

Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

This Appendix presents part of the methodology and legislation, as well as tables outlining responses by stakeholders in response to requests for consultation, and scoping opinions. This appendix should be read in conjunction with the Environmental Statement Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage.

Assessment Methodology

Policy

Table 1 below presents a detailed breakdown of the relevant policy associated with the cultural heritage assessment at Otterpool Park, presented in Chapter 9 of the ES.

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping
 Table 1 Relevant policy and project response

Document	Policy	Summary of Requirements	Project Response
National Planning Policy Framework, as published February 2021 (Ref 9.16)	Section 16	Section 16 of the revised NPPF 2019 contains the government’s policies relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment	This is considered in detail as follows in the rows of this table below
	Paragraph 194	It states that assessment should describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting, consult the relevant historic environment record, assess heritage assets and submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and where necessary, a field evaluation.	Assessments of significance are made in Section 9.3 of the ES and also in more detail in the DBA (Appendix 9.2) and other appraisal reports (Appendices 9.3-9.8). Field evaluation has taken place (Appendices 9.10-9.21 and 9.23).
	Paragraph 197	In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.	The proposals have been designed to meet the strategies set out in the FHDC Local Plan and Core Strategy. A Heritage Strategy has also been prepared for Otterpool Park, designed to enhance the historic environment through community engagement, public art and leisure opportunities at Otterpool Park.
	Paragraph 199	It states that “when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance”.	The significance of all designated heritage assets has been considered and will be conserved as far as possible.
	Paragraph 200	It states that “any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or	There will be no physical alteration or destruction to any designated heritage assets.

Document	Policy	Summary of Requirements	Project Response
		<p>destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.”</p> <p>The footnote to this paragraph states that “non-designated heritage assets of evidential value, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets”</p>	<p>The potential for an adverse impact upon significance due to alteration of settings of designated heritage assets is assessed in Sections 9.4 and 9.5. and settings of all the major asset groups are discussed in detail in Appendices 9.6, 9.7 and 9.8.</p> <p>Certain non-designated heritage assets within the OPA boundary (the Prehistoric barrows, the Roman Villa and certain military buildings and structures) have been assessed to be of equivalent value to scheduled monuments or Grade II Listed Buildings (Section 9.3 and Appendices 9.5 and 9.7) and have been treated as such in terms of their physical preservation within the development proposals. The potential impact of the proposed development upon their settings has also been considered. The barrows have subsequently been scheduled (see below)</p> <p>The project has undertaken an assessment with Historic England’s Enhanced Advisory Service which screened heritage assets on site for designation and resulted in scheduling 9 barrows with the OPA boundary and adding two buildings just outside the OPA boundary to the List.</p>
	Paragraph 201	<p>Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:</p>	<p>The assessment in the ES has concluded that there will be significant effects (in EIA terms) to the setting of one designated heritage asset within the OPA boundary. However, the assessment considers that this equates to less than substantial harm in NPPF terms.</p>

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Document	Policy	Summary of Requirements	Project Response
		<p>a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and</p> <p>b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and</p> <p>c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and</p> <p>d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.</p>	<p>The assessment recognises that there will be (less than substantial) harm to certain heritage assets (both designated and non-designated) but considers that the public benefits of the scheme (as well as the considerations of competing demands – ecology, public amenity, sports provision, sustainable drainage etc) outweighs the harm</p>
	Paragraph 202	<p>Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use</p>	<p>See comment for Para 201</p>
	Paragraph 203	<p>The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.</p>	<p>The assessment, as well as specific Statements of Significance and appraisals written on non-designated heritage assets within the OPA have focussed on significance and on how far the Proposed Development is anticipated to directly or indirectly affect that significance</p>
	Paragraph 205	<p>Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.</p>	<p>The 'Additional Mitigation' measures given in the assessment are largely those 'Preservation by Record' measures.</p>
	Paragraph 206	<p>Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within ... the setting of heritage</p>	<p>The scheme delivers this especially for Westenhanger Castle and its former deerpark</p>

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Document	Policy	Summary of Requirements	Project Response
		<p>assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably</p>	
<p>Folkestone & Hythe District Council Places and Policies Local Plan (September 2020) (Reference 9.8)</p>	<p>Policy HE1</p>	<p>“The Council will grant permission for proposals which promote an appropriate and viable use of heritage assets, consistent with their conservation and their significance, particularly where these bring at risk or under-used heritage asset back into use or improve public accessibility to the asset’. Development which would adversely affect them will not be permitted.”</p>	<p>See above for important archaeological sites and their settings.</p> <p>Most of the significant built heritage assets will be able to continue their current uses e.g. farms and private residences. Certain on-site built heritage assets are currently not accessible and will be more accessible under the development proposals (e.g. several military structures).</p> <p>A Conservation Management Plan for Westenhanger Castle outlining viable uses for this nationally important heritage asset consistent with its conservation and significance has been prepared and is being updated to accompany the OPA</p>

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Document	Policy	Summary of Requirements	Project Response
	Policy HE2	<p>“Important archaeological sites, together with their settings, will be protected and, where possible, enhanced. Development which would adversely affect them will not be permitted.</p> <p>Proposals for new development must include an appropriate description of the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected, including the contribution of their setting. The impact of the development proposals on the significance of the heritage assets should be sufficiently assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Desk-based assessment, archaeological field evaluation and/or historic building assessment may be required as appropriate.</p> <p>Where the case for development affecting a heritage asset of evidential value is accepted, the archaeological remains should be preserved in situ as the preferred approach. Where this is not possible or justified, appropriate provision for preservation by record may be an acceptable alternative. Any archaeological investigation and recording should be undertaken in accordance with a specification and programme of work (including details of a suitable archaeological body to carry out the work) to be submitted to and approved by the Council in advance of development commencing.”</p>	See above.
Folkestone & Hythe District Council Core Strategy Review (Adopted 2022) (Reference 9.9)	Policy SS7 (New garden settlement - place shaping principles)	<p>(5) Enhanced heritage assets</p> <p>A Heritage Strategy shall be agreed that identifies how the development will conserve and enhance local heritage assets and their setting, including the Grade I listed Scheduled Monument of Westenhanger Castle (and its associated barns, stables and outbuildings), the Grade II listed Otterpool Manor Farm and Upper Otterpool and any other designated or non-designated</p>	<p>Westenhanger Castle and its setting is proposed to become a focal point for the new settlement – see above. A new country park has been designed that will enhance the historic landscape setting of Westenhanger Castle.</p> <p>The Heritage Strategy for Otterpool Park will accompany the OPA. It will be reviewed</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Requirements	Project Response
		<p>heritage assets identified. The application shall be supported by a detailed Heritage Strategy, setting out how the long term, viable use of heritage assets will be established and where necessary providing mechanisms for their integration into the development. The Heritage Strategy shall include a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) setting out the management and re-use of the site in relation to Westenhanger Castle, Manor and Barns. The implementation of the Heritage Strategy and undertaking of works on site with potential to affect heritage assets will need careful management; consideration should be given to appointing a Historic Environment Clerk of Works to fulfil this role;</p> <p>b. The Heritage Strategy should include an archaeology strategy, with an initial archaeological assessment guiding archaeological works and to inform discussions about preservation in situ or investigation. The archaeology strategy should be kept under active review;</p> <p>c. The provision of public art should be an integral part of the Heritage Strategy</p> <p>d. Westenhanger Castle and its setting shall become a focal point for the new settlement that informs its character. The development shall provide an enhanced setting for the Castle, including generous public open space through the delivery of a new park, and shall protect key views. Proposals shall explore the opportunity to recreate the historic southern approach to the Castle and provide mechanisms for its integration with the development;</p> <p>e. Other archaeological and heritage assets will be evaluated, conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced. Proposals must include an appropriate</p>	<p>throughout the life-cycle of the development in the light of ongoing archaeological fieldwork. The Heritage Strategy will include, where possible, all the aspects flagged up in this emerging policy including the vision for heritage-inspired public art, an archaeology strategy and also re-use of historic buildings (see scope in Section 9.6).</p> <p>A Conservation Management Plan for Westenhanger Castle outlining viable uses for this nationally important heritage asset consistent with its conservation and significance has been prepared and is being updated to accompany the OPA. It will cross reference to the Heritage Strategy but will be a standalone document.</p> <p>Initial archaeological assessments appropriate to this stage of the project have been undertaken as well as an extensive programme of archaeological fieldwork (Appendices 9.10 – 9.24).</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Requirements	Project Response
		<p>description of the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected, including the contribution of their setting;</p> <p>f. Proposals should explore the potential for:</p> <p>i. Renovating the existing buildings and barns to conserve the heritage assets at Westenhanger Castle and improve the setting of the building;</p> <p>ii. Providing space for appropriate sustainable uses for the asset and its setting; and</p> <p>iii. Enhancing and positively contributing to the conservation of all relevant heritage assets both within and outside the allocation boundary, such as the setting of Lympne Castle and the Lympne Conservation Area where appropriate.</p>	
<p>Folkestone & Hythe District Heritage Strategy, January 2019 (Reference 9.18)</p>		<p>Appendix 2: Case Study - Folkestone Racecourse – the conclusion states that:</p> <p>Special attention will need to be paid to the relationship between Westenhanger Castle and any new development at the racecourse. Any new development should be informed by a detailed understanding of the significance of Westenhanger Castle and following thorough assessment of the contribution that setting makes to the castle’s significance. Focus should be paid in any development scheme to ensuring the long-term sustainable future of Westenhanger Castle and opportunities for enhancement should be sought and delivered... Folkestone Racecourse was created out of a major part of the park surrounding Westenhanger Castle. If major new development is to occur, such as that currently being promoted through the Otterpool Garden Town proposals, then this nationally important heritage asset has significant potential for use under a place-making strategy, such that new residents might</p>	<p>See above. Westenhanger Castle and its setting has been a major influence on the design of the development and has been underpinned by data gathered and assessed in the Statement of Significance (Appendix 9.6).</p> <p>See Consultation and Scoping and tables (Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix 9.9). Also, Sections 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5. Also see the Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>A Conservation Management Plan for Westenhanger Castle has been prepared and is being updated to accompany the OPA.</p>

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Document	Policy	Summary of Requirements	Project Response
		<p>derive an identity from their homes being part of a location that has played such a significant role in the story of the nation.</p> <p>Key development principles are stated as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the historic character of the place to inform future development and create a sense of place • Interpret, promote and celebrate the site’s historic environment and encourage people to explore and appreciate the site’s heritage assets and historic stories • Work collaboratively, so that development supports the long-term future of Westenhanger Castle • Seek opportunities to sustain and enhance the significance of Westenhanger Castle; minimise harm to the setting of the castle and maximise positive and beneficial enhancements • Develop a place-making strategy for the site. 	

Establishing Baseline

A cultural heritage Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) (Appendix 9.2) was undertaken between October and December 2016 to establish the baseline conditions for the Study Area and was updated in August 2017. In addition to the DBA, a DBA Addendum (Appendix 9.2) was undertaken in September 2018 to update the baseline in light of emerging cultural heritage data and updated policy. Further assessment work has been carried out since September 2018 to further establish the detailed cultural heritage baseline conditions for the site and study area. However, assets identified post September 2018 are discussed in the baseline of this ES, with no further addendums to the DBA proposed. Table 2 summarises the main sources and nature of the baseline information obtained in these reports. A full list of sources and historic mapping can be found in the relevant reports.

Table 2 List of sources used in the baseline

Source	Baseline Information
National Heritage List of England	Designated asset data including scheduled monuments (SMs), listed buildings (LBs), registered parks and gardens (RPGs), heritage at risk assets, and registered battlefields.
Kent Historic Environment Record (HER)	Non-designated heritage assets and events data including Historic Landscape Characterisation data
Kent County Council and Folkestone & Hythe District Council websites	Planning policy and Conservation Area (CA) data. Aerial photographs (on KCC website)
Landmark Information Group	Historic OS mapping informing historic map regression.
Kent Archives	Historic mapping informing historic map regression
PastScape website (provided by Historic England)	Information on heritage assets within the study area and the wider area. Also includes aerial photographs
British Geological Survey (BGS) website	Information on the prevailing geological conditions within the study area
Archaeological Data Service website	National Mapping Programme, HLC data and archaeological reports
Arcadis Geotechnical information	Geotechnical information including borehole logs from Arcadis Ground Investigations across the site in 2017 and 2018
South Eastern Research Frameworks (SERF) Documents	Published on the KCC website
Environment Agency	LiDAR data to inform LiDAR analysis
National Monuments Record (online catalogue)	Aerial photographs to inform aerial photograph analysis
Cambridge University Collection of Air Photographs (CUCAP) online catalogue	Aerial photographs
Google Earth Imagery 1940 to present	Aerial photographs
Zetica – Otterpool Park UXO Desk Study & Risk Assessment 2017	Maps, aerial photographs, unexploded ordnance (UXO) information and historic background on RAF Lympne and the rest of the Site

Source	Baseline Information
Multiple walkover surveys and site visits	Information and photographs of heritage assets to inform baseline
Data digitised as a result of detailed archaeological fieldwork	Archaeological finds and features found through evaluation work carried out in the form of geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching.

In addition to this, the following detailed appraisal reports have been produced by Arcadis to inform the baseline conditions and support the ES. These are:

- Historic Landscape Characterisation and Farmstead Analysis (Appendix 9.3)
- Archaeological Appraisal and Fieldwork Strategy (Appendix 9.4)
- Historic Buildings and Structures Appraisal (Appendix 9.5)
- Westenhanger Castle Statement of Significance (Appendix 9.6)
- Prehistoric Barrows at Otterpool Statement of Significance (Appendix 9.7)
- Romano-British Villa at Otterpool Statement of Significance (Appendix 9.8)

Furthermore, a programme of archaeological investigations was undertaken in 2017, 2018, 2020 and 2021 to enhance the baseline of this report (see 9.3). These investigations took the form of geophysical surveys and trial trenching evaluation. The results of these surveys and investigations are reported in the Appendices 9.10 to 9.15 and 9.18, 9.19, 9.21 and 9.23.

Additionally, baseline information has been gathered from recent borehole and other geotechnical investigations which were monitored by Wessex Archaeology (2018) (Appendix 9.17), with follow up geoarchaeological test pitting in 2021 (Appendix 9.20). A landscape archaeologist also wrote an appraisal in 2020 which contributed to the understanding of the wider landscape/deerpark of Westenhanger Castle (Appendix 9.22).

Consultation and Scoping

Consultation

Table 3 provides a summary of the consultation undertaken for this chapter prior to and following the submission of the 2019 application (Y19/0257/ FH). The table summarises how the comments have been addressed in this chapter, where relevant.

Table 3 Summary of consultation

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
Historic England (HE) - Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey Kent County Council (KCC) Heritage Conservation Team		Welcomed early consideration of potential for heritage to inform proposed Development.	n/a.
	Consultation with Arcadis November 2016 to July 2017 4th November 2016- telephone 16th November 2016-1st meeting with all consultees 26th November 2016 – telephone/email 24th of January 2017-telephone/email	Highlighted the Palaeolithic potential of the site and the fact that too little investigation on the potential of the Hythe Beds and Head deposits has been carried out to date Defining a role for Westenhanger Castle and its context. Consideration of the setting and historic views of Westenhanger Castle. Restoring the historic southerly aspect of Westenhanger Castle and sensitively integrating the Castle within the Development (although it lies outside the application boundary);	Geoarchaeological DBA carried out in 2018 incorporating the Site's Palaeolithic potential. Geophysical results used to detect fissures in the Hythe Beds (ES Appendix 9.16). CMP and Statement of Significance for Westenhanger Castle (ES Appendix 9.6) carried out 2017. Updated CMP to be submitted with OPA. A Proposed Use & Redevelopment Masterplan for the Castle was also produced in 2020 (Ref 9.27).
	Site-visit and meeting at Westenhanger Castle 24 February 2017 with Peter Kendall. 17th July 2017- second meeting with all consultees	Conservation Management Plan (CMP) and use-strategy required for Westenhanger Castle to inform design; Statement of Significance for Westenhanger Castle required;	
		Consideration of the setting and historic views of several designated and non-designated heritage assets in and around the site and how these relationships might inform master-planning and design;	The setting of the Castle has been considered within the masterplan since 2017. Historic Buildings and Structures Appraisal carried out 2017 (Appendix 9.5) and Statements of Significance for the barrows (Appendix 9.7) and Romano-British villa (Appendix 9.8) in 2018.

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
		Historic Landscape Characterisation and Farmstead Analysis of Development requested to assist understanding of baseline;	Carried out 2017 (Appendix 9.3).
		Archaeological Appraisal and Fieldwork Strategy to be written to inform archaeological evaluation fieldwork and mitigation;	Carried out 2017 (Appendix 9.4).
		Historic Buildings Appraisal/Screening for designation potential required;	Appraisal carried out 2017 (Appendix 9.5). Historic England's EAS undertaking screening of assets January to August 2020
		Geophysical survey of potential Tudor Garden to the south of Westenhanger Castle required;	Carried out 2017 (Appendix 9.11).
		Pre-determination evaluation of the main scheme by way of geophysical survey and trial trenching requested.	Carried out October 2017 to September 2018 (Appendices 9.10 and 9.12 to 9.15 and 9.18). Further evaluation was undertaken in 2020 (Appendices 9.19-9.21 and 9.23).
		Outreach programme to integrate heritage context into the proposed development	Partially carried out via Otterpool website and press releases. Heritage presence at two Otterpool Park public engagement events held in 2018. Presentation on the archaeological finds delivered by Arcadis to Ashford Archaeological and Historical Society on 15th October 2018. The project has committed to ongoing engagement with local stakeholders and

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
			public outreach took place out over summer and autumn 2021.
<p>HE - Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey KCC –Heritage Conservation Team FHDC/KCC- Heritage Conservation Team</p>	<p>Consultation with Arcadis November to December 2017 21st November- Skype meeting 1st December 2017 – 3rd meeting with all consultees 7th December 2017 meeting with HE</p>	<p>Statement of Significance for Westenhanger Castle reviewed, and extra information, mainly maps and photos, provided (by Peter Kendall)</p> <p>Further discussions on how to incorporate Westenhanger Castle, its related landscape and its deer park into the development proposals</p> <p>Geoarchaeological Desk-Based Assessment required incorporating a review of the geotechnical site data. Likely need for archaeologically-led boreholes or test pits raised</p> <p>The need for an archaeological watching brief on ground investigation works raised</p> <p>Feedback given on the Archaeological Appraisal and Fieldwork Strategy and used as a means of discussion on how best to conduct the fieldwork</p>	<p>Comments and extra information incorporated into update of Statement of Significance for the Castle in October to November 2018 (Appendix 9.6). Extra information since 2018 has now been incorporated in the Castle CMP.</p> <p>The southern causeway has been incorporated into the masterplan and will re-introduce an important aspect of the Castle’s setting. The Castle now forms part of the OPA.</p> <p>Geoarchaeological DBA carried out (Appendix 9.16). Archaeologically-led testpits carried out in 2020 and 2021(Appendix 9.20 and 9.21).</p> <p>A watching brief on ground investigations was carried out in Summer 2018 (Appendix 9.17).</p> <p>Archaeological Appraisal and Fieldwork Strategy report amended October/November 2018 (Appendix 9.4). Consultee comments informed the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for trial trenching (Appendix 9.18) and the DBA Addendum (Appendix 9.2).</p>

Otterpool Park
ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
<p>HE - Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey</p> <p>HE – Regional Science Advisor</p> <p>KCC – Heritage Conservation Team</p> <p>FHDC/KCC- Heritage Conservation Team</p>	<p>Consultation with Arcadis 2018</p> <p>19th January 2018 - walkover of Westenhanger Castle with Peter Kendall and Alice Brockway of HE</p>	<p>Further in-depth discussion with HE and design team over Westenhanger Castle and its landscape and how to enhance its setting</p>	<p>In depth proposals drawn up and presented to HE. See Sections 9.3-9.5 and Design and Access Statement.</p>
	<p>24th January 2018- 4th meeting with all consultees</p>	<p>Geophysical survey of potential Tudor Garden at Westenhanger Castle- report reviewed and approved</p>	<p>Results of Tudor garden geophysics have been incorporated into Statement of Significance on the Castle (Appendix 9.6) and the DBA Addendum (Appendix 9.2).</p>
	<p>4th April 2018- Skype meeting</p>	<p>Geophysical survey results of the main scheme reviewed, approved and discussed</p>	<p>Comments on main scheme geophysics results incorporated into methodology of WSI for trial trenching (Appendix 9.18).</p>
	<p>April 2018 – various phone calls and site meetings regarding the discovery of the Romano-British Villa</p>	<p>Trial trenching results discussed field by field and used to inform masterplan</p>	<p>See Section 9.3 to 9.5 for trial trenching results.</p>
	<p>17th May 2018 – 5th meeting with all consultees</p>	<p>Statement of Significance on the Bronze Age barrows/ring ditches and their settings required to inform master planning.</p>	<p>Statement of Significance of the Barrows carried out July to December 2018 (Appendix 9.7)..</p>
	<p>Various on-site discussions have taken place with Lis Dyson and Ben Found during site visits to view the trial trenching, between December 2017 and August 2018</p>	<p>Metal detecting survey suggested on area of barrows to check for evidence of Anglo-Saxon reuse</p>	<p>A metal detecting survey was organised for summer 2018, however circumstances beyond the control of the project prevented it being carried out. Barrows have been targeted by trial trenching and metal detecting was undertaken during this work. No evidence of Anglo-Saxon reuse has been identified on any of the barrows.</p>
	<p>2nd August – walkover of Westenhanger Castle and the Racecourse with HE</p>	<p>Discussions on the recently discovered Romano-British Villa and how to find out its extent for purposes of creating a sufficient amount of open space around it. The need to understand more about its setting and significance and if it will be</p>	<p>The masterplan was altered (on the 23rd April 2018) to preserve the Romano-British villa in situ and to provide sufficient open space around it. Meetings were held with consultees on 17th May, 20th September</p>
	<p>September 2018 – various consultations by email and phone with Jane Corcoran – Historic England Regional Science Advisor – over the geo-archaeological DBA</p> <p>20th September 2018 – meeting with KCC and FHDC</p> <p>19th October 2018 – 6th meeting with all consultees</p>		

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
		impacted by biodiversity mitigation proposals next to the water course. Discussion of the possibility of scheduling.	and 19 th October 2018. A Statement of Significance on the Villa was carried out July to December 2018 Appendix 9.8).
		Further geophysical survey of the villa site requested including of the field to the north.	Archaeological investigations to determine the extent and significance of the Romano-British villa were undertaken including further geophysics of Villa field, carried out September 2018 and January 2021 (Appendices 9.15). These investigations have broadly defined the extent of the villa. An earth resistivity survey of the villa site was conducted in 2021 but did provided limited further knowledge of the site (Appendix 9.23).
		Discussion around Historic Farmsteads. Temporary use for creative business occupations suggested and community uses of assets should be considered as part of short term or long-term strategies e.g. community farms.	These suggestions around Historic Farmsteads were considered as part of design and, apart from Hillhurst Farm, were not carried forward.
		Requested assurance that if there are gaps in trial trenching work, e.g. on the airfield, the masterplan should have greater flexibility to accommodate future finds.	As part of the Heritage Strategy, further archaeological investigations are proposed in areas where investigation has not been possible to date for reasons beyond the control of the project. These investigations will seek to further understand the heritage assets in these areas and inform detailed archaeological mitigation. Flexibility has now been incorporated into the parameter plans.

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
		<p>Request that the reports and plans from the Oxford Archaeology trial trenching be issued to the consultees as soon as possible in order for them to understand the significance of the finds</p>	<p>These have all now been issued and are attached as appendix 9.18 of the ES.</p>
		<p>Legal protections may be needed for certain heritage assets – Arcadis to consider asking Historic England (HE) to consider this early through the option of an accelerated decision through its enhanced advisory service (EAS)</p>	<p>Arcadis have produced a range of in-depth assessments which identify the significance of the heritage resource (See Appendices 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.8). The Historic England EAS Designation screening process has since been utilised underway.</p>
		<p>Jane Corcoran advised that the Geoarchaeological DBA (Appendix 9.16) be developed into a Deposit Model with transects across the Site and that this should be done for submission with the planning application. KCC also requested some changes be made to this report</p>	<p>The Geoarchaeological specialist who prepared the report (Appendix 9.16) advised that there was insufficient borehole data from the Site to be able to create a deposit model with transects at the time of writing the ES chapter in early 2019.(see Error! Reference source not found.). Since then, a second round of geotechnical/borehole data for the site has been received and geoarchaeological testpits have been dug. If there is enough data now, a deposit model will be created for the site which will be updated and added to as more geo-archaeological fieldwork is done. The geo-archaeological strategy for the site is discussed in more detail in the Mitigation Strategy (Appendix A of the Heritage Strategy) .</p>
		<p>Overall - further information is necessary for consultees to establish whether the proposals are acceptable. Consultees still need to understand what archaeological features are on site, what the</p>	<p>All reports for archaeological investigations carried out to date are available as appendices to this ES (see Appendices 9.10 to 9.24). Limitations of the data due to not being allowed access to evaluate all</p>

Otterpool Park
ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
		significance of those finds are and then re-evaluate masterplan based on these findings.	areas are explained from Section Error! Reference source not found. .
<p>HE - Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey</p> <p>KCC – Heritage Conservation Team</p> <p>FHDC/KCC- Heritage Conservation Team</p>	<p>15th February 2019 – 7th meeting with Arcadis and all consultees</p>	<p>Meeting to discuss the scope of the Heritage Strategy for Otterpool Park.</p>	<p>Scope agreed. At the time of this meeting it was planned that a draft Heritage Strategy will be submitted soon after the submission of the outline application in 2019. A full version would have been prepared for Reserved Matters. As the project has evolved post-2019 The Heritage Strategy will now be submitted with the OPA</p>
<p>HE - Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey</p> <p>KCC – Heritage Conservation Team</p> <p>FHDC/KCC- Heritage Conservation Team</p>	<p>13th May 2019 – 8th meeting with Arcadis and all consultees</p>	<p>Meeting to discuss the Heritage Strategy.</p> <p>Discussion points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent of and significance of the Romano-British Villa and appropriate mitigation • The significance of the barrows and their preservation • The potential Neolithic Causewayed Enclosure • Concerns from the consultees over too much housing proposed around Westenhanger Castle and within its deerpark • The Tiered planning system and where the Heritage Strategy fits into that schedule • Opportunities for Community Archaeology within the new town • Whether the project should make use of HE's Designation Screening Service 	<p>Most of these issues have now been resolved or are in the process of being resolved though:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsequent alterations in the masterplan • Further fieldwork • Development of the Heritage Strategy <p>Decision to utilise the HE Designation screening service. This screening has now taken place.</p>

Otterpool Park
ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
HE - Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey	August 2019	HE asked for confirmation on what the next steps were for archaeological field evaluation. KC replied in September 2019.	Archaeological field evaluation subsequently carried out April to October 2020
HE - Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey	September 2019	Request from Arcadis for comments from the consultees on the scope of next phase of archaeological field evaluation, including geophysics at the castle. HE responded in October 2019 broadly agreeing with our scope.	Archaeological field evaluation subsequently carried out April to October 2020 (see reports – Appendices 9.19 and 9.21)
HE - Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey	September 2019	Peter Kendall sent a list of HE's priorities for the Castle including refilling the moat and carrying out geophysical survey.	The geophysical survey at the Castle has now taken place (Appendix 9.19). The other priorities are being taken forward although not as part of the OPA, but in Tier 2
HE - Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey	November 2019 and January 2020	Peter Kendall asked what progress we had made in terms of further archaeological evaluation on site. KC from Arcadis replied December 2019.	Archaeological field evaluation subsequently carried out April to October 2020 – see above
KCC – Heritage Conservation Team FHDC/KCC- Heritage Conservation Team	30 th January 2020	Heritage workshop with Arcadis, Purcell, KCC/FHDC heritage advisors, the LPA, client, planning consultants and Farrells. Presentation by Purcell and Arcadis as to what the Heritage Strategy will include and how it will address some of their concerns. Specific discussion about the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Heritage Vision Design Principles with regard to heritage assets and their settings Proposals for Westenhanger Castle, Park and setting 	Most of these issues have now been resolved or are in the process of being resolved though: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsequent alterations in the masterplan The acquisition of the Castle by the applicant and its incorporation into the OPA boundary Further fieldwork Development of the Heritage Strategy and the Proposed Use &

Otterpool Park
ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological Matters including update on fieldwork Purcell's Proposed Use & Redevelopment Masterplan for Westenhanger Castle Heritage Trails 	Redevelopment Masterplan for Westenhanger Castle
HE – Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey	January to February 2020	Consultation via emails regarding heritage views analysis required for assessing impacts to setting of designated heritage assets. Includes PK sending out a note of his recommended viewpoints in February 2020	Views analysis and visualisations to and from the castle have now (March 2021) been carried out and has been supplied to HE and KCC
HE KCC – Heritage Conservation Team FHDC/KCC - Heritage Conservation Team	20 th August 2020	<p>Virtual Heritage Workshop with Arcadis, Purcell, HE, KCC/FHDC, the LPA, client and planning consultants. Specific discussions about the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress of and content of the Heritage Strategy Introducing concept design for changes to the castle causeway Introducing the current Phase 1 design Viewpoint work for the Castle area Update on fieldwork The tiered approach How the Heritage Strategy has informed the parameter plans Potential for hybrid planning application Designation screening service 	<p>The evaluation fieldwork was taking place at the time of the workshop. The results have been included in the ES and the Heritage Strategy (where relevant).</p> <p>The Heritage Strategy has underpinned the way the parameter plans have been produced. Parameter plans shared with HE to demonstrate how much flexibility is being proposed.</p> <p>The project team have commissioned viewpoints/visualisations to and from the castle to help the consultees understand if changes to the causeway are acceptable (submitted to consultees in March 2021)</p> <p>The project has since utilised HE's Designation Screening service</p> <p>Arcadis has commissioned resistivity on the Romano-British villa to help clarify its significance. The report (Appendix 9.23) concludes that limited further evidence of the villa's site was achievable, likely due to</p>

Otterpool Park
ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
			<p>recent wet weather and retention of water within the alluvial deposits on the site. Double density magnetic survey might be best for getting some more well defined results.</p> <p>A hybrid application will not be taken forward – see comments below in Table 4</p>
<p>HE LPA - Senior Planning Officer</p>	8 th September 2020	Virtual meeting with Arcadis, HE, the LPA and the client about utilising HE's Enhanced Advisory Service's Designation Screening Service	It was decided at this meeting to take this forward
<p>HE- KCC/FHDC – Heritage Conservation Team LPA – Senior Planning Lead and Heritage Collective</p>	24 th September 2020	<p>Onsite meeting with Arcadis to decide what viewpoints needed more analysis and to walk the causeway leading to the Castle and see on the ground how far the proposed development blocks are from the causeway. Various views to the Castle and The Downs were looked at. HE are worried that the housing does come too close to the causeway and that it will be too high, so having the visualisations done of these views is imperative.</p> <p>Also discussed creation of wetlands as part of nutrient neutrality proposals.</p> <p>Also visited the trial trenches being dug and discussed the findings</p>	Although no absolute agreement about viewpoints was reached Arcadis were able to hear and appreciate the areas of main concern. Views analysis and visualisations for analysis have subsequently been carried out (March 2021) and supplied to HE and KCC
LPA	October 2020	Comments received from the LPA on the Spatial Vision which included concerns about impacts to settings of the Castle and its deerpark and landscape features including the causeway	A collaborative approach involving the design team and wider stakeholders has addressed these issues based on a clear overall framework of routes and spaces

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
LPA - Senior Planning Lead and Heritage Collective	10 th December 2020	<p>Virtual workshop with the LPA, client, Arcadis, Planning Consultants, Tibbalds, and Purcell about the Castle's setting and heritage. Main points for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reiterate key points of the Heritage Strategy, defining our approach to the incorporation of historic assets into the future evolution of the masterplan • To present how the Phase 1 Masterplan proposals are responding to this approach to heritage • Viewpoints work 	<p>The Phase 1 masterplan design is responding to this heritage approach, in particular in regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westenhanger Castle setting – including Westenhanger Park, and the inclusion of the Castle within the application site. • The Castle Causeway • Park edges, to housing development blocks <p>Initial approaches to housing design/typologies.</p> <p>Views analysis and visualisations for analysis have subsequently been carried out (March 2021)</p>
LPA - Heritage Collective	December 2020	<p>Following the workshop on the 10th December the LPA's heritage consultant – Liz Vinson - sent out a heritage review note covering various items to do with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Strategy • ES Chapter 2019 • Scope of Designation Screening 	<p>All of the issues raised have been addressed in the ES chapter and Heritage Strategy.</p> <p>Clarifications also sent to Liz Vinson and the LPA over which assets are being screened for Designation by HE</p> <p>In February 2020 Kate Clover of Arcadis responded to all the issues raised via email</p>
HE via the LPA	Early February 2021	<p>Feedback received from HE and the LPA regarding our proposals for the causeway and the castle setting</p>	<p>Phase 1 masterplan altered</p>

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
<p>LPA – Senior Planning Officer, Senior Development Manager and their historic buildings advisors</p> <p>HE</p> <p>KCC/FH&DC- Heritage Conservation Team</p>	<p>25th February 2021</p>	<p>Virtual ‘round table’ with heritage consultees, planning consultants, client, Arcadis and Purcell to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of Field Evaluation • Tier 1 Control Documents and what needs to be agreed at this stage • Update on Heritage Strategy 	<p>A draft of the Heritage strategy was circulated following this meeting.</p> <p>HE and KCC to look at level of archaeological detail required for southern end of Causeway at this stage as one of the hotspot areas</p> <p>LPA, KCC and HE emphasised hotspot areas around recently revealed barrows within development areas and need for these to be viewed as a collection in the wider landscape in how they are integrated and experienced.</p>
<p>LPA – Senior Planning Officer and their historic building advisor</p> <p>HE</p>	<p>25th March 2021</p>	<p>Virtual meeting with planning consultants, Arcadis, Purcell and client to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review the HE consideration of the causeway and its position within the evolving proposals at Otterpool Park. • Discuss parameters for the Castle in Tier 2 • Discuss the need for an updated CMP for the Castle • Update on how the review of the Heritage Strategy is going 	<p>Distance of development from the causeway to be carefully approached;</p> <p>Design approach of fringes of development addressing the causeway;</p> <p>Landscape treatment in the causeway;</p> <p>Harm to causeway be avoided/minimised within the masterplan;</p> <p>The causeway approach may need to be re-visited in the event the scheduling process</p> <p>The consultees’ review of the Heritage Strategy is underway</p> <p>The client agreed to commission an update of the CMP</p>

Otterpool Park
ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
KCC- Heritage Conservation Team	13 th April 2021	Virtual meeting with Arcadis to discuss Archaeological Fieldwork in the Phase 1 Area, Heritage Strategy, Geoarchaeological work and OSL dating	KCC gave their opinions of the areas within Phase 1 that they would see as high priority for evaluation.
LPA – historic building advisor HE KCC/FHDC- Heritage Conservation Team	First half of May 2021	Written comments received on draft Heritage Strategy	These comments and the meeting on the 12 th May resulted in the Heritage Strategy being restructured
KCC- Heritage Conservation Team LPA – Senior Planning Officer and their historic building advisor HE	12 th May 2021	Virtual meeting with planning consultants, Arcadis, Purcell and client to discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial feedback on draft Heritage Strategy • Castle Causeway- Function and treatment of causeway • Heritage Strategy • Trial Trenching Phase 1 • Designation screening Update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arcadis to prepare an outline plan and programme for fieldwork and trial pits around causeway to share with KCC/HE to confirm • Arcadis to follow up with HE (Sarah Gibson) to confirm start date for next batch of screening • Arcadis and Purcell to share a redraft of the structure of the Heritage Strategy for meeting on 27th
KCC- Heritage Conservation Team LPA - Senior Planning Officer and their historic building advisor HE	27 th May 2021	Virtual meeting with planning consultants, Arcadis, Purcell and client to discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the designation screening process • Restructure of the heritage strategy • General LPA advice on heritage matters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HE EAS's screening process has resulted in the castle causeway and almost all the barrows being scheduled. The process for the other assets was underway at the time of the meeting and has since resulted in two buildings outside the OPA boundary being listed • Purcell and Arcadis's new structure for the Heritage Strategy was approved

Otterpool Park
ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
<p>LPA - Senior Planning Officer and their historic building advisor</p> <p>HE</p> <p>KCC- Heritage Conservation Team</p>	<p>16th June 2021</p>	<p>Virtual 'Page Turn' of the draft Heritage Strategy with LPA, HE, KCC, Arcadis, Purcell, Client and planning consultant to agree that it is going along the right lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Heritage Vision needs to be stronger and less mitigation-based • The Heritage Vision needs to underpin all the actions. • The Strategy needs to secure outcomes – who, what, when • Firm commitments need to be made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The restructured Heritage Strategy was heavily revised following this meeting to take account of consultee comments
<p>LPA - Historic building advisor</p> <p>HE</p> <p>KCC - Heritage Conservation Team</p>	<p>June 2021</p>	<p>Feedback given on Tibbalds' Design Code for Phase 1 including heritage aspects such as the Heritage Vision, the Causeway, the Castle and views analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kate Clover (Arcadis) responded to Tibbalds and the project team on 25th August 2021 to show how the design has responded to the Heritage Strategy • Heritage Strategy was subsequently added to/amended to address consultee concerns
<p>LPA – Senior Planning Officer</p>	<p>18th August 2021</p>	<p>Virtual meeting with Arcadis to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress of Heritage Strategy • Timing of extra archaeological evaluation along the scheduled causeway • Sequencing of archaeological evaluation in the remaining areas of the OPA including high priority areas flagged by KCC and HE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work along the causeway will be for Tier 2 (Phase 1) to inform detailed design and will happen this autumn • Remaining archaeological evaluation in high priority areas will take place in Spring 2022, following OPA submission
<p>HE</p> <p>LPA – Historic Building Advisor</p>	<p>November 2021 to January 2022</p>	<p>Written feedback received from KCC, LPA (Alan Baxters) and HE on the Heritage Strategy</p> <p>Comments on the Castle CMP also received from the LPA (Alan Baxters).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed in revised version of Heritage Strategy • Barrows discussed further in meeting of 3rd February • Comments that relate to the illustrative masterplan also addressed (e.g.

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
KCC – Heritage Conservation Team			cricket pavilion moved away from the causeway)
LPA – Strategic Development Manager, Senior Planning Officer HE KCC – Heritage Conservation Team	26 th November 2021	Virtual 'roundtable' meeting with consultees, Arcadis, the Planning Consultant, client and Purcell to provide feedback on the Heritage Strategy and to discuss the relationship with the other Tier 1 documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments taken on board and worked into next version of the Heritage Strategy • Some comments related to the illustrative masterplan e.g.roads and development blocks too close to some of the barrows • SMC for the evaluation work on the causeway should be with us by 7th December (subject to future revisions in the Written Scheme of Investigation)
HE KCC - Heritage Conservation Team	July 2021 to February 2022 2021	Consultation on the scope of archaeological evaluation along the scheduled causeway to the Castle – a combination of phone calls and emails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope of the evaluation was agreed • The aim is to provide information for Phase 1 Tier 2 Design
HE	28 January 2022	Written comments received on the archaeological mitigation strategy (an appendix of the Heritage Strategy)	Archaeological mitigation strategy updated in light of comments
LPA - Senior Planning Officer HE	3 rd February 2022	Meeting (virtual and in person) with Arcadis, Purcell, Tibbalds and the client to discuss feedback on the Heritage Strategy in relation to the barrows now they are scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arcadis's and Purcell to share their understanding - LIDAR and other available topographical information, viewshed analysis etc for the barrows - with HE • Possible revisiting of school and sports pitches in context of barrows on Barrow Hill • Revisit wording for SDP and development specification

Otterpool Park
ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee	Date of Consultation	Summary of Consultee Issue	How Addressed?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Include associated commitments within Heritage Strategy to future work to develop the understanding of the barrows in more detail (including visual assessment and where possible viewpoints and more work on designing/increasing open space around lone barrows e.g. Barrow 44)•

Scoping

A previous EIA Scoping Opinion was undertaken for the 2019 application, where relevant, the comments from this process have been incorporated within Table 4. For this amended application, a request for a Scoping Opinion was submitted to F&HDC in June 2020. This outlined the work that had been undertaken to date and sets out the proposed approach to the EIA. A Scoping Opinion was issued by F&HDC in July 2020. Table 4 provides a summary of the scoping opinion comments relevant to this chapter, and how they have been addressed.

Additionally, a Scoping Addendum was submitted on 5 October 2021 to outline key changes to the application. These comprised additional land in the north-west corner of the site for provision of the waste water treatment works (WWTW), additional land for highway junction works at Newingreen Junction, minor amendments to clarify land ownership boundaries and a change in the assessment approach in relation to the future uses of Westenhanger Castle. A response was received from F&HDC on this Scoping Addendum as set out in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology. All relevant changes since the submission of the scoping report have been assessed in this ES.

Temple, on behalf of F&HDC, undertook a review of the Draft ES in December 2021. The topic specific comments and response are provided in Table 5.

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
Scoping opinions received in 2018 after first scoping report		
HE	[Scoping Opinion para.] (4.2.3) EIA methodology - HE note the need to agree parameters describing the type and maximum size of new elements in order to understand likely effects and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation. These need to be reproduced in visual representations of the likely appearance of the Proposed Development.	Visualisations of the Development are addressed in Landscape and Visual Impact (Chapter 12). Extra 'heritage' visualisations of certain views have since been produced, in 2021
HE and KCC	9.3.4 -Requested that emerging information from trial trenching and other evaluations be reflected as amendments to the emerging master plan.	The information from the fieldwork is discussed in the ES section 9.3 and the masterplan has been designed to take into account significant remains identified. Further Investigations will be carried out as part of the ongoing Heritage Strategy.
HE and KCC	9.3.3. 9.3.7 9.3.8 and 9.4.32 Info and reports from trial trenching, geoarchaeological DBA and other evaluations (including some appraisal reports) have yet to be shared. Information needed to inform assessment of significance and impacts. There is potential to identify areas where nationally important archaeology may be present and further areas where evaluation is required. There are still areas where nationally important archaeology is expected, not yet been evaluated (e.g. the complex of barrows and other features west of Barrow Hill, Sellindge). It is essential that pre-application work is assessed in the ES	All reports from the archaeological investigations have been subsequently shared and are available as Appendices to this ES.
HE and KCC	9.3.7, 9.3.8, 9.4.27 and 9.4.28 and 9.4.32 - Some of the discoveries are very likely to be of national significance and for which physical preservation in situ is likely to be the appropriate outcome. NPPF advises that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be considered using the same NPPF policies as for designated heritage assets. Para 9.4.21 and 9.4.31 identifies buildings from the assessment process which potentially meet the criteria for special interest and hence listing.	See consultation Table 9 -2 for response. Eight non-designated historic buildings have been treated in a precautionary way within the masterplan i.e. they have been treated as if they are listed. An assessment of non-designated historic buildings has been carried out using Historic England's listing screening criteria (Appendix 9.5) as well as assessments of the significance of Westenhanger Castle (Appendix 9.6), the Prehistoric barrows (Appendix 9.7) and the Romano-British villa (Appendix 9. 8). Also see sections 9.3 and 9.4.

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
HE and KCC	9.3.8 and 9.4.2 Other heritage assets identified should be added to the list of key heritage assets and included on figures. These include the barrow cemeteries to the east and west of Barrow Hill, Sellindge and the Romano-British villa site. KCC's current opinion is that these assets are of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, and should be considered using the same national policies as for designated archaeological assets. Further evaluation, assessment of the barrows as a group and their setting is required to inform the EIA and should be a priority.	Some assets such as the villa and the barrows are now described as key assets in sections 9.3 of the ES and have been given more emphasis, as a result of the assessment of Significance based on the archaeological investigations. They have been preserved within the masterplan. See above for Statements of Significance that have been prepared for the barrows and the villa.
HE and KCC	9.3.7 Romano-British remains identified by geophysical survey east of Lypne Industrial Estate as an example of potential 'showstoppers' that have not been fully evaluated and therefore might pose a risk to the masterplan. KCC stated the need for evaluation as soon as possible. KCC has asked for an additional geophysical survey (resistivity) so that the layout of the villa complex might be better understood. The results of this additional survey would need to be considered in the EIA and the masterplan potentially amended.	This potentially Romano-British asset is described in Section 9.3 and was also discussed at the meeting on the 17th May. Substantial further archaeological investigation has been carried out since the scoping opinion was issued (Appendix 9.14 and 9.21) and the findings are presented in this ES .
HE and FHDC	9.4 and 4.2.6 - Concerned that the red line boundary largely excludes Westenhanger Castle and that the project is not able to deliver benefits against the harm caused by changes within the setting of the castle. District Council's and HE's advice is that Westenhanger Castle should be included within the red line.	The castle was not in the applicant's control at the time the response was received but now is and has been brought into the OPA boundary. The masterplan includes substantial consideration of the significance of the castle and proposes a new country park and open space to the south of the castle, re-instatement of key aspects of its setting including the southern access track and the formal gardens, along with removal of current features that negatively impact the castle's setting.
HE and KCC	Para 9.4.3 and 9.4.4 Some of the historical information relating to Westenhanger Castle is incorrect. Para 9.4.10 There is existing communal value for the site and there is a high potential to increase this by making the castle a key component of the new settlement. 9.4.10 Issues should be explored in the EIA and new or existing uses should be developed at the castle in co-ordination with the Otterpool Park development.	Section 9.3 and also the Statement of Significance for the Castle (Appendix 9.6) have been updated in 2018.

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
HE	Under para 9.5.1 the construction phase could have an impact for the current operation of Westenhanger Castle as the means by which its owner generates the funds with which to look after the site and to continue its conservation.	This is addressed in Section 9.4 and 9.5. Construction effects on the Castle have been revisited and will be minimised via COCP mitigation measures. This is also addressed in the Socio-economic Effects and Community Chapter (Chapter 14).
HE	There are elements of the historic landscape of the castle that are not scheduled. Enhanced understanding for the Site needs to be included in the Statement of Significance for the castle and its landscape. Archaeological remains of historic features associated with the scheduled castle and its landscape may require treatment as per NPPF (2012) para 139.	The Statement of Significance for the Castle (Appendix 9.6) was updated in 2018 with all recorded (at that time) archaeological and landscape features south of the castle and these are also discussed in Section 9.3. Geophysics (Appendix 9.19) and trial trenching has also been carried in these areas (Appendix 9.18 and 9.21). The ES has assessed all these features and the most significant to the setting of the castle will be preserved.
HE	Para 9.6 Archaeological investigations and building or landscape recording are all probable forms of mitigation and for such a large project to be delivered over a long period such work should be set within an overall research agenda for Otterpool Park. An agreed historic environment framework will help to deliver the intention of the NPPF and the need to advance understanding of the significance of heritage assets that are to be lost or harmed. Such a framework would need to be kept under regular review and be responsive to new issues as these emerge over time. It could also provide the means to agree how public display of new information and objects generated by investigations and the deposition of archaeological archives might each be tackled.	The Heritage Strategy serves this purpose.
HE	Agreed the content of para 9.5.3 as to designated heritage assets that are scoped in or out for the EIA process. Para 9.5.4 addresses the important issues for the settings of heritage assets. We agree the five bullet points but at Westenhanger Castle it is not just setting that applies. Parts of the scheduled monument are within the project boundary and may experience change and non-designated historic features associated with the castle are also directly affected. The setting of the newly discovered Romano-British villa is included but not the setting of the Prehistoric barrows.	The non-designated historic features associated with the castle are described in Section 9.3 and how they are impacted is assessed in Sections 9.4 and 9.5. Setting of the barrows is now included.

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
HE	Para 9.6.2 Too high a level of harm could be caused to the significance of the castle. ... key views out from and towards the castle should be agreed with HE for consideration.	An additional piece of work by the Phase 1 designers (with Arcadis cultural heritage input) has been carried out since this scoping opinion to prepare key views from and to the castle and these have been provided to Historic England and KCC. Sections 9.4 and 9.5 assess the impacts.
HE	4.2.3 EIA methodology - HE note the need to agree parameters describing the type and maximum size of new elements in order to understand likely effects and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation. These need to be reproduced in visual representations of the likely appearance of the Proposed Development.	See above response
KCC	Long term effects on heritage assets such as Bronze Age barrows and historic landscapes should be assessed as well as 'built heritage assets'.	See sections 9.3 and 9.4 of the ES
KCC	9..3.1 - Reference should be made to the 2013 Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Policy Paper 'Scheduled Monuments & nationally important but non-scheduled monuments', which sets out current Government policy on the identification, protection, conservation and investigation of nationally important archaeological sites.	Addressed in Section 9.2 of the ES
KCC	9.3.2 - Reference should be made to the emerging Folkestone & Hythe District Heritage Strategy, and to the Kent Farmsteads Guidance.	Kent Farmsteads Guidance is referenced in Appendix 9.3. Folkestone & Hythe Heritage Strategy is referenced in Appendix 9.6.
KCC	9.3.2 -KCC expressed concern in restricting the study area for non-designated heritage assets to 500m. A wider approach to understanding potential needed. Significant non-designated archaeological sites in the wider area such as the Saltwood Tunnel site, should be considered.	Relevant heritage assets in a wider study area such as barrows, villas, Palaeolithic remains and certain designated assets have been discussed in Appendix 9.4, 9.7, 9.8 and 9.16
KCC	9.3.7 - there may be a need to undertake further trial trenching in areas already evaluated to inform the mitigation strategy.	This has been carried out, in 2020. Further trial trenching will be carried out in Tier 2
KCC	9.3.7 and 9.6.1- Apart from the two areas noted above, Figure 9.2 shows further area identified for 'trenching at a later date'. Where there is sufficient flexibility in the masterplan that would allow it to be amended to accommodate unexpected, but nationally important discoveries, KCC is content that evaluation of these areas could generally be deferred to a later date (i.e. post determination of an outline planning application, but before agreement of detailed reserved matters). Where key	A significant amount of further evaluation has since been undertaken (geophysics and trial trenching)

Otterpool Park

ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
	infrastructure requirements are involved, with locations fixed by the application stage, field evaluation prior to determination would seem appropriate.	
KCC	9.4.28 - KCC is currently of the view that the Romano-British villa found east of Otterpool Quarry is of schedulable quality and should be treated in the EIA as if it were a scheduled monument in line with paragraph 139 of the NPPF (2012).	The villa has been preserved within the masterplan as open space, in line with its significance and due consideration has been given to its setting – see Section 9.4
KCC	9.5.4 - Setting of the Bronze Age barrows to the east and west of Barrow Hill, Sellindge should be scoped in, as should any other nationally important archaeology that could yet be revealed by the ongoing trial trenching.	Scoped in - see 9.4
KCC	9.4.10 - The Folkestone Racecourse case study within the Folkestone & Hythe Heritage Strategy should be consulted.	This has been consulted in Section 9.2.
KCC	9.5.1 - The level of visual intrusion at Upper Otterpool and Lower Otterpool needs to be tested through the EIA process.	See chapter 12 - LVIA
KCC	9.6.3 - Commitment on the retention of key historic landscape features and where historic landscape features are not being retained for these to be recorded (including through archaeological investigation). Further assessment will be required as part of the EIA process.	See ES Sections 9.4 and 9.5 on Historic Landscape. See open space parameter plan OPM(P)4002_BB for hedges and woodland to be retained. See Green Infrastructure Strategy for existing vegetation plan
KCC	9.6.5 and 9.6.7 – KCC acknowledges that not all archaeological remains will warrant preservation in situ. Where preservation by record is accepted, appropriate measures should be included to ensure (in line with paragraph 141 of the NPPF (2012)) any information (assets or archives) is stored, managed and publicly accessible. An appropriate research framework needs to be put in place from the outset to guide how the works will be managed for such a large project carried out over a long period of time, extending into the operational phase of the development. The long-term future of the archaeological archives should be considered.	See Section 9.4. A research framework has been prepared which will form part of the Heritage Strategy (Appendix B)
ABC and KCC	Concerns about assets which have been scoped out: Sandling Park Registered Park and Garden; the Romano-British building south of Burch's Rough (which is a Scheduled Monument) and Aldington Church Conservation Area. Requests that the setting effects on these assets need to be scoped in unless robust justification is provided in the ES.	Since the scoping opinion an addendum to the DBA (Appendix 9.2) has been carried out which establishes the anticipated minimal impact to the setting and views of Aldington Church

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
	<p>4.12.1 Premature to scope out archaeological resources, as the archaeological resource not yet been assessed, and proposed mitigation measures have not been agreed.</p>	<p>Conservation Area and the rationale for it not being scoped back in. Additionally, the LVIA includes a viewpoint from Aldington Church and this does not conclude that there will be visual impact (see Chapter 12).</p> <p>Sandling Park has been scoped back in.</p> <p>The setting to Burch’s Rough Romano-British building has been considered and it will be not be impacted – justification will be added.</p>
<p>Response to scoping opinions received in July 2020 after second scoping report.</p>		
<p>HE – Rebecca Lambert (Regional Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Kent, East and West Sussex and Surrey) and Alice Brockway (Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas)</p>	<p>Chapter 5 - Agriculture and Soils and Chapter 10 -hydrology/geology: We flag the necessity and opportunity for archaeological investigation alongside any soil or construction investigations, for example window sampling, geological test pitting or boreholes. There should therefore be a cross reference to archaeological matters in these sections</p>	<p>This has been now cross-referenced in the revised ES Chapter 10- Geology, Hydrogeology and Land Quality. No further Ground Investigations have taken place since the 2018 GI works which were monitored archaeologically (See Appendix 9.17)</p>
<p>HE</p>	<p>The assessment [not just the Cultural Heritage Chapter] should also consider the likelihood of alterations to drainage and ground water patterns that might lead to in situ decomposition or destruction of below ground archaeological remains and deposits. Monitoring of these effects may be required</p> <p>It should also consider the need for ongoing management and maintenance of heritage assets during operation of the scheme.</p>	<p>The only area of known waterlogged archaeology is the field west of the stream, where the Romano-British villa (167) lies. This area will be kept as open space. Chapter 10- Geology, The Hydrogeology section of the Geology, Hydrology and Land Quality Chapter of the ES (Chapter 10) now includes a section on the waterlogged remains here. The groundwater table in this area is likely to remain as current levels or possibly may increase. The conditions of the known and undiscovered waterlogged archaeological remains here is therefore unlikely to change. More detail has also been provided in Section 9.3 to 9.5 of this Chapter.</p>

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
		<p>The need for ongoing management and maintenance of heritage assets during operation of the scheme is outside the scope of this ES chapter. A stewardship and estate management strategy for the new town is being secured under the Section 106 agreement. The ongoing management of Otterpool’s public and community spaces is likely to be the responsibility of a single, community-led body, allowing future residents and businesses to influence the design and ongoing management of community facilities. Their work will be critical to maintaining and building on the quality of the development. The management and use of heritage assets will be included in the remit of this new body. Chapters 4, 5, 8 and 9 of the Heritage Strategy provide ideas and strategies for how these heritage assets should be preserved, interpreted and managed however exact details of how this will be achieved are beyond the scope of this ES chapter.</p>
HE	<p>When the present phase of evaluation is complete there needs to be a thorough review of the significance of what has been revealed and how this might affect the emerging design.</p> <p>We have seen initial reports for some of the archaeological investigations and the implications are likely to be significant and could influence the design of the scheme. It is essential therefore that new data is reviewed and detailed clearly in the report; at present we find these sections distinctly lacking in detail.</p>	<p>The ‘present’ phase of evaluation referred to (geophysics, trial trenching, mini-excavation) was carried out between April to October 2020 (Appendices 9.19 and 9.21), with 3 geoarchaeological test pits being added to that in January 2021 (Appendix 9.20). These reports have been shared with HE and KCC. The baseline of the ES (Section 9.3) has been substantially updated with the results of these investigations and more detail has been added. A review of their significance has been undertaken by Arcadis. Certain of the heritage assets are currently being screened for designation by</p>

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
HE	<p>Section 9.4.3 [of 2020 scoping report]: Request to include mention of the known and potential archaeological remains (including earthworks) within the scheduled monument of Westenhanger Castle which now falls within the OPA. Request specialist analysis of these features in order to fully understand their significance. Sufficient information should be provided to ensure confidence in the conclusions of the ES relating to direct and indirect impacts on Westenhanger Castle. F&HDC has taken further advice on the level of detail required at this outline stage and its advice will be contained within a separate Heritage Advice Note.</p> <p>It is very likely that that there will be a range of other as yet unidentified buried former buildings, structures and deposits within the boundary of the scheduled monument. This potential should be recognised here but will need to be tested through archaeological research and investigation.</p> <p>No mention is made of the complex area of earthworks to the north of the castle that fall within the scheduled area? This area may include evidence relating to a mill and water courses. These should be acknowledged here and we think that specialist analysis of these features will be required in order to fully understand their significance.</p> <p>We note that the manor house is also grade I listed.</p>	<p>Historic England’s Enhanced Advisory Service with results expected by end of August 2021.</p> <p>The ES has now been amended to include these points. A survey and specialist analysis of the earthworks north of the castle has already been carried out, in 2004. The report on this has been sent to HE and KCC. A geophysical survey (Ground Penetrating Radar) of the scheduled area of the castle (Appendix 9.19) has also been carried out since these opinions were given. Results from both these surveys have been incorporated into the baseline. However, the parameter plans show no impacts/development within the scheduled area.</p>
HE	<p>Mitigation measures should include reducing developable areas around Westenhanger Castle to sustain the rural setting which makes an important contribution to its significance. Further mitigation may then follow through density, scale, landscaping, interface of green spaces and built areas, retention of key historic features, landscaping for Westenhanger Park etc.</p> <p>Section 9.6.2 refers to sensitive siting as a mitigation measure. We do not think this is a strong enough commitment to avoidance of harm to designated heritage assets or those of equal significance. Mitigation measures should include reducing developable areas around Westenhanger Castle to sustain the rural setting which makes an important contribution to its significance. Further mitigation may then follow through density, scale, landscaping, interface of green spaces and built areas, retention of key historic features, landscaping for Westenhanger Park etc.</p>	<p>It may not be possible to maintain a rural setting completely. However, significant improvements to the Castle’s setting will be gained through the masterplan. All these design features have been carefully considered with the Castle’s setting in mind.</p> <p>The ES now goes into a more detail on mitigation measures now, especially around the Castle</p>

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
HE/Temple	<p>HE reiterated the need to agree key viewpoints for assessing heritage impacts. This should be recognised in the table (in Chapter 4) and actioned through discussion with HE. Temple (F&HDC) agree and also re-state the need to use lidar to do a ZTV of the castle</p>	<p>Further work on heritage viewpoints has since been carried out in March 2021 (all of which are focussed on views to and from the Castle and its deerpark). The ZTV was not carried forward</p>
HE/ Mills & Reeve	<p>HE raised the potential option of a hybrid application, with plans for the Castle provided in greater detail. Mills & Reeve then looked at how this could work in more detail.</p> <p>We recommend close collaboration of cultural heritage and landscape/visual impact assessment, in order to adequately address issues in relation to setting of designated heritage assets. Techniques such as photomontages, computer generated views analysis imagery, and verified views with wireframes are a useful part of understanding visual impacts. Analysis of the views from within the site boundaries, out of, and across the key site areas in relation to designated heritage sites will be important. We have not yet had the opportunity to agree key viewpoints and would like to do so.</p>	<p>This has been considered but it has been decided not to carry this forward. Plans for the Castle will be submitted in outline as they are not yet at enough detail to assess.</p> <p>Since then more dialogue has taken place between LVIA and Cultural Heritage about dovetailing our two assessments and 2 extra LVIA view points have been added for the purposes of heritage. As stated above we have also had discussion with the heritage consultees about viewpoints and agreed 5 (non-LVIA) views for views analysis around the castle. The views analysis that has taken place has informed our assessment.</p>
HE	<p>Expert landscape historian to look at landscape features around the Castle.</p> <p>The most highly graded heritage assets affected by the proposal are Westenhanger Castle (scheduled monument), barns (additionally Grade I listed) and Westenhanger Manor (Grade I listed). They form a cohesive group and there would be both physical and setting impacts from development of the castle and its former landscape.</p>	<p>The project has since commissioned this. See appraisal by Paul Stamper who is an expert landscape archaeologist (Appendix 9.22)</p>
HE	<p>Concern over heights of proposed buildings around the Castle. Westenhanger character area is identified as a medium density area with max four storeys building height. We are concerned that taller development is proposed in such a sensitive heritage location in relation to the castle and within its associated historic landscape. This will need addressing through the evolving Master Plans and HEF.</p>	<p>The design team has considered this, although it should be noted that the heights shown on the parameter plan are maximum heights.</p> <p>The parameter plans show the 'worst case' in terms of heights. The setting of the castle and its economic viability has been key in determining</p>

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
		the Design - see Strategic Design Principles, DAS and GI Strategy (and the Phase 1 Design Code)
HE	<p>The scoping report doesn't adequately include effects on the Castle now it is within the red line i.e. there will now be more than just an effect to its setting.</p> <p>There is a possibility for construction effects to have a short-term impact on economic viability of Westenhanger Castle. Under section 9.5.1 (possible significant effects during construction), the inclusion of the castle now means that effects will go beyond changes in its setting and will include change to the designated heritage assets themselves, both above and below ground. Such change is necessary to help secure a sustainable future for the castle and its setting, and appropriate effects should be considered. The existing text reflects the old situation not the new ownership, and this change needs to be scoped in.</p> <p>Increased traffic can also causing noise and visual disruption. There is a possibility for construction effects to have a short-term impact on economic viability of Westenhanger; if these have an adverse impact on its use as a wedding venue/other uses implemented in phase 1 as described in the draft plan for the castle. The effects of vibration, and changes in ground water levels and water movement can also be significant, and monitoring may be required during construction; these aspects should be scoped in (see also point 7 comment and Section 1, impacts).</p>	ES amended in terms of effects to setting. Physical effects are not yet known therefore cannot be assessed at this time. Economic affects have been addressed now.
HE	<p>Request for updates to desk-based reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates to the DBA (Appendix 9.2) to include recent fieldwork and desk-based work <p>Updates to the Statement of Significance of the Castle (Appendix 9.6) and the Castle Conservation Management Plan due to our understanding of the Castle and its landscape (and therefore its significance) having been enhanced since the Statement of Significance was revised in 2018</p>	<p>The ES already assesses setting as part of significance. It cannot include detailed setting assessments as it would make it too long. Therefore the ES references the DBA and the various Statements of Significance that have been carried out (Appendices 9.2, 9.6, 9.7 and 9.8)</p> <p>The DBA will not be further updated. Results of the recent fieldwork, desk-based work and views</p>

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
		<p>analysis etc will form part of the Heritage Strategy and the updated ES</p> <p>The ES Baseline have been updated to reflect our enhanced knowledge. Further detail of the study of the castle's landscape is available in Appendix 9.22. Additionally, Purcell have since produced a Proposed Use & Redevelopment Masterplan for Westenhanger Castle. The CMP has been updated and will form part of the OPA</p>
HE	<p>We see the inclusion of the Castle in the development boundary as an opportunity to secure its future sustainability and optimum viable use</p>	<p>Agreed. This opportunity has been fully explored in the development of the masterplan, The Heritage Strategy, The updated CMP and the Proposed Use & Redevelopment Masterplan for Westenhanger Castle</p>
HE	<p>Topographic survey and expert analysis needed of the landscape features north and south of the castle including water features west of the racecourse lake, the causeway and the possible mill and water courses north of the Castle</p>	<p>An earthwork survey was carried out in 2004 on the earthworks north of the Castle. A topographic survey for the whole OPA area has been produced (but not for archaeological purposes). Having discussed with a landscape archaeologist we do not consider that topographic survey of the features south of the castle would not add anything to the Lidar and the Digital Elevation modelling that have already been carried out (see DBA -Appendix 9.2).</p> <p>Augering is due to take place within the waterlogged habital area east of the causeway in autumn 2021 which will provide palaeoenvironmental information.</p>
HE/Temple	<p>Strong recommendation that we utilise HE's designation screening service at this point in the application to help decide on whether any buildings, structures or archaeological</p>	<p>This was done in 2021 and included the barrows, the causeway, most of the buildings inside the red</p>

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
	assets should be designated to ensure that we correctly assess the assets' significance in the ES	line and some just outside, as agreed with HE. Therefore their significance has been accurately determined and any changes have been reflected in the assessment (e.g. the causeway was previously assessed as medium significance and is now high to reflect the scheduling).
HE	Archaeological evaluation needed of the area of the racecourse stable blocks	No action possible at this time, due to the current site conditions. The Heritage Strategy notes that this needs to be done at a later stage of the project, once the stable buildings are demolished. Purcell also to include in their Proposed Use & Redevelopment Masterplan for Westenhanger Castle
HE	HE flag up effects to the Listed Buildings in Sellindge had been scoped out but argue that they will experience temporary effects during construction due to increased traffic	The buildings have been scoped back in
HE	There are several comments by HE on other chapters not just cultural heritage e.g. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 13) and LVIA (Chapter 12). Receptors for noise and vibration impacts also include heritage assets; this should be included and appropriate strategies would be needed for implementing and managing this.	<p>The LVIA chapter strongly references historic landscape and heritage and both chapters dovetail in terms of views and setting. There has been close collaboration of cultural heritage and LVIA, in order to adequately address issues in relation to setting of designated heritage assets</p> <p>The impacts to heritage assets from noise and vibration and mitigation measures are assessed in this chapter (Chapter 9)</p>
HE	HE would like to see an integrated landscape approach to assessment rather than looking at impacts to individual heritage assets. The assessment and supporting documents should demonstrate an understanding of how all the individual elements of the historic environment come together, and which fully analyses how the development proposals may impact upon the special significance of the area, and the assets within it (both designated and non-designated)	The ES baseline has been revised to discuss the heritage across the Otterpool Park landscape. Key asset groups have been identified, discussing individual assets together under one holistic approach to assessment and mitigation for these key assets. Figures have also been revised to illustrate the key groupings across the Otterpool

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
		Park landscape as it developed over archaeological periods.
HE	In order to achieve the above HE strongly support the concept of an overarching Historic Environment Framework (HEF). The HEF will be an evolving document but there is already a significant amount of new information which will need to be incorporated within it.	A Heritage Strategy has been produced which performs this function. The mitigation strategy part of the Heritage Strategy will be updated regularly with all the new information during the lifecycle of the development
HE	HE say that in regard to mitigating impacts to non-designated heritage assets by recording them in advance of destruction “The ability to record the past should not however be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted”	Noted
Temple	The assessment should clearly indicate and take into account the timescales for the delivery of any heritage benefit and avoidance of significant effects upon its setting	This is not possible as, apart from Phase 1, the timescales and phasing for each development area are not known. This is now explained in the ES.
Temple	Additional schemes to be assessed under cumulative effects i.e. those at Lypne Industrial Estate	Now included
Temple	The 2020 Scoping Report notes that there is a relatively long construction timeframe (25 years) and phasing is not known. A reasonable worst case scenario approach should be taken to construction phasing, taking into account early phase occupation as well as the order in which retail and community infrastructure is delivered, which will have implications particularly for noise, air quality, traffic, socioeconomics, health, and landscape and visual impact	This is not specifically a CH issue. Also we don't know which zones will be brought forward when
NE	You should consider whether there is land in the area affected by the development which qualifies for conditional exemption from capital taxes on the grounds of outstanding scenic, scientific or historic interest.	There are none
Temple	Baseline data used for the previous 2019 Application should be ‘in date’ and updated, if required.	Baseline data has been updated with the results of our investigations as well as other (relevant)

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
		findings such as the Bronze Age hoard east of Stone Street
HE	<p>Section 9.6.10 states: “The provision will serve to prevent determination of significant harm to the castle. Similarly, the implementation of measures to safeguard historic buildings and their settings within the development and addressing the historic landscape character and farmstead analysis within the Framework Master Plan will have been secured by the time the development is operational and will not require mitigation.”</p> <p>This statement is not clear; what is meant by provision and prevent determination of significant harm to the castle?</p>	Agree this was not clear. This has now been made clearer in the ES
HE	<p>Section 9.6.9 ‘During operation, it will remain for the measures for the long-term management of Westenhanger Castle and barns, the prehistoric barrows, the Roman villa and the military heritage assets to be considered’ There are likely to be other heritage assets that require this approach; the report will need updating to include new discoveries.</p>	ES chapter updated to say this (Section 9.6)
HE	<p>In line with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), we would expect the forthcoming Environmental Statement to contain a thorough assessment of the likely effects which the proposed development of this area might have upon those elements which contribute to the significance of heritage assets.</p>	A thorough assessment of the likely effects as included within the chapter.
HE	<p>We think heritage benefit must be secured within the consent granted by Tier 1 and we think this could be in the form of a commitment within the S.106 to achieve this objective within an agreed timeframe. We would look for those heritage benefits to be delivered early in the wider delivery of a new settlement at Otterpool.</p>	Early delivery of heritage benefits for Westenhanger Castle is relied upon as mitigation within the Chapter.
HE	<p>If detailed plans have been agreed for Westenhanger by the date the Council determine Tier 1, it may be possible to include for these detailed plans within a hybrid application, though we accept this option may be less desirable. We would like to discuss this further with the Council and applicant as the application proceeds but felt it helpful to highlight this concern as part of our scoping response</p>	<p>A hybrid application has not been taken forward. Continuing engagement with Historic England and Kent County Council has resulted in agreement that the Westenhanger Castle itself is to be used for a future community and commercial use. However at this stage of the proposals the form, siting and detail has of these uses has not been</p>

Otterpool Park
 ES Appendix 9.9 – Heritage Policy, Consultation and Scoping

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
		agreed with HE or KCC and discussions are on-going. It has subsequently been agreed with HE and KCC that further details of the Castle proposals would come forward at a later date following submission of the Otterpool Park planning application. The approach in planning terms would be to address the Castle uses scheme detail through a subsequent 'drop-in' planning application'
HE	There will be a requirement through planning policy to avoid and minimise harm to heritage assets and there will be a presumption in favour of conserving designated assets. By following planning policy and guidance we would also additionally expect the project to be creative in how it might offer opportunities for their enhancement, and how the project might deliver public (heritage) benefit.	Agreed. This is the approach the project has followed
HE	<p>Section 4.13: The original Environmental Statement had an appendix which discussed impacts in NPPF terms, but the revised structure doesn't make it clear if this would also be in the updated ES. We think this should be included in order to address the alternate methodologies of EIA and requirements of the NPPF; in particular the ability to account for the contribution of setting in assessing harm and impact. This can be under-represented through an EIA format as level of harm is not the same as magnitude of impact.</p> <p>The proposed structure of the ES is rigid and separates out different topics. We flag again here that heritage crosses a number of different categories and it will be necessary to identify heritage matters in all relevant chapters.</p>	<p>The 2019 ES did not contain such an appendix - we have always used the EIA terminology. However, now the ES contains a summary to say how EIA terminology (significant effect, not significant effect) equates to NPPF terminology (substantial harm and less than substantial harm)</p> <p>Heritage has now been addressed in other relevant chapters such as Chapter 10 and Chapter 12</p>
HE	Sections 5 agriculture and soils and 10 hydrology/geology: We flag the necessity and opportunity for archaeological investigation alongside any soil or construction investigations, for example window sampling, geological test pitting or boreholes. There should therefore be a cross reference to archaeological matters in these sections.	We have commissioned archaeological watching brief on GI works. Chapter 10 (section 10.4) now includes a requirement for archaeological monitoring for any future GI works

Consultee/Contact	Summary Scoping Opinion Response	Location in the ES
HE	<p>"Section 9.3.2: add in Historic England guidance on writing heritage statements https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/statements-heritage-significance-advice-note-12/</p> <p>Also add National Planning Policy Guidance. This provides useful definitions (e.g. optimum viable use) https://www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment"</p>	Noted and used
HE	<p>Section 9.3.14 - matrix for effect of change; we note that in appendix 3A of the ICOMOS guidance, an asset can generally only be assessed as very high heritage significance if it is of acknowledged international significance. High significance under the same definition would capture a grade I building, SM, grade II building and CA (if it contains an important building) as high significance</p>	Noted and changed in ES
HE	<p>Sections 9.4.21-23 and 9.4.27-31: It is very confusing to have two separate sections in the report dealing with archaeology. We are not clear what the difference between archaeological remains and resources is? These need combining to make an accurate timeline and to provide a more holistic baseline.</p> <p>There is reference in sections 9.4.22/23/27 to new data from archaeological investigation that has expanded knowledge and understanding; however no detail is given here on what this data/knowledge is or actually means in relation to the development site and FMP.</p> <p>We have seen initial reports for some of the archaeological investigations and the implications are likely to be significant and could influence the design of the scheme. It is essential therefore that new data is reviewed and detailed clearly in the report; at present we find these sections distinctly lacking in detail.</p>	Amended

Table 5 Summary of Draft ES Consultation Comments

Consultee	Comment	Response
Temple	We will need to look in more detail at the use of the Westenhanger Castle Conservation Management Plan as a mitigation measure.	Noted
Temple	We note that the Heritage Chapter does not address the potential impact of changes to drainage regimes on buried heritage assets as requested in the Scoping Opinion.	This is now addressed – see sections 9.1 – ‘relevant aspects of the proposed development’ Also in 9.3 and 9.4 where it has been addressed in regard to known waterlogged remains near the Roman Villa and potential waterlogged remains in the habitat area east of the causeway and west of the lake. We have no evidence for waterlogged archaeological remains anywhere else within the OPA site so cannot meaningfully assess impacts