

## **CMP updates from March 2022 to August 2022**

The August revision of the CMP captures comments/ inputs from:

- Historic England (received 30 June 2022)
- Additional comments from Kent County Council (received June 2022)
- Additional comments from FHDC (received May 2022)
- Arcadis' archaeological inputs (received July 2022) – see Arcadis' scope for archaeological inputs attached.

The following text sets out the updates made by section:

### Section 1.0 Introduction

- Minor text updates
- 1.7 Gaps in Knowledge section altered. Archaeology elements of this section moved into new Section 2.6.

### Section 2.0 Site Understanding

- 2.1 – additional landmarks added to Location Plan.
- 2.4 – minor additions to Summary Timeline.
- 2.5 - greater detail added to Sitewide Historic Development Plan.
- 2.6 – an introduction to archaeology is provided with mapping showing location of archaeological investigations within Scheduled Monument and its setting. Following this section, archaeology is integrated into each section of the report.
- 2.7 - greater detail added to Site Description Plan.
- 2.7.1 – greater detail added to Inner Court Plan.
- 2.7.1, 2.7.2, 2.7.3 & 2.7.3 - inclusion of sections detailing previous archaeological surveys (eg. GPR) carried out in Scheduled Monument by area (ie. Inner Court, Outer Court, Landscaping within Scheduled Monument, Landscaping beyond Scheduled Monument) and known archaeology/ archaeological anomalies in these areas. Lidar mapping and mapping of archaeological finds/ anomalies also included with keys identifying (using Arcadis' archaeological inputs).
- 2.7.1 - Addition of Inner Terrace (10) into descriptions (drawing on Arcadis' archaeological inputs) and addition of lidar mapping showing location of terraces.
- 2.7.3 - change of wording in relation to 'landscaping within Scheduled Area' (previously referred to as 'landscape setting' but Historic England pointed out that this landscape forms part of the Scheduled Monument not its setting).
- 2.7.4 - rewriting/ expansion of Wider Setting Beyond Scheduled Monument.
- 2.7.4 – mapping added to show main archaeological features within wider setting of the site (as well as archaeological features on the site (using Arcadis' archaeological inputs).

### Section 3.0 History and Development

- 3.1 - text additions relating to Prehistoric activity in wider setting of Westenhanger eg. Bronze Age barrows.
- 3.1 – further detail about castle's water control system or 'waters' to the north and west, fishponds or ornamental ponds to the south of the Scheduled Monument and the former Tudor garden also to the south (drawing on Arcadis' archaeological inputs).

- 3.1 – Martin and Martin 2001 outline site plan added.
- 3.1 – updated information about the alignment of the former Pound House Track (drawing on Arcadis' archaeological inputs).
- 3.3 – further detail to the sitewide Historic Development Plan.

#### Section 4.0 Assessment of Significance

- 4.3 – text additions to Summary Statement of Significance, namely relating to archaeological remains (eg castle's water control system) and landscaping within Scheduled Area.
- 4.4 – updates to Inner Court, with added detail added to the 'archaeological potential' section within 'Evidential Value' (drawing on Arcadis' archaeological inputs).
- 4.5 – updates to Outer Court, with added detail added to the 'archaeological potential' section within 'Evidential Value' (drawing on Arcadis' archaeological inputs).
- 4.6 – rewriting of Landscape Setting within Scheduled Area, including more detail on archaeological value (drawing on Arcadis' archaeological inputs).
- 4.7 – additions to Landscape Setting beyond Scheduled Area, including more detail on archaeological value (drawing on Arcadis' archaeological inputs).
- 4.8 – Updates/ added detail to Sitewide Significance Plan and Inner Court detail.

#### Section 5.0

- 5.2 - Addition of DCMS Policy Statement to policy section.
- 5.2 – Addition of Folkestone & Hythe District Heritage Strategy.
- 5.3 – Addition of archaeological issues/ risks and associated opportunities (Arcadis' archaeological inputs).
- 5.3.2 – section renamed from 'Archaeology' to 'Gaps in Knowledge: Archaeology' and rewritten (drawing on Arcadis' archaeological inputs)
- 5.6 – addition of opportunity relating to heritage trail.
- 5.9 Use – removal of plans showing potential use options for site, as per request from Historic England.

#### Section 6.0 Conservation Management Policies

- Alteration of REHV6 in response to Arcadis comments.
- Alteration of REHV7 in response to Arcadis comments.
- Addition of policy IV7.

#### Appendices

- Bibliography - addition of reports and surveys previously missed.
- Appendix C – new section added – 'Depths of deposits and potential disturbance' (Arcadis archaeological inputs). This section lists the location of known archaeological deposits on the site, their depths and potential disturbances and can be used to aid decision-making on further archaeological investigations and to guide future proposals for change.

# Otterpool Park

## Archaeological Input into Conservation Management Plan for Westenhanger Castle

### Background

Purcell have prepared a Conservation Management Plan for Westenhanger Castle. The CMP is designed to guide the decision-making for this nationally important monument as the Otterpool Park application gains outline planning permission and the Phase 1 development progresses. Comments on initial drafts of the CMP received from heritage consultees (FHDC/KCC and Historic England) flagged that the Castle's archaeology needed to be made more integral to the CMP and, in particular, it needed updating with the results of the last 4 years of archaeological investigations. Arcadis, as the archaeological specialist who prepared the Archaeological Assessments and Strategies and who commissioned the recent archaeological investigations, were asked to address the detail of the specialist feedback comments. This specialist work has been undertaken with oversight from Purcell as CMP co-ordinator.

### General Scope

- To make archaeology more integral to all chapters of the CMP
- To add in results of archaeological and historical studies that have taken place since 2018 to bring the CMP up to date.
- To input into how this increased archaeological knowledge affects the significance of different components of the Castle
- To feed this understanding into the issues and opportunities section and policies section
- General review of the whole document to check for inconsistencies or out of date information.

### Updates made

- Baseline – Chapters 1, 2 and 3
  - Weaved in archaeological knowledge to Chapters 1, 2 and 3 (Introduction, Site Understanding, History and Development) in order to give a more holistic understanding of the development of the site
  - Included more on potential for pre-medieval archaeology in Chapter 2 and 3 e.g. Bronze Age barrows
  - Renewed assessment and interrogation of recent investigations to respond to KCC's comment that there has been new evidence since the baseline reports were prepared that should be included. The baseline should be reviewed, updated and summarised.
  - Creation of a plan showing areas where archaeological investigation has taken place

- Better archaeological plans that are easier to read, convey more useful information (e.g. location of the below ground remains of the parish church recently found) and are consistent in style throughout)
- The historical background has been bolstered with the archaeological landscape discussed on a period by period basis to explain the phased archaeological evolution of the site using the detailed information gleaned from the up to date HER data.
- Chapter 3 in particular– History and Development – has had archaeological knowledge woven in rather than separating out from the buildings
- Most of the information in Section 5.3.2 has been moved to Chapter 2.
- Added to the gaps in knowledge section currently in Section 5 (using and referring to the Research Strategy which forms Appendix B of the Heritage Strategy)
- Analysis – All Chapters
  - Addressed the KCC/FHDC comment that analysis of archaeology is currently absent from the document e.g. at the moment e.g. trial trenching was described but not how the results have changed our understanding and what this means for informing future work
  - An assessment of the results of this new information in the context of known archaeological data to understand how current knowledge contributes to understanding of the archaeology of the site (its layout, materiality, function and servicing for example).
  - Supplementing the archaeological potential section within the Assessment of Significance chapter (Chapter 4)
  - To accompany this analysis, preparation of a site wide plan which plots the location and type of all known buried archaeological features and standing remains to visually explain the extent of the known archaeological footprint. This leads into identification of gaps in knowledge or archaeological potential which will aid understanding of the potential existence and location of currently unknown archaeology.
  - Preparation of a previous impacts plan which plots all known ground intrusive activity (building footprints, landscaping etc) that has the potential to have impact on pre-dating archaeology to help build up a picture of where archaeological deposits are likely or less likely to survive.
  - Chapter 4 – Assessment of Significance –been expanded to include archaeological updates in Chapter 3 so that archaeology is not separated out from buildings and so that correct levels of significance can be gauged
- Issues and Opportunities - Chapter 5
  - Reviewed and updated to reflect the results of the renewed archaeological baseline and analysis and to incorporate any issues relating to specific standing remains and buried deposits (for example how known ground conditions or development proposals/construction or land use activity may affect the ongoing preservation of archaeological deposits).
  - Section 5.3.2 issues and opportunities added.
- Conservation Management Policies – Chapter 6

- Reviewed and expanded to reflect the results of the renewed archaeological baseline and analysis, in particular to incorporate any policies on specific standing and buried archaeological remains.