

Growing Baldock

Environmental Statement Volume 1: Text
Chapter 9: Archaeology



October 2025

Urban&Civic

Hertfordshire



CONTENTS

9.1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
9.2	RELEVANT POLICY.....	2
	National Policy	2
	Local Policy.....	3
	Any Other Relevant Policy, Legislation or Guidance.....	5
9.3	ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY.....	7
	Scope	7
	Data Sources	8
	Assessment Approach	8
	Significance Criteria	9
	Cumulative Effects.....	11
	Consultation	11
	Uncertainties and Limitations	11
9.4	BASELINE CONDITIONS.....	13
	The Current Baseline.....	13
	The Projected Future Baseline	16
9.5	POTENTIAL EFFECTS.....	18
	Construction Stage	18
	Post-Completion Stage	21
9.6	MITIGATION MEASURES.....	24
	Construction Stage	24
	Post-Completion Stage	25
9.7	RESIDUAL EFFECTS.....	27
	Construction Stage	27
	Post-Completion Stage	27
	Summary of Effects	28
9.8	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	29
9.9	REFERENCE LIST.....	31

APPENDICES

Appendix 9.1	Land to the North and East of Baldock, Hertfordshire. Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
Appendix 9.2	Archaeological evaluation on Land North of Baldock, Phase 1 North Hertfordshire March-June 2024
Appendix 9.3	Archaeological evaluation on land north of Baldock, Zones 1-4, North Hertfordshire August-November 2024
Appendix 9.4	Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report for Land North of Baldock Zone 5

9.1 INTRODUCTION

- 9.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared by Oxford Archaeology and aims to identify and describe the nature and significance of the effects likely to arise as a result of the Proposed Development on archaeology. It summarises the existing baseline conditions for the known archaeology within the Site. This chapter has been prepared in line with the methodology presented in the ES Scoping report (David Lock Associates 2025).
- 9.1.2 The baseline data has been informed by a Desk-Based Assessment (**Appendix 9.1**; Webb 2025), a geophysical survey (Davies 2016) and archaeological trial trenching (Appendices 9.2-9.4; Finn and Muldowney 2017) across the Site. This chapter has been prepared by Robin Webb BA MA ACIfA of Oxford Archaeology. Robin has over 10 years' experience in the heritage industry and has undertaken impact assessments for a variety of projects.
- 9.1.3 This chapter is supported by an appendix (**Appendix 9.1**: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment) which provides full detail on the historic environment baseline used to undertake this assessment.
- 9.1.4 The archaeological effects have been considered in relation to the proposed land uses and the parameters that are defined by the submitted Parameter Plans and Development Specification (refer to Chapter 2 Proposed Development of the ES and the Parameter Plan). The description of the Proposed Development is set out in Chapter 2: Proposed Development.

9.2 RELEVANT POLICY

- 9.2.1 There are several overarching national and regional items of legislation, policy and guidance applicable to the Site. The following section provides a summary of key legislation, policy and guidance with specific reference to this archaeological assessment.

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

- 9.2.2 The NPPF (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, updated 2024) forms the Government's planning policy direction. It gives protection to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Provision for the historic environment is detailed within Section 16: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, which directs Local Planners that:

"Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats" (Paragraph 203)

- 9.2.3 and that:

"These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance" (Paragraph 202).

- 9.2.4 The NPPF also states that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets (World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monument, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and Conservation Areas). If a heritage asset is identified as being lost due to a development, it requires developers to record and advance understanding of the significance any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible (Paragraphs 212-218).

- 9.2.5 The NPPF also states that local planning authorities should look for opportunities within the setting of heritage assets for developments to enhance or better reveal their significance (Paragraph 219).

Planning Practice Guidance

- 9.2.6 Guidance on how the historic environment can be enhanced and conserved through the planning process is provided by the Government through Planning Practice Guidance – Historic Environment, published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG 2019). Heritage interests are defined in Planning Practice Guidance as:

archaeological interest: As defined in the Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework, there will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.

historic interest: An interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material record of our nation's history, but can also provide meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity.

Local Policy

North Hertfordshire Local Plan (2022)

9.2.7 Local planning policy pertinent to this ES chapter can be found within the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 (North Herts Council 2022). The plan sets out how North Herts Council aims to meet the development needs of the area.

9.2.8 Policy HE1 relates to designated heritage assets. It identifies that Scheduled Ancient Monuments are the most important archaeological and historical sites and are given statutory protection with Historic England responsible for their identification and advising the Government on works on them. It also identifies, in Paragraph 12.16, that there are Areas of Archaeological Significance within North Hertfordshire that are considered to be of local importance. It specifies, in Paragraph 12.18, that where development proposals will affect these areas, archaeological assessment will be required, with a full report recording the work and its findings, and submitted to the local planning authority before an application will be determined.

9.2.9 With the scheduled site at Walls Field being on the Heritage at Risk register, Policy HE2: Heritage at risk is also a consideration with regard to archaeology. This states that:

Planning permission will be granted for proposals that seek to conserve or provide new uses for designated heritage assets identified on the national register, or the Council's 'At Risk' register maintained by the Council, that are justified and appropriate to the significance of the asset to return a heritage asset to beneficial use.

Proposals that harm the significance of heritage assets included on national and local registers will be resisted unless the need for, and the benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh that harm, taking account of the asset's significance and importance, and all feasible solutions to avoid and mitigate that harm have been fully assessed.

9.2.10 With regard to archaeology, Policy HE4: Archaeology states that:

Permission for development proposals affecting heritage assets with archaeological interest will be granted provided that:

- a) Developers submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where justified, an archaeological field evaluation.*
- b) It is demonstrated how archaeological remains will be preserved and incorporated into the layout of that development, if in situ preservation of important archaeological remains is considered preferable; and*
- c) Where the loss of the whole or a material part of important archaeological remains is justified, appropriate conditions are applied to ensure that the archaeological recording, reporting, publication and archiving of the results of such archaeological work is undertaken before it is damaged or lost.*

Where archaeological sites have been assessed to meet the criteria for inclusion on adopted registers or maps of locally important heritage assets these shall be treated in the same way as archaeology areas and areas of archaeological significance.

Areas of as yet, unknown archaeology may be identified during research, or through the planning or plan making process. These sites or areas should be treated in the same way as archaeology areas and areas of archaeological significance.

9.2.11 Policy SP13: Historic Environment states that:

The Council will balance the need for growth with the proper protection and enhancement of the historic environment. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight will be given to the asset's conservation and the management of its setting. We will pursue a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment through:

- a) Maintaining a strong presumption in favour of the retention, preservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their setting according to their significance;*
- b) Identifying sites on the national register of Heritage at Risk or on the Council's 'At Risk' register;*
- c) Periodic reviews of Conservation Areas and other locally designated assets; and*
- d) Publication of detailed guidance*

9.2.12 Further to the above, Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) employs special Historic Environment Advisors who provide advice both within the local authority and to applicants. Through the ES scoping process, and pre-application dialogue with HCC, early engagement and consultation about the possible impact of development proposals has been received.

Baldock, Bygrave and Clothall Neighbourhood Plan

- 9.2.13 Additional local planning policy can be found within the Baldock, Bygrave and Clothall Neighbourhood Plan (Baldock, Bygrave and Clothall Planning Group 2021). The plan forms part of the statutory development plan for the area alongside the North Hertfordshire Local Plan.
- 9.2.14 Policy G2 Strategic Green Space relates to the conservation of important green space within Baldock, including the scheduled area of Walls Field. This maintains that improved public access, conservation and interpretation of the scheduled area, informed by community engagement, would be viewed favourably, especially if they enhance the value of the scheduled monument.
- 9.2.15 Policy G6 Local Heritage Assets relates to the character or setting of a heritage asset identified as of local importance. It states that:

Development proposals that would affect the character or setting of a heritage asset of identified local importance should:

- a) seek to conserve or enhance those qualities and features that make it of value; and*
- b) be supported by an assessment of the potential impact on these qualities/ features, commensurate with the scale of the works and their likely significance for the asset's value.*

Any Other Relevant Policy, Legislation or Guidance**Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979) (as amended)**

- 9.2.16 This Act states that any archaeological site or historic building of national importance can be designated as a Scheduled Monument and registered with the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). Any development that may physically affect the monument is subject to the granting of Scheduled Monument Consent. Historic England advises the government on individual cases for consent and offers advice on the management of Scheduled Monuments.

Hedgerow Regulations 1997, as amended by The Hedgerows (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2002 and The Management of Hedgerows (England) Regulations 2024

- 9.2.17 These regulations apply to any hedgerow longer than 20m growing on or adjacent to common land, protected land, agricultural land or land used for forestry or keeping horses. It does not apply to hedgerows forming the boundary to dwellings. They define which hedgerows within England are identified as important and protected against removal and various other works. Heritage-specific criteria for precluding removal of a hedgerow includes if the hedge forms a historical parish or township boundary; it incorporates an archaeological feature which is a scheduled monument; or is part of a

field system that existed before 1845; or an estate or manor boundary that existed before 1600.

9.2.18 The impact assessment work has been undertaken in line with the most up-to-date and relevant guidance for heritage impact assessment, including:

- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (updated 2017) Standards and guidance, including Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment;
- The Historic Environment in Local Plans; Historic Environment Good Practice Advice (GPA) in Planning Note 1 (Historic England 2015a);
- Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment GPA in Planning Note 2 (Historic England 2015b);
- The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment GPA in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) (Historic England 2017); and
- Principle of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (IEMA 2021).

These outline the recommended approach to assessing heritage significance, with this detailed in Section 9.3 below.

9.3 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

- 9.3.1 This assessment has been prepared in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) which provides an approach for describing the significance of a heritage asset. The NPPF specifies that the significance of any heritage asset(s), including any contribution made by setting, should be described in a “level of detail proportionate to the assets’ importance, and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impacts of the proposal on their significance”.
- 9.3.2 The impact of the Proposed Development upon the setting of a heritage asset(s) has been assessed following the methodology detailed in Historic England’s The Setting of Heritage Assets, Good Practice Guidance Advice in Planning Note 3 (2017).
- 9.3.3 The Historic England guidance note provides guidance for managing change within the setting of heritage assets, including archaeological remains and historic buildings, sites, areas and landscapes. It puts forward a staged approach to taking decisions on setting as well as providing advice on how to assess the contribution of views to the significance of heritage assets.
- 9.3.4 The following steps, used within this assessment, are recommended by Historic England as a broad approach to assessment:
- Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected.
 - Step 2: Assess the degree to which these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow the significance to be appreciated.
 - Step 3: Assess the effects of the Proposed Development whether beneficial or harmful, on the significance or on the ability to appreciate it.
 - Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm.
 - Step 5: Make and document the decisions and monitor outcomes.

Scope

- 9.3.5 Historic England’s The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017) specifies that the first step of the assessment should identify those heritage assets likely to be affected by the Proposed Development.
- 9.3.6 The impact assessment considers any designated or non-designated archaeological assets (or potential archaeological assets) located within the Site and designated archaeological assets within a 1km study area from the Site. Figures detailing the study area and all archaeological assets are presented in **Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment**.
- 9.3.7 During the collation of baseline data, consideration was given to all designated heritage assets that fall within the 1km study area. Upon consideration of the location of the Site relative to designated heritage assets outside the study area, it was identified that there

was no potential for impact, due to the distance from the Site and the intervening topography and screening. In particular, the topography of the land and the presence of the A1(M) and A505 which passes between them and the Site. This was confirmed during a site visit.

Data Sources

- 9.3.8 The Site has been subject to a desk-based assessment, geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching that covered c. 3% of the Site. The results of these inform the baseline information in this ES chapter and form the baseline data for this chapter. It should be noted that the results of the geophysical survey and archaeological evaluations provide clear indications of areas of archaeological preservation and an understanding of the Site's potential for buried archaeology (**Appendix 9.1**, Figure 8).

Assessment Approach

- 9.3.9 The impact assessment work has been undertaken in line with the most up-to-date and relevant guidance for heritage impact assessment, as outlined in Section 9.2.
- 9.3.10 Step 2 of Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017) requires the setting and significance of heritage assets to be identified. NPPF defines significance (for heritage policy) as:

"the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting".

- 9.3.11 Elements of a heritage asset's setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

Direct vs. Indirect Impact in Assessment of Heritage

- 9.3.12 The use of direct and impact in the chapter will be as follows:
- 'direct' is used where the impact could cause a physical change (e.g., through excavation) to an asset through removal, disturbance or change of the asset's fabric (which could impact their heritage significance);
 - 'indirect' is used where the impact could cause a non-physical change to a heritage asset (e.g., through an alteration to the setting of an asset, which could impact their heritage significance).

Significance Criteria

- 9.3.13 The criteria for determining the impact of significance is a two-stage process that involves defining the sensitivity (heritage significance) of the heritage assets and the magnitude of the impacts (equivalent to degree of harm to heritage significance). The definitions of sensitivity and magnitude of impact are defined in **Table 9.1** and **Table 9.2** below.

Table 9.1 – Definitions of Terms Relating to Sensitivity (Heritage Significance)

Sensitivity (Heritage Significance)	Definition used in this chapter
High	Perceived international or national heritage significance. For example: World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens. Significance is related to a high degree of evidential, archaeological, historic, aesthetic, architectural or communal heritage interest, or a combination of these.
Medium	Perceived regional heritage significance. For example: some buried archaeological remains and locally designated historic landscapes. Significance is related to a moderate degree of evidential, archaeological, historic, aesthetic, architectural or communal heritage interest, or a combination of these.
Low	Perceived local heritage significance. For example: assets which contribute to local research objectives, assets with a local value, educational interest or cultural appreciation, assets which may have been heavily compromised by poor preservation or poor contextual associations. Significance is related to a certain (lower) level of evidential, archaeological, historic, aesthetic, architectural or communal heritage interest, or a combination of these

Table 9.2 – Definition of terms relating to magnitude of impact

Magnitude of Impact	Definition used in this chapter	
Large	Adverse	Total loss of, or substantial harm to, a heritage asset and/or its setting.
	Beneficial	Improvement to a heritage asset's significance, through restoration, enhancement or increased ability to appreciate that significance.
Moderate	Adverse	Partial loss of, or harm to, or alteration of, a heritage asset and/or its setting which will detrimentally affect its significance.
	Beneficial	An enhancement to a heritage asset and/or its setting which moderately affects its significance, or ability to appreciate the significance.
Small	Adverse	Minor loss of, or alteration to, a heritage asset and/or its setting which leaves its significance largely intact.

Magnitude of Impact	Definition used in this chapter	
	Beneficial	Minor beneficial improvement to a heritage asset and/or its setting which provides some benefit to the historic environment.
Negligible	-	Minimal alteration to an asset which does not affect its significance in any notable way (adverse or beneficial).

9.3.14 It should be noted that the setting of a heritage asset is experienced rather than defined simply as land that might be visible from a heritage asset. In order to be material to the experience of the asset, views must be into surroundings that have a bearing on its significance.

9.3.15 Once the magnitude of impact and the significance of a heritage asset are identified, the method employed for this assessment to identify the significance of the impact is presented in **Table 9.3** below. Where a range of significance of effect is present, the final assessment for each effect is based upon professional judgement.

Table 9.3 – Matrix used for the Assessment of the Significance of Effects

Magnitude of Impact	Sensitivity			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Large	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor
Moderate	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Small	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible
Negligible	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

9.3.16 The impact assessment will assess the potential impacts on a worst-case scenario for the Proposed Development and is based on the submitted Parameter Plan (Drawing UAC092-002 Rev Q). As part of the assessment of indirect (non-physical) impacts to heritage assets relating to changes in their setting, an assessment of how lighting, noise, traffic and visual changes could alter their setting (and as such potentially impact upon heritage significance) will be reviewed using results from other chapters.

9.3.17 Regarding assessment of direct impacts, in general terms, any intrusive ground works associated with site preparation and construction, inclusive of any temporary works areas, could result in physical damage and partial or complete removal of non-designated buried archaeological remains. As such, this scenario will form the basis for identifying the magnitude of impact during the assessment of impact to non-designated remains.

9.3.18 Once impacts have been identified, means by which they can be avoided through design were explored as a priority. If impacts cannot be avoided through design, then alternative strategies (e.g., site investigation and recording for direct impacts) will be proposed. The residual impacts following the implementation of these measures will then be defined and the significance criteria applied.

Cumulative Effects

- 9.3.19 The assessment includes consideration of any likely cumulative effects from the scheme alongside any other proposed developments (commitments) within a defined area in proximity to the Proposed Development which might have shared heritage assets or 'receptors' in common. These other proposed developments will be identified as part of the ES chapter production and contained in a table detailing what potential cumulative effect on heritage assets could occur.
- 9.3.20 Cumulative effects on any archaeological features are considered to have limited, or no, potential for an increase in direct effects or harm due to the site-specific nature of archaeology. This is also because it is assumed that appropriate mitigation will be used as required for any other proposed development (i.e., site investigation, excavation and preservation by record within the Site).
- 9.3.21 Cumulative effects could theoretically occur on archaeological assets where development would cause changes in their setting, and, where two (or more) schemes have 'receptors' in common, these effects could be greater than would occur from the scheme alone. This is assessed in this ES chapter.

Consultation

- 9.3.22 Pre-application meetings were held at an early point in the programme to inform the Growing Baldock Strategic Masterplan and the emerging outline planning application. Since then, Oxford Archaeology have contacted Historic England and are awaiting a reply regarding a meeting to further discuss the designated scheduled areas of the Settlement Site South of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548) and Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305) scoped as potentially impacted by the Proposed Development.
- 9.3.23 Discussions were also held with Historic England regarding the potential of the archaeological remains identified within the Site during the trial trench evaluations.
- 9.3.24 Consultation has been held with Hertfordshire County Council Historic Environment Advisors regarding the archaeological evaluation works taken to date, and discussions are ongoing to identify the archaeological mitigation that could be undertaken across the Site. Discussions to date have been constructive.

Uncertainties and Limitations

- 9.3.25 As with any assessment of the historic environment, in particular archaeological remains, the data being worked with cannot be considered a complete record. This is because the Historic Environment Record (HER) is a record of known non-designated heritage assets that have been recorded and reported. Dependent on how much archaeological work has been undertaken in an area and whether find spots have been reported, limits what level of records may be held within the HER.

- 9.3.26 Similarly, unknown heritage assets are being found regularly, as part of new developments or new local research. As such, the HER is not a complete and final record and does not preclude further heritage assets being found in the future. It does, however, allow for an efficient assessment of archaeological potential on a site, which is then further detailed through surveys.

9.4 BASELINE CONDITIONS

9.4.1 A full baseline for the Site and study area is provided by the evidence presented in **Appendix 9.1** (Webb 2025). The following is a summary of known heritage assets within the study area.

9.4.2 The Walls Field area covered part of a designated scheduled monument. In addition to this, non-designated archaeological assets were identified within all areas of the Proposed Development.

The Current Baseline

Archaeology

9.4.3 The Walls Field area of the Site incorporates the eastern part of the Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1016305). This monument survives as the buried archaeological remains of Late Iron Age and Romano-British structures including houses and a temple, enclosures, metalled streets and burials. This is on the heritage at risk register due to its unsatisfactory condition and vulnerability to plough damage. Its remains have been suggested through a combination of geophysical survey, aerial survey and archaeological excavation. These suggest that it was occupied for a long period from the Late Iron Age through the Romano-British period due to its strategic location and funerary significance.

9.4.4 The Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1003548) lies c. 17m to the west of BA1, outside the Site boundary. This monument was identified as soilmarks of ditched enclosures and pits, with trial trench evaluation indicating occupation through the Late Iron Age, Romano-British, Anglo-Saxon and late medieval periods.

9.4.5 The Site itself is known to contain buried archaeological remains. The assessment work undertaken to date (Appendices 9.1-9.4) has identified 12 areas of the Site (**Appendix 9.1**, Figure 8) which contain areas of archaeological interest. These relate to the remains of Bronze Age barrows, an Iron Age pit alignment, a Late Iron Age boundary, Late Iron Age to Romano-British settlement and agricultural and roadside activity, and late medieval timber buildings and industrial activity. These can be considered of local significance in heritage terms. These were primarily identified within BA1 but also included Bronze Age barrows and remains associated with Ermine Street in BA2; part of an Iron Age pit alignment and an area of Late Iron Age to Romano-British settlement and agricultural activity towards the south of BA3; and the continuation of an area of Late Iron Age and Romano-British enclosures and settlement in the east of BA10.

Setting Assessment

- 9.4.6 In accordance with Step 2 of Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017) the following section assesses the heritage significance of the known archaeological assets identified in the historic baseline that have the potential to receive effects from development within the Site. This section assesses whether and to what degree the Site contributes towards the setting and heritage significance of these archaeological assets.
- 9.4.7 Of the archaeological assets identified within the study area, those with the potential for a change in their settings or significance as a result of the Proposed Development are identified as:
- Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm scheduled monument (NHLE 1003548);
 - Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock scheduled monument (NHLE 1016305); and
 - Archaeological potential, including the 12 areas of archaeological significance.
- 9.4.8 These sites have been identified through the site walkover, considering the location of the Site and the works that are proposed. Due to the topography of the area, as well as the surrounding residential and infrastructure development, two scheduled monuments that lie within the study area were considered to not have the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development:
- Barrow, south of Radwell scheduled monument (NHLE 1012366); and
 - Radwell Roman villa scheduled monument (NHLE 1016308).
- 9.4.9 These two sites did not share intervisibility with the Site, and it was considered that the modern infrastructure, with its associated traffic and noise, separated these monuments from the area of the Proposed Development.

Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm scheduled monument (NHLE 1003548)

- 9.4.10 This area of buried archaeological remains lies c. 17m to the west of BA1 on the opposite side of North Road. The scheduled area is bordered by grassland and trees to the north, west and south, with North Road and the agricultural land of BA1 to its east. Beyond the trees to the west is the A1(M), which was audible at times during the site visit. The scheduled area is on lower ground overlooked by the Site (BA1) with a hedge forming a screen between. It currently a grass area grazed by cattle, with the significance of the asset relating to its below-ground evidential and archaeological value. As such, the setting makes a negligible contribution to the significance of the scheduled area.

Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock scheduled monument (NHLE 1016305)

- 9.4.11 This area of buried archaeological remains lies within the Walls Field area of the Site, c. 13m to the west of BA3. The scheduled area is bordered by residential development to the north, west and south. Although agricultural land extends to the east, a garden centre

and the continuation of Clothall Road partially detract from this. The scheduled area within the Site is agricultural land mostly under arable cultivation at the time of the site visit, while a school and its grounds in the west and sports field in the south-west. This designated area is on the Heritage at Risk Register due to its condition and the threat from ploughing, and although its significance largely derives from its evidential archaeological value, it also has connections with other Romano-British remains in the area, such as Radwell Villa (NHLE 1016308) c. 1.9km to its north due to the presence of Ermine Street extending northwards between the two. As such, the setting of the of the scheduled area makes a low (beneficial) contribution to the significance of the scheduled area.

Archaeological potential

- 9.4.12 Non-designated archaeological remains within the study area are considered to have an unknown level of archaeological interest and significance due to a lack of information on the degree of survival for the remains. However, the geophysical survey and archaeological trial trench evaluations carried out across the Site have indicated that there is a high level of archaeological survival within the Site, with 12 areas identified as of archaeological significance.
- 9.4.13 The desk-based assessment for the Site, incorporating the results of the geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation results, as well as known and suspected former impacts, has identified the archaeological potential of the Site, and this is summarised here.

Table 9.4 – Summary of the Archaeological Potential of the Site

Archaeological period	Type of remains	Area	Archaeological Potential	Archaeological Significance
Prehistoric	Trackways (Icknield Way)	BA1	High	Local (low)
	Bronze Age barrows and burials	BA1 BA2	High	Local (low)
	Iron Age pit alignment	BA3	High	Local (low)
Late Iron Age to Romano-British	Settlement and funerary activity	BA1 BA3 Walls Field	High	Local (low) Local (low) National (high)
	Agricultural activity	BA3	High	Local (low)
Romano-British	Settlement and funerary activity	BA1 BA10 Walls Field	High	Local (low) Local (low) National (high)

Archaeological period	Type of remains	Area	Archaeological Potential	Archaeological Significance
	Communication network	BA1 BA2 Walls Field	High	Local (low)
Early medieval	Settlement	BA1 Walls Field	High	Local (low)
Late medieval	Settlement, leper hospital, burials	BA1 BA3	High	Local (low)
Post-medieval	Agricultural activity	BA1 BA2 BA3 BA10	High	Local (low)
	Railway	BA1 BA10	High	Local (low)
Modern	Dispersed settlement	BA1	High	Local (low)
	Agricultural activity	BA1 BA2 BA3 BA10	High	Local (low)

9.4.14 Overall, there is a high potential for remains of all periods to be encountered across the Site (**Appendix 9.1**, Figure 8), but especially relating to Bronze Age funerary monuments, continued Late Iron Age to Romano-British settlement and agricultural activity from the Late Iron Age onwards. These remains are considered to be of low significance across most of the Site, but of high significance for those remains within Walls Field.

9.4.15 Setting issues are considered below in the assessment of likely effects.

The Projected Future Baseline

9.4.16 The predicted future baseline scenario, without implementation of the Proposed Development in a 'do-nothing' scenario, would be expected to see slow rates of adverse change for the archaeological remains present in the development area. Any areas under cultivation would continue to erode buried archaeological remains sealed below the topsoil, slowly impacting their preservation and potentially their associated heritage significance.

9.4.17 In broader terms, the historic environment is vulnerable to climate change (Atkins 2013), with common generic threats including increased risk of flooding, extremes of wetting and drying, and changes in groundwater levels which all present a significant risk to buried archaeological remains. Overall, the degree of change in the future baseline

conditions for the historic environment is difficult to predict. It is expected, however, to undergo a gradual negative change without the Proposed Development.

9.5 POTENTIAL EFFECTS

- 9.5.1 The assessment of likely effects considers the likely effects without specific or additional mitigation, although planned mitigation for archaeological remains includes a mix of preservation in-situ and preservation through record (comprising appropriate levels of investigation, recording, reporting and archiving).
- 9.5.2 No built development or above-ground infrastructure works, including access routes, compounds and storage areas (with the exception of interpretation boards) are currently expected to take place within the Walls Field scheduled area.
- 9.5.3 No built development (with the exception of the provision of sports pitches and ancillary facilities, footways/cycleways, sports pavilion and local road access) will occur within the Urban Open Land at the south of BA3.
- 9.5.4 There are two potential significant effects which could occur to heritage and archaeology from the Proposed Development during its construction and post-completion stages. These are:
- Direct impact on designated and non-designated archaeological assets: physical impact on features identified within the Site; and
 - Indirect impact on designated archaeological assets: non-physical impact relating to change within the setting of off-site designated heritage assets could occur during construction and/or post-completion of the scheme.
- 9.5.5 These two potential impacts are considered for each heritage asset/group of heritage assets during the construction and post-completion stages of the Proposed Development. The assessment has been undertaken with reference to the assessment of hydrological, lighting, traffic and visual changes which could occur based on the results of the other chapters in this ES.
- 9.5.6 There will be no indirect impact on non-designated heritage assets as any on-site heritage assets (archaeology) will be directly impacted through the construction work.

Construction Stage***Direct Impacts***

- 9.5.7 Direct (physical) impacts during construction would mostly be in the form of removal/destruction of any archaeological remains within the Site due to the construction of the new development. The construction-related activities that could result in this impact are:
- Site clearance/demolition works;
 - Removal of topsoil and subsoil within the Site;
 - Excavation works associated with building foundations;

- Excavation works associated with the sustainable drainage corridor and SUDS basins, and the installation of services, highways infrastructure and the sustainable travel network;
- Hard landscaping;
- Rutting caused by vehicle movements;
- Compression of the ground; and
- Hydrological changes due to construction works and the removal of areas of hedgerow and vegetation.

9.5.8 Any direct (physical) impacts to archaeological assets (and their associated heritage significance) would be permanent and irreversible. In particular, once buried archaeological remains are disturbed or removed without an appropriate record having been made, their context and relationship to other archaeological features and deposits is partially or completely lost and their heritage significance is, as such, likely to be reduced or lost completely.

9.5.9 Hydrological changes could impact the preservation of archaeological remains within the Site. The results of the Hydrology and Flooding Effects Chapter indicate that some areas of the Site are susceptible to flooding from surface water ponding or overland flow. At the time of the site visit, no evidence of flooding was evident, suggesting that it is a seasonal issue. Similarly, hydrology and flooding site investigations did not encounter ground water (Duff 2025, 6), and the archaeological trial trench evaluation works identified limited plant macrofossils that suggested the possibility of waterlogged remains. These were recovered from both deeper (over 0.8m deep) and shallower (0.29m) deposits (Oliveira 2024, 101). The Hydrology and Flooding assessment (Chapter 10) has indicated that there is potential for elevated ground water levels due to the proposed SuDS strategy relying on infiltration for the disposal of surface water.

9.5.10 Where parts of hedgerows are removed during construction, it could be a temporary impact if the hedgerow was enabled to grow back again. However, where the hedgerow is not within an area of green space, it is likely that the impact will be permanent and irreversible. Hedgerows of “importance” (as per the Hedgerow Regulations 1997’s historic criteria) have been identified across the Site, but in the majority of cases, and with the intention within the design specification to retain existing tree/hedgerows and vegetation of value where possible, the lasting impact will only be where access is being established from North Road into BA1, off Royston Road into BA10 and off Clothall Road into BA2 and BA3/Urban Open Land. These locations are highlighted within **Appendix 9.1** (Figure 19). It is worth noting here that these hedgerows are not heritage assets in their own right but are flagged as important due to them conforming to certain historic criteria set out in the regulations, and as such have been considered in this chapter.

9.5.11 The sensitivity of the identified heritage assets (**Appendix 9.1**, Figures 8 and 24) is considered low for most of the buried archaeological remains within areas BA1, BA2, BA3

and BA10, but high for the buried archaeological remains within Walls Field. The sensitivity of the hedgerows is considered low.

9.5.12 The magnitude of the impact is considered large (adverse) due to the complete removal of archaeological remains and parts of the hedgerows during the construction works.

9.5.13 The significance of effect, without mitigation, would therefore be considered moderate adverse

Indirect Impacts

9.5.14 Indirect (non-physical) impacts caused from a change to the setting of designated heritage assets could occur during construction activity due to the presence of machinery, construction traffic and general construction activities taking place. Such effects are temporary.

9.5.15 The designated heritage assets considered to have the potential to experience this type of impact are:

- Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305); and
- Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548).

9.5.16 These were identified by undertaking a setting assessment (Section 9.4 above).

9.5.17 During construction, works within BA1 would be clearly visible from the Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548), and works within BA3 would be clearly visible from the Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305) due to their close proximity and intervisibility. Works within areas BA2 and BA10 would not be clearly visible from the designated heritage assets due to the lack of significant intervisibility between the Site and the setting of these assets, as noted during the setting assessment. Due to the proximity of these designated heritage assets to the Site, the indirect impact of the construction work is not limited to its visual aspect, but also the associated temporary noise aspect associated with construction work and potential for increased light, with lighting expected to be used and issues related to light spillage and glare.

9.5.18 The heritage assets are considered of high sensitivity.

9.5.19 The magnitude of the impact during construction is considered negligible due to the temporary nature of the impacts and the evidential focus of the significance of the scheduled monuments on their below-ground, archaeological value.

9.5.20 As such, the temporary significance of effect, without mitigation, is considered **Minor Adverse**.

Post-Completion Stage

- 9.5.21 This section assesses the impacts on the significance of the archaeological assets during the post-completion stage of the project. As such, the impact significance is identified taking into account the mitigation that will be present once construction is complete (i.e., preservation in situ).

Direct Impacts

- 9.5.22 No direct (physical) impacts will occur to the non-designated archaeological remains and historic hedgerows during the post-completion stage of the project. This is because the identified impacts to archaeological remains would occur and have been mitigated during the construction phase through industry standard archaeological fieldwork and recording. As such, this is not considered further.
- 9.5.23 However, the designated scheduled monument of the Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305) will be removed from agricultural cultivation and will become an area of informal open space managed in accordance with a Historic Environment Management Plan. This will remove the slow rate of adverse change that is currently affecting the preservation of the archaeological remains within the scheduled area from their slow erosion by ploughing.
- 9.5.24 The scheduled area within Walls Field is considered high sensitivity.
- 9.5.25 The magnitude of impact during the post-construction stage is considered small (beneficial) due to the slowing of the erosion of the archaeological remains associated with the Roman settlement.
- 9.5.26 As such, the significance of effect is considered **Moderate Beneficial**.

Indirect Impacts

- 9.5.27 Indirect (non-physical) impacts, relating to changes in the setting of the designated heritage assets, could occur during the post-completion stage of the Proposed Development due to the presence of new buildings, changes in the landscape and increased lighting and traffic (and associated noise and pollution). The designated heritage assets considered for this type of impact are:
- Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305); and
 - Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548).
- 9.5.28 Once the Proposed Development has been constructed, based on the indicative Parameter Plan supplied and Development Specification, there is the potential for a change in the settings of these heritage assets. This is because the Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305) is within the Walls Field area of the

- development, adjacent to area BA3 and overlooked by area BA2, and the Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548) is in close proximity (within 20m) to area BA1. Both of these designated heritage assets share intervisibility with parts of the Proposed Development that will incorporate above ground structures that will overlook the scheduled areas. These buildings will be up to three storeys (12.5m).
- 9.5.29 Other areas of the Proposed Development (BA10, the eastern part of BA1 and the northern part of BA3) share more limited intervisibility with the designated heritage assets due to the topography of the area and the existing development of the area.
- 9.5.30 With regard to lighting, the assessment of lighting levels (Chapter 15) indicates that there will be a slight increase in light sky glow, site aura and light presence, as well as light 'glare' and visual intrusion from the construction processes. Proposed mitigation aims to reduce light spill and glare by focusing the direction of light into the development area and away from adjacent sites, where possible, and by using dark sky compliant lanterns.
- 9.5.31 The assessment of noise levels (Chapter 5) indicates that this would be dominated by road and rail traffic, and that this would be unlikely to vary considerably from those that have already been established.
- 9.5.32 Although the Proposed Development is intending to minimise traffic through the town with embedded mitigation to reduce/restrict traffic flows on North Road and Station Road, and thereby near the scheduled monuments, it is expected that there will be an increase in the traffic levels along Clothall Road and Wallington Road due to the increased population of the town (Chapter 4). Despite the proposals relating to traffic including two junctions (one bus only, one vehicular) off North Road and into BA1 where it overlooks the Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548), the closure of Bygrave Road to most vehicular access and the other principal access into BA1 (the largest area of residential development) at its opposite end, there is an expected reduction in traffic around the area of the Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548). However, along Clothall Road and Wallington Road, both adjacent to Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305), there is an expected increase in traffic.
- 9.5.33 With the increase in traffic, so too comes an increase in noise, with road traffic identified as the main existing constraint due to the proximity of the A1(M) and A505. The presence of both designated heritage assets alongside North Road/Clothall Road, a primary road through Baldock, suggest that there would be an expected increase in both traffic and pollution. However, the traffic forecast (Appendix 4.6 indicates that this will be reduced adjacent to the Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548) but increased adjacent to the Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305).
- 9.5.34 The heritage assets are considered of high sensitivity.

- 9.5.35 The magnitude of the impact during the post-completion stage is considered negligible to the Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548) due to its significance relating to its evidential, archaeological value and the setting being of modern agriculture and residential development in the direction of the Site. The magnitude of the impact during the post-completion stage is considered small (beneficial) for the Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305) due to its removal from agricultural cultivation reducing its erosion from ploughing, and creating green open space that is accessible to local communities. Adding in interpretation boards would also increase this benefit in making the scheduled monument better appreciated.
- 9.5.36 As such, the significance of effect is considered minor adverse for the Settlement site south of Blackhorse Farm (NHLE 1003548) and moderate beneficial for the Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305). It is also considered that the **Minor Adverse** impact would lessen over time, as planting around the Site matures, reducing the visibility of the buildings.

9.6 MITIGATION MEASURES

Construction Stage

- 9.6.1 Standard approaches to archaeological mitigation would be undertaken to ensure any remains which are located within the Proposed Development are excavated and recorded to a level appropriate to their heritage significance.
- 9.6.2 The completed trial trench evaluations have identified areas of significant buried archaeological remains (**Appendix 9.1**, Figure 8) that may be impacted by the development. Once the outline planning application is approved, and as part of forthcoming reserved matters applications, those areas of significant buried archaeological remains which may be directly impacted by the development works, will be proposed for excavation and recording to ensure that they are appropriately managed prior to and /or during construction. Identification of these areas for mitigation would be undertaken by HCC HEAS and detailed within a Written Scheme of Investigation, submitted to and approved by them.
- 9.6.3 Consultation with the HCC HEAS has been sought to discuss these potential areas, with initial thoughts provided by HCC HEAS on potential mitigation areas.
- 9.6.4 This approach to mitigation of impact to archaeological remains is considered industry standard in terms of ensuring they are appropriately preserved by record and the residual effect is generally considered to be possible to reduce or offset to non-significant in EIA terms. Industry standard good practice for archaeological mitigation for this site would be considered open area excavation, including presentation of analysis results within a publication and the physical archive being deposited with a local museum. This option involves machine stripping of topsoil/subsoil to the archaeological horizon. Features are excavated by hand to a percentage agreed with the HCC HEAS. This technique is often used where buried archaeological remains are of importance and associated significance which requires a high sampling percentage of the remains.
- 9.6.5 The archaeological mitigation (excavation and recording) works agreed with NCC HEAS would be timetabled to take place following approval of the outline planning application and prior to construction works commencing. It is expected this would be secured by a planning condition. It is anticipated that a phased approach will be taken to the construction of the development, commencing in area BA2, before progressing west to east across BA1 and BA10, and finishing in BA3. A phased approach to excavation may be undertaken to reflect this, where areas of archaeology are cleared to allow plots to be built.
- 9.6.6 Mitigation for the protection of historic hedgerows considered important has been incorporated into the design specification with the intention to retain as much of the trees/hedgerows and vegetation of value within the development. Although this would

not include all of the hedgerows of interest, due to the access to the different areas from along the roads that follow the parish boundaries, this indicates that parts of the hedgerows marking these boundaries will not be removed. These boundaries are also not hedged along their entire length.

- 9.6.7 If any areas in addition to Walls Field are identified for preservation in situ rather than further archaeological mitigation, regular recorded site visits could be undertaken to ensure that no construction activity takes place within them, except for any that are previously agreed. The preservation of areas of archaeological interest by preservation, would maintain the archaeological value of these remains, thereby retaining their medium significance.
- 9.6.8 With regard to the indirect impacts on designated heritage assets during the construction stage, in terms of the additional visual and auditory impacts, mitigation will utilise the best available techniques as outlined in the OCEMP, and subsequent detailed CEMPS, including confined operational times, the erection of temporary screens. For visual impacts in particular, mitigation will include limiting access to the Site to specific points (off North Road for BA1, off Clothall Road for BA2 and BA3, and off Royston Road for BA10), retaining as much tree and scrub /shrub vegetation as possible, and where it currently acts as screening but is to be removed as part of the development it will be retained for as long as possible before removal. For auditory impacts, mitigation will include regular machine maintenance, avoiding unnecessary noise and turning engines off when possible to reduce the scale of the identified negligible impacts.

Post-Completion Stage

- 9.6.9 The Walls Field area, being entirely a strategic green space with no built development or above ground infrastructure works including access routes, compounds and storage areas (with the exception of interpretation boards) permitted. As such, it forms an area of preservation in situ. Any areas of preservation in situ identified would be marked on all plans as an area not to be entered other than for specified and agreed purposes. While Walls Field already forms a discrete area that would be able to be monitored for infringements, if any areas of preservation in situ are identified elsewhere, they would need to be marked and physically protected on the ground to ensure against accidental access.
- 9.6.10 If any construction work becomes required within the Walls Field area, Scheduled Monument Consent will be required.
- 9.6.11 Regular recorded site visits could be undertaken to ensure that no construction activity takes place within Walls Field, except for any that are previously agreed and, if they are required, that they have Scheduled Monument Consent. The preservation of the remains within the scheduled area, would maintain the archaeological value of these remains, thereby retaining their high significance. Furthermore, making the land accessible as

green space to local communities, with additional interpretation /ability to appreciate the scheduled monument, will be a benefit to the scheduled monument.

- 9.6.12 With the indirect post-completion stage affects limited to the indirect visual and auditory impacts, mitigation for this stage is limited to providing a buffer between the designated archaeological sites and the built development, which has been included as embedded mitigation along the western edge of BA1.
- 9.6.13 In addition, trees or hedges could also be used as screening in order to soften the appearance of the buildings. The use of trees and hedges, although enclosing the scheduled areas more, would reflect their existing setting where planting has already been used alongside residential developments.
- 9.6.14 As with during the construction stage, the mitigation suggested here would not completely offset the negligible impacts identified of the Proposed Development on the archaeological assets. However, they would help to reduce the scale of the impacts by providing some buffering to the Proposed Development. It is also considered that the benefits of bringing the Walls Field scheduled monument (NHLE 1016305) out of arable agriculture into open green space with public access is a benefit that offsets any potential impact.

9.7 RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Construction Stage

Non-designated heritage assets

- 9.7.1 Following the implementation of archaeological excavation and recording, the buried archaeological remains will have been preserved by record, resulting in a lowering or offsetting of the direct impact to one which is considered non-significant in EIA terms (i.e., the residual effect can be considered negligible).
- 9.7.2 Following the implementation of areas of archaeological preservation in situ, and the removal of these from agricultural cultivation, the buried archaeological remains of medium significance will have been preserved for the future, resulting in a lowering or offsetting of the direct impact to one which is considered non-significant in EIA terms (i.e., the residual effect can be considered **Negligible**).

Designated heritage assets

- 9.7.3 Following the use of the most suitable machinery and confined operational times, the visual and auditory impact of the proposed construction works on the setting of the designated heritage assets will have been reduced to one which is considered non-significant in EIA terms (i.e., the residual effect can be considered **Negligible**).

Post-Completion Stage

Designated heritage assets

- 9.7.4 Following the removal of the Walls Field area from agricultural cultivation, the erosion of the archaeological remains within the area will be reduced and the high significance maintained. As a result, the impact on the setting of these designated remains will remain **Moderate Beneficial**.
- 9.7.5 Following the use of mitigation buffer zones, material and planting, as well as staged increases in built development height, the visual and auditory impact of the Proposed Development will have been lowered to one that is considered non-significant in EIA terms (i.e., the residual effect can be considered **Negligible**),

Summary of Effects

9.7.6 The effects identified are summarised in **Table 9.5** below:

Table 9.5 – Summary of the Effects

Potential Effect	Significance (pre-mitigation)	Mitigation Measure	Significance of residual effect
Construction Stage			
Loss of archaeological remains	Moderate to major adverse	Archaeological excavation and recording; and preservation in situ	Negligible
Visual and auditory impact of works and machinery on designated archaeology	Minor adverse	Measures secured within OCEMP and detailed CEMPs e.g. Confined operational times, suitable machinery with regular maintenance, turning engines off when possible, the use of temporary screens, restricted access points, the retention of as much of the existing planting as possible, and its removal as late as possible where it is to be removed.	Negligible
Post-Completion Stage			
Removal of Scheduled remains in Walls Field from intensive agricultural cultivation	Moderate beneficial	Change of land use	Moderate beneficial
Visual and auditory impact of the finished development on designated archaeology	Minor adverse	Use of trees/hedgerows as buffers and screening	Negligible

9.8 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

9.8.1 The overarching method followed in identifying and assessing potential cumulative effects is based upon the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) Advice Note 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment (PINS 2017). Cumulative assessment in relation to heritage and archaeology has taken account of the other identified projects to determine if there is a reasonable likelihood that any cumulative effects would result from their construction and operation. The other proposed developments considered in this cumulative assessment are:

- LG1: Land to the North of Letchworth. North Herts Local Plan Strategic Housing Site LG1 for 900 dwellings. Strategic Masterplan has been adopted. OPA to be prepared; over 1km
- 21/00504/OP: Land to the east of Talbot Way And Kristiansand Way and Flint Road, Letchworth Garden City, SG6 1TY. North Herts Local Plan Housing Allocation LG3 for 120 dwellings. Outline planning permission granted on 3 April 2025, to be commenced; on cusp of 1km
- 22/00741/FP: Land west of Ashwell Road, Bygrave, SG7 5EB. 53.62ha Solar Photovoltaic Farm north of Bygrave. Full planning permission granted on 17 June 2024; over 1km from the Site, undulating ground
- 21/01882/FP: Land east of Rhee Spring and Orwell View, Royston Road, Baldock. North Herts Local Plan Local Housing Allocation BA4 for 42 dwellings. Appeal allowed on 20 May 2025, to be commenced.

9.8.2 **Table 9.6** sets out the potential impacts assessed in this chapter and identifies the potential for cumulative effects to arise, providing a rationale for such determinations.

Table 9.6 – Sensitivity of Receptors

Impact	Potential for Cumulative Effect?	Rationale
Construction Stage		
Indirect impacts on designated heritage assets	No	In combination, effects of developments' construction will not result in a cumulative impact to designated heritage assets through a change in their setting as the other proposed developments do not share significant intervisibility with the designated heritage assets due to their distance, the topography and surrounding development and infrastructure.
Direct impacts on non-designated heritage assets	Yes	Developments acting in combination can have a cumulative impact on the archaeological resource, which would affect the character and nature of the wider archaeological landscape.
Post-Completion Stage		
Indirect impacts on designated	Yes	In combination, effects of developments' post-completion can have a result in a cumulative

Impact	Potential for Cumulative Effect?	Rationale
heritage assets		impact to designated heritage assets through a change in their setting.
Direct impacts on non-designated heritage assets	No	Developments acting in combination will not have a direct impact during their post-completion stage as the non-designated heritage assets will have been mitigated during construction.

- 9.8.3 The only potential for cumulative effect during the construction stage is considered to be through direct impacts to non-designated heritage assets due to a removal of archaeological remains within the wider landscape. Although only one of these planning applications (21/01882/FP) is within 1km of the Site, all four can be associated with this cumulative impact due to the extent and spread of identified archaeological remains within the area.
- 9.8.4 As the removal of the archaeological remains would be (or already have been) undertaken pre-construction for the projects, undertaken by professional archaeologists and resulting in preservation by record for the archaeological remains, it can be considered that this effect is no greater than that considered within the main impact assessment. There is a further argument for the development-led archaeological works to aid in our understanding of the local historic landscape and known archaeological sites, which is a net benefit to archaeological research.
- 9.8.5 The only potential for cumulative effect during the post-completion stage is considered to be through indirect impacts to designated heritage assets due to the increased traffic. The traffic forecast (Appendix 4.5) incorporated the cumulative development impact into its forecast, meaning that increases adjacent to the scheduled areas are only expected along Clothall Road and Wallington Road, adjacent to the Romano-British small town and Late Iron Age settlement at Baldock (NHLE 1016305). The planning application associated with this cumulative impact is 21/01882/FP (BA4); the remainder are unlikely to result in an indirect impact to the designated heritage assets. This is due to the limited intervisibility between those sites and the designated heritage assets due to the distance, topography and intervening development and infrastructure, including the A1(M) for 21/00504/OP and the proposal for LG1, and the limited traffic associated with 22/00741/FP.
- 9.8.6 This assessment of cumulative effects has not identified impacts that are considered to be of any greater significance than those identified in isolation, with the traffic levels of cumulative development already factored into the assessment and no cumulative effects of significance are forecast.

9.9 REFERENCE LIST

- Atkins, 2013, Assessment of Heritage at Risk from Environmental Threat. Key messages Report, in Partnership with English Heritage (now Historic England)
- Baldock, Bygrave and Clothall Planning Group, 2021, Baldock, Bygrave and Clothall Neighbourhood Plan 2018-31
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2014, Code of Conduct (Reading: CIfA)
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2017, Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (Reading: CIfA)
- David Lock Associates, 2025, Growing Baldock. EIA Scoping Report
- Davies, R., 2016, North Baldock, Hertfordshire. Geophysical Survey Report, Stratascan rep. no. J9595, available from:
<https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/library/browse/issue.xhtml?recordId=1210190>
- Duff, M., 2025, 5260I Baldock Masterplan Drainage Strategy Report August 2025, AKT II
- Finn, C. and Muldowney, M., 2017, Archaeological Evaluation on Land Adjacent to Bygrave Road, Baldock, Hertfordshire, October to December 2016, MoLA Northampton, available from:
<https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/library/browse/issue.xhtml?recordId=1142087>
- Foster, S., 2024a, Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report for Land North of Baldock. Zone 5, MoLA rep. no. 4958E-AER-v.1.3_INTERIM
- Foster, S. and Daykin, A., 2025, Archaeological evaluation on Land North of Baldock, Phase 1. North Hertfordshire. March-June 2024, MoLA rep. no. 25/033
- Historic England, 2015a, The Historic Environment in Local Plans. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 1
- Historic England, 2015b, Making Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 2
- Historic England, 2017, The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd Edition). Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 3
- IEMA, 2021, Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), 2019, Planning Practice Guidance – Historic Environment
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), 2024, National Planning Policy Framework (revised)
- North Herts Council, 2022, North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031
- Oliveira, A., 2025, Archaeological evaluation on land north of Baldock, Zones 1-4, North Hertfordshire. August-November 2024, MoLA rep. no. 25/019
- PINS, 2017, Advice Note 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment, Bristol, PINS
- Urban&Civic and Hertfordshire County Council, 2025, Growing Baldock. EIA Scoping Report
- Webb, R., 2025, Land to the North and East of Baldock, Hertfordshire. Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, OA Report 2892