zones are not being put forward as definitive Historic Character Zones. The rationale for the distinctions being discussed is illustrated in more detail in Figures 4.1-4.8, while the complete map of Historic Landscape types in relationship to the Hampshire Landscape Character Areas is to be found at Figure 3.2.

The Chalk

4.21 It is noticeable from Figure 3.4 that Landscape Character Areas 1 and 3 are very similar to each other in terms of the overall figures for the mixture of Historic Landscape Types, though Character Area 3 has more evidence of assarting, small fields and large wavy-edged fields. They both differ more markedly from Landscape Character Area 2.

4.22 From the point of view of the historic character of the landscape, however, these Character Areas do not entirely reflect some discernible patterns in the diversity of Hampshire's chalkland countryside. This variation is discussed below within seven chalkland sub-zones (see Figure 4.10).

Western Chalk

4.23 This area is largely represented by Landscape Character Area 2, which was originally distinguished from Character Areas 1 and 3 principally on the basis of topography, high ground, and differences in woodland cover. The distribution of the Historic Landscape Types indicates that the area is dominated by parliamentary type

fields with relatively little woodland or parkland except for small areas south west of Andover and east of Stockbridge (Figures 4.2, 4.7). This correlates well with HCC Landscape Type "Open Arable."

4.24 Immediately west of Andover there is a notable concentration of pre-1810 settlement.

4.25 Ignoring the topographical considerations, the area dominated by open parliamentary fields can be seen to extend northwards into Character Area 1 between Andover and Basingstoke as far as the chalk scarp, and somewhat southwards into Character Area 3 either side of Winchester.

4.26 The eastern margin of this area of open parliamentary field patterns is very clearly defined by the occurrence of woodland, assarts and parkland along the eastern side of the boundary dividing Character Areas 1 and 2 between the valleys of the Rivers Test and Itchen (Figures 4.2, 4.7).

Central Chalk

4.27 Within Character Areas 1 and 3 there are significant areas still dominated by the parliamentary type field patterns, but with more woodland and parkland. The largest and most coherent area of this kind represents the central area of the chalk extending slightly east of south from the upper reaches of the River Test to take in an area around the upper reaches of the River Itchen. Other more peripheral areas of this character occur around Andover and a north-south band of country between Liss and Four Marks (see north west and eastern sub-zones below).

North West Chalk

4.28 The area north and west of Andover stands out for having a wider range of the field and woodland patterns occurring on the chalk. These include large assarts (HLT 1.3), large wavy-sided fields (HLT 1.6), fields bounded by tracks and roads (HLT 1.15) and limited areas of small fields (HLT 1.16, 1.9). There is also a good range of woodland types. Hangers (HLT 4.6-7) occur on the steep sides of dry valleys on the northern fringes of the chalk.

4.29 South east of Andover Harewood Forest includes open woodland or wood-pasture (HLT 4.10).

4.30 These areas, which form part of Landscape Character Area 1, are separated from large areas of similar diversity of Historic Landscape Types in the eastern part of the Character Area by the areas dominated by parliamentary type fields described above.

Eastern Chalk

4.31 Much of the eastern half of the chalk is characterised by a similar diversity of Historic Landscape Types. This area forms a broad irregular crescent extending from west of Basingstoke in the north to south east of Winchester in the south, and is split between Landscape Character Areas 1 and 3. It again represents a mixed pattern of older pre-parliamentary fields, both large (HLT 1.6) and small (HLT 1.16) with a significant proportion of assarts (HLT 1.1 to 1.4) and small parliamentary type fields (HLT 1.9), intermixed with woodland and parkland (Figures 4.2-4.4 and 4.7). Small fields are particularly common in the southern part of this area,

east of the headwaters of the River Itchen and around the upper reaches of the Meon.

4.32 The pattern of settlement in the eastern part of the chalk is also noticeably more scattered than the western chalk, lacking the attraction of well-watered valley floor locations except along the upper reaches of the River Meon.

North-east and South-east Chalk

4.33 These two areas, east and south east of Basingstoke, and north and north west of Waterlooville, are notable for the extensive areas of fields defined by tracks and roads (HLT 1.15). This is also characteristic, to a lesser degree, of other parts of the southern fringe of the chalk, of Cranborne Chase, and the of the north west and eastern edges of the chalk (Figure 4.8)

4.34 These areas are by no means exactly similar. The south east corner of the chalk, representing the west end of the South Downs, is also distinctive for the extent of hangers and scarp downland. The north east corner (in effect extending west from the North Downs) is characterised more by patches of assarts, woodland and parkland (see Figures 4.2, 4.7, 4.8).

Southern Chalk

4.35 The southern side of the Hampshire chalk within Landscape Character Area 3, changes quite significantly in its character from west to east.

4.36 As already noted, on the basis of the Historic Landscape Types, parts of the

northern edge of this Character Area might be more appropriately linked with the predominantly parliamentary enclosures of Landscape Character Area 2. The western end of the South Downs has also been noted as being distinctive, and some of the remaining areas have a similar combination of Historic Landscape Types as the eastern chalk, noted above.

4.37 However, another distinguishing characteristic of the southern fringes of the chalk (especially between the valleys of the Test and the Meon, either side of the River Itchen) is the occurrence of significant areas of large or straight-sided assarts (HLT 1.3, 1.4). This is especially the case north of Romsey and around Preshute, west of the Meon valley. At the other extreme, there are also some significant areas of "prairie fields" (HLT 1.14), which are not common on the eastern chalk.

Cranborne Chase

4.38 This area, as defined by the Landscape Character Area 4, correlates well as an entity with historic landscape characteristics, which perhaps compare most closely with those of Character Area 2, but include most of the types of field pattern found on the chalk.

Summary of the Historic Landscape Character of the Chalk

4.39 To summarise, the Hampshire chalk can be seen to fall into a number of sub-zones from the point of view of its historic character, which do not entirely coincide with the HCC Landscape Character Areas:

- A western area (and Cranborne Chase) dominated by very open medium to large parliamentary type fields, with little woodland or parks, but some remnant downland
- A central area of similar character but with more parks and woodland
- The north-west corner of the chalk characterised by greater diversity of field patterns, including large assarts, some woodland hangers and parks
- The north east and south east corners of the chalk characterised by a mixture of large fields, but with a high proportion of fields bounded by tracks and roads; woodland associations in the north east area characterised by assarts, in the south east by hangers
- A broadly eastern area characterised by considerable diversity of field patterns, much of them pre-parliamentary in character, and/or relatively small scale, with some significant areas of assarts and woodland
- The west and central parts of the southern edge of the chalk, largely characterised by a mixture of large assarts with areas of woodland and parks, some areas of large fields (some pre-parliamentary type, some "prairie" fields).

North Hampshire

4.40 This area (HCC Landscape Character Area 5) corresponds extremely closely to a clear difference in the distribution of Historic Landscape Types. Its difference from the chalk is very strongly borne out by the markedly different composition of HL Types shown in Figures 3.2, 4.2 and 4.4.

4.41 The detailed variation within the area is described in the Character Area

description in Chapter 3. Broadly speaking the Area can be seen to fall into a number of sub-zones from the point of view of its historic character:

- a western area of extensive assarted woodland, field assarts, some parks, and small 'green' type hamlets (A on Figure 4.10)
- a central section of more open farmland (corresponding roughly to the 'open arable on clay' HCC Landscape Type) (B on Figure 4.10)
- part of the Forest of Eversley, similar to the western section but with more valley floor areas, commons and common edge settlement (C on Figure 4.10)
- the eastern end of the Character Area, part of the former Forests of Eversley and Bagshot, characterised by large scale urban development, heathland plantation and some open heathland and unenclosed recent woodland (D on Figure 4.10).

Western Weald

4.42 From the Historic Landscape point of view, this Character Area, like Area 5, is relatively well defined, though the northern half of the west boundary of the Character Area could be adjusted. It would probably make more sense from the historic landscape point of view to adopt a slightly more westerly course from Selborne round the western edge of Alton, thereby retaining greater coherence for the field patterns associated with the headwaters of the River Wey.

4.43 Overall this Character Area is highly variable and mixed in its historic landscape character, and can broadly be divided into an eastern and a western area, which can themselves be divided into two.

4.44 The remains of Wolmer Forest can be distinguished as part of the eastern area, represented by a complex mosaic of heath and heathland-associated plantation, defence sites, and recent settlement (B on Figure 4.10).

4.45 The area east of the heathland-associated types of Wolmer Forest (A on Figure 4.10) is characterised by a much more intricate patchwork of small-scale field systems, wooded over commons, parkland and remnants of heathland.

4.46 These areas broadly correspond to the HCC Landscape Types for this part of the Character Area.

4.47 The HCC Landscape Types for the western part of Character Area 6 divide it into three long north-south strips ("Open Arable on Greensand", "Greensand Hangers", and "Mixed Farmland and Woodland"). The Historic Landscape Types, reflect some of this north-south grain; but they also suggest that this western side of the Character Area can be divided between a more open northern half (C on Figure 4.10), consisting mainly of large fields (especially pre-parliamentary type HLT 1.6), and a southern half (D on Figure 4.10) of smaller fields and assarts.

4.48 This distinction may well reflect rather different farming strategies. The northern half of this division roughly corresponds to the wider, flatter areas of the headwaters of streams and rivers draining north to the River Wey. The southern half of the division represents the watershed and scarp-foot areas around the headwaters of watercourses draining south and east along the northern edge of the South Downs, though the more open

character picks up again along watercourses north-east and south of Petersfield.

4.49 To summarise, this Character Area is clearly distinctive from the historic landscape point of view, but it is possible to suggest rather different sub-divisions into four areas:

- The former heathland of Wolmer Forest, now largely wooded over;
- The intricate mosaic east of Wolmer
- The open farmland, scarps and valley floor landscape east of Alton
- The detailed mosaic of small assarts, copses fields and scattered settlement of the area from Selborne south to Petersfield

South Hampshire Lowlands and the New Forest

4.50 This section reviews Character Areas 7, 8, 9 and 10. Although these Character Areas do have distinct differences in the coverage of Historic Landscape Types (see Figure 3.5), the boundaries of these Character Areas do not always reflect historical characteristics as clearly as they might.

Urban and Coastal Strip

4.51 Landscape Character Area 10 is composed of the south Hampshire coastal conurbations and associated industry, together with defence-associated features and coastal resources. But from the historic landscape point of view, it can be seen from figures 3.2, 4.5 and 4.6 that these characteristics are in fact split between all four of the south Hampshire Landscape Character Areas (Areas 7-10).

This tends to obscure other historical characteristics between the remaining rural areas.

4.52 Character Area 10 could be extended to include the whole of the main south Hampshire urban industrial and defence complex, (from Waterlooville, through Portsmouth, Fareham, Eastleigh, Southampton and Totton to Fawley). This represents a coherent area dominated by urban and industrial complexes with only limited, and usually isolated fragments of countryside of the coastal plain. Such rural fragments do still reflect aspects of broad historical patterns of pre-urban land use on the coastal plain, but they are mostly now too small for this to be clear. Apart from the limited extent of these areas, they also exhibit characteristics reflecting the proximity of major modern urban centres, such as recreation facilities and scattered post-1810 settlement.

4.53 It is perhaps a matter of debate whether it would be appropriate to include the urban and coastal areas around Lymington and New Milton in a redefined urban and coastal character zone, or whether they might be regarded as part of the adjacent rural areas. The latter approach would be to treat the coast simply as being the fringe of whatever the main landward character area might be, either urban or rural. This depends considerably on how the New Forest Character Area is defined (see below).

South Hampshire Lowlands: (Romsey, Forest of Bere, and Portsdown Hill)

4.54 The rural part of Character Area 7 makes a reasonably coherent mosaic of historic landscape character, though with four fairly distinct sub-zones.

4.55 The western end of the Character Area, west of Eastleigh either side of the Test valley (A on figure 4.10), is dominated by assarted woods and fields, though there are areas of larger more open fields east of Romsey (Figures 3.2, 4.2 and 4.4). There is also a significant amount of post-1810 plantation.

4.56 A central section of the Character Area can be defined broadly as the area between the River Itchen and the River Hamble (B on figure 4.10), largely characterised by an extensive cover of small fields of both pre-parliamentary and parliamentary type (HLT 1.16 and 1.9). There are a few areas of assarts and some larger fields (Figures 3.2, 4.2 and 4.3).

4.57 The third main area of this character area lies either side of the Meon valley (C on figure 4.10), and is dominated by assarted woodland and fields, together with some plantation (figure 4.2). This area is associated with Waltham Chase west of the Meon (the private hunting forest of the medieval Bishops of Winchester) and the Royal Forest of Bere east of the River Meon. In practice the extent of the assarted landscape represents areas that were cleared perhaps as long ago as the middle ages.

4.58 Areas of small-scale parliamentary fields and plantations or replanted

woodland now represent the areas of Waltham Chase and the Forest of Bere that survived as wood pasture or woodland into the post-medieval period. In the case of Waltham Chase, the small fields almost precisely define the extent of the former medieval deer park. In the case of the Forest of Bere, they coincide with areas covered by the 1814 Inclosure Act for the Forest (Chapman and Seeliger 1997, 92-3 and maps 49, Denmead, 139, Soberton, and 143, Southwick and Widley).

4.59 Historically many of the parishes on the chalk downs to the north, and both sides of Portsdown Hill to the south, had rights of common in the Forest of Bere (Cunliffe and Munby, 271-4 and fig. 78).

4.60 The final zone within this Character Area is Portsdown Hill, (shown as D on Figure 4.10). This small but distinctive zone is notable for its string of early to mid 19th century forts. Otherwise it is characterised by remnants of downland, and fairly extensive areas of fields bounded by paths, tracks and roads (HLT 1.15), which also probably represent former downland, on the northern slopes of the Hill.

The New Forest: Core Area

4.61 The core area of the New Forest is very clearly defined, in terms of Landscape Types, Historic Landscape Types and designations. It is characterised by open heath and commons (HLT 5.1, 2.1), purlieus (HLT 5.3), wood pasture, enclosed heathland woods and plantations, (HLT 4.8-4.11). The core of the New Forest has historically always had some degree of special status, much of it being extra-parochial until the 19th century. A

combination of pre-19th century parish boundaries on the western and eastern margins of the Forest and the post 19th century boundary of East Boldre on its southern edge again almost precisely coincide with this core area.

The New Forest: Periphery

4.62 The peripheral areas surrounding the core of the New Forest are also distinctive, but from an historic landscape point of view, there is not much obvious correlation with the boundary between HCC Landscape Character Areas 8 and 9 or, to a lesser extent, between Character Areas 8 and 11.

4.63 On the west side of the New Forest core there is a narrow, intricate mosaic of small fields (HLT 1.16 and 1.9), scattered and common edge settlement (HLT 9.1-9.4) small plantations (HLT 4.5) and occasional parkland (HLT 3.1-3.3) or assarts (HLT 1.1-1.2). This occupies the area between the main heathland block and the gravel terrace landscape of the Avon valley, dominated by more open areas of irregular rectilinear fields (HLT 1.7) and gravel pits (HLT 12.2).

4.64 The general mixture of Historic Landscape Types along the southern periphery of the New Forest core area is similar to that on the west side, but is much more extensive and includes a few areas of larger fields (HLT 1.6 and 1.10-1.11).

4.65 However, the grain of this mosaic of Historic Landscape Types tends to be roughly at right-angles to the coast, or radial to, rather than concentric with the core area of the New Forest. This pattern

makes the boundary between Character Areas 8 and 9 difficult to discern from an historic landscape point of view. These variations can be defined roughly as follows:

- the west end of this area, west of New Milton, is characterised by small old fields and plantations
- the area north of new Milton has an extensive area of late scattered settlement, with some small parliamentary type fields
- the area between New Milton and Lymington is characterised by two areas of predominantly pre-parliamentary and parliamentary small fields
- the Lymington River represents a more complex mosaic of late scattered settlement, and small fields with an area of assarted woods and fields occupying the valley enclave into the core of the forest
- the area south of East Boldre is dominated by medium-sized parliamentary fields
- the Beaulieu River represents another complex mosaic of assarted woods and fields and other old field systems
- the area east of Exbury is characterised by large pre-parliamentary and parliamentary fields.

4.66 Overall in this area, the most common HL Types occur on both sides of the boundary between HCC Landscape Character Areas 8 and 9 (Figures 3.2, 4.2, 4.3). But a few of the less common types do respect the boundary, including the late scattered settlements (HLT 9.2) and the larger fields (HLT 1.6, 1.10, 1.15) (see Figures 4.4, 4.6).

4.67 The eastern margins of the New Forest represent a more general mixture of

extensive assarted woods and fields and other small fields, which are included within the rather wider peripheral zone forming part of HCC Landscape Character Area 8 on the north-east side of the Forest.

Summary of Southern Hampshire

4.68 To summarise, southern Hampshire can be seen to fall into a number of zones and sub-zones from the point of view of its historic character, which do not entirely coincide with the HCC Landscape Character Areas:

- assarted woods and fields, post-1810 plantation either side of the River Test at Romsey
- extensive cover of small fields of both pre-parliamentary and parliamentary type, assarts and some larger fields east of the Itchen
- the Forest of Bere assarted woodland and fields, small-scale parliamentary fields and plantations
- the early to mid 19th century forts, downland and fields bounded by tracks and roads on Portsdown Hill
- the urban coast bordering Southampton Water and the east Solent characterised by conurbations and associated industry, defence-associated features and coastal resources
- the core New Forest heathland, wood pasture, heathland plantations and purlieus
- the periphery of the New Forest and coast of the west Solent, characterised by a highly intricate mosaic of small fields scattered and common edge settlement small plantations and occasional parkland or assarts and a few areas of larger fields.

The River Valleys

4.69 The four main river valleys defined as HCC Landscape Character Area 11 are very varied in their range of Landscape Types, and likewise have very variable Historic Landscape Types which mainly reflect the character of the wider areas through which the rivers flow. However, apart from the obvious high coverage of valley floor types, these areas also have some features which distinguish them from their surroundings, including a relative lack of woodland and high incidence of old settlement (see Chapter 3). Such characteristics could be used to consider refining the boundaries of the Character Area.

4.70 For example, the historic landscape characteristics of the Test valley section of Character Area 11 and its surrounding area in the vicinity of Romsey, suggest that the boundaries of Character Area 11 in this area might be moved further east. This would more clearly reflect the area characterised by the larger open field patterns on the eastern side of the valley, compared with the greater incidence of assarts and woods on the west (see Figures 4.2 and 4.4).

4.71 As discussed in Chapter 3, the Avon valley displays a distinctive river terrace landscape, which is distinguishable from the more general character of the periphery of the New Forest, which again does not exactly correspond to the boundary between Character Areas 8 and 11.

4.72 Apart from the diversity that the Character Area derives through the range of Landscape and Historic Landscape

Types which occupy the valley sides, the valley floors of the main rivers and their tributaries also have distinct characteristics of their own.

4.73 Most of the floor of the Avon valley is of some specific historic character rather than the "miscellaneous" category. It is notable for significant coverage of unimproved grasslands and water meadows (some of which are also of ecological interest). Marsh and rough grazing represents a third important element, and there are smaller areas of woodland and common.

4.74 Much more of the Test valley has been mapped as miscellaneous valley floor, and of the more distinctive Historic Landscape Types, watermeadows and wet woodland predominate, though with some marsh and rough grazing. Watercress beds are a feature of the upper reaches of the watercourses and fishery features also occur, though in both these cases the small size of many features means that they tend to be under-represented in the mapping.

4.75 The Itchen valley is characterised by unimproved grassland, with some watermeadows, especially around Winchester. There are smaller areas of woodland, occasional fisheries and again watercress beds in the upper reaches.

4.76 The River Meon has the narrowest of the valley floor areas of the main rivers, and it is the least distinctive, being almost entirely mapped as "miscellaneous valley floor".

4.77 Of the minor groups of other valley floor areas, there is little to characterise the Loddon and other watercourses in the

Forest of Eversley or those of the New Forest area. But there is a notable concentration of fish- or other ponds along the River Wey and along some of the other watercourses of the Wolmer Forest or Western Weald area.

Chapter 5

Parishes and Settlement Patterns: Community Landscapes

Introduction	1
How Specific Historic Landscape Types Relate to Parishes	1
Parishes in Relation to Landscape and Historic Landscape Types	2
Community Landscape Groupings	3
Settlements	4
Settlement and Post-code Data	4
Settlement Characteristics and Historic Landscape Types	4
The Settlement Characteristics of Different Parishes	5
Conclusions	6

Introduction

5.1 This chapter explores how the Hampshire Historic Landscape Assessment can be used to relate landscape character to communities. This focuses on how patterns of settlements and their associated parishes are related to their surroundings.

5.2 Both parishes and settlements are in some ways special in relation to historic landscape assessment:

- They are ancient in origin
- They are directly related to the socio-economic communities which have been responsible over time for the shaping of historic landscape character
- Parishes represent long-established socio-economic units related to the exploitation and management of a range of natural resources, whereas most Historic Landscape Types are closely related to geology, soils and landform
- Historic settlements (excluding recent urban growth) are very small in extent, and it was not feasible to plot every farm and house. Thus a different approach is required to measure the density and distribution of settlement

5.3 In order to capture a fuller picture of the distribution of settlement a different approach is needed. This is provided by a statistical categorisation of settlement pattern using post-code data, which was originally analysed by the South East Regional Research Laboratory at Birkbeck College for the national character mapping programme.

5.4 The following issues are briefly discussed and illustrated here:

- How specific Historic Landscape Types relate to parishes

- How parishes relate to the general distribution pattern of Historic Landscape Types
- How parishes which have similar proportions of the main groups of Historic Landscape Types can be grouped to show which communities share common landscape characteristics
- How different settlement types and distributions relate to the general distribution pattern of Historic Landscape Types
- How the settlement characteristics of different parishes vary

How Specific Historic Landscape Types Relate to Parishes

5.5 Over much of the county woodland can be seen to cluster along parish boundaries (Colebourn 1983, 8; Figure 5.1). When split by age or type (ancient or recent plantation, assarted or not, heathland or chalk) this broad trend appears to hold good for much of the area.

5.6 This corresponds to a significant extent with woodland being away from settlements, and indeed it is not clear which influence is stronger (though the GIS capability of the data would allow this to be tested).

5.7 If this apparent pattern is true, it suggests a reasonable expectation noted elsewhere (Aston 1985) that woodland tends to be in peripheral locations away from centres of settlement because it is a resource which only requires relatively infrequent visits. This model of woodland being spatially peripheral in land-utilisation territories reflects interesting questions about how parishes came to be defined – how far they reflect pre-existing patterns of landuse

and socio-economic territories, how far they established and shaped such territories within in a process of pioneering land clearance. It is perhaps most likely that they reflect both patterns, reinforcing pre-existing trends of territorial land-utilisation.

5.8 Another example of this kind of issue is the relationship between settlements, parishes and rivers, in respect of the location of settlements and the morphology of their associated parishes in relation to the topography (Figure 5.2). In the chalkland catchments of each of the main Hampshire rivers settlements are very largely located immediately beside the rivers, including their upper reaches where they are winterbourne streams.

5.9 Where the rivers are small, the associated parishes usually straddle the valleys, extending up onto higher ground on either side; but it appears that where the river is large enough to be shared, each parish occupies one side of the valley with a longer length of the river acting as its boundary to provide an adequate area of valley side and high downland. Although in these cases the position of settlements is apparently spatially skewed towards the river, they may still be relatively central to their territories in terms of resource utilization. Using the GIS it would be possible to explore this further to look at how consistent the proportions of valley floor to other landuse related Historic Landscape Types are for the parishes sharing these topographically similar morphologies.

5.10 As with the woods, questions arise about how patterns such as this arose in the definition and development of land-use territories. In these riverside chalkland parishes there may well also be scope for

comparing this with the rather different topographical relationships of settlement and landuse that appear to have existed in the late prehistoric and Roman period.

5.11 These kinds of pattern are perhaps less obvious off the chalk, but may be evident for example with the very large heathland parishes of the New Forest.

Parishes in Relation to Landscape and Historic Landscape Types

5.12 A simple overlay of the HCC Landscape Type areas with the boundaries of parishes (Figure 5.3) quite graphically shows how often parishes straddle different landscape areas, including some of the major Landscape Character Area divisions, most notably along the northern scarp of the chalk.

5.13 A map of the Historic Landscape Types overlaid with the parishes similarly reveals many cases where parishes straddle significant divisions within the broad pattern of the historic landscape mosaic (Figure 5.4). Again this tends to be most obvious along the northern, and to some extent southern boundaries of the chalk, but can also be seen along the western side of the New Forest, west of the River Avon and round Silchester.

5.14 More generally this correlation of Historic Landscape Types with parishes reveals the considerable variation in the range and character of HL Types present within parishes. Some have a much more diverse range of HL Types than others: those in the New Forest and much of the western side of the chalk are amongst the most homogeneous in their different ways, while those straddling the northern scarp of

the chalk and the western Weald are among the most diverse.

5.15 Several of the maps presenting aspects of the data in this report have been plotted with the outline of parishes superimposed, and these further indicate something of how different land-use resources are distributed within parishes. For example Figure 5.5 illustrates the distribution of former heathland (now planted over) around the edges of some of the parishes in north-east Hampshire, and the rather different correlation of parishes with the limits of heathland-associated HL Types in the New Forest. On Figures 6.1 and 6.2 it is possible to discern the occurrence of downland associated HL Types on the periphery of parishes (downland HLT 6.1; downland common HLT 2.2; and the field pattern most strongly related to downland, HLT 1.15).

Community Landscape Groupings

5.16 By combining the historic landscape and parish data sets, the GIS system allows the assessment to be used to analyse the proportions of Historic Landscape Types attributable to each parish.

5.17 This analysis has been carried out and the digital data set accompanying this report includes the full data, together with summary details from which a set of charts showing the historic landscape character of each parish has been generated (Figures 5.6 to 5.11).

5.18 Further statistical analysis of the data would allow the parishes to be ranked according to similarity of historic landscape

coverage and thus grouped to define larger community based areas with similar landscape characteristics.

5.19 This can be seen purely visually with the obvious similarities of the parishes forming the core of the New Forest and those covering much of the western side of the chalk, especially west of the River Test and south of Andover. It is also discernible among the more heterogeneous parishes such as those west of Andover, and south east of Basingstoke.

5.20 Because parishes tend to straddle the strong geological and topographical features which underlie most landscape assessment, this approach represents a radically different perspective, founded on the past interaction of people with their environment rather than being entirely dependent on its physical character.

5.21 This in turn could be taken further by considering how communications and route ways between communities further relate to the historic landscape character of different parts of the county. Figure 5.5 is an example of how an attempt might be made to generate a map of heathland and woodland related communities from the Historic Landscape Types. But a more effective approach, once further statistical work has been done to group parishes according to their historic landscape characteristics, would be to use these groups of similar parishes to select areas to be mapped with full coverage of the HL Types.

5.22 One technical point relating to the use of parish boundaries in this type of analysis is that present day civil parishes do not in some cases correspond to historical (pre-19th century) parishes. This does not

invalidate the approach in relation to the historic landscape characteristics of present day communities, but is relevant to any more detailed historical analysis. By digitising the old parish boundaries and then running the same GIS and statistical analysis, a comparable exercise for historical parishes could be carried out.

Settlements

5.23 For this study it was found that the only settlements that could realistically be plotted at the scale used were those with some degree of clustered nucleation, such as towns, villages and hamlets, or dense concentrations of scattered settlement with paddocks. It was not considered practicable to plot every farm or house.

5.24 It is therefore not possible to use the polygons plotted in mapping the Historic Landscape Types as a complete data set for settlement types in the same way as is more possible for other principal Historic Landscape Types such as fields or woodland.

5.25 Most of Hampshire has historically been dominated by nucleated settlements, (see extract of Professor Brian Roberts' and Dr Stuart Wrathmell's national map of historic settlement pattern, Figure 5.12). So this is only a significant problem for North Hampshire and the fringes of the New Forest and the western end of the Weald.

Settlement and Post-Code Data

5.26 Another approach to capture a fuller picture of the present distribution of settlement is through the analysis of post-code data. This is presented in Figure 5.13, in which seven categories of dispersed or

nucleated settlement are presented. These are as follows:

- No symbol = 0 delivery points (no settlement)
- gl1 = 1-10 delivery points (thin dispersed settlement)
- gl2 = 11-19, and 20+ delivery points where they average more than 100m apart (dispersed settlement)
- gl3 = 20-30 delivery points averaging less than 100m apart (small nucleated settlements)
- gl4 = 31-99 delivery points averaging less than 100m apart (medium nucleated settlements)
- gl5 = 100-500 delivery points averaging less than 100m apart (large nucleated settlements)
- gl6 = more than 500 delivery points averaging less than 100m apart (urban settlements)

5.27 There appears to be significant correlation between these categories and the Historic Landscape Types, not only with respect to identified settlements, but also more general distribution of HL Types (Figure 5.14).

5.28 There tend to be relatively high levels of dispersed and small nucleated settlement in areas dominated by the smaller fields and assarts, usually on the heavier soils. More open countryside with larger fields tend to have much sparser and more nucleated settlement. Extant or replanted heathland is notable for the sparseness of settlement.

Settlement Characteristics and Historic Landscape Types

5.29 The post-code distribution of settlement adds a useful further dimension in

characterising the Hampshire Landscape Character Areas, with which it generally correlates well. It meshes even more neatly and consistently with the Historic Landscape Types mosaic.

5.30 In particular there are high levels of dispersed settlement in the areas with smaller fields, assarts and woodland, and much less dispersed settlement within the main area of parliamentary-type fields on the chalk. The main open heathland of the New Forest is largely devoid of settlement. At a more subtle level of variation a distinction emerges between the western and eastern halves of north Hampshire, which appears to match distinctions in other historic landscape characteristics (see Chapter 3, description of Landscape Character Area 5)

5.31 For areas that are still essentially rural this largely agrees with Roberts' and Wrathmell's (1995) analysis of the 19th century patterns of nucleated and dispersed settlement undertaken at a national level for English Heritage (Figure 5.12)

5.32 The Historic Landscape Type categories for different kinds of settlement also reflect some wider characteristic patterns across the county.

5.33 Almost all the common edge settlement (both pre- and post-1810) occurs in the Forest of Eversley, with some in the area of Wolmer Forest and some on the western side of the New Forest (Figure 5.5).

5.34 All the pre-1810 scattered settlement and paddocks (HLT 9.1) occurs in the New Forest and its environs, and this is also the main area for post-1810 scattered settlement (HLT 9.2). But this HL Type (which includes "stockbroker belt" areas of

detached houses with large gardens as well as small holding type paddocks), is much more widespread. It also occurs alongside the River Hamble, in the Forest of Bere, around Four Marks, some in Wolmer Forest, and a little in north Hampshire. Many of these instances are near large centres of population (Figures 4.6, 5.2, 5.5).

5.35 There are clear differences in the distribution of villages and hamlets between the predominantly riverside nucleated settlement patterns of the central chalk, already referred to, and the much more scattered patterns evident on the eastern chalk and clay and on the lowland clays and sands (see Figure 5.2).

The Settlement Characteristics of Different Parishes

5.36 The data sets available do allow the settlement characteristics of individual parishes to be analysed, but only at a rather crude level. The scale of resolution of the Historic Landscape Types is too large to cover very small settlement units (farms, very small clusters of houses or individual houses). The post-code data is better in providing statistical measure of settlement pattern, and would be suitable for analysing groups of parishes, but is perhaps somewhat limited by the 1km resolution of the data set to be of very much use when it comes to small parishes.

5.37 On the whole, the settlement patterns of individual parishes require more detailed historical analysis from available maps and documentary sources than has been possible in this study. The Historic Landscape Assessment provides a useful context within which more detailed morphological and

chronological studies could be developed. As noted above, one aspect of this is that consideration should be given to the historic parish contexts of settlements, not just their modern civil parishes.

Conclusion

5.38 This chapter has explored something of how historic landscape assessment can be related to communities through the historic landscape characteristics of their parishes and settlements.

5.39 This could be taken further, (as explained above and in Chapter 7), and potentially points the way forward to a rather different approach, which might be termed "Community Landscape Assessment." This would focus more on how communities have related to the natural environment through time, emphasising recurring patterns in the varied resources which they exploited and how this was organised, rather than the underlying natural geology and topography.

5.40 This also raises the possibility of a direct link through from this study and other sources of data held on the HCC GIS system, to make more detailed assessments at community level.

Chapter 6

Time-depth and Landscape Change

Introduction	1
Towards Defining Time-depth in Current Landscape Character	1
Some Possible Scenarios of Landscape Change	2
Chalkland	2
Heathland	4
Woodland and Royal Forests	6

Introduction

6.1 The definition of Historic Landscape Types does incorporate some definite chronological thresholds and a number of typological distinctions, which have chronological implications. The scope for chronological refinement is limited by the emphasis on trying to map differences of form, size and processes of landscape change as well as time within a manageable number of typological categories.

6.2 The basic chronological threshold that has been built in to the assessment has been to distinguish between those areas in which much of the present landcover had developed prior to the 19th century, and those which have had a substantial imprint of 19th century or later change. This chronological threshold was chosen because it represents the earliest time for which there is complete map coverage of a consistent and sufficiently detailed scale to be useful.

6.3 This is clearly not the basis for any detailed chronological analysis or sequencing to provide a reliable analysis of the development of the Hampshire landscape. Nevertheless, some of the other typological distinctions used in the assessment make it possible at least to develop hypotheses about how far earlier landscape characteristics survive. Such hypotheses based on the assessment cannot be definitive but could provide a starting point for more detailed research and for the development of conservation strategies which seek to maintain the character of potentially early landscape characteristics until such time as they are better understood.

Towards Defining Time-depth in Current Landscape Character

6.4 Figures 6.1 to 6.3 provide a sequence of chronologically related 'windows'. They are not equivalent to strict 'phase plans,' such as an archaeologist might present in dissecting the logical relationships of a well-stratified archaeological site; nor are they 'period plans' such as can be compiled from the combination of artefact dating and spatial relationships. They do not even begin to present a picture of the landscape at any particular period, which would be an entirely different exercise. These "chronological windows" only represent a broad-brush view of areas where it might be expected that some of the spatial qualities and morphology of features in the landscape can be expected to retain progressively younger characteristics of the changes that they have undergone.

6.5 Figure 6.1 indicates those areas most likely to retain attributes characteristic of changes and developments that may have occurred in the middle ages and early post-medieval period, although much of the detail (individual houses in settlements, trees in woods) may be younger.

6.6 For Figure 6.2 areas have been added that are likely to retain attributes characteristic of changes in the post-medieval period up to the early 19th century.

6.7 For Figure 6.3 the same has been done, adding areas likely to retain attributes characteristic of changes that took place during the 19th century.

6.8 The final version in this sequence is provided by figures 3.2 and 5.4 which add largely 20th century changes, including the

vast majority, though not all, of the post 1810 urban development.

6.9 What this approach provides is some insight into which parts of the Hampshire landscape can be expected to retain the greatest feeling of time-depth and slow rates of change, and which reflect more rapid or more radical change. Some of the chronological assumptions underlying this may be flawed. For example it is very questionable whether assart field systems need be particularly early (especially HLT 1.3). The GIS model can easily be used to generate such maps, but they must be treated more as a challenge to sort out how field patterns in Hampshire actually developed than as the answer to that conundrum. Also, the scale of the assessment is only very broad brush area characterisation; a visit to any part of Hampshire will be capable of revealing landscape features and even groups of features which may be of considerable interest for, say, the medieval period, even if the predominant characteristics of the area suggest a significant amount of post-medieval change.

6.10 As one would expect, the 'earlier' maps are more patchy than the later ones, but one of their values is to indicate which areas are likely to display greatest coherence of time-depth.

6.11 This is perhaps especially relevant to development planning by indicating areas which are likely to be particularly sensitive to change.

6.12 One of the more ironical, and to some extent salutary observations to be made is that many areas that were remodelled during the last century, largely characterised by

parliamentary enclosure, are often also those with the greatest time depth of all. These areas were often those most heavily exploited in the prehistoric and Roman periods, and older survivals within such areas, like old woodlands such as Micheldever and Itchen Woods, or downland like Martin Down, are havens of especially well preserved prehistoric and Roman archaeology which actually reveal quite different ancient landscapes.

6.13 Although it is not in itself an archaeological study, in this respect the assessment does provide some potential for insight into how landscape conservation management issues may relate to management and conservation of the archaeological resource. However, this would need to be coupled with more detailed data on current land use to be of use at a site-specific level.

Some Possible Scenarios of Landscape Change

Chalkland

6.14 Until about 6,500 years ago the chalk would have been completely forested. Some ancient surviving woodland, might always have remained wooded ever since, but at least some old woods like Micheldever Wood or West Wood Sparsholt show signs of having regrown since the prehistoric or Roman periods (Colebourn 1983, 8). The processes of early woodland clearance are poorly known and are only detectable archaeologically, and though palaeo-environmental evidence of pollen and other biological remains.

6.15 Downland developed in a cleared landscape that often shows archaeological evidence of having been used for prehistoric, Roman and sometimes medieval cultivation; though again it is possible that some may always have been open pasture.

6.16 Most existing pre 19th century field pattern HL Types on the chalk reflect change from either woodland, downland, or existing fields (whether open or enclosed).

Changes from woodland

6.17 Significant numbers of woods on the chalk have outlines which suggest the process of assarting; assart type fields on the chalk include both putatively early ones and demonstrably late examples, including simple modern woodland clearance.

6.18 Tentatively, therefore, it is possible to conclude first, that assarting is a significant characteristic of the chalk as well as other areas (it has simply been more thoroughly overtaken by later developments and is so less apparent in the landscape); and second, that it has probably never stopped (Figures 4.2, 6.4).

6.19 The large woodland complex of Micheldever and Itchen Woods illustrates the complexity of the situation. These woods have prehistoric settlements and field systems within them, demonstrating that much if not all the woodland is Roman or post-Roman regeneration, which has then been assarted (as evidenced by their outline). The medieval and later processes of clearance and development of field patterns are likely to have gone through many stages, and there is evidence of post-1800 assarting at the north east end of Micheldever Wood,

and groups of parliamentary-type and prairie fields abutting them on the other sides.

6.20 It is possible that different field patterns may represent a sequence of initial clearance followed by rationalisation. Thus assarts made in initial clearance might initially have been enlarged, then rationalised into more regular small fields, then enlarged, and finally straightened out into surveyed parliamentary types. This kind of hypothetical sequence can sometimes be discerned spatially, as in the area known as Barnet Side around High Cross north west of Petersfield (Figure 6.4). It is also intriguing that the best boundary found in this area to demarcate HL Type 1.16 from HL Types 1.6 and 1.10 or 1.12 to the west coincides with an archaeological earthwork the Froxfield ditches.

6.21 However, it is highly speculative whether apparent spatial patterns of this sort really do reflect chronological developments, or whether the field morphologies are more related to geology and land-use. This is not an issue that the Historic Landscape Assessment can resolve, but it illustrates the kind of questions that it can pose which may deserve more detailed study.

Changes from downland

6.22 There are two types of field pattern which seem particularly connected with the enclosure of downland. The first appears to represent the creation of fields by the simple expedient of using existing roads, tracks, and paths as their boundaries (HLT 1.15). In some cases this can be seen to coincide with areas that were downland on the first edition 1" OS map (1810), but usually the areas as mapped for the Assessment are larger than the extent downland shown then. This

suggests that this kind of enclosure may have had earlier origins, but continued into the 19th century.

6.23 The other field pattern relevant here are the 'ladder' fields (HLT 1.8), which are again associated with tracks leading up to or over the downs. Mostly these occur in areas of parliamentary-type field patterns, and include regular straight boundaries as the 'rungs' of the ladder so, as defined in the typology, they may be relatively late features. However, a few examples of this pattern with wavy boundaries for the 'rungs' were noted at Tichborne, east of Winchester, suggesting again, that this form may also have earlier origins.

6.24 Whereas parts of some areas mapped as HLT 1.15 were open downland at the beginning of the 19th century, this does not apply to HLT 1.8, though the sides of roads in these areas are often shown unfenced on at least one side. In some cases the "Ladder" type of field pattern thus may also reflect gradual enclosure, or re-enclosure of land already brought out of open downland pastures. But in some cases, bits of these areas may have originated as parts of open medieval fields, as may be suspected with some of the area of "ladder" fields at Martin (Figure 6.5).

6.25 The area round Martin appears to illustrate both something of the changes from early fields, and from downland. Close to the village there are small patches of fields reflecting the enclosure of sinuous medieval strips (HLT 1.5). These appear to have been rationalised into small regular fields with wavy boundaries (HLT 1.16). Others may have been changed into areas of larger wavy-edged fields or straight sided parliamentary types (HLT 1.10, 1.11). The relationship

between fields and downland is evident here too. Large areas of downland (HLT 2.2, 6.1) still survive at Martin Down, and high areas of ex-downland fields bounded by tracks and roads (HLT 1.15) occur to the east of Martin on Little Toyd Down. "Ladder" type fields (HLT 1.8) link the valley floor to the downland (to the west) or former downland (to the east) through a series of parallel tracks. It seems likely that the linear boundaries and tracks that form the sides of the "ladders" may well be ancient features, and that the extent and form of the fields formed between them could well have changed over time. Finally in this area there are large areas of medium to large parliamentary type fields (HLT 1.10, 1.11), which also may have replaced both earlier fields and downland.

Changes from other early chalkland landuse

6.26 Much of the eastern parts of the chalk are characterised by large fields with wavy boundaries (HLT 1.6) that may reflect the enclosure of either downland or open medieval fields. Areas of smaller fields of this kind (HLT 1.16) could also represent similar enclosure processes, but are more likely to be related to early enclosed land such as closes and assarts.

Heathland

6.27 There is clear evidence of prehistoric use of heathland areas such as the New Forest, and increasing evidence of Bronze Age and earlier exploitation. As with the Dorset heaths, it is clear that the New Forest was originally covered by deciduous woodland. The creation of open heathland was largely the result of over-exploitation of fragile soils by Bronze Age farmers (Tubbs 1986). This changed the structure

composition and chemistry of the soil, severely limiting its potential for agriculture.

6.28 This process probably applied equally to other heathlands (there is comparable evidence from Berkshire and Surrey heaths), and may well apply to other areas on similar soils which did not survive as open heathland into recent times.

6.29 Hampshire is particularly rich in former royal and private forests, and some of these areas retain particular characteristics in the landscape that reflect this.

6.30 The very clear distinction between heathland and enclosed farmland around the New Forest reflects long standing legal differences in the status and use of Crown Land and private freeholds which date back to the designation of the area as a Royal Forest by William the Conqueror. It is not primarily a result of geology or natural ecological processes, and it is noteworthy that the distribution of pre-existing settlements at Domesday was similar to that still existing in and around the New Forest. The major exception is Beaulieu, originally a monastic estate, probably of 2,000-2,500 ha, carved out of the Royal Forest and given to the Cistercians by King John in the early thirteenth century. During the 13th and early 14th century a further 417ha was given to the monks and assarted from "waste" (Tubbs 1986). It is possible that some of the extensive assarting still evident in the pattern of fields and woods around Beaulieu reflects this process of medieval clearance and conversion of land to agriculture.

6.31 Apart from the changes at Beaulieu, the impression is that the legal restrictions imposed by William I effectively curtailed gradual encroachment and colonisation of

the Forest, except in a few private enclaves or "purlieus." Some of the smallest purlieu remained open acid grassland pastures, while other larger ones supported small settlements. Fritham, for example, remained a small scattered settlement, while at Burley (which originated as an outlying part of Ringwood parish) scattered settlement has expanded since 1810 to fill much of the former open paddocks of the purlieu.

6.32 Within the peripheral heath areas (Figure 6.6), there is evidence of assarting and small scale enclosure. Some assarts may reflect enclosure of heathland rather than woodland, though the majority seem to be woodland associated. Of the small scale enclosed fields, the ones next to the heath tend more often to be those with straight boundaries (HLT 1.9) rather than sinuous boundaries (HLT 1.16), perhaps suggesting some relatively late encroachment into the heath, as well as rationalisation of earlier field layouts. However, this is much clearer for the New Forest than the other two main heathland areas, where there tends to be evidence of former small fields having become planted over.

6.33 The New Forest displays by far the most complex pattern of heathland woods and wood pasture. The complexity of its development is only very superficially illustrated by this survey, and may be more fully appreciated by the discussions provided by Tubbs (1986) and Peterken, Spencer and Field (1996).

6.34 The Forests of Wolmer, Bagshot and Eversley appear to have been essentially heathland forests, forming parts of much more extensive open heathland that extended into Berkshire, Surrey and Sussex. Lacking the kind of exceptional legal status

that the New Forest enjoys, these once extensive heathland areas have been much more affected by 19th century and later plantation, military activities, gravel digging and urban expansion.

6.35 The area surrounding Wolmer Forest has many of the same historic landscape characteristics as the area south of the New Forest west of Lymington, in which it is quite difficult to discern any ancient sequence or pattern of landscape change because of the overlay of recent landuses. Nevertheless, there is a broad pattern of older enclosed farmland along the valley of the River Wey, with a number of commons fringing the Forest. Areas of small parliamentary enclosure (HLT 1.9) some of which west of Liphook may well be recent assarting, can be seen as representing encroachment into the Forest area extending farmland beyond the ring of commons that fringed the Forest. A somewhat similar pattern can be detected on the west side and round the north end of the Forest. Around Liss assart field patterns suggest the long establishment of the southern boundary of the open Forest (except for a narrow sliver now alongside the railway which was formally enclosed by Inclosure Act).

6.36 It is just possible to detect some similar characteristics in the case of the former heathland of Eversley, where again on the north east side there is evidence of encroachment, whereas a significant part of the south west side is fringed by assarted fields and two deer parks.

6.37 There is a large area of assart field patterns, hamlets, greens and scattered assarted woodland south west of the former heathland of Eversley. One of the notable features of this area is the string of parks,

including four former deer parks, and an almost concentric string of large commons forming two arcs round the east side of the main area of assarts next to the heath. These areas are likely to represent quite ancient arrangements for the clearance and management of woodland and of game in the middle ages.

Woodland and Royal Forests

6.38 The areas of former Royal Forest dominated by clay soils like Bere, and Pamber reflect a rather different character, having areas more heavily dominated by woodland and assart field patterns.

6.39 The earlier stages of clearance tend to be reflected in very extensive areas of assarted woods and fields, deer parks and scattered commons that occur in the wider surrounding area. Some of this may well date back to the early middle ages, and more to late medieval changes, including the process of legal disafforestation from the 14th century onwards of the much larger areas that had been subject to Forest Law in the 12th century (for example there is a documentary record of 70 acres of assarting in Pamber Forest in 1307)..

6.40 The areas subject to Forest Law were never entirely (or even especially extensively) wooded, and the very nature of assarts, evident in their morphology, is the gradual nibbling away at woodland rather than wholesale clearance and replacement with regular fields. Assarting was in fact a source of revenue for the King, as it was subject to fines under Forest Law.

6.41 Furthermore, not all enclosure within the area of the Royal Forests was to make fields. The creation of deer parks was

another way in which areas of forest were enclosed. For example, in 1257 Robert de St John was licensed to create Sherburn Park at what is now Sherbourne St John. Woods were also enclosed with stockades (eg Weston Patrick in 1258). This may well have been a similar process.

6.42 While the open heath and heathland woods and plantations of the New Forest clearly reflect the oldest core of the Forest (as may also be the case with the Wolmer, Eversley and Bagshot heathlands) the other, more wooded medieval forests of Hampshire present a more complex picture.

6.43 It was observed in relation to the chalk, that much of the land that was probably cleared earliest for agriculture is now characterised by the most recent forms of field patterns. Similarly, it can be a variety of relatively recent Historic Landscape Types which reflect the core of the late medieval forests (as listed and mapped by Glassock, 1973) that survived as woodland or wood pasture up to the end of the 18th century. These recent patterns of field enclosure, or woodland replanting in effect represent the final stages of a long process of clearance or enclosure of woodland.

6.44 This is most obvious in the case of the Forest of Bere (Figure 6.7), where the very extensive area of assarted fields and woods between the River Hamble and Havant may correspond to a long process of woodland clearance around Waltham Chase and the Forest of Bere. But these areas are not the surviving area of wood pasture shown as the Forest of Bere on the 1st edition 1" map of 1810. This lay to the north of the main area of assarting, and was enclosed under Act only four years later, in 1814. The Forest of Bere had been subject to inter-

commoning by a significant number of parishes both to the north and south and the 1st edition OS map clearly shows the impression of relatively open wood pasture. The effect of Inclosure was that most of the wood pasture was simply cleared, and replaced by small parliamentary-type fields and paddocks (HLT 1.9). However, one large area (presumably of less heavily browsed pasture) was enclosed and replanted as woodland at West Walk, and another new plantation was created at East Creech Walk.

6.45 Alice Holt, north of Wolmer Forest, was depicted as another area of wood pasture like the Forest of Bere on the 1st edition 1" OS map. A large area of replanted assarted woodland survives, and again areas of small parliamentary type fields (HLT 1.9) occur along its western margin in part of the non-woodland area that was enclosed by parliamentary Act (Chapman and Seeliger 1997, map 15, Binsted). Presumptively earlier, wavy-edged small fields (HLT 1.16) may reflect an earlier stage of enclosure around the southern end of the woodland, while small areas of assarts lie further west and south, and on the other side of the wood (across the county boundary in Surrey).

6.46 In the case of the former Royal Forest of Pamber (Figure 6.8), the remaining area of forest was again enclosed under Act, but in this case a large area of woodland (rather than wood pasture) had survived, and "Pamber Forest" remains today as a core area of ancient semi-natural woodland. This core is again surrounded by an area of small parliamentary type enclosures (HLT 1.9) and straight-sided assarts (HLT 1.4), that largely correspond to the remaining area covered by the Inclosure Act.

6.47 The areas of the other forests that survived into the late medieval period (Glasscock 1973) are perhaps less distinctive, and some of them extended into other counties, but may still be reflected in the mosaic of Historic Landscape Types

6.48 The Hampshire part of the Forest of Chute seems to be reflected in an area of large and medium assarts and hangers in the north west corner of the county, mainly in the parishes of Facombe and Ashmansworth. These parishes were subject to enclosures prior to the period of parliamentary Inclosure. While it is not possible to establish exactly what areas were enclosed, it is worth noting that apart from one area of small wavy edged fields, and another of rather irregular medium sized parliamentary fields the area is dominated by large assarts (HLT 1.3).

6.49 Parts of Buckholt Forest, on the borders with Wiltshire, may be evident in the area of assarts, parks and woodland west of the Test, south of the small parish of Buckholt. This area is characterised by a greater mixture of field types (including small pre-parliamentary and parliamentary types and a few larger parliamentary types as well as numerous assarts) interspersed with patches of woodland. However, no core area can be suggested in the same way as for the others mentioned above.

6.50 Significant areas of medium and large assarts, replanted assarted woods and at least one former deer park south west of Winchester appear to correspond to the Forest of "Bere by Winchester" or "Bere Ashley". The former core of this medieval forest may be discernible in the modern parishes of Ampfield, North Baddesley and Chilworth, which are dominated by significant areas of replanted assarted woods and

straight sided assarts or other parliamentary type fields. Ampfield was originally part of Hursley, which by the time of Inclosure still had two large outlying areas, "Out Wood" and "Eamer Common" which were inclosed by Act in 1809. This suggests that they may well be the remnants of areas of common grazing or wood pasture similar to those which had survived in the Forest of Bere (Portchester).

6.51 As a more general observation, assarting clearly continued into relatively recent times, and it is not unusual to find the straight-sided assarts (HLT 1.4), rather than the older fields with the more sinuous boundaries, as the field parcels closest to the assarted woodland.

6.52 The non-assart field systems in these areas of former Royal Forest predominantly are pre-parliamentary types of enclosure. A significant proportion are small scale, more regular enclosures than the assarts, in areas with relatively few scattered copses and woods (HLT 1.16). They are less obviously the direct result of enclosure of heath or forest (though some may be), and may represent regularisation and modification of older assarts in a further process of clearance. They quite often abut areas of assarted woodland.

6.53 Small straight-sided fields of parliamentary type (HLT 1.9) may represent a similar process at a later stage, further modifying previously regularised patterns, as well as reflecting formal Inclosure as described above.

6.54 Very little is known in detail about the physical process of assarting, and the apparent incidence of assarts along the fringes of heathland Royal Forests raises an interesting issue. This might indicate that the

heathland had in fact been densely wooded; but alternatively it may indicate that the process of assarting was concerned more with the gradual ordering of wood pasture, clearing the areas with fewest trees to make fields in which grazing could be better managed, and leaving denser stands to be enclosed as copses and woods.

6.55 It is clear that, as a process, assarting has continued until very late, and indeed in a modified form continues today. There is also some support for the impression that assarts with straight boundaries may be relatively late, as suggested by the occurrence of the type in part of the area Inclosed from Pamber Forest in the early 19th century. But it is not possible to establish a more detailed idea of sequence with any confidence.

6.56 The different percentages for the size of assarts occurring in the different Landscape Character Areas, which were noted in Chapter 3, suggests that morphologically assarts are at least partly related to geology. It is by its nature a gradual process and while in theory (and occasionally in practice) it is possible to work out the sequence of a given block of assarts this provides little help with trying to establish more general trends.

6.57 It probably is the case that most small and medium sized assarts are medieval or early post-medieval in origin. There also may well have been a process of rationalisation, usually to more regular small fields, as noted above. But it is only the latter end of this sequence that can be demonstrated at all convincingly, and much more detailed work would be needed to establish any more detailed analysis of the processes of change in converting woodland and heath to fields and commons.

6.58 A number of possible approaches might be attempted. One would be to take a well-documented parish or very large estate with a good variety of field types and examine its evolution in detail. An obvious candidate might be the parish of Beaulieu, together with Exbury and East Boldre, which contain almost all the relevant field patterns and significant woodland and heathland.

6.59 Another approach would be to examine north Hampshire in more detail, tracing the boundaries of the medieval forests at different stages while also examining in detail the origins of settlements and trying to relate these to the morphology of the patterns of assarting.

Chapter 7

Applications, Future Use and Potential

Introduction	1
Issues of Scale and Status of the Data	1
National Policy Context	2
Application of the Historic Landscape Assessment for Planning Functions	3
Housing	3
Rural Economy	5
Tourism, Leisure	7
Minerals, Waste, Energy and Reclamation	7
Roads and Traffic	8
Development Control	8
Research and Education	8
Considerations for Further Work	9

Introduction

7.1 This chapter reviews the possible applications of this Historic Landscape Assessment of Hampshire in the planning process, and examine the uses at the County and District levels.

7.2 Some observations are also put forward on possible further analyses and future applications or development for a range of users, including its educational potential.

Issues of Scale and Status of the Data

7.3 This report, and the versions of the digital mapping of the historic character of the Hampshire landscape that it contains illustrate the ways in which the data can be used, not definitive conclusions. The map can be manipulated to shed light on a wide range of questions, many of which will not even have been identified here. This potential to explore is a strength of the system, but it is also a possible hazard if users do not recognise the way the map was compiled, and what this means in terms of what it can be expected to provide.

7.4 The level of detail incorporated into the assessment, in terms of the number of Historic Landscape Types, and the number and size of areas attributed to the types, makes the assessment relatively attractive and simple for application at district or sub-district level. Indeed during the course of the project draft results were made available for use in landscape assessments of the setting of Winchester, The Forests of Bere and Eversley, and to inform the Countryside

Commission and English Heritage about local scale issues in the Basingstoke area.

7.5 However, the use of the assessment at local level needs to be treated with caution. The small size of many of the polygons attributed to types, coupled with the great flexibility of the GIS facility (which allows the whole map to be infinitely rescaled, and overlaid with photographic images, detailed 1:10,000 OS maps and other data), is liable to encourage detailed application which may not be appropriate. Users should therefore be clear what their objectives are, and whether or not they will need to do more detailed research on their area of interest. They should not assume that the Assessment is usable at all scales.

7.6 It is likely, especially when more detailed work is done, that there may be disagreement with some of the detailed mapping incorporated in the assessment. There is no single solution to the challenge of dividing up an infinitely complex and intricate physical environment into a mosaic of typological polygons, even with almost 80 categories. Other interpretations of the historic characteristics of different areas may thus be well legitimate, especially if based on analysis more detailed primary sources than it was feasible to use for this county scale project.

7.7 Some ideas for refinements in the methodology and approach to historic landscape assessment at county level have been explored during the course of the project, but others remain for future development. Some of these need additional information or analyses. Accordingly, the final section makes some suggestions for how the existing data set may be further researched or enhanced.

National Policy Context

7.8 This study fulfils for Hampshire some important strands of advice set out in national policy guidance on conservation of the historic environment (PPG 15). This states that the commitment to sustainable development,

"has particular relevance to the preservation of the historic environment, which by its nature is irreplaceable. Yet the historic environment of England is all-pervasive, and it cannot in practice be preserved unchanged. We must ensure that the means are available to identify what is special in the historic environment; to define through the development plan system its capacity to change, and, when proposals for new development come forward, to assess their impact on the historic environment and give it full weight alongside other considerations" (PPG 15, para 1.3)

7.9 With reference to "The wider historic landscape", PPG 15 advises that,

"There is ... a significant role for local planning authorities. In defining planning policies for the countryside, authorities should take account of the historical dimension of the landscape as a whole rather than concentrate on selected areas. Adequate understanding is an essential preliminary and authorities should assess the wider historic landscape at an early stage in development plan preparation. Plans should protect its most important components and encourage development that is most consistent with maintaining its overall historic character.

"Appraisals [of historic landscape character] based on assessment of the historic character of the whole countryside will be

more flexible, and more likely to be integrated with the aims of the planning process, than an attempt to define selected areas for control. (PPG 15, paras 2.26 and 6.40)

7.10 PPG 15 (para 2.10) refers to the guidance being prepared by the Government's statutory advisers, and stresses the value of early consultation. This guidance has been published by the Countryside Commission, English Nature and English Heritage (1993 and 1996) in two volumes providing detailed advice to planning authorities, setting out the fundamental approach to sustainable development (Conservation Issues In Strategic Plans and Conservation Issues In Local Plans).

7.11 English Heritage has issued a discussion paper on the concept and practice of sustainability for the cultural heritage (English Heritage 1997). A report to the Government's conservation agencies entitled *What Matters and Why* issued by the Countryside Commission (1997) sets out ideas for further refining approaches to the idea of sustainability to assist its promotion at all levels and for many different policy contexts. These are outlined further in Appendix A.

7.12 Taken as a whole, a key part of the established policy for a more holistic approach to conservation of the "all pervasive" historic environment is the appreciation that the environment has always been subject to continuous but variable processes of change. This is part-and-parcel of how the historic character of the countryside develops, survives, is modified or is destroyed.

7.13 Thus the historic environment is not a separate entity, just represented by a few key

monuments or buildings, but represents how the variable process of long term change has affected the character of the whole environment. The way that patterns of change have differed from one place and another is one of the key foundations of an area's local distinctiveness and historic character. Part of that character will be reflected in key monuments, buildings or landscape features of particular intrinsic interest, but, as English Heritage state, these cannot by themselves determine the historic character of an area, and they provide an incomplete picture of what the past can offer to the future.

7.14 The Historic Landscape Assessment provides a more holistic baseline framework for the historic character of the environment within which to consider issues of sustainability and provide a sounder basis for planning future change, more fully informed by past change that has shaped the county's character.

Application of the Historic Landscape Assessment for Planning Functions

7.15 Historic Landscape Assessment is fundamental to an holistic characterisation approach already established in the County Council. Together with the landscape assessment and environmental record information base, it should prove valuable to inform several aspects of the planning process, both at strategic and local plan level, from policy development and forward planning, to development control. It will set a framework at a county level within which more detailed district historic assessments can be focussed.

7.16 A few of the potential areas of application to the planning process and local authorities' conservation and land use advisory functions are illustrated in the following sections.

Housing

7.17 Identifying the demand for new housing and determining the provision for each District is one of the major functions of the County Council. There are techniques developed to assist in the prediction of supply and demand for housing but at present they do not necessarily address the historical component of existing settlement pattern and how its interpretation could give guidance to future allocation.

7.18 Given the premise that the objective of the process is to maintain and enhance the diversity of the different Character Areas of the county, and not to seek homogeneity across the region, analysis of the historical characteristics of settlement can assist in strategic planning.

7.19 As discussed in Chapter 5, the assessment of settlement pattern provides several types of information that may be useful.

7.20 There is clear correlation between the pattern of settlement revealed by postcode data and landscape character defined through the Historic Landscape Types, HCC Landscape Types and HCC Landscape Character Areas. This provides the basis for comparison with 19th century patterns analysed by Brian Roberts and Stuart Wrathmell (1995) on a nation-wide basis (Figure 5.12), though this would probably need refining to a more local level of

analysis to bring out more detailed variation in the patterns.

7.21 The Historic Landscape Types for settlement bring out some variation in the distribution of characteristic forms of settlement, but again this would merit more detailed analysis, again using map regression techniques and approaches to the analysis of settlement form developed by Brian Roberts (1971, 1982).

7.22 The GIS facility potentially allows the present day settlement pattern as represented by the postcode data to be statistically summarised for different spatial entities:

- Historic Landscape Type
- Landscape Type
- Landscape Character Area
- District
- Parish

7.23 It will also allow such analyses after grouping of such entities. It would probably be appropriate to reduce the Historic Landscape Types into the 25 groups used in the analyses presented elsewhere in this report (eg Figures 3.3-3.5, 5.6-5.11, 5.14) for this purpose). The parishes could be grouped by statistical analysis of their historic landscape similarities as suggested in Chapter 5.

7.24 This type of analysis should provide a useful basis for developing a strategic overview of the kinds of new housing development that might be considered appropriate to different areas in the county. This would take account of how different scales of development and different patterns of concentration or dispersal might suit some

areas better than others in terms of sustaining the historic character of the area.

7.25 By correlating the postcode data with groups of Historic Landscape Types or Landscape Types across the county it should prove possible to establish whether these areas have settlement characteristics which might inform any new strategies for design and pattern of housing development.

7.26 What this study does is to provide the technical basis for establishing what mixture of extensive and intensive housing development might suit different areas. It also provides a mechanism for establishing what level of development (if any) they could sustain without significant loss of their intrinsic historic pattern.

7.27 The study is perhaps even more useful in offering some help with considering the broad historical character of the setting and landscape context of existing settlements, and how this varies across the county and within districts. Figures 6.1 to 6.3 give an indication of how some settlements are much more embedded in relatively slowly changing countryside while others are in areas which, taking a long term view, have been subject to more rapid, or at least more recent change. Figure 5.4 suggests that some areas of urban expansion surrounded by countryside with an apparently rich mosaic of the 'older' historic landscape types may not only have reached, but long since surpassed what might now be considered the limit of sustainable growth in relation to conservation of areas of well preserved historic character.

7.28 Sensitivity to the character and intactness of the historic environment is a key issue for sustainability more generally because it normally relates closely to