

ARCHAEOLOGICAL STRATEGY DOCUMENT

ROMSEY

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Historic towns have long been a focus of settlement and community in the landscape. This continuity of urban settlement indicates both the benefits of urban living in terms of quality of life and economic advantage, and that these towns in particular are stable, adaptable and well connected. They are the product of change necessary to meet the needs of successive generations. The archaeological evidence that accumulates within the town illustrates the social, economic, religious, technological and political change through time, not only in that community but locally, regionally and nationally. This archaeological evidence is buried, with artefacts and features such as wall footings, pits, wells and post holes, but is also within the fabric of the historic building and in the patterns of the streets and the layout of the property plots.
- 1.2 Archaeological evidence is important for its potential to increase future knowledge and for its value as a leisure, education and tourism resource. These remains are finite and non-renewable, and are susceptible to destruction both in episodes of development and by cumulative erosion through small scale change. The quality of the urban environment can rely heavily on the historic and cultural attributes of the town. A sustainable future for these settlements and communities must integrate the past with the future.
- 1.3 In addition to the statutory protection afforded by listing and scheduling, the development of government policy for the archaeological and the historic environment has contributed to a change in attitudes towards the preservation, assessment and evaluation of both the buried and standing archaeological resource by local authorities. This is particularly the case in the larger historic towns and cities, like Southampton and Winchester. Government advice in PPG 15 and 16 has highlighted the desirability of preserving historic and archaeological remains, in particular presuming a case for the preservation of nationally important remains (PPG 16 para 8). The advice identifies the important role of local authorities in planning, education and recreation for the protection and management of archaeological sites (PPG 16 para 14). There is a necessity to consider the impact of a development on archaeological remains and PPG 16 emphasises the importance of informed decision making. Where preservation is not merited or justified it is clear that it is reasonable for the planning authority to satisfy itself that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of remains (PPG 16 para 25). During such considerations the Sites and Monuments Record and the Assessment accompanying this strategy have a role, but in some circumstances the planning authority may require additional archaeological information from the applicant prior to the determination of the application (PPG 16 paras 21 and 22).
- 1.4 Although an archaeological survey of Hampshire's smaller market towns was produced in 1976, it has become clear in recent years that there is still a lack of archaeological understanding of the origins and development of the majority of Hampshire's historic towns. This has meant that the protection and management of the archaeological and historical resource in these towns has been insecure. Consequently it has become increasingly important to establish archaeological frameworks and strategies for the smaller historic towns in Hampshire, to protect as appropriate the historic resource, and to ensure it is fully incorporated within the sustainable future of the towns.
- 1.5 Archaeological discoveries have added to the available information on the small-towns of Hampshire creating the subsequent need for management strategies. This in turn has increased the importance of understanding how the basic economic, social and chronological evidence relates to the origins and development of each town. Although the assessment of all available archaeological and historical information will allow the formulation of a set of academically-based research frameworks/priorities (as set out in the Archaeological Assessment Documents), these priorities must be considered to inform future development control decisions and should be able to absorb and adapt to future archaeological discoveries.

- 1.6 Consequently, English Heritage have commissioned an Extensive Urban Survey for Hampshire's historic towns. The survey project has been undertaken through an English Heritage-funded post based in the County Planning Department of Hampshire County Council, with the support and assistance of the County Archaeologist and his staff. The survey provides an up-to-date assessment of the readily available archaeological and historical resource of each selected historic town and consists of three phases: data collection, data assessment and the formulation of a strategy. The results of the data collection and data assessment form the contents of the Archaeological Assessment Document. The Assessment Document presents the archaeology and history of each town, an analysis of the existing town plan, an evaluation of the archaeological potential, the research priorities and the identification of areas of archaeological importance. Areas of archaeological importance, as well as additional site information, are presented both in text and key maps.
- 1.7 The strategy phase of the survey utilises the information presented in the Archaeological Assessment Document and combines it with current government policies and guidance, development plan policies and other local non-statutory policies to provide an enhanced understanding of the likely archaeological implications of development proposals and is for use by the planning authority, developers and the public. Recommended responses and guidance regarding the archaeological and historic environment are then outlined. Key maps accompany this strategy. Naturally a survey of this nature will, on the one hand offer up fresh understanding of the town, and on the other hand raise further questions concerning the origins and development of Hampshire's towns.
- 1.8 It is important to recognise the continuing role of the Sites and Monuments Record, specialist archaeological advice and English Heritage. Whilst the strategy anticipates a range of responses, specialist advice from local authority archaeologists and English Heritage in the light of specific development proposals will be needed to interpret the data, to confirm the importance of the archaeological remains, to judge the significance of the impact and to consider the need for and the benefits of pre-determination evaluation. As new data becomes available in the light of the results of observations, excavations and future research so the understanding of the nature and extent of the historic and archaeological component of the town is likely to evolve. It is inevitable that the interpretation of the strategy will evolve with it.
- 1.9 This Strategy document is in two parts, one which is a general introduction to the Extensive Urban Survey whilst the second part deals specifically with Romsey's town strategy. The Appendix includes excerpts from the Hampshire Structure Plan and Local Plans.

2.0 **Areas of Potential Archaeological Importance**

2.1 Introduction

The primary aim of the data collection and data assessment phases of the Historic Towns Survey Project has been to define areas of varying potential archaeological importance in each town. Four area types have been created, each being ascribed a different grade of archaeological potential. A suite of archaeological responses are then proposed for each of the four areas, from which the most appropriate would be recommended for a particular development. Criteria for the four areas of archaeological importance can be found in the Archaeological Assessment Document. As additional archaeological information becomes available and a greater understanding of the nature and significance of the archaeological resource is achieved, it is possible that some areas will be re-assigned to different levels of importance to reflect our changing understanding of the origins and development of the town. Archaeological evaluation will form a particularly significant tool in defining the desirable archaeological response. The provision by the applicant of the results of an archaeological field evaluation may frequently be requested, as outlined by PPG 16 (paragraphs 21 and 22), reflecting the general recognition of the importance of urban archaeological deposits. The archaeological response to an application in any given urban area will reflect the anticipated

archaeological response in this document (section 3) as well as any evaluation results, where such a study is appropriate and the results are available.

2.2 Some nationally important archaeological remains are designated as Scheduled Ancient Monuments and as such are protected by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act. Designation has been primarily directed towards field monuments and built structures. In view of the detailed control afforded by the Act it is not best suited to the management of extensive archaeological remains within populated and evolving urban centres. In the urban context the scheduled element of the archaeological resource is usually discreet and monumental such as a castle, or a town gate. Scheduling has been used in areas of long term open space encompassing well preserved underlying archaeological evidence, or where significant attrition occurs by processes outside planning control. In general, however, there are likely to be nationally important archaeological remains which are not scheduled but rely on recognition of their importance and due weight being given to them within the planning system.

2.3 Areas of Archaeological Importance

(A) *Areas of Nationally Important Archaeological Remains (ANIAR)*

These are areas identified as nationally important archaeological remains, including Scheduled Ancient Monuments, whose location, character and significance have been ably demonstrated. The impact of development on both the setting and the fabric of the monument is a material consideration.

(i) Scheduled Ancient Monuments

Scheduled Ancient Monuments are to be physically preserved *in situ*. The procedures for the management of Scheduled Ancient Monuments are enshrined in the relevant legislation (Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979), along with details appertaining to grant aid to owners. Development affecting a Scheduled Ancient Monument will require Scheduled Monument Consent from the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport. Such consent is independent of the planning determination, and might not be forthcoming. English Heritage are the archaeological advisors to the Secretary of State and the advice and opinion of English Heritage should be sought by the planning authority for any application affecting a Scheduled Ancient Monument, prior to determination.

(ii) Other Nationally Important Archaeological Remains

As stated in the Government's archaeological guidance within the planning system (PPG16), the management of other nationally important archaeological remains are to be considered within the remit given to local planning authorities and the development control process. Consequently serious consideration must be given to the physical preservation *in situ* of nationally important remains. The criteria used to assess "national importance" are set out in Annex 4 of PPG 16.

Although some historic buildings are also Scheduled Ancient Monuments, most are listed rather than scheduled and are often of archaeological importance, a fact recognised by PPG 15 (paragraph 2.15). Important archaeological remains are often incorporated into surviving buildings or structures. The preservation of those remains should be fully considered in the same manner as those nationally important below-ground archaeological remains, as indeed should the archaeological recording of standing remains which cannot be preserved.

(B) *Areas of High Archaeological Importance (AHAI)*

These are areas that have the potential to contain archaeological remains, buried and standing, whose importance, location and character can be inferred through observation, research and interpretation. These remains may merit physical preservation *in situ*. Where preservation is not justified appropriate archaeological investigation and recording would be a requirement in advance of development.

Because of ongoing archaeological and historical research or evaluation results, AHAI's may be re-assessed and consequently considered of national importance or even for scheduling, in which case policies and procedures as laid down for (A) above should be followed. Equally, additional information might demonstrate a lower archaeological importance than currently anticipated.

(C) *Archaeologically Important Areas (AIA)*

These are areas that have the potential to contain archaeological remains which may provide moderate levels of archaeological information. Whilst in some cases physical preservation is possible, it is most likely that the archaeological response would be one of appropriate investigation and recording, unless the developer wishes to achieve the preservation of the site.

(D) *Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance (ALAI)*

Areas considered to have the potential to include archaeological remains of a character unlikely to provide significant information or archaeological remains whose integrity or density has been compromised by previous development. These remains may require appropriate observation and recording if threatened by future development.

3.0 **Archaeological Responses to Development**

3.1 Important archaeological remains in an historic urban environment can be anticipated and consequently current Government policies for the management of archaeological remains within the planning process are set out in PPG 16. In summary, the PPG requires that the most important archaeological remains should be preserved *in situ* and that, when preservation is not possible, or justified, those archaeological remains adversely affected should be adequately investigated and recorded before and/or during development (such archaeological mitigation may include survey, excavation, recording, post excavation research, preparation and publication of a report). It also states that if early discussions with local planning authorities and consultation of the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) indicate the possible presence of important archaeological remains, it is reasonable for the planning authority to request developers to undertake an archaeological evaluation of the proposed development site, before any decision is made on the planning application (PPG 16 paragraphs 21 and 22). Such an evaluation would aim to provide the additional archaeological evidence necessary to ensure that the full archaeological implications of the development can be properly considered prior to any irreversible decision being made.

3.2 In view of the recognised archaeological importance of complex urban deposits, the need for evaluation might frequently be anticipated. However the assessment of the need for an evaluation can only be taken in the light of the nature of the development and its location and extent, and so no 'Areas of Evaluation' have been incorporated into this document. The results of the evaluation might well clarify that the level of archaeological importance of any given site is different from that anticipated in this document. For this reason the results of evaluation should be available prior to the determination of the application so that the full impact of the development on archaeological remains can be properly considered.

3.3 The advice given in PPG 15 and PPG 16 and subsequently adopted within Hampshire's structure and local plan policies, means that there are a number of archaeological options or responses to development proposals. These include:

- (1) Refusal of planning permission in order to ensure the physical preservation of the remains (which may be above or below ground) and their setting. Where possible the planning authority should consider the longer term management of these resources.
 - (2) A re-design of the development proposal in order to demonstrably secure preservation. Redesign of the proposal may include an engineering solution or amendments to the layout to achieve preservation. If such a response results in the physical preservation of important archaeological remains the local planning authority should ensure the physical management of those remains within the development. This could be achieved, for example, by a management plan sponsored by the local authority, the site owner/developer and local amenity societies.
 - (3) Allowing development to proceed, subject to satisfactory arrangements for archaeological investigation and recording, including standing buildings, before development commences, secured by an archaeological condition.
 - (4) Allowing development to proceed, subject to satisfactory arrangements for archaeological observation and recording, including standing buildings, while development is taking place, secured by an archaeological condition.
 - (5) Allowing development to proceed, with no archaeological requirement.
- 3.4 These responses provide a flexible framework for the consideration of individual development proposals which affect archaeological remains. Within individual developments more than one response might be necessary reflecting variations of archaeology or the nature of development across the site. They will assist both developers and planners in the preparation and determination of planning applications.
- 3.5 In addition to the preservation of the more important archaeological remains, there may be a good case for their promotion and preservation through, for example, interpretation panels or printed leaflets, and their use as an educational resource or as an amenity for the town's inhabitants and visitors. This should provide a better understanding and enjoyment of the town's archaeological and historic heritage and to promote support for the local authority's policies for that heritage. This could be undertaken and sponsored by the site owners, the local authority, schools, local amenity groups or through partnerships between such organisations, and may be particularly welcome where positive policy towards tourism exists.

4.0 **A Strategy for Romsey**

- 4.1 There are three historic towns in the Test Valley Borough Council district within this project - Andover (with East Anton), Romsey and Stockbridge. With differing historic origins each town has developed in different way. The archaeological resource in each case is subsequently unique. Whilst each town's archaeological and historic significance is already reflected in local plan policies for the management of those resources and is subject to the guidance of advice in PPG 16 and 15, this document provides additional guidance for Romsey.
- 4.2 Although the Local Plan has been adopted containing policies for the urban historic environment, this strategy may be taken as additional material consideration in the development control process, introducing further guidance for the preservation and management of Romsey's archaeological and historic heritage. It has been compiled in light of the Government's advice considering archaeological remains and the historic environment within the planning process (PPG 15 and 16) and relevant policies in the Hampshire County Structure Plan and the Test Valley Borough Local Plan. Consequently this strategy could be considered for adoption by the local planning authority as planning guidance (as defined in PPG 12 3.18-3.19) to supplement the policies of the Borough Local Plan.
- 4.3 The strategy develops the information presented in the Archaeological Assessment Document for Romsey, in particular the identified areas of archaeological importance. Appropriate archaeological responses have been formulated for consideration by the Borough Council in anticipation of development proposals, although detailed advice should be sought in the light of development details. These responses can inform the management of the archaeological resource, and provide the controls and guidance which the Borough Council should use when considering planning applications. The strategy may also promote changes in current and proposed Conservation Area designations, the establishment of town trails as well as other local amenity and/or educational proposals for the interpretation and enhancement of Romsey's historic environment.

5.0 **Historic Romsey**

- 5.1 This section is a summary of the more detailed accounts of the archaeology, history, topography and architecture of Romsey to be found in the Archaeological Assessment document that accompanies this strategy.
- 5.2 Romsey lies on the flood plain of the braided lower reaches of the River Test at a point where roads from Winchester, Southampton, Andover, Ringwood and Salisbury converge. The town is approximately sixteen kilometres from Winchester and twelve kilometres from Southampton.
- 5.3 Archaeologically, apart from the Winchester and Southampton, Romsey is probably the most intensively studied town in Hampshire and evidence of all periods from the prehistoric onwards has been recovered from the historic core of the town and surrounding hinterland.
- 5.4 Prehistoric activity in the area of the town of Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age date is represented by finds of flint implements, and pottery. Some of the material has been recovered from the many stream channels that run through the town. Iron Age settlement sites have been located to the east of the town centre, near Orchard lane, and to the south of the abbey at La Sagesse. The latter site also produced an Iron Age tuyère indicating that iron smelting was undertaken at this time.
- 5.5 Artefacts of Roman date have been recovered from several excavations in the town, and Roman building materials are incorporated in the fabric of the abbey. Evidence for a small agricultural type settlement has been recovered from the Newton Lane area of the town but it is suggested that at least some of the building materials found in the abbey were imported into the town from sites in the surrounding landscape.

- 5.6 Unlike many of Hampshire's towns which have yielded little of Anglo-Saxon date, excavations in Romsey have recovered evidence of both Anglo-Saxon occupation and industry. Available evidence suggests that there was a possibly high status settlement at Romsey from the mid-Saxon period. There is also evidence for iron smelting at this time and it has been suggested that the industry was supplying the iron workers known to have been working in *Hamwic*, the mid-Saxon precursor to Southampton.
- 5.7 The traditional date of the foundation of the abbey is 907 but it has been suggested that there was an ecclesiastical institution on the site of the abbey before that date. The tenth-century foundation was a nunnery which appears to have lapsed as it was re-founded in 967 by King Edgar. The initial foundation of the abbey suggests that the estate the abbey was endowed with was royal in origin.
- 5.8 Domesday Book recorded the manor as a possession of the abbey together with four mills. By the late thirteenth century the town had a market charter and the right to hold two annual fairs. Although the town did not achieve borough status until the early seventeenth century it is probable that there was a level of autonomy in the town before the dissolution of the abbey in 1539.
- 5.9 At the dissolution of the abbey its estates were divided and sold. The abbey church, which had always had a parochial function, was sold to the inhabitants of Romsey to serve as their parish church. It is likely that many of the monastic buildings were destroyed at this time although some were converted to domestic and industrial use and still survive.
- 5.10 During the late sixteenth century there are references to a lack of work in the town which led to an 'unlawful assembly of the common people'. It may be that the difficulties in the town were, at least in part, induced by the dissolution of the abbey which must have been a major employer in the town.
- 5.11 Broadlands Park, to the south of the town, developed from medieval origins and became the estate of the 1st Viscount Palmerston in the eighteenth century. It was the home of Viscount Palmerston the nineteenth-century Prime Minister, and in the twentieth century was the home of Lord Mountbatten of Burma.

6.0 **Planning History**

Development Plans

- 6.1 The Test Valley Borough Local Plan was published in draft in November 1990 and placed on deposit in June 1992. Objections to the plan were considered at a public enquiry held from May to December 1993. The inspectors report was published in March 1995 and modifications to the plan were published in November 1995. The Borough Local Plan was adopted on the 8th of April 1996. The plan guides development in the Borough up to 2001. Technical work on the review plan up to 2011 has commenced.
- 6.2 The policies and supporting statements for the management of the archaeological and historical environment in both the County Structure Plan and the Borough Local Plan (as detailed in the Appendix) have the same core understanding that archaeological remains, whether above or below ground, and their settings are a finite and non-renewable resource that should not be needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed or damaged. Both plans underwrite the fact that whilst a small number of archaeological sites and historic buildings are protected by legislation, the majority rely on Structure Plans, Local Plans and the development control process for their continued protection and management.

Romsey Conservation Area (Map A)

- 6.3 The Romsey Conservation Area was designated in 1970 and extended in 1983. Government guidance PPG 15 advises that "the definition of an area's (Conservation Area) special interest should derive from an assessment of the elements that contribute to, or detract from it". These

elements can include its historical development and archaeological significance, property boundaries, building materials etc. Consequently where it can be shown that significant archaeological remains survive and whose preservation is of paramount importance, this strategy document may assist the Borough Council when considering Conservation Area designation.

Recent and Proposed Development (Map B)

6.4 Although there has been some development in the historic core of the town, it has generally been on a relatively small scale. The greatest area of change has occurred on the southern edge of the town, in the area of Banning Street, which has been truncated by the construction of Bypass Road. It is thought that the creation of several car-parks in the town centre has had a limited impact on archaeological deposits.

7.0 **The Management of Romsey's Archaeological Heritage**

7.1 The archaeological potential of Romsey lies in its clear Anglo-Saxon origins, and the town contains valuable evidence for urban development and urban activity through the medieval period to the present day. The abbey's dominance over the settlement will shed light on the relationship of the church and wider society. There have been a number of archaeological excavations and observations carried out during development in Romsey, and there has been a significant level of historical research undertaken. However, such is the complexity of the topography, origins and development of Romsey and its ecclesiastical establishments that there are still many unanswered questions regarding aspects of the town's origins and growth. The areas archaeological importance relate to their potential to resolve these issues. Where evaluation is an appropriate response additional survey may clarify the archaeological potential prior to the determination of an application.

7.2 Areas of Archaeological Importance (Map C)

As defined in Section 2.0 of this Strategy document, the following areas of archaeological importance have been identified in Romsey.

Areas of National Importance

Location: The abbey and its immediate setting (Area 1), King John's House (Area 2)

Potential: The abbey church and its immediate setting, Area 1, dominates the town of Romsey and is important both for the visual contribution to the townscape and for the archaeological evidence that is contained within it. The current building is an important example of a medieval ecclesiastical building and sheds light on building technology, ecclesiastical practice and social philosophy. Although the existing building dates to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the location is also the site of the Saxon nunnery and possibly a minster church. The area will include archaeological evidence for the earlier ecclesiastical structures and for the origins and development of the ecclesiastical complex at this location. Burials may provide an insight into the health and diet of specific sections of the population, such as the nuns, as well as the general population, and of changing burial practice. Archaeological evidence encountered might demonstrate the relationship between these ecclesiastical establishments and the town, and the influence of the Church on the town. Evidence predating the abbey and the nunnery may reveal previous land use, possibly indicating an earlier street layout which might clarify the origins of Romsey.

King John's House, Area 2, was until recently a Scheduled Ancient Monument. It was de-scheduled in favour of its listed building status (it is listed Grade I). The house is a high status building that may have been part of a complex, and was a possession of the abbey at the dissolution. It had probably been used as a guest residence for visitors of higher status. Construction of the roof has been securely dated to 1256 by dendrochronology. The building and its site will contain important

evidence about the origins and early history of the house and its connections to the abbey. It will also contain evidence relating to lives and lifestyles of the higher status population, such as royal retainers and knights, that might be compared with evidence elsewhere in the town and with the abbey. It is also a highly important visual monument in the townscape of Romsey.

Areas of High Archaeological Importance

Location: The suggested abbey precinct and properties to the west of Bell Street (Area 3). The properties on the eastern side of Bell Street and south of the Market Place and The Hundred, land between Church Street and Latimer Street, and to the north of Portersbridge Street (Area 4).

Potential: The precise extent of the abbey precinct, Area 3, is not known. Areas both north and south of the abbey are currently suggested to represent the site of the precinct and so the location for the ecclesiastical complexes that have dominated the town. The definitive extent of the precinct might be confirmed by archaeological study. This area will contain the archaeological evidence for the structures associated with the abbey, both religious and agricultural, and will allow an understanding of their nature, extent and layout, and their date and relative sequence in time. The nature and origins of the ecclesiastical use of the site could be demonstrated through archaeological study, and the land use and street plans that pre-date the precinct may shed light on the earliest origins and development of Romsey. Archaeological evidence of later encroachment onto the precinct will inform the understanding of the changing nature of the precinct, as well as reflecting the Abbey's fortunes and attitudes towards active participation in the economy of the town. Burials will allow an insight into the lives, health and diet of past inhabitants of Romsey, as well as of specific sections of the population, such as the nuns. Burial practices and their change through time may also be traced.

Archaeological evidence for the relationship between the abbey and the town might also be encountered, including evidence for those activities that were carried out in the precinct in addition to worship, such as horticulture, preparation of agricultural produce or industrial activity. There is likely to be evidence for water management, both for any industrial processes being carried out, but also as an essential element of the operation of the abbey.

The properties between Church Street and Latimer Street, around the Market Place, the eastern side of Bell Street and south of The Hundred and along the northern frontage of Portersbridge Street, Area 4, represent the medieval core of Romsey. These areas will contain archaeological evidence for the location, nature and extent of early settlement in Romsey, and for the origins and development of the town. Evidence for the nature of the economy and industry of the town, and the trades and trading associated with the town may be encountered. Evidence for the relationship between the economy of the town and the abbey that dominated it, and the degree to which the town was reliant on the abbey and the visitors it attracted, of both high and low status, may be discernible. Rubbish pits, latrines and rubbish thrown into the water channels may cast light on the diet, lives and lifestyles of the people of Romsey, and could provide contrasts between the higher and lower status elements of the population, and between the ecclesiastical and secular populations. The artefact content of the accumulated soils may shed light on the changing nature of occupation and activity in the town.

The nature of water management and stream crossings have significantly influenced the layout and character of Romsey and the archaeological evidence of these will be important for understanding the evolution of the current town plan. Likewise the nature and extent of encroachment onto the market place, and the location of previous street layouts will improve our understanding of the current town plan. The nature and purpose of water management will also shed light onto the location and

nature of those industries in the town that are water reliant, such as tanning. Water-logging associated with these streams may have resulted in the preservation of organic evidence, such as structural timber elements related to the water management, or of leather or wooden artefacts, and palaeo-environmental evidence.

Surviving medieval buildings, and earlier elements within later structures, can contribute greatly to our understanding of medieval Romsey, and although cellaring may have compromised some elements of the archaeological record, some of those cellars may be of archaeological interest in their own right.

Response:

(1) Archaeological evaluation should be undertaken prior to the determination of any planning application that is likely to have a significant impact.

(2) Depending on the results of any evaluation there may be a requirement for the preservation of important, above or below ground, remains, possibly through a re-design of the development proposals.

(3) If preservation *in situ* is not possible or justified then there is likely to be a requirement for their full excavation and recording prior to development.

Note

Response (2) may highlight the value of additional action, which could include a requirement for:

(a) a management plan/scheme for a particular important archaeological site or historic building to ensure its future preservation;

(b) some form of interpretation e.g. appropriate panels, leaflets or part of a town trail, for an important archaeological site/s or historic building/s.

(c) developing the site or building as an amenity for the town or as an educational resource.

Archaeologically Important Areas

Location:

East and west of Cherville Street (Area 5). North and south of Middlebridge Street (Area 6). East of Latimer Street, south of Love Lane and south of The Hundred (Area 7).

Potential:

The properties east and west of Cherville Street, Area 5, are on the main route to the north and there is evidence to suggest that this part of Romsey may have developed in the medieval period and will contain the archaeological evidence for this and later development. The properties either side of Middlebridge Street, Area 6, are on the main route to the south and to a medieval bridging point of the River Test

The date and nature of development in these areas, and the nature of the economy and industry may be demonstrated through surviving archaeological remains. Evidence for water management relating to water reliant industries, such as tanning, may be encountered where the stream runs, and water-logging may have resulted in the survival of some organic evidence. Such remains may include wooden and leather artefacts, as well as palaeo-environmental evidence. This archaeological evidence will shed light on the relationship of the development and economy of these areas to the abbey and the visitors it attracted, and the lives and status of the inhabitants. It may complement similar evidence from the core of the town. In particular it may be possible to establish if inhabitants in the suburbs were more prosperous than in other parts of the town. Comparison to other parts of the town may clarify the changing nature of Romsey.

Development to the east of the town, Area 7, includes properties on Palmerston Street, The Hundred, Love Lane and east of Latimer Street. These areas will contain archaeological evidence for the development of Romsey. Available archaeological evidence of an early date from Palmerston Street and from Latimer Street indicates that this area may also shed light on the early development of the town. Archaeological evidence for the nature of industry in this part of the town, and of the lives and economy of the people may be encountered. There is also evidence for Iron Age occupation to the rear of Latimer Street. Artefacts within accumulated topsoil may demonstrate the changing nature of occupation in the town.

Response:

(1) Depending on the scale of the proposed development and the survival of above and below ground archaeological remains, archaeological evaluation might need to be undertaken prior to the determination of any planning application.

Depending on development details and available archaeological information, including the results of any evaluation there may be:

(2) a requirement for their full excavation and recording prior to development.

OR

(3) a requirement for archaeological observation and recording during development.

Areas of Limited Archaeological Importance

Location: South of Broadwater Road and the Bypass Road (Area 8). Properties on Winchester Road, and the eastern side of Palmerston Street (Area 9). Mill Lane and Church Lane properties (Area 10).

Potential: Development to the south of Broadwater Road, Area 8, will have compromised the survival of archaeological remains to some degree. However any surviving archaeological evidence will cast light onto the date, nature and extent of the medieval development in this area. In particular surviving archaeological evidence along Banning Street, which was the road to Southampton before it was diverted onto Palmerston Street, may prove important to our understanding of the nature and layout of this part of Romsey. It is also probable that evidence for the southern end of Banning Street, now to the south of the by-pass, will survive. Evidence for water management, and water reliant industries along the streams may be encountered, as well as evidence for other trades in the area. Any water-logging associated with the streams may have resulted in the survival of organic remains, such as structural timber elements, and wooden and leather artefacts.

In Area 9 along Winchester Street evidence for the late medieval and post-medieval development of Romsey along this important road may be encountered. However nineteenth- and twentieth-century development may have compromised the survival of archaeological remains to some degree.

Area 10 includes the frontages to Mill Lane and Church Lane. Mill Lane led to one of the town's mills but the extent of settlement along the lane in the medieval period is not known. It is possible that there was some intermittent settlement in this area in the medieval period. The properties along the western side of Church Lane lie close to the edge of the suggested northern precinct of the abbey. Information about the land use around the abbey and the development of settlement may be recovered from the area.

Response:

(1) Occasionally, an archaeological evaluation may need to be undertaken prior to the determination of any planning application especially where a significant impact is anticipated.

(2) Depending on available information or the results of any evaluation there may be a requirement for the some further investigation and recording prior to development, although

(3) a requirement for archaeological observation and recording during development is more likely.

8.0 **The Future Strategy**

8.1 This Strategy document, in line with Government advice laid out in PPG15 and PPG16, emphasises the role of the planning system conservation policies in the development plan for the protection of the historic environment, including built and buried elements, and the way in which the components of a town compliment each other to form a townscape. Conservation policies should reflect the quality and interest of urban areas as well as individual structures through the designation of Conservation Areas. The historic layout of Romsey and the nature of its component parts reflects its origins, development and character. The designated Conservation Areas throughout the town should reflect the significance of these historic urban elements, as outlined in PPG 15, 4.2.

8.2 It is important to protect this fragile and non-renewable resource for its own sake and for the irreplaceable information about our past which it contains, and its potential for increasing our knowledge and understanding of historic Romsey. It is important to manage and present Romsey's historic environment both to ensure public support for the conservation policies of the Development Plan and to realise the value of the resource to the community for education, recreation and tourism.

8.3 The management of the archaeological resource and its presentation to the public must reflect the local nature of the resource, local priorities, the nature of the community and the role of tourism in the local economy. The stewardship of the archaeological resource needs to be seen as a community responsibility, not simply that of central or local Government. Any strategy that might develop should evolve locally. The preservation of the historic resource will rely very heavily on broad support and understanding from the local community. The Assessment and Strategy documents have a clear role in highlighting the potential of Romsey in this regard and should contribute fully to the promotion of the resource.

8.4 The successful presentation of the archaeological resource to the public will generate interest and promote local heritage. This should involve communicating information to the public about Romsey's past inhabitants, the nature of the town throughout its history, the origins and evolution of existing townscape, and any important points of interest and character. Principal places of interest, historic character and quality within Romsey should then emerge. The presentation of the historic resource is an opportunity to provide an amenity, recreational and educational resource for the community, including local schools.

8.5 There are elements of the Romsey townscape which may form elements of any presentation strategy:

1. The abbey attracts many vistors to Romsey and is an important historic focus to the town. This important building allows the clearest perceptions of the great age and complexity of the settlement at Romsey.
2. King John's House, and the heritage centre close by, are existing facilities through which to describe and present the origins and development of Romsey, and its changing character through time, within surviving historic buildings. King John's house in particular illustrates the complex issues in the relationship between the ecclesiastical and secular in the town.

3. The Market Place forms a natural focus to the town. The abbey gateway and the historic buildings that fringe the Market Place provide links to the heritage of the town around.
4. The water courses in Romsey have played an important role both in the industry and the evolution of the present street plan, and may provide an unusual focus of attention in presenting the heritage of the town.
- 8.6 There are a number of recognised approaches that can be considered in evolving the future strategy for Romsey.
 1. Information Leaflet

Cost effective, the content style and format can reflect the principal audience and the quality and print run the available budget. Sponsorship or heritage grants might be available and distribution can be through schools, libraries and tourist offices, and local shops. The leaflet might describe a route or trail, or relate local landmarks to their historic context.
 2. Information Point

Single or multiple information points can graphically and through text highlight the plan of the town. Sponsorship and heritage grants might be available. The effect of a permanent fixture locally and on pedestrian flows as well as the implications of maintenance need to be considered.
 3. Museum Based Display

A display element within an existing local museum incorporating finds, images and text. A resource of this nature would have the advantage of being able to include any locally recovered artefacts within a display. The County Museums Service may be able to offer advice on local museum based displays. There is an existing local museum display in King John's house opposite the abbey.
 4. Town Trail

Town trails present information in sequence. The trail might be available by leaflet, information point (or points) and might be associated with a discrete symbol or marker on the pavement or on sign posts. Such trails in towns of particular tourism or education potential might be permanently, temporarily or intermittently associated with guides.
 5. Teachers / Community Packs

Teachers packs including plans, principal locations, interpretations and trails might highlight the availability of the local historic resource for use by local schools and the community.
- 8.7 Raising the profile of Romsey's heritage in this way is likely to generate increased local interest in the archaeology and history of the town. Although any promotion of Romsey's heritage should be formulated locally, this document with the Assessment, may form an important element of that formulation process.

APPENDIX

Hampshire County Structure Plan

Policy C3 Policy C3 relates to the implications of statutory designations, including Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

Policy C3: **“Permission will not normally be granted for development which adversely affects: Landscape, environment, nature conservation or scientific interests in: *inter alia* Scheduled Ancient Monuments”**

Supporting Statement.

These statutory designations highlight areas of special importance at a national level of evaluation, and introduce some additional controls through their own legislation. These areas carry a stronger presumption against damaging development than other designations.

Policy E1 Policy E1 relates to urban regeneration.

Policy E1 **“In order to assist regeneration within the urban areas, planning permission will normally be granted for development which achieves: *inter alia* (iii) improvements to the condition or settings of existing buildings of architectural or historic interest;”**

Policy E4 Policy E4 concerns the conservation of the character of historic settlement.

Policy E4: **“Permission will normally be granted for development which conserves and/or enhances the character of historic towns and villages.”**

Supporting Statement.

Paragraph 66: Policy E4 provides the framework for the improvement and conservation of the built environment, especially those buildings and areas of historic or architectural interest.

Paragraph 67: Tourism can provide the economic stimulus necessary to maintain the historic environment, provided that the development involved is compatible with conservation principles.

Paragraph 68: Local plans will need to outline the measures that can be taken to conserve and/or enhance the historic character of particular areas. Measures which might be considered include:

- (i) promoting the retention, maintenance and continued use of buildings of architectural and historic interest;
- (ii) designating areas for conservation;
- (iii) preparing programmes of enhancement.

Paragraph 69. In addition to development which affects the built environment directly, the indirect impact of development, including transport proposals, on cities, towns and villages must be carefully considered against these and other policies in the Plan.

Policy E5 Policy E5 concerns the treatment of sites, where affected by a proposed development.

Policy E5: “Where nationally important archaeological sites and monuments, whether scheduled or not, and their settings are affected by a proposed development, there will be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation in situ. The need for the preservation of unscheduled sites of more local importance will be considered on merit. Where preservation is not possible then local planning authorities should be satisfied before granting planning permission that appropriate arrangements have been made for a programme of excavation and recording prior to development taking place.”

Supporting Statement.

Paragraph 70: Archaeological remains and their settings are a finite and non-renewable resource. Care must be taken to ensure that they are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed. Only a small number of archaeological sites and monuments are protected by national legislation, the majority rely on the Structure Plan, local plans and the development control process for their continued protection and management. Where remains cannot be preserved in situ, then a programme of excavation, recording and publication should be undertaken. In order to ensure that information on all archaeological sites and monuments in Hampshire is available to assist local planning authorities and developers, the County Council will maintain a County Sites and Monuments Record.

Deposit Hampshire County Structure Plan 1996 - 2011 (Review)

Urban Hampshire

Policy UB1 Policy UB1 outlines the basic objectives of urban regeneration.

Policy UB1 “To make the best use of land within urban areas, plans and policies will be promoted which achieve:
inter alia
(iv) improvements to the condition and/or setting of redundant buildings of architectural or historic interest;”

The Coast

Policy C6 Concerns development involving the reclamation of land from the sea or intertidal areas.

Policy C6 “Permission will not be granted for development involving the reclamation of land from the sea or the reclamation, excavation or permanent flooding of intertidal areas of conservation value unless the local authority is satisfied that the proposal:
inter alia
(ii) would not damage the landscape character or sites of historic, archaeological or nature conservation interest;”

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 378. Reclamation will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that it has no undesirable effect, is well related to the existing built up area, and is consistent with other policies in the Plan.

Archaeology

Policies E13/E14 Policies E13 and E14 refer to the treatment of archaeological sites and monuments.

Policy E13 “Development will not be permitted where it adversely effects nationally important archaeological sites and monuments, and their settings, whether scheduled or not.”

Policy E14 “Where an archaeological site or monument is affected by development there will be a presumption in favour of its physical preservation in situ and continuing management, where appropriate. Where physical preservation in situ is not practical or possible, local planning authorities will seek to ensure that provision is made, in advance of development, for an appropriate level of investigation and recording. Where development might effect land of archaeological potential, the local planning authorities may also require developers to arrange for an archaeological evaluation to be carried out prior to the determination of a planning application.”

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 421. The value, variety and vulnerability of Hampshire’s sites and monuments justify the preservation of those most important to the archaeology, history and character of the county.

Paragraph 422. Archaeological sites and monuments and their settings are a finite and non-renewable resource. Care must be taken to ensure that they are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed. Although at present a number of archaeological sites are protected by national legislation the majority rely on the Structure Plan, local plans and the development control process for their continued protection and management as reflected in PPG 16; *Archaeology and Planning*.

Paragraph 423. When considering proposals for development, the local planning authorities will ensure the availability of accurate information from the County Sites and Monuments Record on the condition and significance of archaeological sites affected by development proposals. Such information is essential for the decision-making process on planning and land-use issues and for monitoring the effectiveness of the panning process in protecting archaeological sites.

Paragraph 424. The County Council will promote, where practicable, the appropriate management and enhancement of important archaeological sites and monuments and where resources permit, assist owners to maintain them in good condition and to adopt sympathetic land management regimes.

Built Heritage

Policy E16 This policy relates to the conservation of the character of historic settlements.

Policy E16 “ Development in accordance with other policies in this Plan will be permitted in and adjacent to historic towns and villages provided that it is compatible with the conservation or enhancement of the character of the area and its setting and will not cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance. Particular attention will be paid to:
inter alia
(v) the character and appearance of listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas;

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 430. Development can have serious implications for the historic built environment and all proposals which impact upon it should be assessed in accordance with the criteria set out in this policy. Additionally, to assess the degree to which further growth is acceptable, certain historic towns may need to be the subject of environmental capacity studies. These studies will assess development and management issues, the quality and character of the settlement and the pressure upon it and make recommendations for future action. Local plans will identify the historic towns requiring such studies. The County Council will co-ordinate the production of agreed guidelines to ensure a consistent county-wide approach.

Policy E17

Policy E17 relates to conserving the character of historic towns and villages.

Policy E17

“Local planning authorities will encourage development which will enhance the character and setting of historic towns and villages and which will:

inter alia

(i) serve to stimulate economic regeneration through the retention and re-use of historic buildings and sites;”

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 431. Conserving the built heritage is assisted by encouraging private investment in the upkeep of older buildings. Local planning authorities will look favourably on proposals which will help to maintain the economic vitality of areas or regenerate those areas that have been in economic decline. Although listed buildings should, ideally, continue in the use for which they were designed this is not always practicable. If the only realistic means of ensuring their retention or maintenance is to change the use of the building the planning authorities should, subject to the provisions of Policy E16, adopt a flexible approach when considering such proposals.

Policy E18

Policy E18 concerns Conservation Areas.

Policy E18

“Local planning authorities will ensure the protection of the built heritage by:

inter alia

(i) reviewing the need for additional Conservation Areas and adjusting existing Conservation Area boundaries.

(ii) preparing supplementary planning guidance and proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas;”

Supporting Statement

Paragraph 432. The inclusion of buildings within the lists of buildings of special architectural and historic interest and the designation of Conservation Areas provides the principal means by which the character of historic buildings can be protected. The lists require regular review and updating to take account of new evidence and changing values.

Paragraph 433. The day to day operation of development control provides an important opportunity to ensure that the character of listed buildings and Conservation Areas is retained. Development of buildings of an appropriate design may act as a catalyst to further improve the quality of an area.

Paragraph 434. By contrast, inappropriate development could, eventually, result in the loss of the special interest which led to the Conservation Area designation. Supplementary guidance in the form of design briefs, for example for shop fronts, has a major role to play in promoting and encouraging appropriate design and development in addition to providing support for planning authority decisions.

Proposed Modifications

An examination in public was conducted between 29 October and 10 December 1996 to consider selected representations made on the Deposit Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review). The report of the panel appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment was submitted in March 1997 and published in May of that year. The Panel's recommendations included changes to some of the policies referred to above, in particular the archaeology policies E13 and E14 which the Panel recommended be deleted and replaced by a policy based on Policy E5 of the approved Structure Plan. The three Strategic Planning Authorities: Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council have been considering the Panel's recommendations and it is anticipated that proposed modifications will be published in summer 1999.

Test Valley Borough Council Local Plan

Archaeology and Historic Landscapes

Paragraph 3.82. Test valley has a rich heritage of archaeological features and historic landscapes. Archaeological features, such as tumuli or hill forts, often make a clearly visible contribution to the landscape. Historic landscapes include deserted medieval villages, water meadows and evidence of the enclosure movement and although much of the evidence is below ground, make a more subtle but important contribution to the landscape.

Paragraph 3.83. Both archaeological features and historic landscapes can be destroyed or damaged by unsympathetic farming methods or development involving large areas of land, for example golf courses. Where development may affect an archaeological feature, its preservation in situ will be sought; where this is not practicable developers will be expected to make adequate provision for excavation and recording. If development is proposed within an area where features of archaeological or historic importance may exist, a full field assessment should be carried out in order to identify the most sensitive areas which should be avoided (see policy D1.17). In the case of archaeological features designated as ancient monuments, development will not be permitted in any event if there would be an adverse effect on the monument (see policy E4).

Sites of Archaeological Interest

Policy E4

Policy E4 concerns development which affects archaeologically important sites.

“Development will not be permitted if it would adversely affect an archaeological site or monument, and its setting, which is:

- a) of national importance (whether or not it is a Scheduled Ancient Monument); or**
- b) of local importance where harm could reasonably be avoided.”**

Paragraph 4.14. Archaeological remains should be seen as a finite and non-renewable resource. Government advice (PPG 16 (1990)) is that care must be taken to ensure that archaeological sites and monuments of national and local importance (whether or not scheduled by the Department of National Heritage), are not destroyed or damaged through ill-sited developments. There is a presumption that sites and monuments of national importance should be retained in situ; the need to conserve sites of local importance must be weighed with other interests (PPG16, paragraph 16).

Paragraph 4.15 Within the Borough there are many sites of archaeological interest. These include Scheduled Ancient Monuments which are afforded statutory protection and indicated on the proposals and inset maps. These protected sites and others of more local importance are identified and recorded within the Sites and Monuments Record which is maintained by Hampshire County Council. Preserving sites of

archaeological interest in situ is preferable, and may involve incorporating them within a development. Planning conditions or obligations will be attached to permissions to ensure that adequate provision for excavation and recording of archaeological remains, which are unavoidably threatened by development and which cannot be preserved in situ, is made.

Conservation Areas

Paragraph 4.24 In judging the effect of development or advertisements on a particular Conservation Area regard will also be paid to the particular features as described in the relevant Conservation Area policy document. It is not practicable in this plan to describe the important characteristics of all the Conservation Areas. The key features which should be preserved and/or enhanced in three major Conservation Areas are set out below:

Andover

- a) the medieval street pattern with long narrow plots behind;
- b) all buildings identified as of particular historic or architectural importance.
- c) the dominance of St Mary's Church and the Guildhall in the townscape.

Policy D1

Policy D1 concerns the provision for an archaeological record.

“Development conforming to the other policies of this plan, or which is to be permitted as an exception to these policies, will only be permitted if it:

inter alia

(17) provides for prior investigation and recording of archaeological features where a site is found to be of archaeological interest, and preservation in situ is neither possible nor feasible.”

Paragraph 11.20. If there is evidence that archaeological remains may exist in the area, whose extent and importance are unknown, developers will be required to arrange for an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out before the planning application can be determined in order to enable an informed decision to be made. (Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 16 (1990)).