

## 8 ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE

### 8.1 Introduction

- 8.1.1 Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust's Projects Division have been commissioned to undertake an assessment of the impact of the proposed development upon the archaeological resource and historic landscape (ASIDOHL2), which forms the present chapter of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

### 8.2 Policy and Legislation

#### ASIDOHL2

##### **Register of landscapes of outstanding historic interest in Wales**

- 8.2.1 In 1998, after an extensive consultation exercise, Cadw in association with the Countryside Council for Wales (CCW) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS UK), published Part 2.1 of its *Register of Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales* (Cadw/CCW/ICOMOS 1998). This volume forms part of a series of publications, collectively known as the *Register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales*. The first part of the Register (Part 1) deals with historic parks and gardens, and is being produced in a series of county volumes. Part 2, which deals with landscapes, has been published in two volumes covering all of Wales. The first of these volumes (Part 2.1) covers the Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest; the second (Part 2.2) deals with landscapes of more regional value (Landscapes of Special Historic Interest).

##### **The historic landscape**

- 8.2.2 In addition to any direct effects of the proposal on known and potential archaeological sites, the development has the potential to affect the historic landscape in general and the area of the Historic Landscape of Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows (HLW (MGI) 1) in particular. Recently updated guidance outlined a methodology for assessing the indirect and visual effects of proposals on the historic landscape (ASIDOHL2). The present study of the effects of the proposed development was undertaken according to this methodology. What follows in Section 8 is a summary of the ASIDOHL2 process; the full details appear as a Technical Annex within the Guide to good practice on using the Register of Landscapes of Historic Interest in Wales in the planning and development processes, Revised (2nd) edition including revisions to the assessment process (ASIDOHL2) (Cadw/CCW/Welsh Assembly 2007).

##### **Welsh Historic Landscapes and Historic Landscape Character Areas**

- 8.2.3 The Welsh landscape is steeped in history and displays the influence of man from later prehistoric times through to the industrial era. Some landscapes are of especial historic significance, and in recent years this fact has been recognised by the identification of 58 areas as being key Historic Landscapes. These are described within the *Register of Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales* (Cadw/CCW/ICOMOS 1998) and the *Register of Landscapes of Special Historic Interest in Wales* (Cadw/CCW/ICOMOS 2001).
- 8.2.4 Recent historic landscape characterisation projects across Wales have sought to describe in

detail the Historic Landscapes. Each project involves detailed examination of the landscape; on the basis of which analysis, the Historic Landscape is divided into a number of Historic Landscape Character Areas (HLCAs). Each HLCA is a discrete entity, defined according to archaeological and historical attributes, or by cultural associations, which distinguish it from adjacent areas; HLCAs take diverse forms, ranging from Bronze Age funerary zones to recent industrial landscapes, from unenclosed upland to densely populated settlements.

8.2.5 Historic Landscape Characteristics are the tangible evidence for the activities and habits of past land users and occupiers and reflect their beliefs, attitudes, traditions and values. Such characteristics might equally reflect specific events or functional evolution over time. Historic Landscape Characterisation sets out to establish the historic depth of past human activity within the modern landscape by identifying its principal historic components. In establishing the historical characterisation of landscapes, recent work in Wales has suggested that adopting a practical approach based on subdivision of the overall historic landscape into sub-units of broadly homogenous character is an effective method. This process can be summarised as:

- One (or more) components                      dominant pattern
- One (or more) dominant patterns              coherent character
- Coherent character (with definable limits)    character area (HLCA)
- Several HLCAs                                      local landscape

8.2.6 HLCAs form the basic unit assessed within the ASIDOHL2. As discussed below, the contribution of each HLCA to the wider Historic Landscape (and thus its value in ASIDOHL2 terms) is variable: some are key elements, whilst others are only of incidental importance. Each HLCA directly or indirectly affected by the proposed development is assessed individually within Stages 2-4 of ASIDOHL2. In Stage 5 the results of Stages 2-4 are combined to produce an assessment of the overall impact on the Historic Landscape described by the *Register*.

### **Historic landscapes and the planning process**

8.2.7 The *Register* seeks to promote policies to preserve the character of historic landscapes, although it imposes no additional planning controls and recognises that continuing development is a necessary part of a living landscape. Nevertheless, historic landscapes remain a factor in the planning process:

*‘When Environmental Assessment is necessary, the Town and Country Planning (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1988 require, amongst other things, the significant effects of the development on the landscape and cultural heritage to be assessed. ... Factors that need to be borne in mind include the effect of the development on the overall historic integrity and coherence of the area on the Register, whether by outright removal, severance, fragmentation, or dislocation of historic elements. The cumulative effects of secondary or piecemeal changes over time should also be taken into account.’*

*(Cadw/CCW/ICOMOS 1998)*

8.2.8 Similarly, the most recent guidance given to planning authorities states that:

*'Information on the landscapes on the second part of the Register should also be taken into account by local planning authorities in preparing UDPs (Unitary Development Plans), and in considering the implications of developments which are of such a scale that they would have more than local impact on an area on the Register.'*

*Planning Policy Wales (March 2002, Para. 6.5.23)*

### **Historic landscapes and the planning process**

8.2.9 The development area lies within the Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows historic landscape included within the Cadw/CCW/ICOMOS *Register of Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales*. *Planning Policy Wales (2002)* states that "Information on the landscapes on the second part of the Register should be taken into account in considering the implications of developments which are of such a scale that they would have a more than local impact on an area on the Register".

8.2.10 The guidance emphasises the interaction between different aspects of impact, including landscape and the archaeological heritage, requiring an Environmental Statement to include a description of "the likely significant effects of the development on the environment, which should cover the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, short medium and long-term, permanent and temporary effects ... and the description by the applicant of the forecasting methods used to assess the effects on the environment." In the Register, guidance has been given on the approach to fulfilling this requirement in relation to historic landscapes where effects to be assessed include "the effect of the development on the overall historic integrity and coherence of the area on the Register." This guidance has been amplified in *Guide to Good Practice on Using the Register of Landscapes of Historic Interest in Wales in the Planning and Development Process*.

8.2.11 Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows have been selected as a landscape of outstanding historical interest for (principally) one out of five potential criteria (Cadw/CCW/ICOMOS 1998):

- (4) Buried/Subsumed or destroyed
- Landscapes whose past use may usually only be inferred by historical (documentary) or archaeological (remote or intrusive) methods of investigation.

## **8.3 Assessment Methodology and Criteria**

8.3.1 The assessment comprises a review of existing information about the archaeological resource of an area of 225 hectares on which the Island Farm development is located. The study area is centred on NGR SS 86926 78134 and is outlined in green in Figure 19, Areas of Archaeological Interest. The assessment is intended to conform to the *Institute for Archaeologists' Standards in British Archaeology: Archaeological desk-based assessments*.

8.3.2 Information recorded on the regional Historic Environment Record and National Monuments Record was assessed. Cartographic, pictorial and documentary sources were studied, along

with relevant published information. Current Listed Building data and information on Scheduled Ancient Monuments and registered landscapes was obtained from Cadw. Collections of aerial photographs held by the Central Register of Air Photography for Wales were examined and additional information requested from the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales. A site visit was made on 7th of August 2009

#### Assessment criteria

- 8.3.3 The archaeological sites within the study area are categorised in accordance with the only available criteria that are nationally agreed; these are set out in the Department of Transport/Welsh Office/Scottish Office Design Manual for Roads and Bridges paragraph 3.4 Vol. 11 Section 3 Part 2 (Cultural Heritage).
- Category A: national importance
  - Category B: regional importance
  - Category C: local importance
  - Category D: low importance
- 8.3.4 To these an additional category has been added
- Category U: unknown
- 8.3.5 The assessment of the **importance** of individual sites is essentially a subjective exercise based upon the experience of the project team. The importance of certain sites will be implied by their status within the statutory framework. Scheduled Ancient Monuments will always be of national importance; Listed Buildings will be of at least regional importance. Values assigned to other sites are given both in relation to their individual importance and to their context within the wider landscape.
- 8.3.6 The **condition** of individual sites and the general overall condition of surviving remains has bearing on the value of the sites themselves and on the value that they impart within a wider landscape context. The condition of sites is recorded following the system used by the GGAT HER, using the following criteria:
- Intact: the site is intact
  - Near intact: the site is nearly intact
  - Damaged: the site has been moderately damaged
  - Near destroyed: the site has nearly been destroyed
  - Destroyed: the site has been destroyed
  - Restored: the site has been restored
  - Moved: the site has been moved (usually finds)
  - Not known: the condition of the site is not known

8.3.7 For the purposes of desk-based assessments, **rarity** is assessed at regional level only. The following criteria are used:

- High: very few sites of this type are known
- Medium: the site is not unusual, but cannot be considered common
- Low: the site is quite common

8.3.8 **Group association** is where a connection between sites within the landscape can be demonstrated. These will usually be of the same period, but may include groups where the presence of an earlier site or sites has led to the formation of a later complex, or where an earlier site or sites can be shown to have acquired importance as part of a later complex. The criteria are as follows:

- High: the site forms part of an interconnected complex occupying a clearly definable landscape where little or no fragmentation has occurred
- Medium: the site is part of an interconnected complex, which is either limited in scope or badly fragmented
- Low: there are few or no other sites, which are associated

8.3.9 **Historical association** is where there is a link between the site and known historical or cultural persons or events. Prehistoric sites, which are by definition before historical evidence, cannot have any contemporary historical association, but they may acquire later associations. For the Roman and Early Medieval periods, where survival of historical evidence is poor and patchy, any contemporary documentation at all will be important. Two classifications are given for historical association, one reflecting the certainty of the identification, and the other its importance. Only sites with certain or possible association can be assessed for importance, and historical association can only increase the importance of a site; the absence of it will never decrease its importance.

Historical association- identification

- Certain
- Possible
- Unknown

Historical association- importance

- High
- Medium
- Low

8.3.10 The assignment of values to identified interests requires consideration of the reliability and

accuracy of the source data, ranging from fully-recorded features seen in open excavation to antiquarian comments on finds of note from a poorly-defined location. The **confidence** with which the values have been assigned is noted, using the following criteria:

- High: existing information is reliable and detailed
- Medium: existing information is apparently reliable but limited in detail
- Low: existing information is too limited to allow its reliability to be assessed

8.3.11 The **effect** of the proposal on the archaeological resource has been assessed using the following criteria:

- Severe: total loss
- Major: significant loss, likely to result in a reduction of value of the surviving site
- Minor: loss unlikely to result in a reduction of value of the surviving site
- None: no identifiable effect
- Beneficial: development will protect, preserve or enhance the site better than if the development did not occur

### **ASIDOHL Assessment Methodology**

#### **The Guidelines**

8.3.12 Guidelines setting out a suggested methodology for historic landscape assessment have been produced by Cadw and CCW, in consultation with the Welsh Archaeological Trusts (Cadw/CCW/Welsh Assembly 2007).

#### **Summary of ASIDOHL2 stages**

8.3.13 ASIDOHL2 is structured into five stages, summarised in the table below. A concluding statement follows the final stage.

*Table 8.1: the ASIDOHL2 process*

<b>Stage 1</b>	Compilation of an introduction of essential, contextual information
<b>Stage 2</b>	Description and quantification of the direct, physical impacts on the HLCAs affected
<b>Stage 3</b>	Description and quantification of the indirect impacts on the HLCAs affected
<b>Stage 4</b>	Evaluation of the relative importance of the parts of the HLCAs affected by development in relation to:  the whole of the HLCA concerned  the whole of the Historic Landscape  the national context

<b>Stage 5</b>	Assessment of the overall significance of development, and the effects that altering the HLCAs concerned has on the whole of the Historic Landscape
----------------	---

Quantification of results

- 8.3.14 ASIDOHL2 Stages 2 - 4 involve a grading and scoring process, by which figures can be offered for the direct and indirect impacts, and for the relative importance of the HLCAs (and their individual components) within a local and national context. Leading from this, a similar grading process is followed in Stage 5, producing a single figure for the overall significance of the impact of the proposed development. It is noteworthy that the ASIDOHL methodology as it presently stands cannot lead to the expression of positive benefits of a development, the range of impacts being graded from Very Severe to Very Slight.
- 8.3.15 The basic grading and scoring criteria are reproduced in the tables below. The formulae and working processes leading to the final scores for Stages 2-5 are not replicated here, for they are unnecessary for all but the most specialist reader of this report. The full methodology can be found in the Technical Annex described above (Cadw/CCW/Welsh Assembly 2007).

**The ASIDOHL2 Stages**

Stage 1: Contextual information

- 8.3.16 The first stage is to gather essential contextual information that forms the introduction to the report. In addition to information such as the planning history, necessary issues such as the historical background to the area are addressed within the early pages of the present report.

Stage 2: Direct effects

- 8.3.17 Direct physical impacts are quantified and expressed in three ways, namely:
- (a) *in absolute terms, expressed as a percentage of the area of land that is directly affected*
  - (b) *in relative terms, expressed as a percentage of key elements that are directly affected*
  - (c) *in landscape terms, expressed by statements concerning the extrinsic value of elements that are directly affected*
- 8.3.18 Table 8.2, on the following page, shows the criteria for assessing the magnitude of the direct physical impacts of a proposed development on an historic landscape in absolute and relative terms – steps (a) and (b) above.

*Table 8.2: Criteria for assessing the magnitude of direct physical impacts on elements of an HLCA*

<b>75-100%</b>	permanently lost or removed	Very severe
<b>50-74%</b>	permanently lost or removed	Severe

<b>30-49%</b>	permanently lost or removed	Considerable
<b>15-29%</b>	permanently lost or removed	Moderate
<b>5-14%</b>	permanently lost or removed	Slight
<b>1-4%</b>	permanently lost or removed	Very Slight

8.3.19 The intrinsic importance or status of each element or characteristic affected should also be briefly described, recorded together with a statement of intrinsic importance or status using the categories adopted by the Welsh Archaeological Trusts (that extend those as set out in the Department of Transport/Welsh Office/Scottish Office Design Manual for Roads and Bridges paragraph 3.4 Vol. 11 Section 3 Part 2 (Cultural Heritage):

- Category A: national importance
- Category B: regional importance
- Category C: local importance
- Category D: low importance
- Category U: unknown

8.3.20 Table 8.3 shows the criterion for expressing the magnitude of the direct effects of a proposed development in landscape terms – step (c) above. This aspect is considered in two stages. First, the value of each affected element to the HLCA is assessed. Second, the effect of the loss (or partial loss) of that element or characteristic to the HLCA is considered; for example, how much does the loss of element X (or part thereof) diminish the value of Y as a landscape?

*Table 8.3: Criteria for assessing the magnitude of direct effect on landscape value*

<b>Element – value to the HLCA</b>	<b>Landscape value Effect</b>
Very High	Lost
High	Substantially Reduced
Considerable	Considerably Reduced
Medium	Moderately Reduced
Low	Slightly Reduced
Very Low	Very Slightly Reduced

8.3.21 Key to the ASIDOHL2 process is its scoring system, by which the overall magnitude on an HLCA can be expressed, detailed in Table 8.4 below. The scores for each affected element are added together and then the total averaged. To this mean figure is added the score for the magnitude of absolute impact (the total area of the HLCA to be affected). This produces a final figure, which provides a measure of the overall magnitude of direct, physical impacts.



Scores are then graded against the 28-point scale shown in Table 8.5.

Table 8.4: Direct physical impacts: grades and scores

<b>Impacts and element sensitivity</b>	<b>Score</b>
Direct physical impacts – absolute	
Very Severe	6
Severe	5
Considerable	4
Moderate	3
Slight	2
Very Slight	1
Direct physical impacts – relative	
Very Severe	6
Severe	5
Considerable	4
Moderate	3
Slight	2
Very Slight	1
Site Category	
A	4
B	3
C	2
D	1
U	1
Direct physical impacts – landscape value	
Very High	6
High	5
Considerable	4
Medium	3
Low	2
Very Low	1
Landscape value effect	

Lost	6
Substantially Reduced	5
Considerably Reduced	4
Moderately Reduced	3
Slightly Reduced	2
Very Slightly Reduced	1

Table 8.5: Overall magnitude of direct physical impacts

Score	Grading
24-28	Very Severe
19-23	Severe
14-18	Considerable
9-13	Moderate
4-8	Slight
0-3	Very Slight

Stage 3: Indirect effects

8.3.22 Indirect physical effects are classified by ASIDOHL2 as physical and visual.

8.3.23 Indirect physical effects are categorised as:

*(a) An increased risk of exposure, erosion, disturbance, decay, dereliction or any other detrimental physical change to elements, during or consequent to development.*

*(b) Related to (a), the likelihood of increased management needs to maintain elements as, for example, through altered habitats, water levels, increased erosion, new access provision, etc., during or consequent to development.*

*(c) The severance, fragmentation, dislocation or alteration of the functional connections between related elements, for example, a field system becomes 'severed' from its parent farmstead by an intervening development.*

*(d) The frustration or cessation of historic land use practices, for example, it becomes more difficult or impossible to manage an area in a traditional manner as a result of development.*

*(e) The frustration of access leading to decreased opportunities for*

*education, understanding or enjoying the amenity of elements, during or consequent to development.*

8.3.24 Indirect (non-physical) visual effects are categorised as:

*(a) Visual impact on elements from which a development can be seen (considered up to its maximum height). Impacts can be on 'views to' or 'views from' elements, and should be assessed with particular reference to key historic viewpoints and essential settings. These should be considered in relation to a site's original character and function, as well as to the vantage points and visual experience of a visitor today. In some cases, key historic viewpoints may no longer be identifiable, but it may be possible to make reasonable assumptions on the basis of archaeological or historical information. Key viewpoints should also include those that have subsequently become acknowledged as such, for example, as depicted in artists' drawings and paintings, or as features on popular routes or trails.*

*(b) Impact on the visual connections between related elements, by occlusion, obstruction, etc. For example, an essential line of sight between historically linked defensive sites will become blocked or impaired by an intervening development.*

*(c) Conversely, the creation of inappropriate visual connection between elements not intended to be inter-visible originally, by the removal of intervening structures, barriers, shelters, screening or ground.*

*(d) Visual impact of the development itself in relation to the existing historic character of the area, considering:*

*(i) its form – the scale, number, density, massing, distribution, etc. of its constituent features;*

*(ii) its appearance – the size, shape, colour, fabric, etc. of its constituent features.*

8.3.25 For each category of indirect physical or visual impact the magnitude is graded as Very Severe, Severe, Considerable, Moderate, Slight or Very Slight. The assessment of severity is based on professional judgement rather than on fixed criteria. The magnitudes are scored between 6 and 1, according to the scale for direct physical impacts (shown above in the second row of Table 8.4).

8.3.26 The overall magnitude of indirect impacts are also graded in a similar fashion to the overall magnitude of direct impacts, using the 28-point scale shown in Table 8.5.

#### Stage 4: Evaluation of relative importance

8.3.27 Stage 4 is concerned with evaluating the relative importance of the part of each HLCA directly or indirectly affected by the development, in relation to:

(a) *the whole of the HLCA*

(b) *the whole of the Historic Landscape*

8.3.28 followed by an evaluation of:

(a) *the relative importance of the HLCA within the national context*

8.3.29 The criterion for determining the relative importance or value of the HLCAs and their component elements are as follows:

- Rarity
- Representativeness
- Documentation
- Group value
- Survival
- Condition
- Coherence
- Integrity
- Potential
- Amenity
- Associations

8.3.30 Each criterion is graded as Very High, High, Moderate, Low and Poor. Criteria values in steps (a), (b) and (c) are scored as shown below in Table 8.6.

Table 8.6: Stage 4 evaluation scores

Criterion value	Score
Very High/ Good	5
High/ Good	4
Moderate/ Medium	3
Low	2
Very Low/Poor	1

8.3.31 These scores enable a figure to be calculated that reflects the relative importance of individual HLCA elements and entire HLCAs in the terms of the immediate Historic Landscape and the national context.

- 8.3.32 The final part of Stage 4 is to determine the average, overall value of all the HLCAs (or parts thereof) affected. This is achieved by combining the scores in steps (a), (b) and (c); once again the calculations are not rehearsed below, but the average overall figure is graded as shown in Table 8.7.

*Table 8.7: Stage 4 grades of overall value*

Score	Grading
80-100	Very High
60-79	High
40-59	Considerable
20-39	Moderate
5-19	Low
0-4	Very Low

*Stage 5: Assessment of overall significance of impact*

- 8.3.33 This final stage combines the results of Stages 2 - 4 to produce an assessment of the overall significance of impact of development, and the effects that altering the HLCA (or HLCAs) concerned will have on the whole of the Historic Landscape as identified by the *Register*. This is determined by setting out and scoring the value of the affected HLCAs against the consequent reduction in value caused by the proposed development to the Historic Landscape.
- 8.3.34 Stage 5 summarises the findings from earlier parts of the process by focussing on three specific issues:
- (a) *Impact caused by development (based on Stages 2 and 3 results)*
  - (b) *Value of HLCAs (based on Stage 4 results)*
  - (c) *Reduction of value of the Historic Landscape*
- 8.3.35 Each criterion is graded as Very High, High, Medium, Low or Very Low. Although scoring is used extensively in Stages 2 - 4, it is not recommended that the scores from these stages are directly combined or 'converted' to determine the Stage 5 score. Rather, judgements are based on professional interpretation and judgement; this approach enables the data to be assessed more flexibly, and for significant 'highs' and 'lows' to be considered, rather than merely the average figures. The overall significance of impact score is graded as show below.

Table 8.7: Stage 5 overall significance of impact

Score	Grading
26-30	Very Severe
21-25	Severe
16-20	Fairly Severe
10-15	Moderate
4-9	Slight
0-3	Very Slight

## 8.4 Baseline Data and Assessment

### Walkover survey

- 8.4.1 A walkover survey was conducted on 7th of August 2009. The area was photographed; all sites previously identified from a search of the regional Historic Environment Record and National Monuments Record were visited in order to assess their current condition. A sample of photographs taken illustrating the current condition of the archaeological interests and the site in general can be seen in Volume 3, Appendix 8.1.

### General historical background (Figure 19 Areas of Archaeological Interest)

#### **Prehistoric (up to AD43) and Roman (AD43 to 410)**

- 8.4.2 There is evidence of human activity in the vicinity of the study area from the Mesolithic period onwards. At Merthyr Mawr Warren, located a short distance to the southeast of the proposed development, recovered artefacts indicate that the site was occupied during the Mesolithic, Neolithic, early Bronze Age (represented by cist graves and tumuli), Iron Age (with evidence of metal working) and medieval periods, and the area is included in the Register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales.
- 8.4.3 The excavation of a Neolithic causewayed enclosure at Ewenny (PRN 00404m), less than a kilometre south of the study area, has produced evidence setting the landscape of the area into its environmental and chronological context. There was no evidence for the clearance of mature or ancient wildwood for the construction of the monument, with the landscape appearing to have been cleared for some time, with some secondary regeneration woodland of oak, ash, alder, yew and apple trees as well as shrubs and bushes such as hazel, blackthorn, gorse/broom, and heather. These range of species suggest woodland and woody communities growing on neutral to podzolic soils, and the shrubs (gorse/broom, hazel and heather) tend to confirm a more open sparsely wooded environment, perhaps with mature trees (oak, ash, yew) on the steeper slopes. Within the wider landscape some cultivation of hulled wheat (emmer) occurred, the grains recovered were relatively large and typical of Neolithic assemblages where grain was hand picked (Lewis forthcoming).
- 8.4.4 Other Neolithic monuments found in the area include Coed y Cwm chambered tomb (00369s/Gm116) and Tinkinswood Long Cairn (00374s/Gm09). Tinkinswood is the most

impressive monument of its type in the Vale of Glamorgan and when excavated in the early 20th century was found to be 40m long by 2m high and contained over 50 individuals in a chamber capped by the largest capstone in Wales (weighing 40 tons) (Pearson and Lewis 2003, 7). Bronze Age round barrows are broadly distributed across the Vale of Glamorgan and tend to be sited in elevated positions and those near the coast have fine views out over the estuary, like those at Sully and Dunraven, whilst those inland tend to be grouped into small cemeteries (Lewis and Hudson 2006, 8).

- 8.4.5 The proposed development lies on what is believed to be the alignment of the Roman road from Caerleon to Neath. The route west from Cardiff generally follows the route of the modern A48, although its exact location in the Bridgend area is less clear. It has been suggested that it headed towards Ewenny Priory, crossing the Ewenny and Ogmore Rivers, before again mirroring the alignment of the A48 towards Port Talbot (Hunter 2002).
- 8.4.6 The route of the road between the two rivers is somewhat clearer, as an agger (a cambered earthwork forming part of a Roman road) has been recorded by the RCAHMW in 1983, running from SS 9040 7827 to SS 9020 7834, a distance of approximately 220m. However, these grid references place the feature parallel, but almost 100m to the northeast of the generally accepted line of the road (ID 01016.5w). Therefore, it is suspected that an error in the NGR is responsible for the discrepancy (Sherman and Evans 2004, 24). The regional HER notes that the route of this agger may be extended by two straight field boundaries (IDs 01016.5w and 01016.6w), which have been noted as being different in content and appearances to others nearby. Whilst these two hedges are on a different alignment to that of the agger (see Figure 19 - Areas of Archaeological Interest) this is probably explained by the inaccuracy in the RCAHMW grid references.
- 8.4.7 The Roman fort of *Bomium* is also located in the vicinity, although again its exact location remains unclear. Documentary evidence (in the form of the Antonine Itinerary) places the site somewhere between Caerleon and Neath. However, the historic distances do not match the modern measurements. The Antonine Itinerary, which details distances in Roman miles mp (*mens pedalis*) along roads spanning the Roman Empire, states in *Iter XII* that *Bomium* is situated 15mp from *Nidum* (Neath) and 27mp from *Isca* (Caerleon). The total distances between places described in *Iter XII* do not add up correctly, and attempts have been made to correct the figures given. While in no way conclusive, these studies have suggested that *Bomium* is situated somewhere to the west of the Ewenny River, possibly between it and the Ogmore River.

#### **Early Medieval (410 to 1066)**

- 8.4.8 Relatively little is known of the Vale of Glamorgan in the period between the 5th and the 11th centuries AD. Known settlement sites are few, though the defended settlement at Dinas Powys was shown by excavation to have been of a high status site from the 5th to the 7th centuries. In general, excavation has shown that there was a reoccupation of the earlier Iron Age hillforts in a period of political fragmentation and increased security. Early-medieval burials and artefacts have been found at a number of Roman sites suggesting some form of continuity of occupation. Other large burial sites have been found at the Atlantic Trading Estate (Barry) and more recently at Llandough (Penarth) (Lewis and Hudson 2006, 10).
- 8.4.9 References to pre-Norman settlement at Kenfig, such as that in the now partly discredited *Gwentian Brut*, to settlement at Kenfig existing during the 9th century, and traditions that in 1080 Iestyn ap Gwrgan, the last native ruler of *Morgannwg*, had a castle (location as yet

unknown) at Kenfig are compelling (Roberts 2003, 25).

- 8.4.10 The early part of this period was the 'Age of the Saints' and in the Vale, in the late 5th and 6th centuries, tradition places the early Christian monastic communities of St Illtyd at Llantwit Major and St Cadoc at Llancarfan (Lewis and Hudson 2006, 10). A number of decorated stones carved between the 10th and 12th centuries have been discovered a short distance to either side of the development area at Ewenny Priory and Ogmore. These stones are of a religious nature and possibly indicate the presence of a monastic settlement in this area, which may have been a precursor to the Norman foundation of Ewenny Prior (Maylan 1991, 14).

#### **Medieval (1066 to 1485)**

- 8.4.11 A short distance to the southwest of the study area an impressive, moated, masonry castle was established as early 1116 by William de Londres (Ogmore Castle, 00234m/Gm37/93019). Ogmore Castle was built on the southern bank of the River Ewenny at a strategically important tidal ford; the castle was abandoned between the 1530s and 1632 with the exception of the Court House that stayed in use until the early 19th century. A little over a kilometre to the north of Ogmore Castle a further castle (Candleston 00258m/Gm095/LB11230/93050) was constructed. The castle and corresponding manor derive their name from the Cantilupes, who were the first tenants at Candleston after the St Quintins sub-eneffed the site. The standing structural remains at Candleston represent four main periods of masonry building, the most significant being the 12th century tower-house (a lightly fortified manor house, one of only five built in Glamorgan). The site continued in use as a farmhouse until the 19th century.
- 8.4.12 Perhaps the most interesting medieval settlement in the area is that of Kenfig. The church of Maudlam, dedicated to St Mary Magdalane and first mentioned in the mid-13th century documents, has a sub-rectangular churchyard, possibly indicating an early origin, with its original Early-medieval dedication now lost. The strategic and exposed position of the castle borough as the western outpost of the Lords of Glamorgan in the 12th century accounts for its exceptionally full documentary record. Between 1167 and 1321 the Welsh, now confined to the nearby uplands of Margam Mountain, made no less than eight recorded attacks on Kenfig. Both Kenfig Castle and the Church of St James are first mentioned in the period 1135-54. It is clear therefore, that the borough with its recorded church had been founded at the latest by the middle of the 12th century and had been provided with earth and timber defences. In the middle of the 14th century, Kenfig was a substantial borough of perhaps 700-800 persons. 'High', 'East' and 'West' Streets are recorded, as well as a chapel to St Thomas, the Guildhall and a *maladaria* (a hospital or leper house). By 1470, the town had been virtually abandoned, due to sand encroachment. The following year the burgesses were instructed to leave their church and move to Pyle, where a new settlement was developing. By the 1530s the antiquary Leland noted only 'a village on the est side of Kenfik, and a Castel, both in ruins and almost shokid and devoured with the sandes that the Severne se there castith up'. By 1572, only three burgesses remained, while a borough survey of 1665 recorded only a single family living 'on the site of the ould castle' (Roberts 2003, 25).

#### **Post-medieval (1485 to 1901) and modern (1901 to present)**

- 8.4.13 For the most part the Vale, lacking the mineral resources of coal, iron ore and limestone, was spared the rapid industrial expansion of the valleys to the north during the Post-medieval



period, with pottery being the principal industry in this area. At least fifteen production sites have been identified (Lewis 1982, 3). The local industry reached a peak in the 19th century when it was producing ornate display pieces as well as more functional items. The clays were also exploited for brick making and large areas of clay pits must have been excavated in the region. In spite of the Industrial revolution and the concomitant population explosion in the neighbouring Welsh valleys, the Vale of Glamorgan has remained largely unaffected, continuing its long and relatively prosperous agricultural history (Lewis and Hudson 2006, 12).

- 8.4.14 Some years before the Second World War, Glamorgan County Council acquired land at Island Farm for their proposed Police Headquarters. However, the looming outbreak of war resulted in the postponement of their plans, the Police Headquarters subsequently being housed in a redundant munitions factory east of Bridgend (Hunter 2002).

#### **Specific historical background**

- 8.4.15 During the late 1930s the Island Farm complex (ID 2214m/31802) was constructed as a barracks to house women employed at the Brackla ammunition storage Royal Ordnance factory (NPRN 308124) and the Waterton shell filling Royal Ordnance factory (NPRN 91719), a short distance outside of Bridgend. The huts consisted of two single-storey prefabricated concrete accommodation wings with a central, brick-built ablutions block. At the rear of each hut was a two-storey brick-built tower, which housed a boiler room below a water tank.
- 8.4.16 The accommodation was unpopular, however, and the site remained unused until 1943, when the 2nd Battalion, 109th Infantry Regiment of the United States Army were stationed there prior to the D-day landings.
- 8.4.17 The barracks were converted to a PoW camp (Camp 198) shortly after the Normandy Landings in 1944, with accommodation for nearly 200 German and Italian prisoners. The site was not fully completed when the first consignment of Germans arrived at the camp and a number of the huts and a small church were built by the prisoners.
- 8.4.18 During the night of the 10th March 1945, 67 prisoners escaped from Hut 9 (ID 2215m/31803). This was the largest escape of German prisoners in Britain during World War II. The escape tunnel was dug from the room on the south side of Hut 9 (Howell 2000, 8). The tunnel had been fitted with electric lighting, a ventilation pipe made of conjoined tin cans and a hand-operated fan to circulate fresh air around the excavations. The tunnel had been propped up with wooden props fashioned from camp furniture. A 'pin-up' of a woman was painted on the wall above the tunnel entrance, in order to distract the attentions of the guards (Vincent 1990).
- 8.4.19 One group of prisoners stole a car in Bridgend intending to drive to Croydon, where they knew a large airfield was located. The car they choose failed to start, as the prisoners were debating their course of action, four guards returning from a night-out, offered to give the vehicle a push start. Once the car had been started the prisoners headed towards the English border only to become entirely lost, taking a risk they decided to ask a passing pedestrian for directions. The man, a tram driver going home after a late-night shift, believed the prisoners cover story of being Norwegian engineers and accepted a lift to the outskirts of Cardiff. On leaving the tram driver the prisoners headed towards England only to run out of petrol somewhere between Chepstow and Gloucester, where they were arrested having abandoned the car (Daily Worker, March 12th 1945 and Daily Express, March 12th 1945).
- 8.4.20 Two of the escaped prisoners made it as far as Southampton before being discovered

sleeping in a wood, by a local farm hand (Daily Express, March 16th 1945). All of the escapees were eventually re-captured and returned to Island Farm.

- 8.4.21 Exactly how the tunnel was excavated was unknown at the time of the escape, as no tools or spoil were discovered by the prison guards, although it was assumed that crude tools had been created out of kitchen utensils. The method of spoil disposal was only discovered in the mid-1980s when Hut 9 was vandalised. The excavated clay had been shaped in round clay balls and then passed through a false air vent into a cavity created behind a false wall, built on the inside of the L-shaped walls of the hut (Coast 2009). The escape tunnel was re-opened in 2003 by a group of local history enthusiasts and was found to be largely intact, with the wooden props still preventing roof collapse (*Ex Inf*).
- 8.4.22 The successful tunnel was the second of two escape routes excavated by the prisoners, a tunnel dug from Hut 16 having been discovered some weeks earlier by the prison guards. Previously to the breakout of the 10th March two prisoners had successfully escaped by fashioning a crude set of wire-cutters out of a pair of iron bars and cutting a hole in the perimeter fences. Their escape was only discovered when they were arrested by chance in Port Talbot ([www.islandfarm.fsnet.co.uk](http://www.islandfarm.fsnet.co.uk)).
- 8.4.23 The last of the 1634 rank and file prisoners were transferred to Camp 181 in Worksop, Nottinghamshire on the 31st March 1945; after which Island Farm was designated Special Camp XI. The new camp held over 180 senior German officers awaiting trial on war crime charges. They included some of Hitler's closest advisers, including *Generalfeldmarschalls* Rundstedt, Manstein, Kleist and Brauchitsch. The last prisoners left the camp in May 1948, the camp was then used as a centre for displaced persons (Western Mail, 22nd April, 1948) and is marked on the fourth edition (1941) Ordnance Survey map as hostels and a well fare centre. The remains of the camp were demolished in 1994, with the exception of Hut 9 (Howell 2000, 8).

### **Archaeological background**

- 8.4.24 In 1992 GGAT Projects conducted a watching-brief on the excavation of 62 geotechnical test-pits on the site of the Island Farm POW camp (02214m/31802). Examination of the test-pits revealed no traces of any archaeological features apart from a remnant of the Post-medieval/modern plough soil relating to former land use; the development area lay within an extensive tract of farmland prior to the construction of the Bridgend By-pass between the First and Second World Wars (Sell 2001, 5).
- 8.4.25 GGAT Projects conducted an archaeological assessment on the site of Island Farm in 2000 (Howell 2000) that identified 29 sites of archaeological interest, including fifteen Grade II Listed Buildings and five new sites within the project's defined studied area. In 2002 a desk-based assessment was conducted by CgMs Consulting on the site of Island Farm (Hunter 2002). This desk-based assessment clarified the information presented by Howell in 2000. All of these sites have been identified in the current desk-based assessment (see Appendix 8.2 for detailed site descriptions).

### **Review of Cartographic and Aerial Resources**

#### **Cartographic Sources (Figure 20 Historical maps – Maps 1-5)**

- 8.4.26 The 1807 map of Ewenny Demesne showing other lands adjoining in the several parishes of

Ewenny, Coity and Coychurch (D/DE 476) shows the southeastern quarter of the study area. This map shows an arable landscape covered in a network of sub-rectangular fields and a narrow strip of woodland paralleling the course of the Ewenny River.

- 8.4.27 The 1840 tithe map for the parish of Coity Lower (P/80/2 and P/80/3) depicts a landscape dominated by arable fields, with a small patch of woodland to the southwest of Island Farm Barn and Pond (04353m), referred to as 'Shaw' in the accompanying apportionment. This name is likely to derive from the Old English word *shaw* meaning a 'small wood' 'thicket' or 'copse' (Hanks 1979). Running through the centre of the proposed development area is a narrow lane (04354.0m) running towards Island Farm. This lane forms part of the *Heolgam* or 'Crooked Way' that was closed by order of the Quarter Sessions in *circa* 1860 (Randall 1955), consequentially by the time of the first edition (1878) Ordnance Survey map a substantial section of this lane is not marked. However, the route of the lane is preserved in the modern landscape by well-established hedgerows, which may have formed part of the original route boundary.
- 8.4.28 The pattern of land division has changed little between the surveying of the tithe map in 1840 and the third edition Ordnance Survey map in 1918, with the exception of the construction of the Vale of Glamorgan Railway in 1889. The route of this railway is shown curving through the southeastern quarter of the development area from the second edition (1899) Ordnance Survey Map onwards. However, some field boundaries were removed in the southern and eastern parts of the area between 1840 (tithe map) and the first edition (1878) Ordnance Survey map. The fourth edition Ordnance Survey map of 1941 reveals a dramatic change in the character of the area, with the construction of Island Farm PoW camp, numerous new houses, schools and the A48 trunk road.

### **Pictorial Sources**

- 8.4.29 A series of four black and white photographs taken in the late 1940's showing German officers arriving and leaving Bridgend after the Second World War where examined at the Bridgend Central Library. Two of the photographs showed Field Marshall von Rundstedt who had been Commander of Chief for the German armies in the west during 1940 and 1942, as well as commanding the German Southern Wing in the East in 1941. Although von Rundstedt was brought to trial at Nuremberg he was not charged and returned to Island Farm where he was held until his release in 1948. The most interesting of these photographs shows von Rundstedt leaving Island Farm for Nuremberg in 1946, passing past a rank of 187 saluting German Generals (Hawthorne 1989).
- 8.4.30 A collection of digital photographs showing objects created by the inmates of Island Farm and held by the South Wales Police Museum (SWPM) where examined on the website for Welsh heritage and culture (Gathering the Jewels (GTJ), [www.gtj.org.uk](http://www.gtj.org.uk)). These objects consisted of a wooden hand mirror (GTJ reference GTJ75009, SWPM reference 1992-154/1), a crude knife (GTJ reference GTJ75010, SWPM reference 1992-154/2) illegally fashioned from a metal strap and a wooden board game (GTJ reference GTJ75007, SWPM reference 1990-1/1-4). Concealed within the board game were five cylindrical compartments, which contained a German bullet, an English bullet and a button. Written on the back of the board game, in broken English, is an inscription that reads: "This box have been in a terrible place. In side is a German bullet also button also British bullet. Mine one is covered."
- 8.4.31 A selection of digital photographs ([www.islandfarm.fsnet.co.uk](http://www.islandfarm.fsnet.co.uk)) taken between the late-1980s and the early-1990s showing some of the war art painted by the Island Farm prisoners was

studied. The pictures were painted directly onto the walls of the hut and included a variety of subjects. By far the most popular subject were pictures of partially clothed young women, including portraits of women called Cora, Monika, Ann, Ulla and Erika. Other subject matter included Germanic urban and rural scenes, a map of the western coast of Europe, coats of arms for the cities of Fürth and Elbing and planes in combat. A number of German slogans were also painted on the walls that included *Für unsere Heimat alles* (Everything for our homeland) and *Unfrei is nicht ehrlos* (Captivity is not dishonourable).

### **Aerial Photography**

- 8.4.32 The earliest coverage of the development area dates from 1946 showing the entirety of the proposed area of development. The Island Farm PoW camp (02214m/31802) is shown fully constructed although seemingly vacant with no visible activity noted at the site. To the east of the development area an enclosed field system is shown, similar to that marked on the first – third edition Ordnance Survey mapping. Bridgend's southwestern suburb Whiterock is shown at its current extent and rows of houses are shown on both sides of Ewenny Road, much like today. However, the hotel contained within the triangle formed by the A473, Ewenny Road and the rail-tracks has yet to be built; instead the land is occupied by enclosed fields with grazing stock visible on the photograph.
- 8.4.33 Coverage dating to 1948 (CPE UK 2433 3078 – 3081) shows a new, tarmac-surfaced, bridge on the Ewenny Road constructed over the Ewenny River. Coverage from 1950 (58 RAF 497 5105 – 51010) shows that a roundabout has been constructed on the intersection of the Ewenny Road and the A473. An aerial photograph from 1962 shows that buildings in the western section of the PoW camp have been demolished, with the exception of Hut 9, which is still extant today. The row of residential housing to the east of the PoW camp (Island Farm Road and Island Farm Close) has been extended to its modern-day pattern. Coverage from the late 1960s and 1970s shows the continued urbanization of the southern edge of Bridgend with a small hotel being shown on aerial photographs OS 67 090 102 - 105 and a tennis court been shown on aerial photographs OS 79 129 083 - 084. Coverage from 1981 shows the PoW camp overgrown with vegetation and the roofs having collapsed on a number of the northern buildings. Aerial photographs MAFF 911 177 and 179 taken in 1982 show Crossways House (IF10) seemingly overgrown and abandoned. Aerial photographs from the late 1980s to the late 1990s (OS 89 073 539 – 540, OS 89 278 001 – 002, OS 89 387 078 – 079 & 095 – 096, OS 90 082 232 – 235, Geonex 7391 136 – 137, 1PRU RAF 2470 005 – 006 and 050 – 051, Terrence Soames Photography and COWI 2006) show the continued decline in the PoW camp, with the site gradually being over grown with shrubs and trees and all of the buildings, bar Hut 9, being demolished.

### **Archaeological Interests**

- 8.4.34 There are 50 sites of archaeological interest identified within the study area (Table 8.1). None of these are Scheduled Ancient Monuments; fourteen are protected as Listed Buildings, all at Grade II level. Further information relating to these interests can be found in the gazetteer in Appendix 8.3. Part of the Registered Historic Landscape of Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows lies within the study area, and a separate ASIDOHL study has been conducted in order to assess the significance of the impact of the development on the Historic Landscape.
- 8.4.35 Numbers with a letter suffix are Primary Record Numbers (PRNs) in the regional Historic

Environment Record (HER). Five and six figure numbers without a letter suffix are National Primary Record Numbers (NPRNs) of the National Monuments Record (NMR), as supplied to the HER under the ENDEX agreement. Numbers with a 'LB' prefix are Listed Buildings, as provided by Cadw. Numbers with an 'IF' prefix are new sites identified during the course of the assessment.

Table 8.8: Identified archaeological interests

ID	Name	NGR	Period	Status	Value
00401m/40797	Ewenny Pottery	SS90377779	Post-medieval	None	B
00413m	Possible location of <i>Bomium</i>	SS90457815	Roman	None	A
00904m/19440/LB11 262	Newbridge Farm	SS89717880	Post-medieval	LBII	B
01016.5w/86926	Glanwenny/Caerleon - Loughor Roman Road	SS90307813	Roman	None	B
01016.6w/86926	Glanwenny/Caerleon - Loughor Roman Road	SS90407827	Roman	None	B
01055m	Pottery sherds (possible kiln site)	SS904774	Post-medieval	None	C
01704m	Stone artefact	SS90287822	Unknown	None	C
01810m	Possible location of <i>Bomium</i>	SS89257861	Roman	None	A
01892m/37616/LB11 263	Newbridge Farm Barn	SS89657880	Post-medieval	LBII	A
02214m/31802	POW Camp (198) Special Camp XI	SS89857845	Modern	None	A
02215m/31803/LB11 362	Hut 9	SS90037847	Post-medieval	LBII	B
02430s	Vale of Glamorgan Railway	SS90217789	Post-medieval	None	C
02483m	Vervil bank and ditch	SS892775	Unknown	None	C
02570m	Claypits Pottery	SS902778	Post-medieval	None	B
02572m	Ochr-Draw/Ewenny Bridge Pottery	SS90307746	Post-medieval	None	B
02573m	Ochr-Draw Farmhouse	SS90177743	Unknown	None	C

ID	Name	NGR	Period	Status	Value
02574m	Ochr-Draw Barn	SS90177740	Unknown	None	C
04352m	Island Farm	SS90257847	Post-medieval	None	C
04353m	Island Farm Barn	SS90127815	Post-medieval	None	C
04354.0m	Trackway	SS899607819 5	Unknown	None	B
04355m	Quarry	SS90407867	Post-medieval	None	C
05192m	Group of Clearance Cairns at Merthyr Mawr	SS892077835 4	Modern	None	C
18409	Cottage Homes	SS90157875	Post-medieval	None	B
18789	Glanwenny House Lodge	SS90537824	Post-medieval	None	C
19324	72 Merthyr Mawr Road	SS9078	Post-medieval	None	C
19559	Pandy	SS89337877	Post-medieval	None	C
31859/LB11338	Preswylfa Childrens Home	SS90177882	Post-medieval	LBII	B
31860/LB11339	Preswylfa Childrens Home 1	SS90207879	Post-medieval	LBII	B
31861/LB11340	Preswylfa Childrens Home 2	SS90207876	Post-medieval	LBII	B
31862/LB11341	Preswylfa Childrens Home 3	SS90187874	Post-medieval	LBII	B
31863/LB11342	Preswylfa Childrens Home 4 and 5	SS90167872	Post-medieval	LBII	B
31864/LB11343	Preswylfa Childrens Home 6 and 7	SS90147868	Post-medieval	LBII	B
31865/LB11344	Preswylfa Childrens Home 8	SS90117872	Post-medieval	LBII	B
31866/LB11345	Preswylfa Childrens Home 9 and 10	SS90067875	Post-medieval	LBII	B

ID	Name	NGR	Period	Status	Value
31867/LB11346	Preswylfa Childrens Home 11	SS90087877	Post-medieval	LBII	B
31868/LB11347	Preswylfa Childrens Home 12	SS90107879	Post-medieval	LBII	B
31869/LB11348	Preswylfa Childrens Home 13	SS90127881	Post-medieval	LBII	B
43139	Pont Ogwr	SS89277866	Post-medieval	None	C
265766	Glanwenny Garden	SS90307818	Post-medieval	None	C
IF01	Rifle Range	SS895167858 2	Post-medieval	None	C
IF02	Quarry	SS900087864 0	Post-medieval	None	C
IF03	Quarry	SS895237804 9	Post-medieval	None	C
IF04	Claypits	SS904537796 1	Post-medieval	None	C
IF05	Mount Pleasant Farm	SS904537796 1	Post-medieval	None	C
IF06	New Inn Pottery	SS906607849 5	Post-medieval	None	B
IF07	Marl Pit	SS906957854 0	Post-medieval	None	C
IF08	Pond	SS894607820 0	Post-medieval	None	C
IF09	Building	SS900107788 0	Post-medieval	None	C
IF10	Crossways	SS896807838 0	Modern	None	C
IF11	Pottery	SS899607871 0	Post-medieval	None	C
IF12	Group of 3 cairns	SS896707815 0	Unknown	None	A

## 8.5 Historic Landscape Baseline Data and Assessment – ASHIDOL 2

8.5.1 The development comprises a total of 52.05ha in area, 35.37ha of which lies within the Ochr Draw and Island Farm Historic Landscape Area (HLCA017) (Roberts 2003). However, there is the potential for up to a further five character areas to be in-directly affected, Merthyr Mawr (HLCA012), Merthyr Mawr Warren/Cwningaer Merthyr Mawr (HLCA013), Candleston/Trecantle (HLCA014), Ogmore Down/Rhos Ogwr (HLCA016) and Ogmore/Ogwr (HLCA018). The following are the relevant HLCA description excerpts from the Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows Landscape Characterisation report (Roberts 2003; see Figure 21 Historical Character Areas):

### **HLCA 017 Ochr Draw and Island Farm**

#### **Historic Background**

8.5.2 The historic landscape area of Ochr Draw and Island Farm comprises a surviving fragment of agricultural landscape now dominated by regular fields, which represent the final stages of rationalisation of a former medieval pattern of strip fields. The Dunraven Estate maps and the tithe map of the area indicate stages in the development of the current post-medieval field pattern from the vestiges of survival of the former medieval 'infield-outfield' system characterised by varied dispersed ownership of small plots or quilllets throughout the area. By the latter half of the 18th century land ownership in the area has already been largely consolidated and the majority holding by this date is under the control of the Dunraven Estate, however lesser holdings survive, isolated within and dividing the Dunraven lands into fragmentary parcels. The 1st edition 6-inch OS 1884 depicts the former farmstead of Island Farm, now demolished and replaced by a retail park, and just beyond the boundary of the character area. The farmstead itself dated from the 19th century; its plan typical of an industrial agricultural farm with agricultural buildings, set apart from the dwelling, and arranged around a rectangular yard.

8.5.3 The surviving buildings of the area include Ochr Draw Farm adjacent to the line of the Vale of Glamorgan Railway (location unchanged from 1st edition OS 6-inch 1884) and Newbridge Farm, the latter an interesting early 17th century 3-storey farmhouse with 19th century additions and internal alterations (Listed Grade II along with an outbuilding). The house, though subject to recent drastic restoration retains a number of original features including hollow- and sunk-chamfered mullioned windows, entrance doorway with carved spandrels and a hollow-and-wave moulding, and hoodmoulds. Island Farm Barn, an isolated field barn with an adjacent cruciform pond, depicted on the tithe of 1840 within an enclosure called 'Cae Skibbor' (Barn Field), also remains.

8.5.4 The Vale of Glamorgan Railway in use for mineral and passenger traffic since 1897 (virtually a subsidiary of the Barry Railway from inception) crosses the eastern part of the area. The line survived to be separately amalgamated into the GWR under the Railways Act, 1921, ceased passenger services in 1964, but continued open for through-freight, notably coal to the CEGB Aberthaw Generating Station, its usefulness boosted by an additional single line extension just to the north of the area in 1980, to serve the Ford Company's Bridgend plant.

8.5.5 Just beyond the eastern boundary of the area lie remains of clay pits associated with the well-known Ewenny Pottery and Clay Pits Pottery.

8.5.6 An interesting, though generally uncharacteristic feature of the area are the remains



associated with the Island Farm WWII PoW camp, built as a barracks for munitions workers during the late 1930s and adapted for use as a prison camp and in 1943 the scene of the only major escape of German POWs.

**Key Historic Landscape Characteristics**

*'Largely post-medieval agricultural landscape, with evolved but fairly regular field pattern and distinctive boundaries; post-medieval agricultural settlement; communications corridor including line of Roman road (Caerleon-Loughor) and public/industrial rail'*

- 8.5.7 Ochr Draw and Island Farm, a largely post-medieval agricultural landscape, is characterised by evolved but fairly regular field pattern of medium-large regular fields; distinctive boundaries and an associated loosely dispersed settlement pattern of isolated farms/cottages, including interesting examples of vernacular architecture, such as Newbridge Farm. The area contains an important communication route (ie the Roman road between Caerleon-Loughor, its alignment preserved by two sections of straight field boundary), as well as tracks, and lanes both straight and winding of early post-medieval if not medieval date including *Heolgam* (the crooked way) depicted title of 1840. The eastern side of the area is clipped by the extant line of the former Vale of Glamorgan Railway, while the north of the area is crossed by the A48.

**HCA 012 Merthyr Mawr**

**Historic Background**

- 8.5.8 The historic landscape area of Merthyr Mawr is a landscape of some importance and includes the bulk of the registered park and gardens of Merthyr Mawr House (PGW: site evaluation Grade II\*; Listed buildings Merthyr Mawr House and stables (Grade II); lodge (Grade II), included as a 'small, attractive landscape park laid out at the same time as the house was built in the early nineteenth century. Contemporary pleasure grounds with some good specimen trees and shrubs, and gardens with a very fine large glasshouse of 1900. Remains of the walled gardens of the earlier house.'
- 8.5.9 It should be noted that the boundary of character between HLCA 012 and the adjacent HLCA 018 is at best imprecise and difficult to define, with many characteristic traits overlapping and in common. The most obvious and historic boundary in the area is the *Afon Ogwr* (river Ogmor) itself, despite minor differences between historic, parish boundaries, agricultural holding boundaries and more recently designated boundaries; for this reason the boundary between the HLCAs has been placed along the line of the River Ogmor itself. This satisfies the area of the park and garden as defined on the 1st edition OS 6-inch map. HLCA 013 is defined as those parts of the demesne land lying within the parish of Merthyr Mawr, and an area of associated farmland adjacent to the west around Warren Farm. Two enclosures contained within the registered park and garden on the opposite side of the Ogmor River notably Coed Pwll-y-fflew and Waun-y-ferwill (only the latter formed part of the Merthyr Mawr Demesne land in 1813) have been included within HLCA 018.
- 8.5.10 The house of Merthyr Mawr was constructed between 1806 and 1809 on a new site by Sir John Nicholl in a classical style (Henry Wood of Bristol, architect and sculptor), replacing the earlier 16th/17th century Hall of the Stradling family (St Donants). The house is a five-bay two-storey classical mansion faced in white local carboniferous limestone, with a hipped roof

and sash windows, and central single-storey porch with Tuscan columns in the north front. A lower wing, partly built later than the main projects to the east, while on the west side a veranda with a glass canted roof supported on cast-iron pillars, built in 1819, runs along the entire length of the house. The Old Hall was situated to the south-west of the 19th century house, on or near the site of the Farm; remains of the Tudor courtyard now forms one of the farm outbuildings, the rest having been demolished c1806.

- 8.5.11 The park was designed and planted between 1806 and 1838 by Sir John Nicholl, most of the work being carried out after the house was completed in 1809. An estate map of 1794 by John Williams shows the area of the park as fields, with very little woodland, and with the old Hall and its gardens along what became the west boundary. The garden and grounds were laid out by Sir John Nicholl between 1806 and 1838, at the same time as the park was made. The present layout differs in some respects from that shown on the William Weston Young estate map of 1813 and on a drawing of the same date by him: at that time there was a slope bounded by a semicircular fence in front of the house, a fence extending to the west, a smaller veranda, and a 'greenhouse' to the west of the house, on the site of the present summer house. The map shows that at this stage the northern half of Chapel Hill was not yet wooded, that in 1813 the pleasure grounds did not extend south-westwards to the road, and that the garden to the west was laid out with a rather rococo design of waving paths and irregular but symmetrical shrubberies. Further evidence of the development of the garden comes from a picture of about 1860 showing grass terraces in front of the house, and the garden bounded by a stone-built ha-ha. A painting by Mary de La Beche Nicholl of 1867 shows island beds and bedding on the lawn and a view framed by trees to Ogmores Castle. By 1875-77 (Ordnance Survey map) the present layout is mostly in place.
- 8.5.12 To the north of Merthyr Mawr House is Chapel Hill with its small roofless fifteenth-century chapel, St Roque's Chapel (Scheduled ancient monument: Gm 247), in which are two 11th century carved stones (Scheduled Ancient Monument: Gm 26). This stands within a small Iron Age fort, Chapel Hill camp (Scheduled ancient monument: Gm 248), the only visible remnant of which is a low bank encircling the hilltop.
- 8.5.13 Beyond the wall of the Merthyr Mawr estate, the estate village of Merthyr Mawr is a rare survival. The lack of modern intrusions gives an impression of rural pre-1950s Vale settlement, since lost elsewhere. While the cottages in the village have undergone minor visual alteration (ie fenestration), they largely retain their original character and are still thatched. The main examples are Church Cottage, 17th century lobby-entry plan, with the entry at the right end of the façade, subsequently was moved to the left end. Keeper's Cottage, extended, is also of the lobby-entry type. Holly Cottage (with stair projection), Diana Cottage, c1700 and Wellingtonia, the latter extended, are end-entry houses with entrance doorways in the end wall beside the hall fireplace. Oak Cottage retains its original four-centered stone doorway (16th century), which opens into an unheated room, with the hall off. Examples of pattern-book estate architecture are also found in the village, eg the Lodge to Merthyr Mawr House with its hipped thatched roof, central chimneystack, and symmetrical façade. Cartographic evidence indicates the village had a mill, millpond and race (18th/19th century maps), which appear to have been supplanted by a sawmill.
- 8.5.14 The parish church of St Teilo (1849-51) at the west end of the village was designed by Benjamin Ferrey a fellow pupil and biographer of Pugin, in partnership with John Prichard of Llandaff in the Early English style with frequent local architectural references (e.g. Caerphilly Castle hall and Llandaff Cathedral chapter house). The churchyard contains two medieval

figural monuments and a collection of fragmentary head-stones and crosses generally of 11th-12th century date, found in the churchyard or on the site of the medieval church, and also from the St Roch (St Roque's) chapel. The latter includes one with interlace, and a much earlier stone, bearing a fragmentary inscription in Roman capitals, dated to the 5th century.

**Key Historic Landscape Characteristics**

*'Post-medieval gentry estate: house, parkland and garden, and associated estate village; varied settlement pattern; post-medieval vernacular, picturesque and polite estate architecture; post-medieval agricultural landscape; distinctive field boundaries; relict prehistoric and medieval settlement/fields'*

- 8.5.15 Merthyr Mawr is characterised as a largely intact post-medieval gentry estate, centred on Merthyr Mawr House, within its parkland and garden setting (Registered park and garden: PGW (Gm) 12 (BRI)), and associated estate village ranged between the parish church and Home Farm. The estate village, which includes church, schoolhouse, farmsteads, cottages and Post Office is characterised by its nucleated – organic and loosely scattered settlement pattern and retains important examples of post-medieval vernacular, picturesque and polite estate architecture. The surrounding associated landscape setting is characterised as an essentially post-medieval agricultural landscape typified by evolved, but fairly regular post-medieval field pattern showing signs of having evolved from medieval strip fields. The area retains distinctive field boundaries with evidence for relict prehistoric and medieval settlement and fields. While ecclesiastical landscape characteristics are represented by the post-medieval church built on site of medieval church (St Teilo's), which has an early medieval foundation supported by an important collection of Early Christian Monuments (inscribed stones and crosses). The medieval chapel (St Roque's), within the grounds of Merthyr Mawr House is a further indication of the ecclesiastical importance of the area. The multi-faceted nature of the area is emphasised by numerous other site types from prehistoric military/defensive features to industrial archaeological features (eg fulling mill), buried archaeological remains (cropmarks/parchmarks), communications features (ie footpaths, tracks and lanes both winding and straight) and a number of historic associations. The development of the landscape is well documented by surviving cartographic sources, and the area would benefit from further in-depth study of this material.

**HLCA 013 Merthyr Mawr Warren/Cwningaer Merthyr Mawr**

**Historic Background**

- 8.5.16 The historic landscape area of Merthyr Mawr Warren/Cwningaer Merthyr Mawr is a landscape area of some historical importance, reflected in its partial status as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM Gm 432), based on a concentration of archaeological features and finds revealed from time to time from beneath the shifting sands. The area, a national nature reserve and SSSI, is the location of the deserted medieval village and Manor of Candleston, the majority of which was abandoned following sand incursion by the early post-medieval period. During the post-medieval period the land was acquired by the Merthyr Mawr Estate.

**Key historic Landscape Characteristics**

*'Nationally important unenclosed be-sanded landscape; multi-period and multi-functional'*

*landscape; post-medieval rabbit warren'*

- 8.5.17 Merthyr Mawr Warren/Cwningaer Merthyr Mawr is characterised as an unenclosed be-sanded landscape, the majority of which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The character of the area is as a multi-period and multi-functional buried landscape: comprising buried prehistoric, medieval and post-medieval deserted settlement/fields (eg cultivation ridges, settlements at Pwll-y-defaid and near Candleston, and site of Coniger or Warren House, medieval manor house), and prehistoric funerary and ritual landscape. Buried finds of all periods have been recovered from the area. Other characteristic site types include prehistoric to post-medieval 'industrial' features (eg Iron Age bloomery and post-medieval corn mill), post-medieval rabbit warren, post-medieval and modern military/defensive structures and a firing range. In addition a small stretch of medieval road is partly exposed from the sand.

#### **HLCA 014 Candleston /Trecantle**

##### **Historic Background**

- 8.5.18 The historic landscape area of Candleston/Trecantle is dominated by the remains of Candleston Castle, built c14th century and occupied until the early 19th century. This was the fortified manor house of the de Cantelupe family. The site is defended by a D-shaped enclosure of the 14th century, crenellated as part of the early 19th century alterations which include a stable. The original 15th century structure comprised two parts: a single-pile range across the east end of the enclosure, with a tower added to the outside of the enclosure on the south. The Hall range, 14th century, was partly remodelled during c1500; the first-floor hall of this date retains an impressive perpendicular chimneypiece with four-centred ogee arch constructed of the local green sandstone. The tower retains a pointed, chamfered arch into a ground-floor cellar, and adjacent mural stair and an externally corbelled fireplace among other features such as garderobe and remains of parapet corbelling of the roofs, blocked west opening at the stair-head, originally opening on to the wall-walk of the enclosure wall.

##### **Key historic Landscape Characteristics**

*'Manorial centre of Candleston Castle set within an area of mixed agricultural and wooded landscape (including Ancient Woodland) on the fringe of Merthyr Mawr Warren; relict archaeology: medieval and post-medieval settlement/fields (including fortified manor); buried archaeology; historic associations'*

- 8.5.19 Candleston/Trecantle comprises the Manorial centre of Candleston Castle and includes three south facing valleys adjoining Merthyr Mawr Warren. The area is characterised by varied but generally evolved/irregular field pattern with tracts of Ancient and other broadleaved woodland and 20th century forestry. The area is strongly characterised by relict archaeological features: ranging from the fortified manor of Candleston Castle, an important example of medieval/post-medieval vernacular architecture, with associated medieval and post-medieval agricultural landscape (including Candleston Farm). The area, like the adjacent HLCA 013, also has buried archaeological remains, mainly indicated by prehistoric find scatters. The area has historic associations with the de Cantelupe family.

## **HLCA 016 Ogmore Down/Rhos Ogwr**

### **Historic Background**

- 8.5.20 The historic landscape area of Ogmore Down/Rhos Ogwr is an area of unenclosed common land above Ogmore village and an area containing a typical variety of relict archaeological features. The irregular boundary of the area is indicative of encroachment from the late medieval, but mainly early post-medieval periods (eg agricultural settlement of landless farm labourers are typically located extending along several of the lanes leading to and from the Down, such as alongside Heol-y-mynydd as depicted on the 1st edition 6-inch OS map. Part of the area is currently used as a golf course.

### **Key Historic Landscape Characteristics**

*'Unenclosed common; recreational open space; Ancient and other broadleaved woodland; with a small multi-period relict archaeological landscape element with communication features'*

- 8.5.21 Ogmore Down/Rhos Ogwr is characterised as an area of unenclosed Down or Common with important potential as recreational open space and partly comprises dry un-improved hill pasture, and is partly in use as a golf course. The area includes, in addition to the open common, Kings Wood a tract of Ancient and other broadleaved woodland, and unmanaged scrub (*Graig Ddu*). The area retains a small number of relict archaeological features including a single known prehistoric funerary and ritual feature, a Bronze Age round cairn (PRN 0230m), possible medieval agricultural and settlement landscape element is represented by features such as pillow mounds and recti-linear terracing of indeterminate age and a deserted rural settlement, a medieval long hut, at the head of Pant Norton. Numerous communication routes, from footpaths, to tracks and lanes, including the possible medieval routes of Heol-y-Mynydd and Heol-y-Slough, which connect the site of Ogmore Castle and the Downs, also traverse the area.

## **HLCA 018 Ogmore/Ogwr**

### **Historic Background**

- 8.5.22 The historic landscape area of Ogmore/Ogwr comprises the low-lying river terrace at the junction of the Ogwr (Ogmore) and Ewenny rivers. The area includes two enclosures contained within the registered park and garden of Merthyr Mawr, which lies on the opposite side of the Ogmore River (see HLCA 012) notably Coed Pwll-y-fflew and Waun-y-fervill (only the latter formed part of the Merthyr Mawr Demesne land in 1813). HLCA 018 is based around the shrunken settlement of Ogmore. The medieval and early post-medieval settlement at Ogmore originally comprised a nucleated grouping; prior to the Glyndwr rebellion the settlement comprised 22 tenants and 27 cottages, the rebellion reduced it to six tenants. The settlement remains as a farm, Ogmore Farm and a small hamlet to the south of the Castle.
- 8.5.23 The castle of Ogmore (SAM Gm 037) was originally constructed c1100 by William de Londres; the primary castle was an oval ringwork with attached D-shaped bailey to the west. The masonry defences date from the 12th and 13th centuries most significant is a 2-storey rectangular Keep (early 12th century, later heightened), probably one of the earliest Norman

buildings in the region, the rectangular 'cellar' and the a curtain wall and gateway (13th century) with parallels at Coity and Newcastle. The outer bailey contains the courthouse (14th/15th century), a structure where manorial courts were held until the early 19th century.

**Key Historic Landscape Characteristics**

*'Nucleated-organic shrunken settlement and medieval ringwork/stone castle strategically located within agricultural/floodplain landscape with enclosures of medieval or earlier origin; buildings of architectural interest; multi-period relict archaeological landscape including prehistoric promontory fort and medieval ecclesiastical features Ancient and other broadleaved woodland; communication corridor and historic associations'*

- 8.5.24 Ogmor/Ogwr is characterised as an area of enclosed generally low-lying land at the confluence of the Ogmor and Ewenny Rivers, largely typified by water meadow land liable to flooding, but including the small area of the enclosed Fleming's Down with its Iron Age promontory Fort (SAM Gm 466). The concentration of settlement is found at the village of Ogmor with its strategically placed medieval Castle, the centre of medieval Lordship. The settlement is characteristically a nucleated organic cluster of farms/cottages (including public house, the Pelican Inn, on the 1st edition OS 1884) centred on castle. Characteristic; medieval/post-medieval vernacular buildings/regional houses are represented by Ogmor Farm, Ogmor Cottage and Ty-maen, the latter a regional house with chimney backing on entry and outside cross passage.
- 8.5.25 The agricultural landscape has evolved, and varied field pattern of small to large enclosures, with some indications of medieval strip fields surviving and is characterised by varied, yet distinctive boundaries. An area of Ancient woodland (Kings Wood) survives at the foot of Fleming's Down.
- 8.5.26 The area is an important multi-period relict archaeological landscape of considerable time depth and variety including: prehistoric, medieval and post-medieval settlement/fields, a medieval shrunken/deserted village. The area is dominated by military/defensive features including prehistoric promontory fort and medieval Castle (Ogmor), and has also been considered the possible site of Roman fort (the illusive *Bomium*), as yet unproven.
- 8.5.27 The location of early medieval slab cross and inscribed stones found at Ogmor castle suggest some former ecclesiastical function/importance; the Vervil boundary dyke (SAM Gm 465), nearby also indicates territorial boundaries dating to at least the early-medieval period if not earlier. The area has characteristic features (eg a medieval weir and the system of leats and a millrace at Ogmor Corn mill) associated with rural industry: mostly associated with milling, including fulling (14th century) and tidal mills, sawmill, limekilns are also indicated. The area is also characterised by numerous features connected with transport and communications, including the possible Roman/medieval Road *Heol-y-milwyr*, footpaths, tracks and both winding and straight lanes. A variety of river crossings/fording points including the ancient stepping stones (SAM Gm 184) at Ogmor Castle and a number of interesting bridges such as the striking late 16th or earlier four-arched New Inn Bridge, the New Bridge of 1827, and a steel cabled suspension footbridge of 1840 (all Grade II Listed) are characteristic of the area (and the adjacent HLCA 013).

## 8.6 Predicted Effects – Archaeological Sites

### Effect of the development on archaeological sites (Table 8.2)

8.6.1 A total of 50 sites have been identified within the study area, ten of which are located within the proposed development area. The impact of the proposed development has been assessed as 'severe' in eight cases, 'major' in a single case and with a 'beneficial' effect for one site. The impact of the proposed development on the remaining 39 sites situated within the study area, but outside of the actual development area, has been assessed as 'none'; these entries have been removed from the table below.

Table 8.9: Effect of the development on known archaeological interests

ID	Name	NGR	Period	Value	Effect
02215m/31803 /LB11362	Hut 9	SS90037847	Modern	A	Beneficial
02214m/31802	POW Camp (198) Special Camp XI	SS89857845	Modern	A	Major
01016.5w/869 26	Glanwenny/Caerleon - Loughor Roman Road	SS90307813	Roman	B	Severe
01016.6w/869 26	Glanwenny/Caerleon - Loughor Roman Road	SS90407827	Roman	B	Severe
04353m	Island Farm Barn	SS90127815	Post-medieval	C	Severe
04354.0m	Trackway	SS899607819 5	Unknown	B	Severe
IF08	Pond	SS894607820 0	Post-medieval	C	Severe
IF09	Building	SS900107788 0	Post-medieval	C	Severe
IF10	Crossways	SS896807838 0	Modern	C	Severe
IF12	Group of 3 possible Cairns	SS896707815 0	Unknown	A	Severe

### Justification of assessment

#### 02215m/31803/LB11362

8.6.2 Hut 9 (ID 02215m/31803/LB11362) is located to the north of the area designated as the 'Nature Conservation Area' and a new maintenance road will be constructed off the A48 By-pass road to enable the council to maintain it, therefore the proposed development has been assessed as having a 'beneficial' effect of this site. It should, however, be noted that CCW have concerns with the effects on a population of lesser horseshoe bats currently roosting in Hut 9. A purpose built bat-house will hopefully displace the bats from this sub-optimal habitat and allow the Council to perhaps restore the site as a visitors centre in the future.

8.6.3 Improving access to the site of Hut 9 (ID 02215m/31803/LB11362) will have a 'beneficial'

effect on this site. Improving the appearance of Hut 9 and providing public interpretation boards describing the historic use of the site and the resulting prison break would enhance the 'beneficial' effect on this monument. It is, however, noted that these further improvements are not practical at the current time due to the presence of a population of lesser horseshoe bats roosting in Hut 9 (see paragraph 8.6.2 above).

**02214m/31802**

- 8.6.4 The proposed development has been assessed as having a 'major' impact on the Island Farm PoW camp as a large proportion of this site will be destroyed by groundworks associated with the construction of the development's access road off the A48 By-pass Road and the 'Green Bridge'. It is noted, however, that the Island Farm PoW camp is located within the 'Nature Conservation Area', if the surviving remains of the site were incorporated within the design of this area and preserved *in situ* the effect of the development upon the PoW camp could be reduced to 'minor'.

**01016.5w/86926 and 0106.6w/86926**

- 8.6.5 The exact route of the Roman road as it passes through this part of the development area is uncertain; the RCAHMW has recorded a section of agger running for 220m, however, the location of this agger is dubious due to a perceived error in the recorded NGR. The regional Historic Environment Record notes two straight field boundaries as being of a different content and appearance to those nearby and suggests that they may represent the fossilised route of the Roman road, however, they are on a different alignment to the recorded location of the agger. The Ordnance Survey and Margary (Margary 1957) believe that the route of the road is fossilised in the course of the A48 By-pass Road. Due to this debate it will be necessary to locate the route of the road prior to development; a geophysical survey was discussed but is considered impractical due to the topography of the site. Therefore a programme of test-pitting followed by excavation has been recommended.
- 8.6.6 The proposed development has been assessed as having a 'severe' impact on the eastern section of the Glanwenny/Caerleon – Loughor Roman road (ID 01016.5w/86926), as noted on the regional Historic Environment Record, as it will be destroyed by groundworks associated with the construction of the 'Phase II Extension to the Science Park'.
- 8.6.7 The proposed development has been assessed as having a 'severe' impact on the western section of the Glanwenny/Caerleon – Loughor Roman road (ID 01016.6w/86926), as noted on the regional Historic Environment Record. The field boundary forming site 01016.6w/86926 is located within the 'Nature Conservation Area', if the surviving remains of the site were incorporated within the design of this area and preserved *in situ* the effect of the development upon the PoW camp could be reduced to 'none'.

**04353m**

- 8.6.8 The proposed development has been assessed as having a 'severe' effect on the Island Farm Barn and the associated cruciform pond, as it is assumed that landscaping related to the construction of science park will remove them.

**04354.0m**

- 8.6.9 The proposed development has been assessed as having a 'severe' effect on the sunken



trackway as it will be destroyed landscaping and groundworks associated with the 'Bridgend Town Football Club' stadium, the 'Out Door Amphitheatre', the 'Piazza Open Space', the access road off the A48 By-pass Road and the 'science park'.

- 8.6.10 An archaeological evaluation across the route of the trackway was considered as a method of mitigating this effect, however, given the nature of sunken trackways, it was decided that this technique would not provide a positive outcome; it is considered more appropriate to record the nature of the trackway as it exists today. Therefore topographic and photographic surveys are recommended in order to preserve this monument in record before it is removed.

#### **IF08**

- 8.6.11 The proposed development has currently been assessed as having a 'severe' effect of the Pond IF08 as it is assumed that landscaping involved with the 'Nature Conservation Area' will destroy this site. It is, however, noted that should this site be preserved *in situ* within the 'Nature Conservation Area' the effect of the proposed development may be reduced to 'none'.

#### **IF09**

- 8.6.12 The proposed development has been assessed as having a 'severe' effect upon Building IF09 as it will be removed by groundworks associated with the construction of the 'Indoor 4G Training Pitch'.

#### **IF10**

- 8.6.13 The proposed development has currently been assessed as having a 'severe' effect on Crossways (ID IF10) as it is assumed that landscaping involved with the 'Nature Conservation Area' will destroy this site. Should this site be preserved *in situ* within the 'Nature Conservation Area' the effect of the proposed development may be reduced to 'none'.

#### **IF12**

- 8.6.14 The proposed development has been assessed as having a 'severe' effect upon the Group of three possible Cairns as it will be destroyed by groundworks associated with the 'Shared Car Parking' and the three 'Out Door Training Pitches'.

## **8.7 Predicted Effects – ASIDOHL2**

### **Assessment of direct, physical impacts of the Island Farm development (ASIDOHL2 Stage 2)**

- 8.7.1 The development area comprises 52.05ha, 35.37ha of which lies within the Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows Historic Landscape. The overall Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows Historic Landscape extends to 3370.521ha; therefore the maximum overall area, which could be directly affected by the application proposal, represents approximately 1.05% of the entire area on the register. Approximately 70% of the development area lies within HLCA017 (Ochr Draw and Island Farm Historic Landscape Area) the rest of the development area lies outside of the landscape on the register (see Figure 21).

Table 8.10 Assessment of direct physical impacts of the development (ASIDOHL2 Stage 2)

<b>Assessment of direct, physical impacts on historic character area 017</b>				
Absolute impact (loss of area)		Magnitude & score		
35.37ha of 106.9ha, 33.09%		Considerable - 4		
<b>Relative and landscape impacts (loss of known characteristics or elements) &amp; scores</b>				
Element / % loss	Status	Magnitude	Landscape value	Landscape value effect
Largely post-medieval agricultural landscape, with evolved but fairly regular field pattern and distinctive boundaries – 64%	C – 2	Severe – 5	Considerable - regular shaped fields with distinctive patterns – 4	Substantially reduced - 5
Post-medieval agricultural settlement – 34%	C – 2	Considerable – 4	Considerable – one of three remaining post-medieval agricultural buildings (island farm barn) in character area – 4	Considerably reduction - 4
Communications corridor including line of roman road (caerleon – loughor) and public/industrial rail – 5%	A – 4	Slight - 2	Low – 0.4km of possible medieval trackway preserved as field boundaries – 2	Slightly reduced - 2
A group of three possible prehistoric funerary monuments – 100%	U – 1	Very severe – 6	Very high – a group of three previously unrecorded, possible funerary monuments – 6	Lost - 6
<b>Overall magnitude of direct physical impacts on historic character area 017</b>				
Score		Grading		
19		Severe		
<b>Summary of overall magnitude of direct impact on historic character areas</b>				
Impact	Score		Magnitude	
Hlca 017	19		Severe	
<b>Absolute overall magnitude of direct impact on combined historic character areas</b>				
Impact	Average score on scale of 28		Magnitude	
Hlcas within development area	19		Severe	

**Assessment of indirect impacts on the historic landscape of the Island Farm development (ASIDOHL2 Stage 3)**

***Indirect, physical impacts (ASIDOHL2 Stage 3a)***

- 8.7.2 The development has the potential to have an indirect, physical impact on a single Historic Character Area, Ochr Draw and Island Farm (HLCA017).

*Table 8.11 Assessment of indirect physical impacts of the development (ASIDOHL2 Stage 2)*

<b>Assessment of indirect, physical impacts on historic character area 017</b>		
Impacts	Status & score	Magnitude & score
Increased risk of disturbance to the field boundaries forming part of the post-medieval agricultural landscape	C – 2	Moderate – 3
Increased fragmentation of field boundaries possibly preserving route of Caerleon – Loughor Roman Road	A – 4	Very Severe - 6
Increased management need for the area of the post-medieval agricultural landscape, which is to be turned into a nature conservation area	C – 2	Slight – 2
Further fragmentation of the post-medieval agricultural landscape	C – 2	Considerable - 4
The fragmentation of the possible medieval trackway preserved as field boundaries and sunken trackways	A – 4	Considerable - 4
The fragmentation post-medieval agricultural settlement	C - 2	Considerable - 4
The cessation of historic land use practices – agriculture	C – 2	Considerable - 4
<b>Overall magnitude of indirect visual impacts on historic character area 017</b>		
Average score: 6.43		

***Indirect (non-physical) impacts (ASIDOHL2 Stage 3b)***

- 8.7.3 The proposed development has the potential to have an indirect, non-physical impact on four Historic Character Areas, Merthyr Mawr Warren (HLCA013), Ogmore Down (HLCA016), Ochr Draw and Island Farm (HLCA017) and Ogmore (HLCA018).
- 8.7.4 It is considered that the development will have no visual impact on the Historic Character Areas of Merthyr Mawr (HLCA012) and Candleston (HLCA014). The proposed development area is not visible from Merthyr Mawr (HLCA012) due to the woodland (based on previous fieldwork in the area (Lewis 2003) between it and the development. Candleston (HLCA014) is located within dense woodland and there are no long or medium ranged views looking east

towards the proposed development.

- 8.7.5 The significant historical views from Merthyr Mawr House (PGW (Gm) 12 (BRI), which is located within the Merthyr Mawr (HLCA012) Historic Character Area are to the southeast and southwest (Cadw and ICOMOS 2000, 14) and are orientated away from the direction of the proposed development; therefore the Island Farm development will have no impact upon them.

Table 8.12 Assessment of indirect physical impacts of the development (ASIDOHL2 Stage 2)

<b>Assessment of indirect, visual impacts on historic character area 017</b>		
Impacts	Status & score	Magnitude & score
View to hlca012 partially altered (from ngr ss 90280 78300, view to west)	C – 2	Very slight – 1
View to hlca018 partially blocked (from ngr ss 89880 78210, view to southwest)	C – 2	Moderate - 3
View from hlca013 partially altered (from key view 09, view to north-northeast)	C – 2	Slight – 2
View from hlca016 partially altered (from key views 05 and 06, both views to northeast)	C – 2	Moderate - 3
View to the western and eastern extremes of hlca017 partially altered (from ngr ss 89750 77870, from to east and west respectively)	C – 2	Moderate - 3
Large-scale change to the essential setting of the post-medieval agricultural settlement within hlca 017	C – 2	Considerable - 4
Development form (average value of element sensitivity: $12/6 = 2$ )	2	Moderate - 3
Development appearance (average value of element sensitivity $12/6 = 2$ )	2	Moderate - 3
<b>Overall magnitude of indirect visual impacts on historic character area 017</b>		
Average score: 4.75		
<b>Overall magnitude of indirect impacts on historic character area 017</b>		
Total score on 28 point scale	Grading	
( $4.75 + 6.43 = 11.18$ ): $\frac{11.18 \times 28}{20} = 15.65 = 16$	Considerable	
<b>Assessment of indirect, visual impacts on historic character area 013</b>		
Impacts	Status & score	Magnitude & score

View to hlca017 partially altered (from key view 09, view to north-northeast)	C – 2	Slight - 2
Development form (average value of element sensitivity: 2/1 = 2)	2	Moderate - 3
Development appearance (average value of element sensitivity: 2/1 = 2)	2	Slight - 2
Overall magnitude of indirect visual impacts on historic character area 013		
Average score: 4.33		
<b>Overall magnitude of indirect impacts on historic character area 013</b>		
Total score on 28 point scale	Grading	
(4.33 + 0 = 4.33): $4.33 \times 28 = 6.06 = 6$ 20	Slight	
<b>Assessment of indirect, visual impacts on historic character area 016</b>		
Impacts	Status & score	Magnitude & score
View to hlca017 partially altered (from key views 05 and 06, both views to northeast)	C – 2	Moderate - 3
Development form (average value of element sensitivity: 2/1 = 2)	2	Moderate - 3
Development appearance (average value of element sensitivity: 2/1 = 2)	2	Slight - 2
<b>Overall magnitude of indirect visual impacts on historic character area 016</b>		
Average score: 4.67		
Overall magnitude of indirect impacts on historic character area 016		
Total score on 28 point scale	Grading	
(4.67 + 0 = 4.67): $4.67 \times 28 = 6.54 = 7$ 20	Slight	
<b>Assessment of indirect, visual impacts on historic character area 018</b>		
Impacts	Status & score	Magnitude & score
View to hlca017 partially altered (from key views 01, 02 and 018, views from south-southwest, southwest and north-northeast respectively)	A - 4	Considerable - 4
View from hlca017 partially altered (from ngr ss 89880 78210, view to southwest)	C – 2	Moderate - 3

Development form (average value of element sensitivity: $6/2 = 3$ )	3	Moderate - 3
Development appearance (average value of element sensitivity $6/2 = 3$ )	3	Moderate - 3
<b>Overall magnitude of indirect visual impacts on historic character area 018</b>		
Average score: 6.25		
<b>Overall magnitude of indirect impacts on historic character area 018</b>		
Total score on 28 point scale	Grading	
$(6.25 + 0 = 6.25)$ : $\frac{6.25 \times 28}{20} = 8.75 = 9$	Moderate	
<b>Summary of overall magnitude of indirect impact on historic character areas</b>		
Impact	Score	Magnitude
HIca017	16	Considerable
HIca013	6	Slight
HIca016	7	Slight
HIca018	9	Moderate
<b>Absolute overall magnitude of indirect impact on combined historic character areas</b>		
Impact	Average score on scale of 28	Magnitude
HLcas affected by the development	10	Moderate

#### Evaluation of relative importance (ASIDOHL2 Stage 4)

- 8.7.6 By its place in the Register, the historic landscape of Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows is considered to be a landscape of outstanding historic interest in its entirety. The evaluation of the character areas in a national context therefore *'should not be regarded as down grading of certain areas: it is simply acknowledging that within a landscape that is all of national importance, some areas, characteristics, or elements may well be of greater value than others'*.
- 8.7.7 The guidelines for the evaluation of relative importance, stage 4 of the ASIDOHL2 process, are summarised above. Stage 4 is concerned with evaluating the relative importance of the part of each HLCA directly or indirectly affected by the development, in relation to:

- (a) *the whole of the HLCA*
- (b) *the whole of the Historic Landscape*

8.7.8 It was considered that assessing the relative importance of the HLCA within the national context (Stage 4c of the ASIDOHL2 process), a difficult and onerous task itself, would not aid the assessment of the landscape to any great degree; for this reason it was omitted in this study.

8.7.9 The criteria used to determine the relative importance, or value, of the historic character areas affected by the development are those established in the 'Guide To Good Practice'; these are based on the following:

- Rarity
- Representative-ness
- Documentation
- Group Value
- Survival
- Condition
- Coherence
- Potential
- Integrity
- Amenity
- Associations
- 

8.7.10 Criteria values in steps (a), (b) and (c) are scored as follows:

*Table 8.13: Stage 4 criteria values*

<b>Asidohl2 stage 4: evaluation scores</b>	
Criterion value	Score
Very high/good	5
High/good	4
Moderate/medium	3
Low	2
Very low/poor	1

**Evaluation of the relative importance of the part of Historic Character Area 017 effected by the development in relation to: (a) the whole of the historic character area, and (b) the whole of the historic landscape area on the Register**

Table 8.14 Evaluation of the relative importance of the part of historic character area 017 affected by development

Value	(a) whole of historic character area					(b) whole of historic landscape area on the register				
	V. High / v. Good	High / good	Mod. / med.	low	Poor / none	V. High / v. Good	High / good	Mod. / med.	low	Poor / none
In relation to:	(a) whole of historic character area					(b) whole of historic landscape area on the register				
Rarity	✓						✓			
Representative-ness	✓								✓	
Documentation		✓					✓			
Group value			✓					✓		
Survival		✓					✓			
Condition			✓					✓		
Coherence	✓					✓				
Integrity		✓						✓		
Potential			✓					✓		
Amenity			✓					✓		
Associations				✓				✓		

Relative importance of the part of historic character area 017 affected by development		
Average score (a) out of 55	Average score (b) out of 55	Average of (a) and (b)
41	37	39

8.7.11 Justifications for evaluations within category a) whole of Historic Character Area:

- A singular example of a field boundary noted on the regional Historic Environment Record as being different in content and appearance to others nearby. This field boundary is believed to mark the line of the Caerleon – Loughor Roman road.
- The section of the Historic Landscape Area affected by the proposed development contains all of the characteristics of the entire Historic Landscape Area.



- The landscape retains its original function – an agricultural landscape interspersed with agricultural settlements.
- Whilst large sections of Antonine Itinerary *Inter XII* (Margary's route RR60c) have been authenticated by various authorities (see below) the section of the road thought to be fossilised in the hedge boundary with the Historic Character Area has yet to be fully authenticated.

8.7.12 Justifications for evaluations within category b) whole of Historic Character Area on the Register:

- Only two or three similar historic elements are broadly similar to other elements within this HLCA on the *Register* (a largely post-medieval agricultural landscape, a post-medieval agricultural settlement and a communications corridor including the line of a Roman road).
- The landscape retains its original function – an agricultural landscape interspersed with agricultural settlements.
- The route of the Roman road forms part of the Antonine Itinerary *Inter XII* (Margary's route RR60c), while stretches of this route are predicted from limited evidence; large stretches of it are authenticated by RCAHMW, the Ordnance Survey and Margary.

**Evaluation of the relative importance of the historic character areas 013, 016 and 018 indirectly effected by the development in relation to (b) the whole of the historic landscape area on the Register**

*Table 8.15 Evaluation of the relative importance of historic character area 013 indirectly affected by development*

Value	V. High / v. Good	High / good	Mod. / med.	Low	Poor / none
In relation to:	(b) whole of historic landscape area on the register				
Rarity	✓				
Representativeness	✓				
Documentation			✓		
Group value	✓				
Survival	✓				
Condition	✓				
Coherence		✓			
Integrity			✓		
Potential	✓				
Amenity	✓				

Associations		✓			
--------------	--	---	--	--	--

Relative importance of historic character area 013 indirectly affected by development		
Average score (a) out of 55	Average score (b) out of 55	Average of (a) and (b)
0	49	49

8.7.13 Justifications for evaluations within category b) whole of Historic Character Area on the Register:

- This Historic Character Area is a multi-period landscape (prehistoric onwards) and forms the core landscape within the *Register*. Due to the landscapes survival and preservation and its multi-period nature it is unique within the historic landscape of Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows.
- The be-sanded nature of the landscape means that survival and condition of the elements forming the landscape is very good; however, due to the be-sandment the original function of the landscape has ceased, whilst the be-sandment also means that the landscape is difficult to interpret by the non-specialist.
- The buried and well-preserved nature of the multi-period landscaped within this Historic Character Area offers considerable scope for further landscape studies.
- The dune-system provide wide-ranging scope for public educational and recreational facilities.

Table 8.16 Evaluation of the relative importance of historic character area 016 indirectly affected by development

Value	V. High / v. Good	High / good	Mod. / med.	Low	Poor / none
In relation to:	(b) whole of historic landscape area on the register				
Rarity		✓			
Representativeness				✓	
Documentation			✓		
Group value			✓		
Survival			✓		
Condition			✓		
Coherence			✓		
Integrity			✓		
Potential			✓		

Amenity			✓		
Associations				✓	

Relative importance of historic character area 016 indirectly affected by development		
Average score (a) out of 55	Average score (b) out of 55	Average of (a) and (b)
0	32	32

8.7.14 Reasoning for judgements within category b) whole of Historic Character Area on the Register:

- Only two or three similar historic elements are broadly similar to other landscapes on the Register (ancient woodland and unenclosed common).
- The landscape contains three of four linked elements (possible medieval agricultural and settlement landscape represented by features such as pillow mounds, deserted rural settlement and a medieval long hut).
- The historic themes of the landscape are present, such as the deserted rural settlement and medieval long hut, meaning this is a landscape of moderate articulation.
- The historic elements are present within the landscape but given their nature are not readily visible or easy to understand.

Table 8.17 Evaluation of the relative importance of historic character area 018 indirectly affected by development

Value	V. High / v. Good	High / good	Mod. / med.	Low	Poor / none
In relation to:	(b) whole of historic landscape area on the register				
Rarity	✓				
Representativeness		✓			
Documentation	✓				
Group value	✓				
Survival	✓				
Condition		✓			
Coherence	✓				
Integrity	✓				

Potential		✓			
Amenity	✓				
Associations	✓				

Relative importance of historic character area 018 indirectly affected by development		
Average score (a) out of 55	Average score (b) out of 55	Average of (a) and (b)
0	52	52

8.7.15 Reasoning for judgements within category b) whole of Historic Character Area on the Register:

- Sole example of an Iron Age promontory fort within the historic landscape of Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows.
- Historic Character Area contains most of the elements that characterize the landscape (medieval ringwork/stone castle, agricultural landscape, multi-period relict archaeological landscape, ancient and broadleaf woodland and communication corridor).
- More than 80% of the elements within the landscape survive, however those elements only survive in a moderate condition for their class.
- The dominant historic themes are present within the landscape and they retain their original function.
- The elements within the landscape retain their original character and are both highly visible and easily understood.
- The Iron Age promontory fort, medieval castle and relict archaeological landscape provide a wide-ranging scope for public educational and recreational facilities.
- The medieval castle and village of Ogmor is associated with the Glyndwr rebellion, while the two enclosures located within the Historic Character Area are associated with Merthyr Mawr House (PGW (Gm) 12 (BRI), which is located within the Merthyr Mawr (HLCA012) Historic Character Area.

Table 8.18 Summary of average overall values for historic character areas affected by the development

Historic Character Area	Average value from stages a-c converted to a scale of 1-100	Grading
HLCA 017	(70.91) – 71	High
HLCA 013	(89.09) – 89	Very High
HLCA 016	(58.18) – 58	Considerable
HLCA 018	(94.55) – 95	Very High

Average Overall value, or combined evaluation figure for stage 4	
Average overall value	Grading
(78.18) – 78	High

**Assessment of the overall significance of the impact of the development  
(ASIDOHL2 Stage 5)**

- 8.7.16 This section assesses the overall significance of the impact of this development and the effects that altering the Historic Character Areas concerned will have on the whole of the Historic Landscape Area on the Register. This final stage combines the results of Stages 2 to 4 to produce an assessment of the overall significance of impact of development and the effects that altering the historic character areas concerned has on the whole of the Historic Landscape Area on the Register. This is determined by setting out and scoring the value of the character areas affected in relation to the effect caused by development and the consequent reduction in value of the historic landscape area on the Register. The results are set out in the following table:

*Table 8 19 ASIDOHL2 stage 5: summary of the overall significance of impact on landscape of historic interest 'hlca 017'*

Value of character area (based on stage 4 results)	Impact caused by development (based on stages 2 & 3 results)	Reduction of value of historic landscape area on register
Medium  Key elements of varying intrinsic importance and/or condition and/or group value and/or generally typical of this or other historic landscape areas on the Register.	High  Substantial land loss and consequent fragmentation and/or visual intrusion causing some key elements to be removed or changed so that group value and/or coherence and/or integrity are significantly diminished, and/or amenity value greatly reduced.	Medium  Development impact on key elements is such that there is some, but still appreciable, reduction in the overall value of the historic landscape area on the Register.
SCORE: 6	SCORE: 7	SCORE: 6
TOTAL SCORE: 19	OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Fairly Severe	

Table 8.20 ASIDOHL2 stage 5: summary of the overall significance of impact on landscape of historic interest 'hlca 013'

Value of character area (based on stage 4 results)	Impact caused by development (based on stages 2 & 3 results)	Reduction of value of historic landscape area on register
Very High  Key elements of very high intrinsic importance and/or condition and/or group value, and/or not found elsewhere in this or other historic landscape area on the Register.	Very Low  Marginal land loss and consequent fragmentation and/or visual intrusion causing negligible changes to elements and their values.	Very Low  Development impact on key elements is such that the value of the historic landscape area on the Register remains essentially unchanged.
<b>SCORE: 9</b>	<b>SCORE: 1</b>	<b>SCORE: 1</b>
TOTAL SCORE: 11	OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Moderate	

Table 8.21 ASIDOHL2 stage 5: summary of the overall significance of impact on landscape of historic interest 'hlca 016'

Value of character area (based on stage 4 results)	Impact caused by development (based on stages 2 & 3 results)	Reduction of value of historic landscape area on register
Medium  Key elements of varying intrinsic importance and/or condition and/or group value and/or generally typical of this or other historic landscape areas on the register.	Very low  Marginal land loss and consequent fragmentation and/or visual intrusion causing negligible changes to elements and their values.	Very low  Development impact on key elements is such that the value of the historic landscape area on the register remains essentially unchanged.
<b>Score: 5</b>	<b>Score: 1</b>	<b>Score: 1</b>
Total score: 7	Overall significance of impact: slight	

Table 8.22 ASIDOHL2 stage 5: summary of the overall significance of impact on landscape of historic interest 'hlca 018'

Value of character area (based on stage 4 results)	Impact caused by development (based on stages 2 & 3 results)	Reduction of value of historic landscape area on register
High  Key elements of high intrinsic importance and/or condition and/or group value, and/or uncommon elsewhere in this or other historic landscape areas on the register.	Low  Slight land loss and consequent fragmentation and/or visual intrusion causing limited numbers of key elements to be removed or changed so that group value and/or coherence and/or integrity are slightly diminished, and/or amenity value slightly reduced.	Low  Development impact on key elements is such that there is slight reduction in the overall value of the historic landscape area on the register.
<b>Score: 8</b>	<b>Score: 3</b>	<b>Score: 3</b>
Total score: 14	Overall significance of impact: moderate	

### Summary of loss through development impact

- 8.7.17 The development will have a direct impact and an indirect physical impact on a single Historic Landscape Character Area (Ochr Draw and Island Farm HLCA017), and an indirect, visual impact on four Historic Landscape Character Areas (HLCAs) of the Registered Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows Historic Landscape. The overall significance of impact of the proposed development on each of these four HLCAs and the entirety of the Historic Landscape on the Register is summarised in the following table:

Table 8.23 Overall significance of impact of the island farm development on the merthyr mawr, kenfig and margam burrows landscape of outstanding historic interest

Impact	Total score	Overall significance of impact
Hlca 017	19	Fairly severe
Hlca 013	11	Moderate
Hlca 016	7	Slight
Hlca 018	14	Moderate
Average of combined hlcas 013, 016, 017 and 018	$(19+11+7+14)/4 = 12.75$	Moderate
Historic landscape on the register	13	Moderate

## 8.8 Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

- 8.8.1 A map regression exercise combined with analysis of documentary sources and aerial photographs has identified ten sites of archaeological interest within the area of proposed development, of these sites it has been determined that the potential development will have a 'beneficial' effect on one site, a 'major' effect on a single site and a 'severe' effect on the eight remaining sites.
- 8.8.2 Improving access to the site of Hut 9 (ID 02215m/31803/LB11362) will have a 'beneficial' effect on this site. Improving the appearance of Hut 9 and providing public interpretation boards describing the historic use of the site and the resulting prison break would enhance the 'beneficial' effect on this monument.
- 8.8.3 The northern section of the proposed development area is occupied by the site of the Island Farm PoW camp (ID 02214m/31802); the site visit conducted for this assessment established that the remains of the PoW camp are more intact than previously thought. As a result it is recommended that a total station survey should be conducted across this site in order to record the locations of the surviving remains. Due to the dense coverage of trees and shrubs across the site it is not currently possible for this survey to be conducted, therefore a programme of vegetation clearance will be necessary before the survey can be achieved.
- 8.8.4 The proposed development will have a 'severe' effect on the projected route of the Glanwenny/Caerleon – Loughor Roman road (IDs 01016.5w/86926 and 01016.6w/86926). The exact route of this Roman road as it passes through the proposed development area is not known, therefore it is recommended that a series of archaeological test-pits are excavated across the site in order to locate it; once the line of the road is established two evaluation trenches should be cut across the road in order to record its composition.
- 8.8.5 The proposed development will have a 'severe' effect on the Island Farm barn and the associated cruciform pond (ID 04353m), in order to mitigate this effect it is recommended that a Level 2 building survey, as set out in *English Heritage's Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice* (2006) should be conducted on the barn and a Level 2 monuments survey as set out in *RCHME's Recording Archaeological Field Monuments* (1999) should be conducted on the pond, prior to the commencement of development works.
- 8.8.6 The route of a sunken trackway (ID 04354.0m) of probable medieval date, forming part of the *Heolgam* or the Crooked Way has been identified as running through the proposed development area on a northeast – southwest alignment. The proposed development will have a 'severe' effect upon this trackway. Therefore topographic and photographic surveys to a Level 3 monuments survey as set out in *RCHME's Recording Archaeological Field Monuments* (1999) is recommended in order to preserve this monument in record before it is destroyed.
- 8.8.7 During the map regression exercise a group of three possible prehistoric cairns (IF12) were identified on the first through to fourth edition Ordnance Survey maps (1878 – 1941) and on the modern Ordnance Survey mapping. Unfortunately it was not possible to visit this site during the production of this assessment, so it was not possible to positively identify these monuments. As a result it is recommended that an archaeological evaluation be conducted at the site of these monuments prior to the commencement of development works, in order to confirm the identification and inform a more detailed mitigation strategy.
- 8.8.8 The proposed development has currently been assessed as having a 'severe' effect on the



pond and Crossways (IDs IF08 and IF10), it is currently recommended that this effect should be mitigated by conducting an archaeological watching-brief on all groundworks in these areas. However, it is noted that these two sites are located within the confines of the 'Nature Conservation Area' and the provision of more detailed construction methods may reduce the effect of the proposed development upon these sites and the corresponding nature of the archaeological response.

- 8.8.9 It has been assessed that the proposed development will have a 'severe' effect on building IF09; it is therefore recommended that an archaeological watching-brief be conducted during all groundworks in the area of this site.
- 8.8.10 The archaeological works should be carried out to the professional standards laid down by the *Institute for Archaeologists*.

### **Residual Impact**

- 8.8.11 Provided that the mitigation recommendations for sites 02214m/31802, 01016.5w/8961, 01016.6w/8961, 04353m, 04354.0m, IF08 – IF10 and IF12 are followed the effect of the proposed development will be reduced to 'none' and as a consequence there will be no residual impact on the archaeological resource.
- 8.8.12 The mitigation for Hut 9 (ID 02215m/31803/LB11362) will result in a need for continual management of the site in order to maintain public access to Hut 9.
- 8.8.13 If sites 02214m/31802, 01016.6w/8961, IF08 and IF10 are incorporated within the 'Nature Conservation Area' and preserved *in situ* for continual management of the site to prevent these sites from deteriorating.

## **8.9 Summary and Conclusions**

- 8.9.1 The Glamorgan-Gwent Archaeological Trust, Projects Division (GGAT Projects) have undertaken a desk-based assessment of the archaeological effects of a proposed development at Island Farm, Bridgend. The assessment reviewed information held by the regional Historic Environment Record (HER) and the National Monuments Record (NMR), as well as cartographic and documentary sources. Aerial photographs were examined and a site visit conducted.
- 8.9.2 Part of the Registered Historic Landscape of Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows lies within the study area, and a separate ASIDOHL study has been conducted in order to assess the significance of the impact of the development on the Historic Landscape (see Section X). This ASIDOHL and desk-based assessment form part of a larger Environmental Impact assessment.
- 8.9.3 A total of 50 sites of archaeological interest were identified within the study area during the course of the desk-based assessment, none of which are Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Fourteen of these have statutory protection as Grade II Listed Buildings, although only one (Hut 9 of PoW Camp (198) Special Camp XI, 02215m/31803/LB11362) is located within the study area.
- 8.9.4 The effect of the development on the sites of known archaeological interest has been assessed as Severe in five cases, major in a single case and Beneficial in one. The severely affected sites are two sections of the projected route of the Glanwenny/Caerleon - Loughor

- Roman Road (01016.5w/86926 and 01016.6w/86926), Island Farm Barn (04353m) and a sunken Trackway (04354.0m), whilst the proposed development will have a major effect on the POW Camp (198) Special Camp XI (02214m/31802). It is considered that the development will have a Beneficial effect on Hut 9 (02215m/31803/LB11362).
- 8.9.5 A map regression exercise combined with analysis of documentary sources and aerial photographs has identified four previously unrecorded sites of archaeological interest within the development area a Pond (IF08), a Building (IF09), Crossways (IF10) and group of three possible Cairns (IF12). It has been assessed that the proposed development will have a Severe effect on all four sites.
- 8.9.6 In order to mitigate against the effect the proposed development will have on the above sites of archaeological interest it has been suggested that:
- 8.9.7 A total station survey should be conducted on the site of POW Camp (198) Special Camp XI (02214m/31802).
- 8.9.8 A series of test-pits should be excavated across the projected route of the Glanwenny/Caerleon - Loughor Roman Road (01016.5w/86926 and 01016.6w/86926); once the route has been established two evaluation trenches should be excavated across its route.
- 8.9.9 A topographic and photographic survey should be conducted along the route of the Trackway (04354.0m).
- 8.9.10 An archaeological evaluation should be conducted on the group of three possible Cairns (IF12) in order to confirm their identification and inform future mitigation.
- 8.9.11 An archaeological watching-brief should be conducted on all groundworks in the vicinity of the Pond IF08, the Building IF09 and Crossways (IF10).
- 8.9.12 It should be noted that the development lies within a landscape of high archaeological complexity, with important remains of all periods. Given the historical and archaeological importance and sensitivity of the surrounding landscape, and the high numbers of finds recovered from the vicinity, it is clear that there is potential for buried remains dating to all periods in the development area.
- 8.9.13 The ASIDOHL2 assessment exercise has established the overall significance of the impact of the Island Farm development upon the historic landscape of Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows has been assessed as 'moderate'. However, 'moderate' is relatively low on the ASIDOHL2 scale of significance, and as a result it is not considered that the proposed development would greatly reduce the capacity for understanding or appreciating the landscape's historical meaning or significance.

#### **ASIDOHL2 Concluding Statement**

- 8.9.14 The ASIDOHL2 process has identified that there will be a single direct physical impact upon the historic landscape, in the Historic Landscape Character Area (HLCA) of Ochr Draw and Island Farm (HLCA017). The direct physical impact of the proposed development to HLCA017 has been assessed as 'severe' with 64% of the post-medieval agricultural landscape and 34% of the post-medieval agricultural settlement being destroyed, along with a minor loss (5%) to the communication corridors running through the character area. The proposed development will also lead to the complete loss of three possible funerary monuments.

- 8.9.15 On the basis of principal representative viewpoints (PRVs) and with reference to contour mapping and site visits, the ASIDOHL2 process identified a range of visual impacts to four HLCAs, Merthyr Mawr Warren (HLCA 013), Ogmore Down (HLCA016), Ochr Draw and Island Farm (HLCA017) and Ogmore HLCA018). The visual impact was assessed taking into account the sensitive nature of the architectural plan, where the development has been designed to blend into the surrounding landscape (eg the 'green roof' on the 4G Indoor Sports Centre (Chapter 10, Paragraph 10.6.11) see Chapter 10 for a full discussion of the architectural and visual design of the proposed development) and the 'tree screening' to be planted around the development. Therefore, the proposed development will have a 'slight' effect on HLCAs 013 and 016, a 'moderate' effect on HLCA018 and 'considerable' effect on HLCA017.
- 8.9.16 The overall significance of the impact of the Island Farm development upon the historic landscape of Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows has been assessed as 'moderate'. However, 'moderate' is relatively low on the ASIDOHL2 scale of significance, and as a result it is not considered that the proposed development would greatly reduce the capacity for understanding or appreciating the landscape's historical meaning or significance.

## 8.10 References

### Sources cited in the text

- Barrie D S M, 1994, A regional history of the railways of Great Britain, volume 12 South Wales (2nd edition), Nairn*
- Cadw/CCW/ICOMOS, 1998, Register of landscapes of outstanding historic interest in Wales, Cadw*
- Cadw/CCW/ICOMOS, 2001, Register of landscapes of special historic interest in Wales, Cadw*
- Cadw/CCW/Welsh Assembly, 2007, Guide to good practice on using the register of landscapes of historic interest in Wales in the planning and development process: revised (2nd) edition including revisions to the assessment process (ASIDOHL2), Cadw*
- English Heritage, 2006, Understanding Historic Buildings, A guide to good recording practice, Swindon*
- Hanks P (ed.), 1979, Collins Dictionary of the English Language, Collins*
- Hawthorne, S, M, 1989, Island Farm Special Camp 11 for Prisoners of War, Brynteg Comprehensive School, Bridgend*
- Howard Humphries Consulting Engineers, 1997, Geological desk-top study of Island Farm, in Island Farm and Brewery Field, Bridgend: a leisure, sports, business and residential development, submission for outline planning consent*
- Howell K, 2000, Island Farm, Bridgend: an archaeological assessment, GGAT Report no. 2000/067*
- Hunter J, 2002, Island Farm, Bridgend: an archaeological desk-based assessment, CgMs Consulting Report no. 3137*

*Lewis, R, forthcoming, Ewenny, a causewayed enclosure in the Vale of Glamorgan: post-excavation report*

*Lewis, R and Hudson, N, 2006, Landscapes working for the Vale of Glamorgan: History and archaeology aspect, GGAT Report no. 2006/012*

*Lewis, R, 2003, Merthyr Mawr Estate, Vale of Glamorgan: Tir Gofal HE2 Farm Visit report, GGAT Report no. 2003/078*

*Lewis, J, M, 1982, The Ewenny Potteries, Cardiff*

*Margary, I, D, 1957, Roman roads in Britain, Volume 2, London*

*Maylan, N, 1991, Archaeological desk-top survey Schwyll to Brackla Watermain, GGAT unpublished report*

*Newman J, 1995 The Buildings Of Wales: Glamorgan, Yale University Press*

*Pearson, A and Lewis, R 2003, Prehistoric funerary & ritual sites: Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Cardiff, Monmouthshire, Newport, Torfaen and the Vale of Glamorgan, GGAT report no. 2003/027*

*Randall H J, 1955, Bridgend: the storey of a market town, Bridgend Library and Information Service*

*Roberts, R, 2003, Historic Landscape Characterisation: Merthyr Mawr, Kenfig and Margam Burrows. Part 1 and 2 landscape characterisation and management, GGAT Report no. 2003/081*

*Sell, S, H, S, 2001, Bridgend Science Park, archaeological watching-brief, GGAT Report no. 2001/002*

*Sherman, A, and Evans, E, 2004, Roman roads in South East Wales: desk-based assessment with recommendations for fieldwork, GGAT Report no. 2004/073*

*Vincent, J, 1990, 'Island Farm Camp', After the Battle, 67, 28-39*

*Welsh Assembly, 2002, Planning Policy Wales, Welsh Assembly*

#### Newspaper articles

*Daily Express, March 12, 1945*

*Daily Express, March 16, 1945*

*Daily Worker, March 12, 1945*

*Western Mail, April 22, 1948*

#### Internet sites

[www.islandfarm.fsnet.co.uk](http://www.islandfarm.fsnet.co.uk) , 4<sup>th</sup> August 2009

[www.gtj.org.uk](http://www.gtj.org.uk) , 11<sup>th</sup> August 2009

Television programmes

*Coast, Series 4, Lands End to Porthcawl (TV Programme) BBC 2, 28<sup>th</sup> July, 2009*

*Sources consulted but not cited*

*Cadw, ICOMOS UK, 2000, Register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales, Part 1: Parks and Gardens (Glamorgan), Cadw*

*Caple, R, F, 1992, Proposed residential and associated development at 'Broadlands', Bridgend, an archaeological appraisal*

*Thomas, R, 2003, Twentieth century military recording project: Prisoner of war camps (1939 – 1948), English Heritage*

*Harmers Limited, 2002, Environmental statement: proposed development comprising WRU National Academy, sport and leisure facilities, hotel/restaurant, business park, housing and associated access arrangements, Island Farm, Bridgend, Volume 1 – None technical summary*

*G, T, Clark's map of Bridgend, 1848, RCAHMMW*

*George Yates's map of Glamorgan, 1799, RCAHMMW*

*The Dunraven map of Bridgend, 1778, A map of part of the estates of Charles Edwin, surveyed by Edward Thomas, RCAHMMW*

*Thomas, H, 2007, Historic Gardens of the Vale of Glamorgan. Welsh Historic Gardens Trust*

Cartographic sources

*A map of Ewenny Demesne with other lands adjoining in the several parishes of Ewenny, Coity and Coychurch, 1807, Jn Williams, D/DE 476*

*Tithe Map and Apportionment for the parish of Coity Lower, 1840, P/80/2 and P/80/3*

*Ordnance Survey 1:2500, 1878, First Edition*

*Ordnance Survey 1:2500, 1899, Second Edition*

*Ordnance Survey 1:2500, 1918, Third Edition*

*Ordnance Survey 1:2500, 1941, Fourth Edition*

*SSEW, 1983, 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales and Legend, Harpenden*

## 8.11 Glossary

**ASIDOHL:** *Assessment of the Significance of Impacts of Development on Historic Landscape*

**CRAPW:** *Central Registry of Air Photographs for Wales*

*HER: Historic Environment Record*

*LBII: Grade II Listed Building*

*NGR: National Grid Reference*

*NMR: National Monuments Record*

*PGW: Parks and Gardens of Wales*

*RCHME: Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (now part of  
English Heritage)*

*RCAHMW: Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales*

*SSSI: Site of Special Scientific Interest*