**Brief description**

St Michael's church is the only mediaeval parish church remaining intact in central Southampton. Dating from c1070 it has historic fabric dating from C12, C13, C14, C15 and two key refurbishments in the 19th century; 1828 and 1872. It was the civic church of Southampton until 1835. The base of the central tower is c1070 with the rest of the tower dating from the late mediaeval period. The steeple was rebuilt in 1745 and further heightened in 1877. Inside there is much 19th century remodelling with former early galleries now removed. There is a tomb with effigy to Henry VIII's Chief Justice Sir Richard Lyster (died 1553) who lived at Tudor House, Bugle Street. Beneath the church in the north-west corner is a late mediaeval vault which is a scheduled ancient monument.

**Designations**

- Grade I Listed
- Vault adjoining Church below paving of St Michael’s Square is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Number: 1001847)
- Old Town West Conservation Area
Heritage asset values

Evidential

- The physical fabric of the church reveals a highly complex series of changes over a timeline dating from the C11 to the late C19
- The church sits within the former Norman settlement of the walled town. St Michael is the patron saint of Normandy
- Late medieval vaults beneath the church. These were discovered in 1969
- The tower was built dis-proportionately high to act as a landmark for navigators at sea. It was constructed in 1732 and thought to have replaced an earlier structure, it was further heightened in 1877
- The east window depicts the lost medieval churches of St John’s, St Lawrence, St Michael’s, Holyrood and All Saints
- Building sits and is liturgically orientated within the plan of the medieval walled town but has always enjoyed a larger plot than its neighbouring buildings reflecting its high status

Historical

- The historic association with Henry VIII’s Chief Justice Sir Richard Lyster (died 1553) who lived at Tudor House, Bugle Street and is buried in the church
- The church was the civic church of Southampton until the early C19
- The Mayor of Southampton is still sworn in at a ceremony within the church
- The font is C11 and made from a single block of black Tournai marble. It is one of four such fonts in Hampshire

Aesthetic

- Very high quality medieval stonework to various windows throughout the church
- Evident in a number of watercolours and drawings of C18 and C19 Southampton and pre-war photographs
- The spire and east window closes the street view looking west along Bernard Street. This is a high quality townscape construct which has been present from at least the 18th century but accentuated by C19 and C20 town and city planning
- Strongly defines and encloses the east side of St Michael’s Square
- The combination of east window and slender spire make for a very attractive composition especially seen in relation to the post-war buildings which frame longer views at street level

Communal

- A regularly used parish church set within an established historic community
- A highly valued local landmark within a part of the city which has an intimate and historic scale

Significance of heritage asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidential</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Communal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-6 High to Very High
3-4 Moderate to Moderate
1-2 None or Very Low
Brief description
For the purposes of this study, the waterfront extends from Royal Pier (Grade II listed) westwards to the King George V dry dock and pumping station (both Grade II). The waterfront comprises open dockside with a number of purpose-built modern low-rise sheds, the former Solent Mills (a locally listed building) and a series of tall skeletal cranes painted a distinctive gun-metal grey. The working dockside also includes the Grade II listed dock gates 8 and 10. To the immediate west of Royal Pier is Mayflower Park, a green space with a small car park between the working port and the Royal Pier and the only publically accessible section of waterfront.

Designations
- Dock Gate 8 and 10 to Western Docks Grade II Listed
- Royal Pier Grade II Listed
- King George V Dry Dock Grade II Listed

A. ‘The Walls of Southampton’ an engraving by WH Bartlett 1809-1854. The work was produced to illustrate a book; ‘The Ports, Harbours, Watering Places and Coast Scenery of Great Britain’ 1842, by William Finden, Edward Francis Finden & William Henry Bartlett
B. Area now containing West Quay Shopping Centre prior to land reclamation, c1920s. Note the river/sea-fed open bathing pool in the foreground (copyright Historic England)
C. Present day Grain Terminal
Heritage asset values

Evidential

- Southampton at the start of the C20 was close to the metropolis and the continent, and had ample space for development on reclaimed land (necessary to cope with the demands of the escalating size of ships). The result is Western Dock and Mayflower Park. Prior to the 1930s this area was tidal mudflats adjacent to the medieval walls of Southampton

Historical

- Southampton’s ‘gateway to the world’ during Southampton’s heyday in the interwar period when 46% of all the UK’s ocean going passenger traffic with 560,000 travellers were passing through Southampton ports
- Historical association with major shipping lines including Cunard and the White Star Line which in the early C20 began to relocate from Liverpool to Southampton
- The Western Docks during the First World War had been requisitioned as No. 1 Military Embarkation Port
- The New Docks (later renamed the Western Docks) was the largest civil engineering construction project at a British port in the inter-war years. Cunard’s Mauretania was able to berth at the first completed section of the quay in October 1932 and the docks were completed by 1933
- The Royal Pier was opened 1833 by Princess, later Queen, Victoria

Aesthetic

- The dock skyline can be seen from, across and often glimpsed from within the historic walled sections of the city and beyond, and in particular from the tops of the western facing sections of the town wall and from the elevated platform of the Civic Centre. These views are city-defining
- The very distinctive and highly flamboyant entrance building to the Royal Pier is a local landmark of some significance
- The extent and former line of the towns wall defences can be appreciated from Mayflower Park. There are multiple views looking north and north-east of the town walls
- There is a view to St Michael’s spire from Mayflower Park
- The older dock cranes which form part of the wider setting of this area provide a strong industrial aesthetic which is both functional and evocative

Communal

- Mayflower Park is used once a year for the Boat Show and as such its communal value as an exhibition space adjacent to the water is very high although this is limited to private entry
- Mayflower Park is a well-used local amenity space and provides open views across the River Test and towards the Western docks. It is a popular local destination and also provides a good viewing point at which to appreciate the cruise ships berthed at Western Dock

Significance of heritage asset

- **Evidential**
  - 5-6 High to Very High
  - 3-4 Moderate to Moderate
  - 1-2 None or Very Low

- **Historical**
  - 5-6 High to Very High
  - 3-4 Moderate to Moderate
  - 1-2 None or Very Low

- **Aesthetic**
  - 5-6 High to Very High
  - 3-4 Moderate to Moderate
  - 1-2 None or Very Low

- **Communal**
  - 5-6 High to Very High
  - 3-4 Moderate to Moderate
  - 1-2 None or Very Low
3.2 Defining a tall building in Southampton

Policy AP 17 of the City Centre Action Plan currently defines a tall building as being 5 storeys or more (or of equivalent height).

This study is based on the premise that the continuing viability and vitality of the city centre is key to the achievement of city growth. Southampton’s constrained urban area will inevitably lead to a general increase in density and uplift in height, particularly at the accessible city centre.

Given this context and the general pattern of established building heights within the city centre, for the purposes of this study a tall building is defined as being above six storeys or more (or of equivalent height).

3.3 Approach specific to Southampton

On establishing the key heritage assets for the city centre the project team have reviewed existing documents which make reference to or define views of these heritage assets (see Key References at the end of this study).

On review, the team have sought to identify where views have already been attributed value, through, for example inclusion in the City Centre Area Action Plan or in conservation area appraisals (such as that produced by the City Council for the Oxford Street Conservation Area) or in the City Characterisation report (2009). The views have been reviewed and formed part of a shortlist which was presented to and approved by the client team. These views are considered to be ‘strategic’ in terms of either their subject matter (such as the Bargate) and/or their breadth in terms of the city as a whole (such as those from Itchen Bridge (CCC.1, STMIC.1) or from (WF.7/8) or to the water(WF.1, WF.2, WF.3, WF.4, WF.5, WF.6)).

The appraisal of these views includes defining areas within which the heritage asset can be enjoyed and appreciated within their historic context. This Heritage Asset Viewing Area (HAVA) is defined on the view mapping. Within the HAVA, the project team have defined an optimum viewing place, a location which best represents the heritage asset in terms of its key heritage values and in terms of the least intrusion from inappropriate or poor quality development. This is not the only place from which the heritage asset can be viewed but is the place which is described and defined in detail in the accompanying text.
In each case the characteristics of the view have been subdivided into a series of headings. Each of the headings is provided with a score which is summarised by the circular matrix (the spider web) which accompanies each assessment. These are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Level of heritage significance</th>
<th>Level of heritage significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>How well the key heritage asset can be seen and understood in the view. In particular their relationship with other heritage assets and their response to their context. Mention made about the viewing point and its significance (linked to Kineticism)</td>
<td>Heritage assets are clearly seen and understood in the context of other heritage assets. Retain most if not all of their historic context with very little loss of erosion of significance</td>
<td>Very limited appreciation and most of their context lost or heavily eroded (by for example modern development of indifferent quality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Degree to which the heritage assets within the view are impacted upon by either modern development which has encroached upon the key values of the setting, or the loss of key elements of the setting which has resulted in a degree of loss of meaning and connection with the past or with other heritage assets previously associated with each other</td>
<td>The values of the key heritage assets as defined in section 3.1 have been maintained and remain substantially relevant and intact. Are not impacted upon by poor or badly sited modern development</td>
<td>Major impact upon the immediate and wider setting key heritage asset resulting in the complete or almost complete loss of historic context and meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Degree to which the view is associated with historic events, people or artistic depiction. Including examples of key events including dates and details where highly significant</td>
<td>High degree of association with in some cases events, individuals, groups of international significance</td>
<td>Relatively limited obvious association with any local, national or internationally significant people or events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>Importance of the view to the local community and how significant the view is in terms of the familiar and cherished local scene as defined and valued by local users</td>
<td>Highly cherished locally and often the subject of illustrative material relating to the relevant heritage assets (such as forming part of town guides historically and presently)</td>
<td>No perceived local value and no recognition or appreciation of importance/significance to the local/regular user/resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time depth</td>
<td>Extent of time which can be viewed in the surviving heritage asset and whether this has changed over time to its present state. Generally provided by a period of time (for example 800 years) and/or accompanied by key dates where relevant</td>
<td>Relatively long period of time (compared with the earliest surviving elements of the city) with clear evidence of appreciation (through for example illustration) over time and relating to condition</td>
<td>Relatively short period of time (compared with the earliest surviving elements of the city) and/or only present from/appreciated for a short period of time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of the description and weighting is to provide a framework within which to assess the potential impact of development within that view zone. The view zone which is shown on the location plan is divided into an area which is highly sensitive to change and areas which are sensitive to change. Areas outside the view zone for that particular view are considered to be of low or no sensitivity in terms of the significance of that particularly heritage asset. Tall buildings falling within the zone defined as ‘highly sensitive’ have the potential to cause substantial harm to the significance of the key heritage asset(s) forming the subject of the view. Tall buildings falling within the areas defined as ‘sensitive’ have the potential to cause less than substantial harm to the key heritage asset(s).

The purpose of the weighting of the various aspects of the characteristics of the view is to allow for the opportunity of quick comparison and in other cases as a management tool where for example, improving the score might be an aim of any proposed development. For instance, ‘condition’ where scoring low, there may be the opportunity to improve the condition of the view through development management and in others to allow for the interpretation of elements of a view which may not be immediately apparent such as the ‘familiarity’ of a view or in the case of ‘appreciation’ to enable the degree to which the heritage asset can be appreciated both individually and in grouping of heritage assets and where development may be able to improve or better reveal that relationship.

The supporting photographic studies of the chosen assessment point within the HAVA show the extent of view as seen from the human eye. This shows a representation of the view at a certain time of day in certain light, weather and seasonal conditions. The view is representative but is essential in terms of identifying in the view what important elements contribute to the character, appreciation and condition of the view (heritage assets) and what elements detract from and erode the significance of the view (existing tall buildings and structures, highway infrastructure, signs and in some cases natural features; trees and hedges). The heritage assets which relate to the significance of the setting of the key heritage asset have been highlighted on a separate colour-washed layer. The emphasis on the highlighting of the ‘heritage layer’ is to enable the insertion of proposed buildings within this heritage context to be undertaken clearly and effectively.

By understanding the significance of the heritage asset and the contribution and character of the setting to its significance the assessment is able to make conclusions about what would maintain and preferably enhance that significance. This is guidance for how the City Council should seek to at the least preserve the significance and not allow any development which would cause substantial harm to the key heritage asset. It is hoped that the guidance provided with each of the strategic views will form the evidence base for policy directly relating to the protection of these assets from inappropriate development (tall buildings) and in some cases any development within the ‘highly sensitive’ zones.