

- 7.30 The following buildings are Grade II Listed, and are attributed to the 18th century or early 19th century:
- The Cottage, Climping Street (**29**) c. 100m from the Site;
 - Dove Cottage (**26**) c. 350m from the Site;
 - Virginia Cottage, Climping Street (**28**) c. 450m from the Site;
 - The Black Horse Public House, Climping Street (**27**) c. 700m from the Site.
- 7.31 These buildings are located on Climping Street, to the south of Crookthorn Lane, which is considered to be one of the four traditional areas of Climping.
- 7.32 The Yeakel and Gardner Map of 1778 indicates that only Virginia Cottage and the Black Horse Public House building, considered to be a Land Mark Building by Arun District Council (ADC 2015) were present at this time. All buildings are extant on the Tithe map of 1843.
- 7.33 The original setting of these buildings is considered to be that indicated by the maps of 1778, and 1843, which show little development in the intervening years in the immediate area of Climping Street. The buildings appear to have been set with distinct plots of land, bordered in most cases by extant Sussex flint walls. The buildings are inward facing along the road, and would have enjoyed open views to the east and west from the rear.
- 7.34 The modern day setting of these buildings has changed little since this time; several modern residential properties have been constructed along the street but this has not significantly affected its historic character, which is considered to strongly reflect the original setting of the listed buildings. Views from the rear of these properties are still largely unaffected by modern development, although the Crookthorn Road is now a fast and busy dual carriage way which is joined from the northern end of the Climping Street and is likely visible from the rear of The Cottage (**29**).
- 7.35 It is considered highly unlikely that the proposed development will be viewed from the properties located to the south of Climping Street due to the general topography, which slopes southwards as well as intervening mature trees and buildings located at the rear of several of the properties.
- 7.36 There is potential for The Cottage (**29**) to experience a partial view of the proposed development beyond Crookthorn Lane, however, it is considered unlikely that this building was sited in this location for views to the north, as the building is facing southwards. Views to the rear of the building, in a northerly direction, have already undergone considerable change due to

the development of the farm building located immediately north of the property as a retail venue, and due to the increasing traffic along the Crookthorn Road. It is therefore considered that the setting of this building in this particular direction does not positively contribute towards the understanding of this particular heritage asset.

- 7.37 Taking these factors into consideration it is considered highly unlikely that the setting of these buildings will be affected by the proposed development.

Listed Buildings associated with Kents Farm

- 7.38 The following buildings are Grade II Listed, and are attributed to the 18th century:

- Kent's Farmhouse (**20**) c. 400m from the Site;
- Barn at Kent's Farm to the South East of the Farmhouse and to the South of Nos 1 And 2 Brookpits Manor Cottages (**21**) c. 500m from the Site;
- Nos. 1 and 2 Kents Dairy Cottages (**24**) c. 450m from the Site.

- 7.39 These buildings are associated with Kents Farm, one of the major farmsteads in ownership of Christs Hospitals at the time of the Tithe. The Farmhouse and Dairy buildings are seemingly extant in 1778 and the Barn is first identified on the Tithe Map of 1843. These buildings, although associated with Christs Hospital are not associated with the land that forms the Site.

- 7.40 The original setting of these buildings, as indicated in the map of 1778 consisted of fields and they are likely to have had views east and west of their locations, as indicated by the Character Plan produced by Arun District Council in 2015. Kents Farm House is also identified as a Landmark Building in this plan.

- 7.41 With the exception of the widening of the Crookthorn Lane, to the north, there has been very little, if any modern development in the immediate vicinity of these buildings. Therefore a strong sense of the original wider setting of the buildings has been maintained.

- 7.42 The buildings are all converted to residential dwellings and heavily screened from the surrounding landscape by dense, tall, mature trees that surround the properties, providing privacy from the small lane (Crookthorn Lane/Brookpit Lane) passing to their north. This screening of trees, noted in the Character Plan (ADC 2015) also, in part, serves to isolate the buildings from their original wider landscape setting.

- 7.43 As the buildings are located down slope, south of the Crookthorn Road / A25, and as the development is screened with mature trees, it is considered highly unlikely that views of the proposed development will be possible.
- 7.44 It is therefore considered highly unlikely that the setting of these buildings will be affected by the proposed development.

Listed Buildings associated with Brookpits Farm

- 7.45 The following buildings are Grade II Listed:
- Brookpits Manor (17) – 16th century - c. 500m from the Site.
 - Brookpits Cottage (23) – 18th century - c. 500m from the Site;
- 7.46 Brookpits Manor is a restored late 16th century house which is not related to a manorial estate (VCH, 1997). The house was divided into two cottages by 1914. Between 1972 and 1974 the property underwent extensive restoration to convert it back to a single dwelling. Original panelling and fittings survive, including brick fireplaces with four-centred arches; one on the first floor has the date 1656 moulded in plaster above it, probably indicating the date of building. The farm was owned by Christs Hospital, and the central two-storeyed gabled porch has the arms of Christs Hospital over it. It is believed that the farm was sold to Christs Hospital shortly before 1860 (VCH, 1997). These buildings, although associated with Christs Hospital are not associated with the land that forms the Site.
- 7.47 Brookpits Cottage is attributed to the 18th century, and is adjacent to the Manor building to the east.
- 7.48 Both buildings are south facing with far reaching views southwards across fields. The property boundary to the south is formed of a Sussex flint wall which extends across the front of both properties. The A259 links with Crookthorn Lane and forms the rear, northern boundary to both these properties. The A259 was constructed between 1937 and 1973 to provide access to Littlehampton.
- 7.49 The Yeakel and Gardner Map of 1778 indicates that the original setting of the two buildings was formed of the surrounding agricultural land and associated farmstead buildings. The flood plain land of the River Arun lay nearby to the east.
- 7.50 These buildings, although associated with Christs Hospital are not associated with the land that forms the Site. The southward facing aspect of the buildings negates any major views of the proposed development in this direction.

- 7.51 Views from the rear of the buildings, in a northerly direction, have already undergone considerable change due to the construction of the A259 that now forms the rear boundaries of the two properties. It is therefore considered that the setting of the buildings in this direction does not positively contribute towards the understanding of these particular heritage assets.
- 7.52 Taking these factors into consideration it is considered highly unlikely that the setting of these buildings will be affected by the proposed development.

Climping Deserted Medieval Village – Scheduled Monument (12)

- 7.53 The Scheduled Monument of Climping Deserted Medieval Village (DMV) is located at its closest point c. 100m from the Site, next to St Marys Church, associated with the DMV and known to have been established by 1086. The earthworks include rectangular house platforms, depressions and banks up to 1.2m high. An area of flint metalling is considered to be a trackway associated with the village. A trial cutting revealed brick and stone walling of buildings as well as medieval pottery sherds on the site. In 1999, an archaeological watching brief nearby at Church Farm Cottage, west of the remains, recorded pits of medieval and post-medieval date, medieval pottery and animal remains suggesting that the village extended in this direction.
- 7.54 The original setting of this monument is considered to be much the same as St Marys Church, which is thought likely to be contemporary with the medieval village, but not shown on maps until 1778. To the east of the church lay the River Arun and the area between comprised flood plain land. Further to the west, the then small town of Littlehampton lay on the opposite side of the River Arun. The area to the north, west and south mainly comprised an agricultural landscape, with field boundaries clearly dividing the surrounding landscape at this time.
- 7.55 Due to the considerable development located immediately to the north of St Marys Church and west of the monument, the current day wider setting of the monument is considered no longer representative of the original setting of the monument and does not significantly contribute to the understanding of the heritage asset in this direction.
- 7.56 The immediate setting to the north which takes in views of St Marys Church, the south and to the east of the monument remains largely unchanged, and is considered to make a significant contribution to the setting of the monument. Views in this direction are not towards the proposed development, which lies to the southwest of the monument.

- 7.57 Views towards the proposed development from the monument are screened by dense, tall, mature trees surrounding the properties adjacent to the west side of Church Road.
- 7.58 Taking these factors into consideration it is therefore highly unlikely that the setting of this monument will be affected by the proposed development.

8.0 ASSESSMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

8.1 Introduction

- 8.1.1 A preliminary review of the known heritage resource indicates that there are no known heritage assets within the proposed development area, however there are two designated heritage assets – the deserted medieval village of Climping and St Marys Church, located in close proximity to the Site boundary.
- 8.1.2 Modern redevelopment of the immediate surrounding area of the Site has enabled various small scale archaeological investigations to take place which have revealed evidence of activity from all periods.
- 8.1.3 It is therefore considered that there is the potential for as yet unknown heritage assets of archaeological interest (i.e. below-ground archaeological remains) to be present within the proposed development area.

8.2 Prehistoric

- 8.2.1 The results of the research carried out as part of this study have established that remains dating to the prehistoric period have been identified within the 1km Study Area, during the development of the area to the immediate north of the Site, as well as during the laying of pipelines, along the eastern boundary of the Site. Further remains dating to this period have been located during redevelopment works at the former Ford Aerodrome site, located north of the Site, from archaeological works conducted at the nearby Oyster Catcher Inn, located immediately to the southwest of the Site, and at various other locations within the 1km Study Area.
- 8.2.2 The potential of the Site to contain as yet unknown heritage assets of this date is therefore considered to be **Medium**.

8.3 Romano-British

- 8.3.1 Discovery of Roman date finds are more limited within the 1km Study Area, but have been found along the eastern boundary of the Site during the laying of pipelines, as well as at the former Ford Aerodrome site, located north of the Site.
- 8.3.2 Based on the above, the potential of the Site to contain as yet unknown heritage assets of this date is considered to be **Low-Medium**.

8.4 Anglo-Saxon

- 8.4.1 The HER data pertaining to the Anglo-Saxon period is also limited within the 1km Study Area. However, the two recorded instances of the discovery

of Anglo-Saxon date finds have been recovered from archaeological works just north of the Site boundary during archaeological works at the former nurseries, as well as during the laying of pipelines along the eastern boundary of the Site area.

- 8.4.2 Therefore, the potential of the Site to contain as yet unknown heritage assets of this date is therefore considered to be **Low-Medium**.

8.5 Medieval

- 8.5.1 There are no sites of finds dating to this period within the Site area itself, however, St Marys Church is known to have been established by 1086, and is associated with the deserted/shrunken medieval village of Climping, which lies c.100m east of the Site boundary.

- 8.5.2 The area of the deserted/shrunken medieval village is likely to have extended to the area adjacent to the Site, as evidenced by the archaeological works conducted in 1999 at Church Farm House (25), located to the north of the Site boundary. It is possible that the deserted/shrunken medieval village may have extended further into the area of the Site. However, given the location of Church Farm and the probability that the farm is older than the extant farm buildings (CKC, 1999), it is reasonable to suggest that the Site area was within the agricultural fields associated with Church Farm at this time.

- 8.5.3 Based upon the above, the potential of the Site to contain as yet unknown heritage assets related to the deserted/shrunken medieval village of Climping is considered to be **Low- Medium**.

- 8.5.4 Based upon the above, the potential of the Site to contain as yet unknown heritage assets related to medieval date agricultural activity is considered to be **Medium-High**.

8.6 Post-Medieval

- 8.6.1 The development area for this period is relatively well understood through a combination of the HER data records and cartographic sources, and indicates that the land that forms the Site area was used for agricultural purposes throughout this period and remained undeveloped.

- 8.6.2 Various sources consulted as part of this appraisal record the presence of buildings within the Site. These are located to the north of the Site where two small buildings likely to have been part of the western extent of Church Farm were extant until c. 1937, and to the west of the Site, where an 'L' Shaped building was extant until at least 1981. The 'L' shaped building was of 19th century date and built near to an earlier building identified in the cartographic sources from 1778.

- 8.6.3 Based on the above it is considered highly likely that building remains are present at the Site in the identified areas. Due to the continued use of the Site for agricultural purposes until the present day, the Site also has a **Medium-High** potential to contain as yet unknown heritage assets related to post-medieval date agricultural activity.

8.7 Summary of Potential

- 8.7.1 A desk-based assessment can generally only consider the potential of a site in principle. As is the case here, its conclusions usually require testing by fieldwork in order to confirm whether remains are actually present and, if this is the case, to establish their character, condition and extent and thus indicate the weight that ought to be attached to their preservation. It must always be acknowledged that remains of a type for which there is no prior evidence may be found on a site by fieldwork.

- 8.7.2 The potential for discovery of heritage assets has been revealed by a review of the known cultural new heritage baseline in the immediate vicinity. The estimated potential for heritage assets being located within the Site can be summarised thus:

- Prehistoric - Medium;
- Roman – Low-Medium;
- Anglo-Saxon – Low-Medium;
- Medieval (related to DMV) - Low-Medium;
- Medieval (related to agricultural activity) – Medium-High;
- Post-medieval (related to agricultural activity) – Medium-High;
- Post-medieval (related to surviving building foundations) – High.

8.8 Preliminary Assessment of Significance

- 8.8.1 The significance of a heritage asset is ‘the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest’ (NPPF 2012, Glossary). Given that this desk-based assessment has only been able to establish the potential for heritage assets to be present within the Site in principle the significance of such assets cannot be conclusively determined at the present time.

- 8.8.2 However, it is likely that any archaeological remains, should they be present are likely to be of the following significance:

- Prehistoric - Local;
- Roman – Local;
- Anglo-Saxon – Local;
- Medieval (related to DMV) – Regional/National;
- Medieval (related to agricultural activity) – Local;
- Post-medieval (related to agricultural activity and related to surviving building foundations) – Local.

9.0 EXISTING IMPACTS ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

- 9.1 The results of the research carried out as part of this study indicate that there has been little construction activity at the Site from at least the late 18th century. Two discrete areas of development have been identified, located to the north and to the west, where several small buildings were constructed between 1778 and 1876. In these areas the construction of the buildings is likely to have destroyed or severely truncated any archaeological deposits, however, given the potential date of construction, the remains of these buildings, if present, maybe considered to be of historical interest in their own right.
- 9.2 The Tithe Map of 1843 indicates that the Site was utilised for agricultural purposes as arable fields at this time; the subsequent cartographic sources indicate that the fields have remained in agricultural use since this date, and are currently utilised as arable fields.
- 9.3 As the Site continues to be used for arable/agricultural purposes, it is considered likely that any below ground archaeological features, should they be present, will at least have been partially truncated by cultivation/ploughing. It is likely that only deeper archaeological features, should they be present, survive.

10.0 IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

10.0.1 In considering the significance of the impact of the development on any heritage assets that are present it is necessary to understand both the significance of the asset and the likely degree of impact (e.g. how much of the asset will be destroyed). Although presence/absence and significance of any heritage assets on the site is undetermined there is potential for such assets to be present. As heritage assets are a fragile and non-renewable resource such impacts on them are considered to be adverse.

10.0.2 The development will include excavation for foundations and services, as well as the construction of roads, and landscaping of gardens/open areas and spaces.

10.0.3 Based upon the above, the following impacts have therefore been reasonably assumed:

10.1 Impacts on designated heritage assets

Physical impacts on designated heritage assets

10.1.1 This report concludes that there will be no physical impact to any designated heritage asset.

Setting Issues relating to designated sites

10.1.2 Based upon the research conducted as part of this study, it is concluded that there are unlikely to be any setting issues arising from the development at the Site.

10.1.3 As detailed design plans were not available at the time of writing, it is recommended that:

- the mature tree bordering the Site are retained;
- that the height, scale and form of the proposed buildings respect that of nearby Listed Buildings;
- that the proposed buildings utilise local materials in keeping with nearby Listed Buildings.

10.2 Impacts on non-designated heritage assets

Physical impacts on non-designated heritage assets

10.2.1 Based upon reasonable assumed construction activities for a development of this type, it is considered likely that construction activities will severely

truncate, if not completely destroy any subsurface archaeological features that exist at the Site.

Setting Issues relating to non-designated heritage assets

10.2.2 No setting issues relating to non-designated heritage assets have been identified.

11.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.1 The assessment has outlined the archaeological potential of the Site and examined the effects of existing impacts and as far as possible, proposed impacts upon that potential. This assessment is based on a desk-based survey of existing information, and cannot therefore be considered to be a definitive statement on the presence or absence of archaeological deposits in any given area. A site assessed as having low potential may still contain unsuspected archaeological deposits.
- 11.2 The archaeological potential has been assessed as Medium for archaeological remains of prehistoric date, as Low-Medium for remains of Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon date, Low - Medium for archaeological remains of medieval date where they are related to the deserted/shrunken medieval village of Climping, and Medium-High for archaeological remains of medieval and post-medieval date related to agricultural activity, across all areas of the Site. The assessment has identified two discrete areas of previous development relating to the construction of small buildings between 1778 and 1876, the remains of which are considered likely to be present, especially to the west of the Site.
- 11.3 The development will have a direct impact upon any archaeological remains, should they be present and further archaeological investigation is necessary to determine the presence, or absence, and condition of survival, of any such remains.
- 11.4 The following provisional recommendations are suggested:
- It is recommended that an archaeological geophysical survey of the Site is undertaken ahead of ground works;
 - It is also recommended that a programme of surface artefact collection (field walking) is undertaken, if conditions allow ahead of ground works;
 - The results of the above surveys can be used to determine the requirement for further investigation, such as evaluation by trial trenching, should it be warranted.
- 11.5 Based upon the research conducted as part of this study, it is concluded that there are unlikely to be any setting issues arising from the development at the Site.
- 11.6 The requirement for and scope of any further archaeological work will be determined by the Local Planning Authority (Arun District Council) and their archaeological advisors (West Sussex County Council).

12.0 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Archaeology South-East would like to thank the following for their help and advice in the preparation of this report:

John Baird;

Parker Dann Chartered Town Planning;

The Staff at the West Sussex Records Office for provision of documents.

13 REFERENCES

- Archaeology South East, 2000. *Archaeological Investigations at Fordacres, Horsemere Green Lane, Climping, West Sussex.*
- Archaeology South East, 2000. *An Archaeological Evaluation at Chesswood Mushroom Farm, Horsemere, Green Lane, Climping, West Sussex.*
- Archaeology South East, 2001. *An Archaeological Evaluation at Cropthorne, Horsemere Green Lane, Climping, West Sussex.*
- Archaeology South East, 2005a. *Summary Interim Report on Archaeological Excavations on land to the rear of the "Oystercatcher" Public House and Restaurant, Yapton Road, Climping, West Sussex.*
- Archaeology South-East, 2005b. *An Archaeological Evaluation of Land to the rear of the "Oystercatcher" Public House and Restaurant, Yapton Road, Climping, West Sussex.*
- Archaeology South East, 2009. *Archaeological Excavations on land to the rear of the "Oystercatcher" Public House and Restaurant, Yapton Road, Climping. Report No.2009001.*
- Archaeology South-East, 2011. *Archaeological Excavations on Land to the rear of the "Oystercatcher" Public House and Restaurant, Yapton Road, Climping, West Sussex - Post-Excavation Summary and Proposals for Publication. Project Number: 2064.*
- Arun District Council (ADC), 2015. *Clymping Character Assessment.*
- A. P. Baggs and H. M. Warne, 1997. '*Climping*', in *A History of the County of Sussex: Volume 5, Part 1, Arundel Rape: South-Western Part, Including Arundel, The Victoria History of the Counties of England*, ed. T P Hudson, pp. 126-147
- Brandon, P., 1974. *The Sussex Landscape*. Hodder and Stoughton.
- Brandon, P.F. and Short., B. 1990. *The South-East from AD 1000*, London: Longman.
- Butler, C., 2008. *West Sussex Under Attack*. The History Press.
- CKC Archaeology, 1999. *An Archaeological Watching Brief at Church Farm Cottage, Church Lane, Climping, West Sussex.*
- Drewett, P. 1999. Later Hunter Gatherers, in Leslie, K. & Short, B. (eds.), *An Historical Atlas of Sussex*. Chichester: Phillimore.