

Orion Heritage

Platf9rm, Floor 5 & 6 Tower Point, 44 North Road, Brighton BN1 1YR

+44 1273 573803

Colony, 5 Piccadilly Place, Aytoun Street, Manchester, M1 3BR

www.orionheritage.co.uk



February 2025

Prepared by Becky Ryan BA (Hons) MCIfA

Former Novartis Site, Phase 1 - Archeology Technical Note

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This technical note presents an overview of the archaeological baseline of the study site and assess the impact of the proposed development upon any relevant archaeological deposits.
- 1.2 Outline planning permission has been granted for the erection of up to 300 dwellings, including the conversion of existing office buildings, employment floorspace and provision of flexible commercial/community space (Horsham District Council Ref: DC/18/2687). This technical note supports an application for the revised residential proposal across Phase 1 of the site.

Location and Description

- 1.3 The study site is located to the north of Horsham, with Parsonage Road and Wimblehurst Road to the north of the site and railway lines to the east, west and south and formed part of the former Novartis facility. It is located at TQ 17774 31839.

2.0 Methodology

- 2.1 This technical note has been prepared in line with the requirements of current national and local planning policy, current best archaeological practice and the appropriate national and local standards and guidelines.
- 2.2 This technical note has been informed by an archaeological desk-based assessment previously produced for the study site (Hampshire Services 2018) (Appendix A).

3.0 Planning Background, Development Plan Framework and Guidance

- 3.1 The following planning policies and guidance documents have been taken into account during the production of this technical note:
 - Ancient Monuments & Archaeological Areas Act 1979;
 - National Planning Policy Framework (2024); and
 - Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).



Orion Heritage Ltd. Registered No.9579723.
Registered address: The Old Casino, 28 Fourth Avenue
Hove, East Sussex, England, BN3 2PJ

4.0 Archaeological and Historic Background

4.1 An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment has been produced for the study site (Hampshire Services 2018) which utilised a 500m radius search area from the centre of the study, collating data from the West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER) and historic maps. The bracketed numbers in the text below relates to records contained within the West Sussex HER.

4.2 No designated heritage assets of archaeological interest (Scheduled Monuments and Registered Battlefields) were identified within the search area.

4.3 There are no records of Palaeolithic or Mesolithic date located within the search area, with the earliest period represented is the Neolithic, although evidence is limited to the find spot of a flint dagger (MWS4628).

4.4 There are no records of Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman, Saxon/early medieval or medieval date recorded within the search area.

4.5 Evidence of post-medieval to modern activity across the search area includes farms (MWS13262 & MWS9287), residential dwellings (MWS8794 & MWS64) and brickworks (MWS4836, MWS5145 & MWS4836). The study site was purchased by Novartis, a Swiss pharmaceutical company in the mid-1930s who used it for their new headquarters and drugs manufactory (MWS8806).

4.6 Cartographic evidence indicates that the study site was agricultural land until the development of the pharmaceutical works in the mid-1930s, with the Phase 1 part of the study site being formed by the long driveway to the main works' buildings, with an entrance lodge at either side and tennis courts to the north, which is latterly replaced by a building.

4.7 The desk-based assessment concluded that the overall archaeological potential for the study site is very low to negligible.

5.0 Impact Assessment

5.1 Previous impacts on the archaeological potential within the study site will have been as a result of the construction and subsequent expansion of the pharmaceutical works (MWS8806). A site visit undertaken as part of the desk-based assessment indicated that the majority of the study site has been levelled which will have had impacts upon any below ground archaeological deposits which may have been located within the study site.

5.2 It is not anticipated that there will be impacts upon below ground archaeological remains as a result of the proposed development as a result of the limited archaeological potential of the study site, combined with previous impacts as a result of the modern development of the site. As such no archaeological mitigation measures are recommended.

6.0 Conclusions

6.1 There is limited or no evidence of prehistoric to medieval activity recorded within the search area, with the best represented period the post-medieval to modern. The study site was in agricultural use

from at least the 19th century until the mid-1930s when it was developed as a pharmaceutical manufactory (MWS8806).

- 6.2 It is considered that there is a very limited to negligible potential for previously unrecorded archaeological deposits and previous impacts on the archaeological potential of the study site arising from the 20th century development across the site.
- 6.3 Impacts upon below ground archaeological deposits are not anticipated as a result of the proposed development.
- 6.4 The conclusions of the 2018 desk-based assessment, namely that no further archaeological work is required, remain accurate.



Novartis Site, Horsham, West Sussex

Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment

West Sussex County Council

October 2018

Document Control Information

Document Information

Document Identification	HA/005
Document Name	Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
Project Name	Novartis Site, Horsham, West Sussex
Client	West Sussex County Council
Document Author	Neil Adam
Document Version	2
Document Status	Final
Date Released	9 th October 2018

Document Edit History

Version	Date	Additions/Modifications	Prepared/Revised by
1	22 nd June 2018	First Draft	Neil Adam
2	9 th October 2018	Final Version	Neil Adam

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1 INTRODUCTION	4
2 PROJECT BACKGROUND	4
3 AIMS	4
4 METHODOLOGY	5
5 SOURCES	5
6 SITE DESCRIPTION	5
7 GEOLOGY	5
8 LEGISLATION AND POLICY BACKGROUND	6
9 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BASELINE	10
10 SUMMARY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	15
11 PREVIOUS IMPACTS	16
12 IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	16
13 MITIGATION	17
14 CONCLUSIONS	18
15 BIBLIOGRAPHY & REFERENCES	19

Figures & Appendices

Figure 1: Undesignated Heritage Assets within Study Area

Figure 2: Extract From Parish Tithe Map of Horsham - 1844

Figure 3: 1st Edition Ordnance Survey (OS) Map – 1875

Figure 4: OS Map – 1911 Edition

Figure 5: OS Map – 1961 Edition

Figure 6: Site plan of the former Novartis complex

Figure 7: Draft Land Use and Density Parameter Plan

Appendix 1: Heritage Assets located within Study Area

Executive Summary

Hampshire Services was commissioned by the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) to carry out an Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) of archaeological issues relating to a proposed re-development of the former Novartis Pharmaceuticals building at Wimblehurst Road, Horsham, West Sussex (centred on NGR 517963 121701). The site formerly comprised of a number of office blocks, laboratories and workshops associated with its use by Novartis and although the site is now vacant and most of the buildings have been demolished, three buildings have been retained.

The DBA established that there is little or no recorded evidence for prehistoric, Roman or early medieval activity in the area immediately around the site and within it. The site appears to have been part of an open field system that once occupied the area around the historic medieval core of Horsham, land that was enclosed in the post-medieval period. The site then became part of the parkland established around Wimblehurst House, before being used as the location for the CIBA and then later the Novartis Paramedical works. The site was extensively impacted by the pharmaceutical works as it expanded gradually over the 20th century. This development appears to have impacted around 90% of the total area, with much of this impacted created by the levelling actions, the excavation of wall foundations, basements, car parks and service trenches. Overall, the site appears to have been severely impacted by the construction of the previous complex, much of which has now been levelled.

It appears that at the time of writing it is proposed to divide the site into four sections. Sections A and B will be housing, Section C will see the preservation of the existing locally listed building will be converted to a mixture of residential and commercial use. Zone D in the eastern half of the site will be utilised as an employment zone for commercial units. There are also planned to be areas of open space and car parking.

Due to the sever impacts created by the construction of the previous pharmaceutical complex during the mid to later 20th century, it is likely that almost all sub-surface features pre-dating this period will have either been completely removed or severely truncated to the point where interpretation of such features, if they were exposed by future groundworks, would prove problematic. These previous impacts, combined with the relatively low archaeological potential of the site prior to development, means that the proposed re-development would have little to no impact on the local archaeological resource.

Due to a combination of low to negligible archaeological potential prior to the 20th century and the severe impacts on the site of 20th century development, it is considered that no further archaeological work needs to be conducted in relation to the proposed development.

1 Introduction

1.1 Hampshire Services was commissioned by the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) to carry out an Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) of archaeological issues relating to a proposed re-development of the former Novartis Pharmaceuticals building at Wimblehurst Road, Horsham, West Sussex (centred on NGR 517963 121701) and hereafter referred to as 'the Site'.

2 Project Background

2.1 The Site comprises approximately 7.52 hectares located to the north of Horsham town centre, bounded by Parsonage Road to the north, Wimblehurst Road to the West and the railway lines from Horsham station along the east and southwestern boundaries.

2.2 The Site itself formerly comprised of a number of office blocks, laboratories and workshops associated with its use by Novartis and although the Site is now vacant and most of the buildings have been demolished, three buildings have been retained. These are two Wimblehurst Road 'gateway' buildings and a 1930s Art Deco building that was used for offices and was extended in the 1960s and 1980s. This central structure was included on the Horsham Town Local List (February 2011) as a locally important historic building.

2.3 The original vision when West Sussex County Council (WSCC) purchased the Site from Novartis was for at least two thirds to be allocated for a Health & Life Science Campus. The remainder of the Site would then be allocated for residential development.

3 Aims

3.1 This DBA will consider all archaeological issues that may arise from the re-development. The impact of the development upon the Built Heritage aspects of the Site and the area immediately around it will not be considered here.

3.2 This DBA will include an assessment of any designated and undesignated heritage assets, where this distinction applies, for the following categories of heritage assets:

- Scheduled Monuments, Archaeological Sites, find spots and events
- Registered parks and gardens (national and county lists, listed below)

4 Methodology

4.1 A zone measuring 500 metres in diameter was established around the centre of the Site (as shown in all Figures) in order to place the proposed development within its archaeological context. This zone is hereafter referred to the 'Study Area' which forms the data framework for this assessment.

5 Sources

- The West Sussex Historic Environment Record (WSHER) is the definitive database for archaeological, historic building, and Historic Landscape Character data in the area. This was consulted for the preparation of the DBA.
- Relevant historic maps were consulted at West Sussex County Record Office at Chichester, West Sussex

6 Site Description

The Study Area encloses an urban landscape covered by 20th century development comprising housing, industrial sites, open recreation grounds and a section of current railway. Generally the area slopes steadily from east to west. The north eastern end of the Study Area is located at c. 70 metres OD, dropping gradually to c. 50 metres at the western end. The Study Area is located on high ground to the north of the River Arun and to the east of Boldings Brook (a tributary of the Arun).

7 Geology

7.1 The majority of the Study Area located upon a deposit of Upper Tunbridge Wells Sand Mudstone, while the north-west corner of the Site is located upon Upper Tunbridge Wells Sand Sandstone and Mudstone. Both of these bedrock geologies are sedimentary in nature and were formed approximately 134 to 139 million years ago during the Cretaceous Period (BGS website).

8 Legislation and Policy Background

8.1 **Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002)**

Archaeological sites that have been designated as being of national importance are contained within a schedule maintained for that purpose and are referred to as Scheduled Monuments. They are protected by the 1979 Act. Works impacting these monuments will require scheduled monument consent independently of any planning permission. The settings of these monuments are also protected and are a material consideration within the planning process. Whilst the national planning policy framework seeks for development to not only respect and conserve but also enhance and be informed by these heritage assets it also recognises that in some circumstances an adverse impact might be accepted but only in '*wholly exceptional circumstance*'. NPPF accords the same level of protection to national important archaeological sites which have not been designated as scheduled monuments within the planning system, although these sites are not protected by the 1979 Act.

8.3 **National Planning Policy Framework**

8.4 The policy framework within which local planning authorities should consider planning applications is the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in 2018. The importance of conserving, and enhancing the historic environment is clearly a material consideration.

8.5 NPPF paragraph 189 states that;

- *In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the*

proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

8.6 NPPF paragraph 190 states;

- *Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.*

8.7 NPPF sets out guidance on assessing the significance and the impact of the proposal.

Paragraph 192;

- *In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*
 - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
 - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
 - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*

8.8 Paragraphs 193 and 194 state;

- *When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.*
- *Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:*

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional

8.9 Paragraph 195;

- *Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:*
 - a) *the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
 - b) *no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
 - c) *conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
 - d) *the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

8.10 Paragraph 196

- *Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*

8.11 Paragraph 197;

- *The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.*

8.12 Footnote 63 in paragraph 194 recognizes that new archaeological discoveries may reveal hitherto unsuspected and hence non designated heritage assets:

- *Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.*

8.13 Within paragraph 199 NPPF requires local planning authorities to ensure that where there is any loss of heritage assets the opportunity/requirement is to advance understanding of the historic environment, but it is also stressed that advancing understanding is not by itself sufficient reason to permit the loss of an heritage asset:

- *Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.*

8.14 Horsham District Council Planning Policy

8.15 The Horsham District Planning Framework was adopted in November 2015. This framework includes Policy 34 that refers to Cultural Heritage matters and which is reproduced in full below:

Policy 34

Cultural and Heritage Assets

The Council recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and as such the Council will sustain and enhance its historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage assets. Applications for such development will be required to:

1. *Make reference to the significance of the asset, including drawing from research and documentation such as the West Sussex Historic Environment Record;*
2. *Reflect the current best practice guidance produced by English Heritage and Conservation Area Character Statements;*

3. Reinforce the special character of the district's historic environment through appropriate siting, scale, form and design; including the use of traditional materials and techniques;
4. Make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area, and ensuring that development in conservation areas is consistent with the special character of those areas;
5. Preserve, and ensure clear legibility of, locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric and materials;
6. Secure the viable and sustainable future of heritage assets through continued preservation by uses that are consistent with the significance of the heritage asset;
7. Retain and improves the setting of heritage assets, including views, public rights of way, trees and landscape features, including historic public realm features; and
8. Ensure appropriate archaeological research, investigation, recording and reporting of both above and below-ground archaeology, and retention where required, with any assessment provided as appropriate.

9 Archaeological Baseline

9.1 Designated Sites

9.2 No Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens (RPGs) or Designated Battlefield Sites have been recorded within Study Area.

9.3 Previous Archaeological work

9.4 At the time of writing no previous archaeological work has been recorded within the Study Area

9.5 Undesignated Heritage Assets by Period (Figure 1)

9.6 Palaeolithic Period (c.500,000 BP – 8,000 BC)

The Palaeolithic encompasses a vast period of time in which the Study Area has been subject to dramatic climate changes as well as development in the morphology of the landscape. Studies of the Palaeolithic in southern England have focused in the past on the raised beach deposits in West Sussex where internationally important evidence of activity have been preserved in the sand deposits of earlier coastlines and little information has been garnered from the Horsham region. No Palaeolithic heritage assets have been recorded within the Study Area to date.

9.7 Mesolithic Period (8,000BC – 4,000 BC)

The Mesolithic period sees the gradual re-settlement of Britain following the end of the last Ice age c. 10,000 BC. This was characterised by a hunter-gatherer society with no permanent settlements, although rare examples of temporary encampments have been recorded. The main evidence for Mesolithic activity consists of scatters of flints where tool production has been in progress over a relatively short period of time. These sites tend to be found along the edges of the rivers, mostly on the first terrace above the floodplain, although upland sites have also been recorded. Large spreads of worked flint have been recorded over the past two centuries within the woodland around Horsham, including some of the earliest evidence for post-glacial activity in the south of England (Jacobi, 1982). These distinctive tools are known as 'Horsham Points' due to their geographical location. However, no Mesolithic finds have been recorded within the Study Area to date.

9.8 Neolithic Period (4,000BC – 2,200 BC)

The Neolithic period sees the introduction of agriculture to Britain, although this appears to have been a gradual process. The first permanent settlements established while the archaeological record suggests a continuation of hunter gathering in some places alongside the new farms. No such evidence has been recorded within the Study Area, although a chance find of a flint dagger (**MWS4628**) was recorded close to Richmond Road by JP Gardiner in 1988, c. 300 metres to the south west of the Site.

9.9 Bronze Age (2,200 BC – 700 BC)

This period sees the expansion of agriculture across southern Britain and the establishment of many more permanent settlements with accompanying roadways and field systems. The area around Horsham appears to have been heavily wooded at this time with the poor quality soils of the area relatively undeveloped for agriculture (Armstrong, 1995). There is little evidence of Bronze Age activity in the immediate area around the Site and no heritage assets from this period have been recorded within the Study Area.

9.10 Iron Age (700BC – AD 43)

The Iron Age saw an expansion of agricultural field systems and the enlargement of settlements across West Sussex, along with the appearance of defended central places such as the Hillforts. As with the Bronze Age, there appears to be little evidence of Iron Age activity in the immediate area (Armstrong, 1995) and no heritage assets have been recorded within the Study Area.

9.11 Roman Period (AD 43 - AD 410)

Following the invasion of AD43, southern England appears to have become rapidly assimilated into Roman culture. The former Roman road known as Stane Street that ran between Chichester and London together with the remains of a former Roman roadside settlement or *Mansio* has been recorded at Alfrödean, c. 6 km to the west of the Site. No heritage assets dating from the roman period have been recorded within the Study Area or the Site itself.

9.12 Early Medieval Period (AD 410 – AD 1066)

The immediate post-Roman period in southern England is poorly understood in general. The histories of Gildas and Bede, both written centuries later and of questionable authority, describe various stories of invasion and conquest from the later 5th century onwards, however, it appears clear from the archaeological record that following the withdrawal of Roman authority from Britain in AD 410 Sussex began to be settled by groups from north west Europe, including the *Saxones*, *Jutes* from Denmark and *Angles* from *Angleynn*, (now the region of Shleswig Holstein in Germany). Those settling in Sussex were known as the South Saxons or the *suthsaexe*, from which the county derives its name (Welch, 1983). The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, commissioned in the 9th century, states that Aelle, the first King of the South Saxons, probably landed in East Sussex in AD 477. Sussex functioned as an independent kingdom up to the 9th century. However, following the Battle of Ellendun in 825 the South Saxons submitted to King Egbert of Wessex, although it is probable that Sussex was not fully annexed by Wessex until 827. Ethelbald of Wessex was crowned King of Sussex and the other south-eastern kingdoms in 858 (Edwards, 2004). The first mention of Horsham was in King Eadred's land charter of AD 947 as describing a detached pasture place of Washington manor 18 km to the south. No actual settlement was recorded here and the name may relate to where horses were bred or kept in meadows by the River Arun. No heritage assets dating from the Early medieval period have been recorded within the Study Area.

9.13 Later medieval Period (1066 – 1550)

Following The Battle of Hastings in 1066 Sussex was divided into five new baronies, called *rapes*, by King William I, each with at least one town and a castle within it. This enabled the King to control manorial revenues and thus the greater part of the county's wealth. William gave these rapes to five of his subordinates. The Rape of Bramber, which included Horsham, was granted to William De Braose, 1st Lord of Bramber (VCH, 1986).

9.14 Horsham is not listed in the Domesday survey of 1086 as it appears that there was still no settlement here (*ibid.*). Horsham was called a borough in 1235, and its urban status is confirmed by references to merchants trading there later in the 13th century, and by the fact that the already large Norman church required rebuilding on an even larger scale at the same period. In 1322 Horsham was wealthy enough to supply one armed footman for the war in Scotland, like other towns. At that date it remained small, having the lowest taxation assessment of any Sussex borough except Bramber in 1334. The next two centuries, however, were a time of very rapid growth, as in other Wealden towns but to a greater degree: in 1524 Horsham's taxpayers had a higher average wealth than those of any other town in the county, while only Chichester and Petworth in western Sussex were assessed for a greater total sum (VCH, 1986).

9.15 No heritage assets dating from the later medieval period have been recorded within the Study Area.

9.16 *Post-medieval Period (1550 – 1800)*
The post-medieval period sees extensive political and social changes in England, beginning with the reformation of the mid-16th century, followed by the Civil War of the 17th Century and ending with the extensive enclosure of common land, the de population of the countryside and the onset of the industrial revolution at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century.

9.17 The town of Horsham grew steadily through the 17th century and by the later 18th century had become the dominant town in the area, overtaking its local rival, Petworth (VCH, 1986). Its trade was stimulated partly by its function as a centre of county administration and partly by its good road communications (*ibid.*) In 1730 the town was described by a visitor as the metropolis of the Weald and the building of a barracks in the 1790s brought further prosperity. In 1814 Horsham was called the most considerable for trade in Sussex (*ibid.*).

9.18 Parsonage Farm (**MWS13262**) is a 17th century 4 sided L-Plan loose courtyard farmstead, c. 320 metres to the north east of the Site with additional detached elements to the main plan. The farmhouse is detached with the gable facing the yard. It is in an isolated location and has suffered c. 50% loss of structure.

9.19 *Modern Period (1800 – Present)*

9.20 The removal of gaol and assizes in the first half of the 19th century and the closure of the barracks, together with the demise of the borough and the eclipse of road traffic, took away much of Horsham's importance (VCH, 1986), although this was partially revived by the arrival of the railway in the mid-19th century. The creation of the administrative county of West Sussex in 1889 gave it a new importance for a time as joint county town with Chichester and with the 20th-century revival of road transport and with railway electrification the town continued to expand. By the end of the 1930s after two decades of suburban expansion, became chiefly a dormitory for commuters to London, although in the post-war years it has become subordinate in importance to Crawley and Gatwick Airport (ibid.).

9.21 Wimblehurst Lodge (**MWS8794**), located c. 25 metres to the north of the Site, was the original gate house for Wimblehurst House (now demolished), that was built in the Edwardian Tudor revival style c. 1880. It is a two storey structure of brick with tile hanging at the first floor. It has half timber gables and a projecting oriel window along with timber sliding sash windows with leaded lights. It is set in mature gardens, behind a low brick wall. Wimblehurst House was once surrounded by a stylised Park (**MWS64**) that was recorded on the first edition Ordnance survey (OS) map of 1874 before being covered by the later 19th and early 20th century expansion of Horsham.

9.22 The sites of two former 19th century brickworks are located within the Study Area (**MWS4836** and **MWS5145**). The latter appears on the First Edition OS map of the area, c. 290 metres to the south west of the Site, published in 1873-4, while the former is noted on an OS map published in 1875, c.110 metres to the south east of the Site. Brickworks **MWS4836** was occupied by a foundry by 1896 and a new brick field started, although this had been abandoned by 1909.

9.23 Angus's Farm (**MWS9287**) was a 19th century double sided loose courtyard farmstead, once located immediately to the south west of the Site with a detached farmhouse set away from the yard. It was located within a village but the farmstead has been enveloped and lost by the expansion of Horsham.

9.24 The Site itself, which is currently owned by Novartis (**MWS8806**), was purchased by the Swiss pharmaceutical company CIBA in the mid-1930s. The Site was approximately 20 acres of the former Wimblehurst estate. Close to a water supply and offering scope for the construction of a railway siding, the Site was ideal for CIBA's new headquarters and drugs manufactory. The gate lodges, flanking the main entrance to the site, were built in 1937, with the main building following the year after. Pharmaceutical production started at the Site in 1939 and continued throughout the war. In 1950 CIBA established a medical department at the Site, and a research and development division opened in 1965. The 1960s also saw the growing agrochemical side of the business separated from pharmaceuticals, and move to site at Duxford near Cambridge. In 1970 the company merged to form CIBA-Geigy: its headquarters being at the Horsham site. In 1996 CIBA-Geigy merged with Sandoz to form Novartis.

9.25 The on-site buildings are discussed in detail the Built Heritage Desk-Based Assessment which accompanies this DBA.

9.26 *Map Regression (Figures 2-5)*

9.27 The earliest surviving map of the Site and its surrounding area is the Horsham Parish Tithe Map, published in 1844 (Fig 2). At this time the Site was occupied by parts of seven enclosed fields (numbered 2032, 2033, 2035, 2036, 2045a, 2046 and 2047). All of these fields are listed as being under arable cultivation. Two fields (2033 and 2035) are listed in the Tithe Award as having the names 'Windmill Post Field' and 'Lower Windmill Post', suggesting that a windmill or an associated foundation mound once existed close to Parsonage Road on the north east side of the Site.

9.28 The First Edition Ordnance Survey map of the Site was published in 1875 (Figure 3). By the mid-1870s the Site now covered five fields and was bounded to the east and south west by the new constructed railways, while Wimblehurst House is shown to the north of the Site for the first time. The Site remains little changed by the publication of the 1897 edition (not illustrated), but by the time of the 1911 edition, housing has been constructed along Richmond Road to the south west (Figure 4). The 1932 OS map (not illustrated) is the last to show the Site as being covered by fields, as the CIBA works were constructed 3 years later. The latest available OS map, that published in 1961 (Figure 5), shows the pharmaceutical works covering much of the Site, with a bank at the eastern end indicative of terracing, probably associated with ground levelling prior to the construction of the factory buildings.

10 Summary of Archaeological Potential

10.1 There is little or no recorded evidence for prehistoric, Roman or early medieval activity in the area immediately around the Site and within it. The Site appears to have been part of an open field system that once occupied the area around the historic medieval core of Horsham, land that was enclosed in the post-medieval period. The Site then became part of the park land established around Wimblehurst House, before being used as the location for the CIBA and then later Novartis Paramedical works. Therefore, taking into account the archaeological and historical background of the Site, its overall archaeological potential is considered to be very low to negligible.

11 Previous Impacts

11.1 The site was visited by Hampshire Services on 7th June 2018. Although access to the site itself was not possible, almost all of the site footprint was visible from a number of viewpoints around the boundary.

11.2 As the plan of the former Novartis complex (Figure 6) shows, the Site has been extensively impacted by the pharmaceutical works as it expanded gradually over the 20th century. This development appears to have impacted around 90% of the total area of the Site, with much of this impacted created by levelling actions, the excavation of wall foundations, basements, car parks and service trenches. The small parts of the Site given over to open space, principally along the north eastern edge, also appear to have been landscaped. Overall, the Site appears to have been severely impacted by the construction of the previous complex, much of which has now been levelled.

12 Impact of the proposed development

12.1 Limitations of Data

12.2 At the time of writing The Draft Land Use and Density Parameter Plan of the development proposals (Figure 7) has been made available to Hampshire Services. The outline plan has been used in this section as the basis for a series of estimations as to how development would be likely to impact upon as yet unrecorded archaeological features and/or deposits. These estimations may vary considerably from the final proposals when they are presented for scrutiny.

12.3 Construction Methodology

12.4 From consultations with the Draft Land Use and Density Parameter Plan (Figure 7), it appears that at the time of writing it is proposed to divide the Site into four sections. Sections A and B will be housing, Section C will see the preservation of the existing locally listed building will be converted to a mixture of residential and commercial use. Zone D in the eastern half of the Site will be utilised as an employment zone for commercial units. There are also planned to be areas of open space and car parking.

12.5 Although no masterplan is available at this time it is highly likely that construction of these dwellings and industrial units will involve ground reduction and levelling episodes, the excavation of wall foundation trenches and possibly basements, as well as service trenches. Wall foundation trenches are likely to be excavated to at least 1.5 metres below current ground level, while access route ground reduction could be between 500mm and several metres. Any basement excavations could be anywhere between 2 and 3 metres below current ground level. Service trenches may vary between 300 and 500mm in depth depending on local requirements.

12.6 Impact on Archaeology

12.7 Due to the sever impacts created by the construction of the previous pharmaceutical complex during the mid to later 20th century, it is likely that almost all sub-surface features pre-dating this period will have either been completely removed or severely truncated to the point where interpretation of such features, if they were exposed by future groundworks, would prove problematic. These impacts, combined with the relatively low archaeological potential of the Site prior to development, means that the proposed re-development would have little to no impact on the local archaeological resource.

13 Mitigation

13.1 Due to a combination of low to negligible archaeological potential prior to the 20th century and the severe impacts on the Site of 20th century development, it is considered that no further archaeological work needs to be conducted in relation to the proposed development.

14 Conclusions

14.1 Hampshire Services was commissioned by the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) to carry out an Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) of archaeological issues relating to a proposed re-development of the former Novartis Pharmaceuticals building at Wimblehurst Road, Horsham, West Sussex (centred on NGR 517963 121701). The Site formerly comprised of a number of office blocks, laboratories and workshops associated with its use by Novartis and although the Site is now vacant and most of the buildings have been demolished, three buildings have been retained.

14.2 The DBA established that there is little or no recorded evidence for prehistoric, Roman or early medieval activity in the area immediately around the Site and within it. The Site appears to have been part of an open field system that once occupied the area around the historic medieval core of Horsham, land that was enclosed in the post-medieval period. The Site then became part of the parkland established around Wimblehurst House, before being used as the location for the CIBA and then later the Novartis Paramedical works. The Site was extensively impacted by the pharmaceutical works as it expanded gradually over the 20th century. This development appears to have impacted around 90% of the total area, with much of this impacted created by the levelling actions, the excavation of wall foundations, basements, car parks and service trenches. Overall, the Site appears to have been severely impacted by the construction of the previous complex, much of which has now been levelled.

14.3 It appears that at the time of writing it is proposed to divide the Site into four sections. Sections A and B will be housing, Section C will see the preservation of the existing locally listed building will be converted to a mixture of residential and commercial use. Zone D in the eastern half of the Site will be utilised as an employment zone for commercial units. There are also planned to be areas of open space and car parking.

14.4 Due to the sever impacts created by the construction of the previous pharmaceutical complex during the mid to later 20th century, it is likely that almost all sub-surface features pre-dating this period will have either been completely removed or severely truncated to the point where interpretation of such features, if they were exposed by future groundworks, would prove problematic. These previous impacts, combined with the relatively low archaeological potential of the Site prior to development, means that the proposed re-development would have little to no impact on the local archaeological resource.

14.5 Due to a combination of low to negligible archaeological potential prior to the 20th century and the severe impacts on the Site of 20th century development, it is considered that no further archaeological work needs to be conducted in relation to the proposed development.

15 Bibliography & References

Armstrong, J.R., 1995, *A History of Sussex*

Edwards, H., 2004, Ecgberht [Egbert] (d. 839), King of the West Saxons in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

Jacobi, Dr R. M., 1982, 'Mesolithic Findspots near Horsham' in Warnham Historical Society: Contribution No.5

Welch, M.G., 1983, *Early Anglo-Saxon Sussex*, BAR 112

Victoria County History, 1986, *A History of the County of Sussex: Volume 6 Part 2, Bramber Rape (North-Western Part) Including Horsham*

<http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>