# Chapter 6

Assessment of designated heritage assets with the potential to experience setting change

**6.1** This chapter assesses the potential impact on the 28 designated heritage assets that have been identified as potentially being sensitive to the development of the site through changes to their settings. Where appropriate (e.g. due to functional or historical relationships), the assets have been grouped for the purposes of assessment.

## **Scheduled Monuments**

**6.2** The location of scheduled monuments within the vicinity of the site that may be sensitive to setting change is shown on Figure 6.1 (below).



© Historic England 2021. Contains Ordnance Survey data. © Crown copyright and database right 2021. CB:JI EB:Statton\_M LUC FIG4a\_11043\_r0\_Designated\_sensitive\_scheduled monuments\_A4L\_08/01/2021 Source: OS, HE, DCC

Land North of Dorchester January 2021

# Discontinuous surviving sections of Roman aqueduct [NHLE ref: 1002730 and NHLE ref:1013337]

Summary

Significance of asset	Contribution of the site to significance	Risk of harm to asset	Level of effect
High	Low	None	None
Scheduled monument	The site forms a marginally important part of the heritage significance of the asset and this contribution to heritage significance may be affected by the development of the site.	The significance of the heritage asset will not be harmed.	The development of the site does not interact with the asset or its significance.

#### Description

**6.3** This scheduled monument survives as buried remains and earthworks and comprises a series of discontinuous sections of a Roman aqueduct; an artificial channel that carried water c. 12 miles from a tributary of the River Frome near Littlewood Farm into Roman Dorchester (Durnovaria). Part of the aqueduct – located 90m south of the site at its closest - is separately scheduled with Poundbury Camp [NHLE ref: 1013337], which it adjoins before proceeding into Dorchester, where it may have run to Princes Street. The other discontinuous sections lie 450m south of the site at their closest.

**6.4** Aqueducts were used throughout the Roman period with the earliest constructed by the Roman army immediately following the Roman Conquest of Britain, in order to supply water to military installations. This appears to have been the case at Dorchester, as recent investigations have identified the dam at the source of the aqueduct and an army camp adjacent to it.<sup>66</sup> By the end of the second century, most public towns had been provided with aqueducts with the water provided being used for domestic purposes, including bathing, as well as for some industrial processes. The aqueduct at

Dorchester appears to have served the town once the army left.

**6.5** All Roman aqueducts functioned on a gravity flow principle, meaning that the impounded water source was at a higher level than the place to be supplied, and flowed towards it under the influence of gravity. Three main types of Roman aqueducts are known.<sup>67</sup>

- pipeline aqueducts carried water through enclosed pipe work, which was normally ceramic, lead or wooden.
- Channel aqueducts carried water in U-shaped channels, normally a wooden or stone duct, which was either open or covered by stone flags.
- Leat, the simplest form of aqueduct, carried water in an open clay lined channel dug into the ground.

**6.6** The Dorchester aqueduct channel is a leat, with a chalk cut channel measuring 1.8m to 3.1m wide and 1.8m to 2.1m deep.<sup>68</sup> In some places, the excavated soil forms an outer bank, or terrace, to the channel, which may have been clay lined. At the source end, excavations have shown that it was a small, closed channel with wooden sides and wooden lid.<sup>69</sup> The date at which the aqueduct fell out of use is unclear, the NHLE website states that there is evidence of re-cutting indicates that aqueduct was maintained and used until the 5th-6th centuries<sup>70</sup>; however, the University of Bournemouth's project on the aqueduct suggests that the aqueduct fell out of use in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, and that a later phase of the aqueduct was never completed.<sup>71</sup>

6.7 Aqueducts often extended for several kilometres following contour levels, and this is true of the Dorchester aqueduct which follows the contours of the southern side of the Frome Valley. The course of the scheduled remains of the aqueduct is generally easily traceable through a largely agricultural landscape, although the western half of the route is interrupted by the settlement of Bradford Peverell. The eastern end of the aqueduct - including that separately scheduled as part of Poundbury Hillfort - has also has a more urban setting as the development at Poundbury is currently being extended west to the edge of the monument, where it is adjacent to the A37, as well as north to Poundbury Road, which runs along the top of the valley above the final stretch of the aqueduct as it approaches Poundbury Hillfort. Poundbury can - or will therefore be experienced in conjunction with these sections. East of the A37, the setting of the aqueduct also includes the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup>http://web.archive.org/web/20070728190713/http://www.roseivy.demon.co.uk/ aqua/page4.htm

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup> <u>https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1002730</u> [accessed 25.03.2020]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> <u>https://www.pastscape.org.uk/hob.aspx?hob\_id=959813</u> [accessed 25.03.2020]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup>http://web.archive.org/web/20070728190539/http://www.roseivy.demon.co.uk/ aqua/page3.htm

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1002730

<sup>71</sup>http://web.archive.org/web/20070728190539/http://www.roseivy.demon.co.uk/ aqua/page3.htm

Land North of Dorchester January 2021

Great Western Railway (which runs under Poundbury Hillfort) and the B3147, which adjoins the A37.

Figure 6.2: View of the aqueduct earthworks either side of the A37 (looking southwest)



Figure 6.3: Section of the aqueduct south of Roman Road looking southeast (with Poundbury visible in the distance)



Figure 6.4: View of the site from the section of aqueduct scheduled as part of Poundbury



## Significance

**6.8** As one of only 60 Roman aqueducts now known in Britain this is a rare monument type. The scheduled parts of the Dorchester Roman Aqueduct survives well but is included on Historic England's Heritage at Risk register due to its declining condition, which mainly arise from arable clipping.

**6.9** The monument is of national importance due primarily to its archaeological value. The heritage significance of the aqueduct is primarily evidential as it comprises archaeological and environmental evidence relating to its construction, longevity, social, political, and economic significance, technical achievement, and overall landscape context. The visible earthwork remains also have some historical illustrative value as a rare example of Roman aqueduct in Britain, albeit one of functional rather than monumental design (i.e. it is a cut channel rather than a stone bridged structure/ arcades).

**6.10** In terms of setting, the largely undeveloped agricultural setting of the asset allows for an appreciation of the topography that allowed the aqueduct to function. The spatial/visual relationship to the historic core of Dorchester (e.g. Durnovaria) is also important to understanding its history and function. The on-going Poundbury development has diminished this to some extent.

## Contribution of the site to significance

**6.11** The site makes a low contribution to the significance (i.e. setting) of the aqueduct. There is some intervisibility between the more eastern sections of the aqueduct, but as indicated by the ZTV at the scoping stage, there is none with the more western sections of the aqueduct. The site does not include any land that contributes to the asset's keys functional relationships e.g. topography or Dorchester. The undeveloped nature of the site allows for some understanding of the historical context of the asset and its functional relationship to Roman Dorchester.

## Sensitivity and potential harm

**6.12** The sensitivity of the aqueduct to the indicative masterplan proposals is **none**. The areas of site closest to the aqueduct is Open Space South. The Link Road will cross this area, approximately 400m northeast of the aqueduct. This will introduce more development into an area that is largely undeveloped (former water meadows), save for the B3147 and railway. It will be visible from the aqueduct and in conjunction with it, when viewed from further east. The Link Road may introduce additional noise and light pollution too. The closest area of housing – Housing West – would be approximately 875m northeast of the aqueduct and would also be visible from the monument. The ability to experience this change within the setting of the aqueduct would not fundamentally affect the evidential or illustrative value of the

Land North of Dorchester January 2021

asset, as its topography and association with Dorchester would remain legible.

#### Level of Effect

**6.13** Taking into account the significance of the asset (high) and the risk of harm to its significance (low/ none), the overall level of effect of the development of the site on the historic environment is **none.** 

#### Options for sustainable development

**6.14** The Link Road should be designed to minimise any potential noise or light pollution. Sightlines within the development could be considered to minimise the loss of the setting from which the asset can be experienced. Public interpretation of the monument and increased public understanding of its significance should be considered, where possible.

## Long barrow and four bowl barrows 500m west of it [NHLE ref: 1019416] and bell barrow in Highfield plantation and two bowl barrows immediately northwest of Forty Acre plantation [NHLE ref: 1019415]

#### Summary

Significance of asset	Contribution of the site to significance	Risk of harm to asset	Level of effect
High	Low	None	None
Scheduled monuments	The site forms a marginally important part of the heritage significance of the asset and this contribution to heritage significance may be affected by the development of the site.	The significance of the heritage asset will not be harmed.	The development of the site does not interact with the asset or its significance.

#### Description

**6.15** This dispersed group of eight round/ bell Bronze Age barrows and an earlier Neolithic long barrow are prominently located on a hilltop, overlooking the Frome valley (close to part of the course of the Roman aqueduct which supplied water to the town of Durnovaria), approx. 500m+ east of the site.

6.16 Long barrows are earthen or drystone mounds with flanking ditches which acted as funerary monuments during the Early and Middle Neolithic periods (3400-2400 BC). This example lies to the northwest of the bowl barrow cemetery and is aligned north west by south east. Partially excavated in 1881 by E. Cunnington, it comprises a mound composed of earth and chalk, with maximum dimensions of 50m in length, 25m in width and 0.6m in height. Either side of the mound is an approximately 5m wide ditch, from which material was quarried during the construction of the monument. Although the ditches have been infilled and no longer survive as earthworks, they will survive as buried features. Human remains and flint implements have been recovered from the long barrow, and a secondary cairn containing another burial was identified at its south eastern end. It is common for earlier ritual features such as these to be associated with barrows, although the relationship with such monuments is poorly understood.

**6.17** Round barrows are later Bronze Age (c.2000-700 BC) burial monuments. Those in this cemetery, were recorded by L. Grinsell in 1959 and the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England in 1952. Each has surviving above ground remains, with a mound between 25m and 30m and between about 0.4m and 1m in height. Like the long barrow, each mound is surrounded by a quarry ditch approximately 2m wide and now infilled. The barrows were also partially excavated by E. Cunnington in 1880 – 1887, who identified a burials, cremations and various grave goods including pottery, metal artefacts and worked flints. A later inhumation burial associated with Roman Samian pottery was also recorded in one mound. Most developed over a considerable period, often many centuries, and in some cases acted as a focus for later burials, as this one appears to have.

**6.18** Barrows exhibit considerable diversity of burial rite, plan and form, frequently including several different types of round barrow, and are occasionally associated with earlier long barrows as this group are. Where large scale investigation has been undertaken around them, contemporary or later "flat" burials between the barrow mounds have often been revealed. To the southeast of this cemetery there is an extensive ancient field system [DHER ref: MDO20901] with possible prehistoric origins. The field system has been eroded by ploughing and is not included in the scheduling.

**6.19** In terms of setting, the assets retain an undeveloped open setting that allows for their prominent siting to be appreciated. However, the ability to experience the group as a whole is not possible due to them being sited either side of Roman Road and visually separated by hedgerows. Like many other long barrows, the example in this cemetery may have been intentionally located close to the river. However, the ability to appreciate this relationship is now diminished by vegetation along the river.

Land North of Dorchester January 2021

## Significance

**6.20** The significance of these assets is high, as reflected by their designated status. Long barrows represent the burial places of Britain's earliest farming communities and as such are one of the oldest visible field monuments. Approximately 500 examples have been recorded nationally. Round barrow cemeteries are more common, occurring across most of lowland Britain. However, their diversity and longevity as a monument type provide important information on the variety of beliefs and social organisation amongst Bronze Age, and later, communities.

**6.21** Whilst these assets did survive comparatively well – and some still do - most have been reduced by ploughing and both groups are now on the Heritage at Risk register. Partial excavations have attested their ability to contain important archaeological and environmental evidence that will aid our understanding of the monuments form, function, and associated social practices, as well as the historical depth of the landscape in which they were constructed.

**6.22** In terms of setting, the spatial and visual relationship between the burial mounds is important to understanding their group function and history. Their prominent siting is also important to their monumental functional and the fact that some also acted as territorial or route markers.

## Contribution of the site to significance

**6.23** The site has some intervisibility with these monuments and includes part of the River Frome with which the Long Barrow may have a relationship, having likely been deliberately sited in relation to it. In principle, therefore development of the site could potentially affect the legibility of this relationship if development extended along the river valley and interrupted this relationship. However, as the stretch of river within the site lies 70m to the southeast of the monument and is screened by trees any such change would likely be minimal, especially given that the monuments relationship to the river directly north of it (which is likely to be more important) would remain intact.

**6.24** Beyond the river, the undeveloped character of the site can be said to provide a landscape setting broadly similar to that in which these monuments historically stood, but this does not contribute to the assets key archaeological, or lesser historical illustrative, value. Development of this area of the site would therefore not affect the heritage significance of the asset.

## Sensitivity and potential harm

**6.25** The sensitivity of these assets to the indicative masterplan proposals in none. The area of site closest to these assets is Open Space South. The Link Road would run

through this area – approximately 1.3km to the east of the southernmost mound. Parts of Housing West - approximately 1.6km to the northeast – would also be visible. This would result in some change to their wider landscape setting but would not affect their heritage significance as none of their key setting relationships would be altered.

## Level of effect

**6.26** Taking into account the significance of the asset (high) and the risk of harm to its significance (none), the overall level of effect of the development of the site on the historic environment is **none**.

## Options for sustainable development

**6.27** If the indicative masterplans are altered, then the new proposals will need to ensure that they still conserve the assets key setting relationships as set out above.

## Maiden Castle [NHLE ref: 1015775]

#### Summary

Significance of asset	Contribution of the site to significance	Risk of harm to asset	Level of effect
High	Low	None	None
Scheduled monument	The site forms a marginally important part of the heritage significance of the asset and this contribution to heritage significance may be affected by the development of the site.	The significance of the heritage asset will not be harmed.	The development of the site does not interact with the asset or its significance.

#### Description

**6.28** Maiden Castle is an Iron Age hillfort located on a chalk hilltop along the South Downs Ridgeway. Excavations in the 1930s and 1980s have shed much light on the development of the site, demonstrating a complex sequence of occupation.

**6.29** The earliest human activity attested on the site dates to the Neolithic period, when the hilltop was cleared of vegetation and a causewayed enclosure constructed. Pits and flintwork have been taken to indicate that the enclosure was used as symbolic space for special activities, such as flint axe production. When this enclosure fell out of use, it was

Land North of Dorchester January 2021

replaced by a long barrow: a chambered burial tomb. This large and highly visible monument may have developed from an earlier long barrow, the presence of which is suggested by two infant burials. Other long barrows along the ridgeway appear to be orientated in relation to this one, and in turn influence the siting of later Bronze Age barrows, of which there are two within the hillfort. Other Bronze Age evidence includes a small enclosure situated near the centre of the hilltop.

**6.30** The first hillfort on the site was constructed in the early Iron Age. It was extensively redeveloped throughout the period to become one of the largest and most complex examples of the type now known in the country. It is particularly noted for the scale and extent of the outer ramparts and well-developed entrance earthworks. Excavation has demonstrated the survival of extensive buried deposits including human burials, structural foundations, and occupation debris. It was not the only hillfort in the area, but formed part of a network of similar settlements, some of which were intervisible.

**6.31** By the time of the Roman Conquest, and the establishment of the Roman town of Durnovaria to the north east at Dorchester, occupation of the hilltop had declined. However, there may still have been some activity as a Romano-Celtic temple was constructed at the eastern end of the fort during the 4th century AD, near to a pre-Roman shrine. The dedication of the temple is unknown, but it was likely to have been to a non-Christian god.

**6.32** In the post-Roman period, the hilltop was used for grazing of stock and several dew ponds were constructed to provide water. It was ploughed during the 17th century but does not appear to have been since.

Figure 6.5: Google Earth image (map data  $\textcircled{}{}^{\odot}$  2020 Google) of Maiden Castle (looking north)



Figure 6.6: View of Dorchester from Maiden Castle



Figure 6.7: View of Dorchester and the western part of the site (beyond Dorchester) from Maiden Castle





Figure 6.8: View of Dorchester and the eastern part of the site (beyond Dorchester) from Maiden Castle

Land North of Dorchester January 2021

## Significance

**6.33** Maiden Castle has **high** significance, as reflected in its scheduling. Its primary heritage significance is derived from its archaeological value as site of great time-depth and rarity. Causewayed enclosures and bank barrows are rare forms of monument nationally and their association at Maiden Castle is one of only two cases to be identified. Although a more common monument, the later round barrows form part of a larger monument group along the ridgeway that is one of the largest of its kind. The Iron Age hillfort is likewise one of the largest and best preserved of its kind and is highly important in terms of understanding the nature of social organisation within the Iron Age period. The site also contains important Roman archaeological remains.

**6.34** As a well-preserved outstanding example of an Iron Age hillfort Maiden Castle also has considerable historical illustrative interest. It is this interest that its setting mainly contributes to, with the hillfort's dominant siting and wide-ranging views towards Poundbury hillfort and the other ridgeway burial monuments reflecting the inhabitants concern with defence and power. Although its intervisibility with Poundbury is now largely diminished by modern development, this strategic design intent is easily appreciable through the sheer size and scale of the asset's physical remains and its topographical siting. The undeveloped surroundings of the monument allow both these attributes to be fully appreciated both from within and beyond the asset.

**6.35** Maiden Castle is a well-known local landmark that has been much written about over the years. Its connection with the history of English literature, through reference in the novels of Thomas Hardy, contributes to its historical (associative) significance.

## Contribution of the site to significance

**6.36** The site lies approximately 2.9km north of Maiden Castle and is visible behind Dorchester in long ranging views, along with the northern ridgeway. The site makes a **low** contribution to the significance of the Maiden Castle; it is undeveloped and allows for an appreciation of its historic hinterland and the relationship between prehistoric monuments within it, particularly with Poundbury Camp, although this is difficult to discern given the distance and intervening development.

## Sensitivity and potential harm

**6.37** The risk of harm to Maiden Castle is **none**. Development of the site would result in the loss of some of the rural backdrop behind Dorchester but would not entirely eradicate it. The new development would be read as part of Dorchester and would not affect the ability to understand the strategic landscape siting of the asset and its relationship with other prehistoric monuments such as Poundbury.

#### Level of effect

**6.38** Taking into account the significance of the asset (high) and the risk of harm to its significance (none), the overall level of effect of the development of the site on the historic environment is **none**.

## Roman Road in Kingston Park [NHLE ref: 1002691]

#### Summary

Significance of asset	Contribution of the site to significance	Risk of harm to asset	Level of effect
High	None	None	None
Scheduled monument	The site does not contribute to the heritage significance of the asset and so the asset is not sensitive to development of the site	The significance of the heritage asset will not be harmed.	Asset of high, medium, or low significance where the development of the site does not interact with the asset or its significance.

#### Description

**6.39** The Roman road network in Britain, which may to some extent have only consolidated many existing prehistoric routes rather than being built wholly anew, was extensive. It enabled the quick movement of troops and supplies, and in so doing facilitated the conquest and subsequently the administration of the province. As the site of a Roman fort and town Dorchester lies in an area where several Roman roads meet. One of these was a major road connecting Badbury Rings to Dorchester (Margary 4E), the route of which is partly denoted by the present B3150 (Stinsford Road) approach to Dorchester. The Roman road continues northeast beyond the A35/ B3150 roundabout roughly along the route of what is now Hollow Hill Road, which passes through Kingston Maurward registered park and garden.

**6.40** This scheduled monument comprises a 150m stretch of the Roman road, which lies just north of Hollow Hill Road in an area of fields. The listing description provides no information on the monument, but typically a Roman road is evidenced by its agger (the embankment on which the road surface was laid), which comprises multiple layers, and flanking ditches. They may also be characterised by central stone ribs, kerbs, and culverts, not all of which will necessarily be contemporary with the original construction of the road. Construction pits are also common alongside roads. It is likely that this stretch survives – or did survive – as earthworks as it is marked on

Land North of Dorchester January 2021

the early OS maps meaning that it must have been visible during the mapping surveys. It would also need to survive well in order to qualify for scheduling.

6.41 In terms of setting, there is limited visibility from the scheduled monument due to vegetation to the immediate north and south, along the present road, meaning it is not possible to see Dorchester. A second much larger section of the Roman road with a dog-leg bend is scheduled further northeast [NHLE ref: 1004562]. However, this scheduled section lies within woodland and so there is no experiential relationship between the two. A Roman milestone [NHLE ref: 1154863] also stands at the A35/ B3150 roundabout about 945m southeast of the monument and 90m east of the site (the NHLE spatial marker shows the asset approximately 50m northwest of its correct location). However, this is not its original position as the stone was moved a short distance c. 1866 and again in 1957, and it now stands almost 1m above the level of the modern road.<sup>72</sup> It too has no experiential relationship with the scheduled section of the road by Hollow Hill (or the development site).

Figure 6.9: Roman milestone [NHLE ref: 1154863]



Significance

**6.42** The heritage significance of this asset is high and is derived primarily from its archaeological and, to a lesser extent, historical illustrative interest as a good example of a highly representative monument of the Roman period. It will contain archaeological and environmental evidence relating to the road's construction, development, maintenance, social, strategic, political, economic, and military significance, its role as a major communications route through time and its overall landscape context. Setting does not appear to contribute to

<sup>72</sup> 'Stinsford', in An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Dorset, Volume 3, Central (London, 1970), pp. 252-257. British History Online http://www.britishhistory.ac.uk/rchme/dorset/vol3/pp252-257 [accessed 27.03. 2020]. the road's significance, although it might be argued that the present road – which is of similar alignment to the southwest - allows for an approximate understanding of the route of the Roman road.

## Contribution of the site to significance

**6.43** Due to intervening vegetation and topography the site makes no contribution to the landscape setting of the asset.

## Sensitivity and potential harm

**6.44** The development site cannot be experienced from or incombination with the asset. It is therefore not sensitive to the development of the site and not at risk of harm.

## Level of effect

**6.45** Taking into account the significance of the asset (high) and the risk of harm to its significance (none), the overall level of effect of the development of the site on the historic environment is **none**.

## Options for sustainable development

**6.46** As there is no risk of harm from the development no options for sustainable development have been outlined.

## **Listed buildings**

**6.47** The location of the listed buildings identified as potentially being sensitive to setting change are shown on Figure 6.10 (below).