

Minutes

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT FORUM

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BUCKINGHAMSHIRE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT FORUM HELD ON WEDNESDAY 2 MAY 2012 IN MEZZANINE ROOM 1, COUNTY HALL, AYLESBURY, COMMENCING AT 2.30 PM AND CONCLUDING AT 4.21 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Members

Mr C Cashman
Mr R Evans
Mr R Pushman (Chairman)
Mr N Crank

Organisation

Aylesbury Vale District Council
Diocese of Oxford
Buckinghamshire County Council
Milton Keynes Council

Officers

Mr M Andrew
Mr J Brushe
Mr S Kidd
Mr B Thorn
Ms J Wise
Ms K MacDonald
Ms E Hands

Organisation

Wycombe District Council
South Bucks District Council
Buckinghamshire County Council
Bucks County Museum
Buckinghamshire County Council
Buckinghamshire County Council
Aylesbury Vale District Council

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Apologies of absence were received from Hugh McCarthy, Mike Farley, Gary Marshall and Eliza Alqassar.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Cashman declared an interest as a Member of the National Trust and Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2011 were confirmed.

4 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Mr Kidd asked Members to note that the publication of the National Planning Policy



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



Framework.'

5 HIGH SPEED TWO (HS2)

Members received the report of the County Archaeologist on High Speed Two (HS2).

Mr Kidd reported the following:

- The Government announced the intention to proceed with HS2 in January.
- A timetable has been published
- The Government aims to lay a Hybrid Bill before Parliament by the end of 2013 which is a tight timeframe
- This means there is less than one year to produce an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which is a short timeframe for such a large project.
- Paragraph 6 of the report highlights the main changes for Buckinghamshire and the Historic Environment.
- Different consultants are being asked to carry out the assessments on different parts of the route and not more than one consultant can carry out more than 2 assessments. This raises concerns how the assessments will be merged, how will consistently be achieved and how can residents be assured that the breaking up of the assessment of the route does not disadvantage local areas.
- There is 573 listed buildings within 1km of the line
- 0.29km of the route passes through Hartwell Park
- The route cuts through Grims Ditch
- 64km of the route passes through known areas of archaeological interest
- 107km is in the Chilterns AONB (excluding bored tunnel)
- In Turweston the cutting is 100m wide and there is huge variation in the scheme
- The real impact is much wider and this has not been specified in any detail
- There is a proposed viaduct in a major ecological setting of important heritage assets where visual or noise aspects should be a consideration
- There will be a huge impact on the character of the Chilterns and members need to get involved
- AONB is not registered in cultural chapter
- The National Trust is interested in pushing for tunnelling in the area
- Members may feel that they have not been given enough information to feed into the scope. E.g. Landscape effect
- Is the consultation really meaningful – considering the timeframe?

A Member commented that he had looked at the proposed route along the Missendens and said that the tunnel and cutting with ventilation shafts will be a major construction in the area. He raised concern about construction camps which would be needed for workers.

Mr Kidd invited Members to comment on the issues raised in the HS2 EIA Scoping Consultation. He asked Members to look at the document – 'Cultural Heritage' which had been circulated to Members and consider the points in relation to the landscape and noise. He asked for Members to email him any comments.

Mr Kidd then advised that HS2 Ltd had set up Community Forums and described the structure. It was suggested that there could be an advice note aimed at Community Forums.

Members agreed to:

- a) Email comments on issues raised by the HS2 EIA scoping consultation to Mr Kidd
- b) Establish a working party to advise member organisations and local groups on the heritage implications of HS2, especially through preparation of an advice note and input to the local planning forum and community forums.
- c) Agreed that Hartwell registered historic park and Grim's Ditch scheduled monument be put forward for addition to English Heritage's 'heritage at risk' register.

6 MILTON KEYNES ARCHAEOLOGICAL OFFICER'S REPORT

Members had received and were invited to note the report.

Mr Crank advised that one piece of fieldwork stood out – Manor Farm Quarry, Wolverton. He said that the waterlogged remains included two log ladders which were iron age, possibly bronze age and were in excess of 2 metres long in a waterhole feature. He said that the investigation was part of the Western Expansion area.

7 BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGIST'S REPORT

Members had received and were invited to note the report.

Mr Kidd informed the Forum that the County Council's Planning, Environment and Development Service and Transport for Buckinghamshire had been merged to create a new 'PLACE' service. The Forum was advised that the County Archaeological Service no longer existed as a separate entity but had been combined with the natural environment, landscapes and rights of way definitive map in the Planning, Advisory and Compliance Service's (PACs), environmental and information team.

8 BUCKINGHAMSHIRE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD: UPDATE

Members had received and were invited to note the report.

Ms Wise advised that at the March 2011 meeting of the Forum it had been agreed that the top priority for HER enhancement in 2011/12 should be inputting local buildings of note in Wycombe, Chiltern and South Bucks. She said that there had been progress on adding local buildings of note and that Wycombe and Chiltern Districts have been completed. She said that the progress on South Bucks District had been slower as unfortunately the volunteer had left and Julia will be carrying the work forward onto next year's workload, although she hoped that this would be done quickly.

Members were informed that prompted by the offer of volunteers by the War Memorials Trust, a project was begun to input records of war memorial onto the HER. She said that unfortunately the promise of volunteers from the Trust was not forthcoming but that HER volunteers were currently working on the project and 70% had been completed. She said that once data entry is completed the intention is to visit the accessible memorials, photograph them and carry out a condition survey.

The Officer was asked if she knew the number of hits to the website. She advised that the statistics were not current available but that as soon as they were she would let the Forum know.

9 COUNTY MUSEUM REPORT

Members were invited to note the County Museum Report.

Mr Thorn advised that the museum would be submitting a bid to the HLF for a major capital redevelopment of the resource centre at Halton to make it more fit for purpose. He also informed Members that as from next year the Museum would be run as a charity.

10 NATIONAL TRUST REPORT

Members had received and were invited to note the report.

Mr Evans commented that Ms Pudney had been heavily involved in the New Inn, Stowe restoration project and said she had done a splendid job.

11 CHURCH ARCHAEOLOGY

Mr Evans reported on behalf of Mr Julian Munby, Diocesan Archaeological Advisor who advised that the DAC continues to give advice on the need for archaeological work where not covered by secular controls. He advised that reports had been received from:

- Holy Trinity Church, Old Wolverton, Milton Keynes – Archaeological Watching Brief (burials and ground formation from former castle)
- High Wycombe Bellframe recording
- Archaeological Watching Brief at Holy Cross Church, Slapton, (Church foundations and ditch)
- St Mary's Church, Wavendon, (Burials)
- All Saints High Wycombe (Burial vaults, tile floor)

12 CONSERVATION OFFICERS' REPORTS

(i) AYLESBURY VALE

Ms Hands advised of the following:

- There had been a dip in listed buildings/planning applications, although numbers were now starting to pick up.
- Officers had now moved offices and were now based at the Gateway, Aylesbury.
- Wendover and Padbury Conservation Areas had been approved
- Aston Stanford was out to public consultation and Ashendon, Bishopstone, Sedrup and Hartwell would be going out to public consultation shortly.
- Major development applications have been submitted for Hampden Fields and Fleet Marsden
- The development at Bierton has been through the planning process and is subject to a Section 106 agreement.
- AVDC is looking at a Highways Protocol regarding street signage, lighting etc in Conservation Areas.
- The Heritage Towns Event was very popular.

(ii) **CHILTERN**

Nothing to report

(iii) **MILTON KEYNES**

Mr Crank advised of the following:

- MK Full Council passed a motion to undertake a local list. The team will meet with key stakeholders to take this project forward.

(iv) **SOUTH BUCKS**

Mr Brushe advised of the following:

- The Clock Tower in Cliveden is now complete

(v) **WYCOMBE**

Mr Andrews advised of the following:

- A meeting will be held with Chiltern Railways to progress work at High Wycombe Station
- Bledlow has been sold
- Three Conservation Areas are currently out to consultation: Amersham Hill, Leigh Street Furniture area and Priory Avenue.
- Work at Fawley Court is ongoing

13 EMERGENCY RECORDING FUND:

Members had received the report of the Treasurer.

The Forum was asked to approve a funding request from Milton Keynes Council, which was agreed.

The Forum was then asked to agree to a contribution request of £2000 for 2012/13 in accordance with the formula contained in the report. A Member commented that when the Emergency Recording Fund was initially started it was agreed that there would be an annual weighted contribution. He suggested that a £1000 contribution could be requested each year for the next five years, split in accordance with the weighting formula. In response it was commented that Officers may not have the authority to agree this and it was agreed that Officers would discuss with Cabinet Members if necessary.

Action: Conservation Officers

14 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr Kidd advised that he had been contacted by Detective Inspector Harrison regarding a hate crime initiative. Mr Kidd asked Members to notify him if they had received any similar contact, commenting that Thames Valley Police were trying to promote the initiative within the Thames Valley area.

He also advised Members that he had been alerted to the fact that metal detectors were being used on the Berryfields site by individuals who did not have permission to be on the site.

15 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on 26 September 2012, 2.30pm, Mezz 2, County Hall, Aylesbury, Bucks

CHAIRMAN

AGENDA ITEM 5

HIGH SPEED 2

To: Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum

Date: 2nd May 2012

Authors: Report of the County Archaeologist

A. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1 To advise members of the consultation on scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment for HS2 and discuss and help co-ordinate historic environment responses.

B. PROPOSED ACTION

- 2 The Forum is invited to:

- a) **COMMENT on issues raised by the HS2 EIA scoping consultation.**
- b) **ESTABLISH a working party to advise member organisations and local groups on the heritage implications of HS2, especially through preparation of an advice note and input to the local planning forum and community forums.**
- c) **AGREE that Hartwell registered historic park and Grim's Ditch scheduled monument be put forward for addition to English Heritage's 'heritage at risk' register.**

C. RESOURCES

- 3 Undefined but will be a major commitment over the next three years, and through to opening in 2025 if the scheme obtains parliamentary approval. BCC and other authorities are currently seeking funding from HS2 Ltd to cover their costs, including a license agreement for use of environmental information.

D. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 4 In January 2012 the Government announced the intention to proceed with HS2, and announced the preferred line of route for London to the West Midlands. HS2 Ltd is now taking forward the first phase of the project to begin the next stage of engineering, design and environmental work. Government aims to deposit a hybrid bill in Parliament by the end of 2013 to seek the powers to construct and operate Phase 1 of HS2 with the aim of obtaining Royal Assent in

environmental effects associated with the Proposed Scheme. The draft EIA Scope and Methodology Report forms the basis for consultation with key consultees on the scope and methodology for the EIA. It provides a brief description of the Proposed Scheme and sets out environmental issues to be considered in the EIA. It also outlines the approach to the consideration of significant effects and their mitigation to be employed in the EIA. The deadline for comments is midday on 30th May 2012.

- 7 An historic environment technical group has been established as a forum for English Heritage and local authorities to agree and promote best practice and consistency along the route. At present representatives of HS2 Ltd do not attend (although that may change) and views are fed back to them via English Heritage who sit on the HS2 Environmental Forum. HS2 are also establishing county-level planning forums and local community forums. There are seven community forums in Buckinghamshire. Responses to the EIA scoping will be made by each affected local authority (county and district), the Chiltern Conservation Board and the over-arching 51M group of local authorities. Quite probably there will be many other responses from local, objector and special interest groups.
- 8 Cultural Heritage is covered in chapter 8 of the EIA Scoping and Methodology Report, although there will be important overlaps with other chapters – particularly ‘landscape, townscape and visual assessment’ and ‘noise and vibration’. Initial assessment indicates that although the chapter is not particularly clearly structured it does identify most of the general heritage issues but that there is a need for improvements, notably:
 - a) Consistency with NPPF terminology relating to undesignated heritage assets, significance and harm.
 - b) Recognition of the importance of cultural heritage to the Chilterns AONB and appropriate treatment.
 - c) Clarification of the method for assessing setting impacts including recognition that both noise and visual impact (including lighting) may cause harm and loss of viability; and that mitigation measures such as landscaping or sound barriers may themselves be harmful. Proposed criteria for excluding consideration the setting of certain undesignated heritage assets need to be revised.
 - d) Identification of the need for bespoke specialist studies of the significance of the designed landscape at Hartwell and options for mitigating impact; and of the overlap with geological conservation for the potential for significant Pleistocene deposits along the route, including faunal remains and Palaeolithic archaeology (overlaps with geology considered under land quality).
 - e) Include consideration of the historic character of farms, roads and rights of way and their overlaps with other topics (e.g. agriculture and soils).

HS2 and the Historic Environment of Buckinghamshire

An advice note on responding to the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Consultation from the Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum*

DRAFT v1

HS2 Ltd have to prepare an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to inform Parliament on the most likely significant environmental effects associated with the Proposed Scheme. They are now consulting on the scope of the EIA to define the focus of the subsequent environmental assessments to be undertaken. The draft EIA Scope and Methodology Report forms the basis for consultation with key consultees on the scope and methodology for the EIA. It provides a brief description of the Proposed Scheme and sets out environmental issues to be considered. It also outlines the approach to the consideration of significant effects and their mitigation to be employed in the EIA. The deadline for comments is midday on 30th May 2012.

Cultural Heritage is covered in chapter 8 of the EIA Scoping and Methodology Report which covers impacts on historic buildings, historic landscape and archaeological sites. There will be important overlaps with other chapters – particularly ‘landscape, townscape and visual assessment’ and ‘noise and vibration’.

The County Council’s own environmental baseline assessment indicates that there will be significant affects on the historic environment including:

- Destruction of part of Grims Ditch, a scheduled monument;
- Cutting through and severing part of Hartwell Park, a registered historic parkland;
- Visual and noise intrusion affecting the settings of listed buildings, conservation areas and other heritage assets;
- Destruction of historic landscape features (hedges, ancient woodland, historic lanes etc) and loss of historic character along the corridor, especially within the Chiltern AONB;
- Destruction of many archaeological sites, some recorded and others yet to be discovered;
- Harm to historic assets of value to local communities and/or for tourism.

In responding to the consultation the Historic Environment Forum suggests that groups may wish to draw attention to:

* The Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum is a consultative group attended by the County and district councils, Milton Keynes Council, the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society, National Trust and Diocese of Oxford.

8 Cultural heritage

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 This section of the report describes the methodology to be used in the assessment of the likely significant effects upon heritage assets to be affected by the Proposed Scheme.

8.2 Definitions

8.2.1 Heritage assets are defined by Government in (National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Annex 2 Glossary³⁹) as 'A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Heritage assets include designated heritage assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing). Heritage assets include those that are designated under legislation (refer to NPPF Annex 2 Glossary Designated heritage assets) as well as that are undesignated assets. Undesignated assets are heritage assets formally identified by Local Authorities and recognised through their inclusion within the local Historic Environment Record - HER.

8.2.2 Cultural Heritage is generally and most easily divided into three key areas comprising:

- Archaeological and palaeo-environmental remains
- Historic landscapes; and
- Historic buildings.

8.3 Effects

8.3.1 Effects to be assessed are direct and indirect, temporary, permanent and cumulative. Each of these is examined below in the context of the Cultural Heritage assessment.

8.3.2 A direct effect is one that will occur to the physical fabric or land of an asset and its curtilage, and will include any effect upon the setting of that asset arising directly from the Proposed Scheme.

8.3.3 An indirect effect is one that might arise as a consequence of the operation or construction of the railway by, for example, affecting viability of land leading to dereliction of buildings and land leading to changes in the management or land use of archaeological or historic landscape features.

³⁹ Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), 2012, *National Planning Policy Framework*, The Stationery Office

- Undesignated archaeological or historic landscape sites including:
 - Sites listed in the HER and the English Heritage National Monuments Record;
 - Archaeological assets of schedulable quality and as identified in PPS5 paragraph 9.6;
 - Sites or areas predicted or known from desk based or fieldwork study;
 - Palaeo-environmental remains etc.;
 - Known historic settlements including those identified as being of archaeological interest in local planning authority documents;
 - Hedges protected under Hedgerow Regulations (*The Hedgerow Regulations, 1997*⁴⁰), and;
 - Non-designated parks, gardens and battlefields.

8.4.4 Baseline data sources will include:

- Details of designated sites held by English Heritage;
- Local Authority mapping and appraisal documents (where available) of conservation areas;
- Records of Ancient Woodland maintained by Natural England, Defra and the Forestry Commission;
- Historic landscape character mapping;
- HER data, for an area of 5km either side of the route, held by local authorities and English Heritage, including the National Buildings Record (NBR) and National Monuments Record (NMR);
- Archaeological assets of schedulable quality and as identified in NPPF paragraph 130.
- Aerial photographs;
- Geological mapping as held by British Geological Survey;
- Site visit and walkover survey from public land, or from private land where access has been previously arranged and approved;
- Zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) as identified by the Townscape and Visual Assessment;
- Documentary, cartographic and other resources as deposited within local studies libraries, County and National Records Library;
- Readily available published material, building surveys and gazetteers;
- Data from preliminary works such as boreholes or test pits already collected or collected/created during the lifetime of the assessment scheme;
- Implementation of a programme of geophysical survey, the scope of which is to agreed, subject to land access and the restrictions of other disciplines;
- Light detection and ranging (Lidar) and other remote sensing surveys as appropriate and agreed; and
- Archaeological trial trenching and other intrusive techniques as appropriate and agreed.

⁴⁰ HM Government, 1997 No. 1160, *The Hedgerows Regulations 1997*, The Stationery Office

Country south and country north

- 8.5.6 The Country south section of the Proposed Scheme passes through the Chilterns. Much of the Proposed Scheme will be in either tunnel or cutting but elements are also elevated on viaduct or embankment.
- 8.5.7 The Country north section of the Proposed Scheme passes through the rural and suburban areas of Warwickshire and Staffordshire and will be partly in cutting and on viaduct but with substantial sections at grade.
- 8.5.8 To identify those heritage assets that may be affected by the Proposed Scheme a study area of 500m from the edge of the land take for the Proposed Scheme or as defined by the zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) as identified by the Townscape and Visual Assessment will be established.
- 8.5.9 Field visits will be carried out to designated heritage assets and archaeological assets of schedulable quality (where access is possible) within the study area. A survey of the study area to examine its broad historic landscape will also be carried out. A more targeted walkover survey of 250m from the land take for the Proposed Scheme will be carried out in order to verify the baseline research, assess the nature and condition of known heritage assets and identify hitherto unidentified features which may be affected by the Proposed Scheme.

8.6 Consultation

Consultation on the AoS

- 8.6.1 A large number of consultation responses were received in respect of the Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS). Responses included those from formal bodies including English Heritage, the National Trust, the Garden History Society and local planning authorities. Other responses were received from local amenity societies, specialist interest groups and other stakeholders.
- 8.6.2 The response from English Heritage in relation to heritage assets focused on matters affecting setting. English Heritage is of the opinion that a 350m study area either side of the line is inadequate to assess impacts on setting. As a consequence of this response it is proposed that the study area will be determined by the defined ZTV.
- 8.6.3 English Heritage was also concerned over the omission within the AoS of known archaeological assets. They were concerned that this omission did not therefore take into account those undesignated archaeological assets of schedulable quality.
- 8.6.4 English Heritage acknowledges the distinction in gradation between Grade I and Grade II* buildings and those listed at Grade II. It is their view that a 'regionally important' classification does not reflect the national designation of Grade II listed buildings. A geographical based terminology is not part of

8.7 Key aspects of the scheme in relation to heritage assets

8.7.1 Key aspects of the Proposed Scheme for this topic may include:

- Construction works which require the physical excavation, demolition, removal or alteration to heritage assets;
- Settlement of heritage assets induced by tunnelling, deep excavations or construction of retaining walls;
- Impacts upon the setting of heritage assets affecting significance, public appreciation or understanding of the resource;
- Loss of coherence of heritage assets, such as through severance;
- Temporary setting effects on designated assets;
- Ground disturbance caused through the implementation of ecological and other mitigation measures;
- Damage to waterlogged deposits through changes in groundwater regimes;
- Increased noise effects upon heritage assets affecting public appreciation or understanding of the resource;
- Vibration effects upon heritage assets during both construction and operation; and
- Protection of heritage assets during construction activities.

8.8 Scope of assessment

Spatial scope

8.8.1 All heritage assets, designated and undesignated within the defined study areas that may be affected by the proposals will be identified and assessed.

8.8.2 Within both the rural and metropolitan sections as defined, a study area will be set. This will allow identification and assessment of setting to be adequately considered. Within the maximum extent of the study only designated heritage assets of the highest significance as defined in PPS5 paragraph 9.1 will be identified and their setting assessed. Further assessment of Proposed Scheme impacts will be carried forward only for those heritage assets where the Proposed Scheme would impact upon the setting of the asset such that significance (archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic) would be affected.

Temporal scope

8.8.3 Within both the rural and metropolitan sections as defined, a study area will be set. This will allow identification and assessment of setting to be adequately considered. Within the maximum extent of the study only designated heritage assets of the highest significance as defined in NPPF paragraph 132 will be identified and their setting assessed. Further assessment of Proposed Scheme impacts will be carried forward only for those heritage assets where the Proposed Scheme would impact upon the

8.9.3 In May 2011 English Heritage published its guidance '*Seeing History in the View*' (2011a)⁴². The guidance which deals specifically with assessing impact upon heritage views and multiple assets contains a useful approach of baseline analysis and assessment of impact with a series of tables to assist in the process. More recently in 2011 English Heritage published its guidance on the Assessment of Setting which sets out an approach to the analysis and assessment of setting and its relationship to the heritage significance of an asset (English Heritage, *The Setting of Heritage Assets*, 2011b⁴³).

8.9.4 Policy in respect of heritage assets is set out in NPPF.

Approach

8.9.5 The methodology set out in each of these documents can be summarised as follows:

- Identify the baseline assets and their setting;
- Assess the significance/value of the baseline assets and their setting;
- Identify and define the magnitude of impact and the significance of the effects;
- Identify any mitigation and or scope for mitigation; and
- Assess the development impact and its effect on the significance of the asset taking into consideration any mitigation proposed.

Assessment of significance – value of baseline assets

8.9.6 The significance of a heritage asset is defined as 'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic'. (Annex 2 Glossary). Assets can be designated or un-designated. Designated assets are so designated in accordance with national or international criteria (conservation areas are a regional designation) and have statutory protection. In assessing the significance of an asset English Heritage has outlined a number of values which contribute to overall significance. These include evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value (Conservation Principles – Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (2008))⁴⁴. Non-designated heritage assets may exhibit equivalent values to those which have been granted statutory protection.

⁴² English Heritage, 2011a, *Seeing History In The View; A Method For Assessing Heritage Significance Within Views*, English Heritage

⁴³ English Heritage, 2011b, *The Setting Of Heritage Assets, English Heritage Guidance*, English Heritage

⁴⁴ English Heritage, 2008, *Conservation Principles – Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*, English Heritage

Significance (value)	Asset Categories
	modest quality. Historic Townscapes with historic integrity.
Not Significant	Assets identified as being of no historic, evidential, aesthetic or communal value. Assets whose values are compromised by poor preservation or survival or of contextual associations to justify inclusion into a higher grade.
Uncertain	Areas of identified archaeological potential, and areas not yet prospected.

Magnitude of impact

8.9.10 Development Impacts can be direct or indirect, and can be characterised in terms of timing, scale, duration, reversibility and the likelihood of the impact occurring. Impacts can be short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary and can be positive or negative.

8.9.11 An impact can occur to the setting of a heritage asset such that significance is affected. Guidance on how to establish impact on an asset's significance is set out by English Heritage (2011a).

8.9.12 The magnitude of an impact can vary from 'High' to 'No change' as set out in Table 8 and can be beneficial or adverse.

Table 8 - Factors influencing the assessment of magnitude of impacts

Impact Rating	Description of Impact
High	Change such that the significance of the asset is totally altered or destroyed. Comprehensive change to setting affecting significance, resulting in changes in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.
Moderate	Change such that the significance of the asset is affected. Changes such that the setting of the asset is noticeably different, affecting significance resulting in changes in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.
Low	Change such that the significance of the asset is slightly affected. Changes to the setting that have a slight impact on significance resulting in changes in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.
Minimal	Changes to the asset that hardly affect significance. Changes to the setting of an asset that have little effect on significance and no real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.
No change	The development does not affect the significance of the asset. Changes to the setting do not affect the significance of the asset or our appreciation of it.

(such as the County Records Offices and Metropolitan Records Centres) will be available to the project teams.

Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Forum – May 2012

Agenda item 9

County Museum Report

Since the last meeting of the forum, the intention to deposit 51 site archives has been notified to the County Museum, of which 18 are from the Milton Keynes Council area. This is almost double the amount from the previous 6 months.

There are two, linked, important pieces of news from the museum in the last 6 months. Firstly, BCC cabinet has now approved the devolution of the county museum to a full charitable trust. We have recruited a small shadow trust board, to work with the museum over the next year, with the intention of expanding the group of trustees, and the trust becoming fully operational, and taking over running of the museum, next April.

The other significant piece of news is the initial approval from BCC for the museum to submit a bid to the HLF for a major capital redevelopment of the resource centre at Halton. At the moment, we are working with DCA associates to create the bid, and consulting with stakeholders about the possible form and functions of a new resource centre.

Detailed questions about either project should be addressed to the museum manager, Sarah Gray.

Archaeological projects notified to the museum, Sept 2011 - Apr 2012

2011.218.1	Cotswold Archaeology	paper archive from archaeological recording at Dancers End water main; no associated finds
2011.219	Cotswold Archaeology	archive from building recording at Slad Farm, Water Eaton, Bletchley; archive not yet deposited
2011.220	Cotswold Archaeology	archive from evaluation at Orchardway wind farm, Haversham; archive not yet deposited
2011.221	Archaeological Services Ltd	archive from evaluation at Willowbridge marina, Stoke Road, Bletchley; archive not yet deposited
2011.222	Archaeological Services Ltd	archive from watching brief at 3 St Faiths Close, Newton Longville; archive not yet deposited
2011.223	Northamptonshire Archaeology	archive from evaluation at College Road, Aston Clinton; archive not yet deposited
2011.224	Northamptonshire Archaeology	archive from watching brief on land at the Grange, Haversham; archive not yet deposited
2011.225	John Moore Heritage Services	archive from watching brief at Stable House, 25 The Green, Brill; archive not yet deposited
2011.226	John Moore Heritage Services	archive from building recording at The Queens Head pub, 1-3 Temple Street, Aylesbury; archive not yet deposited
2011.227	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	archive from evaluation at 25 High Street, Haddenham; archive not yet deposited
2011.228	Oxford Archaeology South	archive from evaluation at Wayside Farm, Fleet Marston; archive not yet deposited
2011.229.CLD	National Trust	group of items found during restoration of Corinthian Arch at Stowe House, under the floor in the attic room; includes iron sword, iron bradawl with wooden handle, iron knife; 5 pieces of textile, possibly 18th century, possibly deliberately hidden a concealed clothing group; also Anglo Saxon iron spear head, found just outside the arch during gardening work; sword and spear conserved at UCL

2012.19	Chess Valley Archaeology and History Society	archive from excavation at Lowndes Park Mound, Chesham; archive not yet deposited
2012.20	Chess Valley Archaeology and History Society	archive from excavation at Valley Farm, Sarratt Bottom; archive not yet deposited
2012.21	Cotswold Archaeology	archive from evaluation at Astwood Grange Wind Turbines; archive not yet deposited
2012.22	Thames Valley Archaeological Services	archive from watching brief at 44 High Street Haddenham; archive not yet deposited
2012.23	Headland Archaeology Ltd	archive from evaluation and trenching at Stoke Heights wind farm, Stoke Goldington; archive not yet deposited
2012.35	Northamptonshire Archaeology	archive from watching brief at land adjoining Bay Tree Cottage, Adstock; archive not yet deposited
2012.36	Northamptonshire Archaeology	archive from watching brief at land at Carlton House Club, Olney; archive not yet deposited
2012.37	Souterrain Archaeological Service Ltd	archive from watching brief at Hanslope; archive not yet deposited
2012.38	Archaeology in Marlow Society	archive from excavation at Warren Wood, Little Marlow; archive not yet deposited
2012.39	Wardell Armstrong Archaeology	archive from excavation at Common Farm, Wolverton; archive not yet deposited
2012.41	Archaeological Services Ltd	archive from excavation in County Museum garden, Aylesbury; excavation carried out subsequent to finding human remains during landscape gardening work; archive not yet deposited

Brett Thorn
Collections Officer (Archaeology)