

The West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Order 201X
ES - Vol 1 - Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage - Built Heritage
Regulation 5(2)(a)
Montagu Evans - July 2018

9 Cultural Heritage - Built Heritage

Introduction

- 9.1 This chapter of the ES assesses the likely significant environmental effects and associated likely direct and indirect effects of the Proposed Development on Cultural Heritage receptors, where this refers to built heritage receptors.
- 9.2 This chapter considers above ground heritage receptors within and outside the Site boundary, including Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) outside the Site (setting impacts only). In this chapter an analysis of impact on the historic landscape character is also included in accordance with the Scoping Report. A separate archaeological chapter, Chapter 8 of this ES, considers direct impacts on the below ground cultural resources within the Site boundary.
- 9.3 This chapter first describes the relevant legislation and historic environment policy context, and then sets out the methods used for assessment and details of the criteria used to determine significance. The significance of heritage receptors is identified in the baseline section of this chapter. The potential impacts and effects as a result of the Proposed Development are then assessed, followed by a discussion of mitigation or control measures required to reduce or eliminate adverse effects. The chapter concludes with a summary of the subsequent residual effects and likely significant effects associated with the Proposed Development.
- 9.4 This chapter is accompanied by the following technical appendices presented within ES Volume 2:
- Technical Appendix 9.1 Historic Map Regression;
 - Technical Appendix 9.2 Map of Heritage Receptors;
 - Technical Appendix 9.3 Map of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal;
 - Technical Appendix 9.4 Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area Appraisal (Staffordshire County Council, 1978);
 - Technical Appendix 9.5 Historic Landscape Character Maps;
 - Technical Appendix 9.6 Photographic Gazetteer of Heritage Receptors; and
 - Technical Appendix 9.7 List Entry Descriptions.
- 9.5 This chapter is written by professionals with historic environment and planning qualifications at Montagu Evans LLP (Montagu Evans).

Legislation and Policy Context

Relevant National Legislation and Policy

National Policy Statement for National Networks (2014)

- 9.6 The National Policy Statement for National Networks (the 'NPS') (2014) outlines the importance of the historic environment as a resource.
- 9.7 At the outset, the NPS notes that *"construction and operation of national networks infrastructure has the potential to result in adverse impacts on the historic environment"* (paragraph 5.120). Given the potential scale of developments which fall under the jurisdiction of the NPS, it is clarified at paragraph 5.126 that *"Where the development is subject to EIA the applicant should undertake an assessment of any likely significant heritage impacts of the proposed project as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and describe these in the environmental statement"*. The Proposed Development is the subject of an EIA, and so this type of assessment is applicable.

- 9.8 The classification and interest of a heritage asset is clarified at paragraph 5.122 of the NPS as follows:
- "Those elements of the historic environment that hold value to this and future generations because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest are called 'heritage assets'. Heritage assets may be buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes. The sum of the heritage interests that a heritage asset holds is referred to as its significance. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting."*
- 9.9 The NPS goes on to state that both designated and non-designated heritage assets should be considered as part of any assessment of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). The document identifies that designated assets include World Heritage Sites, SAMs, listed buildings, designated wreck sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, and conservation areas (paragraph 5.123).
- 9.10 The definition of a non-designated heritage asset is set out at paragraph 5.125 in the following terms:
- "The Secretary of State should also consider the impacts on other non-designated heritage assets (as identified either through the development plan process by local authorities, including 'local listing', or through the nationally significant infrastructure project examination and decision making process) on the basis of clear evidence that the assets have a significance that merit consideration in that process, even though those assets are of lesser value than designated heritage assets."*
- 9.11 In terms of the historic environment, the NPS requires applicants to assess:
- "the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance."* (paragraph 5.127)
- 9.12 Setting is defined in the document as:
- "the surroundings in which [a heritage asset] is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral."*
- 9.13 The NPS provides guidance on decision making. The Secretary of State (SoS) should *"seek to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by the proposed development (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset), taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise"* (paragraph 5.128). Paragraph 5.129 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on any heritage assets, the Secretary of State should *"take into account the particular nature of the significance of the heritage asset ... This understanding should be used to avoid or minimise conflict between their conservation and any aspect of the proposal"*.
- 9.14 Paragraph 5.130 requires the SoS to:
- "take into account the desirability of sustaining and, where appropriate, enhancing the significance of heritage assets, the contribution of their settings and the positive contribution that their conservation can make to sustainable communities – including their economic vitality. The Secretary of State should also take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the"*

- historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials, use and landscaping (for example, screen planting)."*
- 9.15 Paragraphs 5.131-134 set out a balancing mechanism for weighing harm to heritage assets against the benefits that may flow from a proposed development. It notes in para 5.132 that *"the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset, the greater the justification that will be needed for any loss"*.
- 9.16 In the event of substantial harm, paragraph 5.133 of the NPS applies as follows. This paragraph replicates the wording of paragraph 133 of the NPPF:
- "Where the proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss of significance is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that loss or harm, or alternatively that all of the following apply:*
- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
 - no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
 - conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
 - the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use."*
- 9.17 The NPS goes on to state at paragraph 5.134 that:
- "Where the proposed development 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 securing its optimum viable use."*
- 9.18 In regards to conservation areas in particular, the NPS notes at paragraph 5.135 that:
- "Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. The Secretary of State should treat the loss of a building (or other element) that makes a positive contribution to the site's significance either as substantial harm or less than substantial harm, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the elements affected and their contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole."*
- 9.19 The SoS is also required to view the loss of any heritage asset in light of the merits of the new development. This is set out at paragraph 5.136:
- "Where the loss of significance of any heritage asset has been justified by the applicant based on the merits of the new development and the significance of the asset in question, the Secretary of State should consider imposing a requirement that the applicant will prevent the loss occurring until the relevant development or part of development has commenced."*
- 9.20 As part of proposals, it is stated at paragraph 5.137 that:
- "Applicants should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably."*
- 9.21 At paragraph 5.138 it is furthermore stated that the SoS should not take into account the condition of a heritage asset, i.e. any deliberate neglect or damage resulting in dereliction, into its decision.
- 9.22 At paragraphs 5.139 the NPS is clear that:
- "A documentary record of our past is not as valuable as retaining the heritage asset and therefore the ability to record evidence of the asset should not be a factor in deciding whether consent should be given."*
- 9.23 In cases where the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset's significance is justified, a programme of recording is required in order to:
- "advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost (wholly or in part). The extent of the requirement should be proportionate to the importance and the impact. Applicants should be required to deposit copies of the reports with the relevant Historic Environment Record. They should also be required to deposit the archive generated in a local museum or other public depository willing to receive it."* (paragraph 5.140)
- 9.24 Paragraph 5.141 gives the SoS the right to add requirements to the development consent order to ensure that recording is undertaken in a timely manner in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) agreed with the local authority and/or Historic England where relevant.
- 9.25 The NPPF (below) provides further guidance on these issues, and it is cited for completeness.
- ### National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- 9.26 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes 12 core planning principles, which includes the need for planning to *"conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations"* (paragraph 17).
- 9.27 Chapter 7 of the NPPF outlines the Government's policy regarding design. It emphasises that *"good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people"* (paragraph 58). Developments should *"function well and add to the overall quality of an area"* which can be achieved by responding to the local context and use of appropriate, high quality architecture and landscaping. Developments should also *"optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks"*.
- 9.28 With regard to cultural heritage, Chapter 12 of the NPPF (paragraphs 126 to 141) sets out the national planning policies on the historic environment. The NPPF stresses that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource that should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (paragraph 126).
- 9.29 The policies contained within the NPPF which are not included in the NPS are set out below for completeness. Paragraph 135 is especially relevant with regards to the assessment of non-designated heritage assets in development proposals.
- 9.30 Paragraphs 126 and 127 address the approach to heritage in Local Plans, and the designation of conservation areas. These topics do not pertain to the proposals put forward in this application.
- 9.31 Paragraph 135 states that:
- "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 affect directly or indirectly 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."*
- 9.32 Paragraph 135 is important as it defines the approach to the assessment of non-designated heritage assets which are affected by a development. The approach to non-designated heritage assets is not presented in the NPS, where paragraph 5.133 concerns designated heritage assets only. There are a number of non-designated heritage assets identified within the scope, and the balanced judgement endorsed by paragraph 135 of the NPPF will be implemented.

- 9.33 Paragraph 136 advises the decision maker that the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset should not be permitted without taking *“all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred”*.
- 9.34 Paragraph 140 considers enabling development, and states that the opportunity to secure the future conservation of a heritage asset could outweigh the dis-benefits of departing from planning policies.

National Planning Practice Guidance (2014)

- 9.35 Guidance for the application of the NPPF is provided by the Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). This guidance was published as a web based resource on 6 March 2014. In preparing Local Plans and taking decisions, local planning authorities need to consider and have regard to planning practice guidance issued by the Government.
- 9.36 The guidance states that to support economic, social and environmental objectives, the following design issues should be considered:
- Local character (including landscape setting);
 - Safe, connected and efficient streets;
 - A network of greenspaces (including parks) and public places;
 - Crime prevention;
 - Security measures;
 - Access and inclusion;
 - Efficient use of natural resources; and
 - Cohesive & vibrant neighbourhoods (Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 26-006-20140306. Revision date: 06 03 2014).
- 9.37 With regard to managing physical form the guidance states that the following should be considered:
- Layout – the way in which buildings and spaces relate to each other
 - Form – the shape of buildings
 - Scale – the size of buildings
 - Detailing – the important smaller elements of building and spaces
 - Materials – what a building is made from (Paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 26-023-20140306. Revision date: 06 03 2014)
- 9.38 In regard to the setting of a heritage asset and how should it be taken into account during the assessment of new development, the guidance reiterates the approach to setting provided in the NPPF, and expands the approach to setting and the way it is defined:
- “The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.*
- The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance.*
- When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset’s significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation.”* (Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 18a-013-20140306. Revision date: 06 03 2014)

- 9.39 The NPPG includes advice on what constitutes public benefits in the decision making process. In particular, it makes clear that these are anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress in a scale or nature that may benefit the public.
- 9.40 Public benefits may include heritage benefits, such as:
- *“sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting*
 - *reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset*
 - *securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long-term conservation”* (Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 18a-020-20140306. Revision date: 06 03 2014).

South Staffordshire District Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (December 2012)

- 9.41 South Staffordshire District Council (SSDC) adopted the Core Strategy as a development plan document in December 2012. It sets out general policies in relation to the protection of the historic environment.
- 9.42 Policy EQ3 (Conservation, Preservation and Protection of Heritage Assets) reads as follows:
- “The conservation and enhancement of South Staffordshire’s historic environment will be achieved by a number of means:*
- *The council will establish, review and maintain records of known heritage assets including:*
 - *Listed Buildings*
 - *Scheduled Ancient Monuments*
 - *Conservation Areas*
 - *Registered Parks and Gardens*
 - *Buildings of Special Local Interest (a ‘local list’)*
 - *Undesignated heritage assets*
 - *Other historic landscapes*
 - *and will support and encourage ever greater appreciation, knowledge and enjoyment of the District’s historic environment and heritage assets through:*
 - *Joint working with local communities and interest groups such as civic and historical societies;*
 - *The continual development and refinement of the Local List; and*
 - *Interaction with the County Council’s Historic Environment Record (HER).*
 - *The Council will support and encourage measures which secure the improved maintenance, management and sustainable reuse of heritage assets, particularly those which are identified nationally or locally as being at risk. Where necessary an assessment will be made of whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.*
 - *The Council will ensure that development which affects a heritage asset of its setting will be informed by a proportionate assessment of the significance of the asset, including its setting, which is likely to be affected the proposals. These will be judged by considering the extent to which an asset’s archaeological, architectural, historic or artistic interest will be harmed, including its conversation, in the interest of present and future generations.*
 - *In the case of development a conservation area proposals will be considered against any management plan and appraisal adopted for that area.*
 - *The Council will consider the significance and setting of all proposed works to heritage assets, informed by relevant guidance that is supported by English Heritage [now Historic England]. In addition the following principles will be adhered to:*

- *Minimising the loss of disturbance of historic materials;*
- *Using appropriate materials; and*
- *Ensuring alterations are reversible.*
- *The Council will require all works proposed to heritage assets, or sites with the potential to include assets, to be informed by a level of historical, architectural and archaeological evidence proportionate to their significance. Where appropriate, the Council may also require historical research and archaeological recording to be undertaken before works to a heritage asset commence.*
- *Heritage assets including Listed Buildings (and those on a local list) Registered Parks and Gardens (and other historic landscapes)."*

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- 9.43 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCA Act) provides the statutory instruments which are used to assess the impact of development proposals on listed buildings and conservation areas. The following sections of the PLBCA Act set out the duties of the decision maker:
- Section 66(1) When determining applications, the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting of any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
 - Section 72(1) In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
- 9.44 Sections 66(1) and 72(1) are relevant as the Proposed Development will take place in the setting of listed buildings and a conservation area. There will also be some minor direct effects to the conservation area itself.
- 9.45 In preparing our analysis we are mindful of the considerable weight attached to the preservation or enhancement of the setting of heritage assets, which has been clarified by the Court of Appeal judgement in *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy vs East Northamptonshire et al* [2014]. The Court held that *"to make an assessment of the indirect impact of development or change upon an asset it is first necessary to make a judgement about the contribution made by its setting"*. In turn, the decision ruled there is a "strong presumption" against granting planning permission for development which would cause harm to heritage assets precisely because the desirability of preserving the special interest is of "considerable importance and weight".
- 9.46 *Jones vs Mordue* [2015] confirmed that, generally, if a decision maker applies his or herself to the considerations at paragraphs 132 to 134 of the NPPF, then (absent some contrary indication) s/he has discharged the statutory duties at Sections 66 and 72 of the 1990 Act.
- 9.47 *Palmer vs Herefordshire Council & ANR* [2016] confirmed that where a development would affect a heritage asset or its settings in different ways, some positive and some negative, the decision maker may legitimately conclude that although each of the effects has an impact, the overall effect is taken on the basis of the development as a whole. On this basis, paragraphs 133 or 134 of the NPPF would only be engaged where the harm is not outweighed by the heritage benefits delivered by a development.

The Hedgerows Regulations (1997)

- 9.48 The Hedgerows Regulations came into effect on the 1st June 1997. The regulations fall under the Environment Act 1995. THR was created to set out the statutory provisions to protect British hedgerows, in particular those which were 30 or more years old.
- 9.49 THR sets out the properties that make a hedgerow 'important', and are therefore afforded protection under the legislation. In summary, a hedgerow is considered important if it is more

than 30 years old and meets one or more of the criteria described below. The criteria are twofold: firstly, archaeological and or historical importance, and secondly, the wildlife and landscape interest.

- 9.50 In this Chapter of the ES we are primarily concerned with the archaeological and historical interest of the hedgerows on the Site. The ecological aspect of the hedgerows is set out in Chapter 10 – Ecology and Nature Conservation prepared by Ramboll Environ.
- 9.51 The archaeological and historical criteria are as follows (as set out in Schedule One Part II of the Hedgerows Regulations):
- Marks part or all of the boundary of a historic parish or township that existed before 1850;
 - Incorporates an archaeological feature (or is associated with one) included in the schedule of monuments compiled by the Secretary of State under section 1 (schedule of monuments) of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979(7) or recorded in a Sites and Monuments Record (dating from 27 March 1997);
 - Marks the boundary of a pre-1600 AD estate or manor (or visibly associated with one) and is listed in a Sites and Monuments Record or other such document held at a Records Office since 27 March 1997;
 - Forms an integral part of a field system predating the Inclosure Acts (1896) and is recorded in a document held at the relevant date at a Record Office; and/or
 - Is visibly related to any other building or features associated with Inclosure, is substantially complete, or is of a pattern which is recorded in a document prepared before the relevant date by a local planning authority, within the meaning of the PLBCA Act(9), for the purposes of development control within the authority's area, as a key landscape characteristic.
- 9.52 Written permission is required from the relevant decision maker for the removal of an important hedgerow as identified in the above criteria. A hedgerow removal notice must be submitted to the local planning authority, who must agree the works in a written notice. The details of the hedgerow removal notice are set out in section 5 of the 1997 Regulations. In accordance with Section 5(1) of the Hedgerows Regulations, there are exceptions in which a hedgerow removal notice is not required. These circumstances are set out in Section 6.

Material Considerations and Guidance

Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment¹

- 9.53 Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 (GPA2) is intended to assist those implementing historic environment policy, and provides information on assessing the significance of heritage assets, using appropriate expertise, historic environment records, recording and further understanding, neglect and unauthorised works, marketing and design and distinctiveness.
- 9.54 The note emphasises the importance of understanding the significance of any heritage asset likely to be affected by development proposals, and the contribution (if any) that setting makes to that significance. It states that this understanding is important in the conception and design of a successful development, and in enabling the relevant decision maker to make decisions in line with legal requirements, the requirements of the development plan and those of the NPPF.
- 9.55 The note provides guidance on three aspects of significance:
- *"Understanding the nature of the significance is important to understanding the need for and best means of conservation. For example, a modern building of high architectural*

¹ Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment. Available at <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa2-managing-significance-in-decision-taking/> [Accessed 7 September 2017]

interest will have quite different sensitivities from an archaeological site where the interest arises from the possibility of gaining new understanding of the past.” (paragraph 8)

- *“Understanding the extent of that significance is also important because this can, among other things, lead to a better understanding of how adaptable the asset may be and therefore improve viability and the prospects for long term conservation.” (paragraph 9)*
- *“Understanding the level of significance is important as it provides the essential guide to how the policies should be applied. This is intrinsic to decision-taking where there is unavoidable conflict with other planning objectives.” (paragraph 10)*

9.56 The note advocates a structured approach to assessing development proposals likely to affect the significance of heritage assets, and proposes six stages to follow, stating ‘it is good practice to check individual stages of this list but they may not be appropriate in all cases and the level of detail applied should be proportionate’. These are:

- *“Understand the significance of the affected assets*
- *Understand the impact of the proposal on that significance*
- *Avoid, minimise and mitigate impact in a way that meets the objectives of the NPPF*
- *Look for opportunities to better reveal or enhance significance*
- *Justify any harmful impacts in terms of the sustainable development objective of conserving significance and the need for change*
- *Offset negative impacts on aspects of significance by enhancing others through recording, disseminating and archiving archaeological and historical interest of the important elements of the heritage assets affected.” (paragraph 6)*

Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets²

9.57 The Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second Edition) (GPA3) was published in December 2017. It supersedes the first edition of the guidance (March 2015) which was prepared to replace ‘Seeing the History in the View: A Method for Assessing Heritage Significance within Views’ (English Heritage, 2011). The guidance is designed to assist those implementing historic environment policy and managing change within the settings of heritage assets, including historic buildings and sites, areas, and landscapes.

9.58 GPA3 refers to the definition of setting in the NPPF which states that the setting of a heritage asset is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. The setting of a heritage asset can contribute to its significance.

9.59 The approach to assessing the setting of heritage assets is given in 5 stages:

- Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected;
- Step 2: Assess the degree to which these settings and views make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated;
- Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on the significance or on the ability to appreciate it;
- Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm; and
- Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

9.60 At Step 2, the guidance provides a checklist of potential attributes of setting that may help to understand the contribution of setting to significance. The guidance acknowledges that *“Only a limited selection of the attributes listed [are] likely to be particularly important in terms of any single asset”*. The attributes are as follows:

The assets physical surroundings	Experience of the asset
Topography	Surrounding landscape or townscape character
Aspect	Views from, towards, through, across and including the asset
Other heritage assets (including buildings, structures, landscapes, areas or archaeological remains)	Intentional intervisibility with other historic and natural features
Definition, scale and ‘grain’ of surrounding streetscape, landscape and spaces	Visual dominance, prominence or role as focal point
Formal design e.g. hierarchy, layout	Noise, vibration and other nuisances
Orientation and aspect	Tranquillity, remoteness, ‘wildness’
Historic materials and surfaces	Busyness, bustle, movement and activity
Green space, trees and vegetation	Scents and smells
Openness, enclosure and boundaries	Diurnal changes
Functional relationships and communications	Sense of enclosure, seclusion, intimacy or privacy
History and degree of change over time	Land use
	Accessibility, permeability and patterns of movement
	Degree of interpretation or promotion to the public
	Rarity of comparable survivals of setting
	Cultural associations
	Celebrated artistic representations
	Traditions

9.61 Regard has also been had to the particular description of setting for buried assets because of the Scheduled Ancient Monuments which are being assessed as part of this chapter. It is stated that:

“Buried archaeological remains may also be appreciated in historic street or boundary patterns, in relation to their surrounding topography or other heritage assets or through the long-term continuity in the use of the land that surrounds them. While the form of survival of an asset may influence the degree to which its setting contributes to significance and the weight placed on it, it does not necessarily follow that the contribution is nullified if the asset is obscured or not readily visible.”

9.62 The guidance identifies development characteristics pertinent to the setting assessments as part of Step 3 which are set out below. The assessment presented in this chapter has had regard to the relevant development characteristics arising from the Proposed Development.

Location and siting of development	Form and appearance of development
Proximity to asset	Prominence, dominance, or conspicuousness
Position in relation to relevant topography and watercourses	Competition with or distraction from the asset

² Historic England (2017) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets. Second Edition, December 2017. Available at <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/> [Accessed 9 March 2018]

Position in relation to key views to, from and across	Dimensions, scale and massing
Orientation	Proportions
Degree to which location will physically or visually isolate asset	Visual permeability (the extent to which it can be seen through), reflectivity
	Materials (texture, colour, reflectiveness, etc.)
	Architectural and landscape style and/or design
	Introduction of movement or activity
	Diurnal or seasonal change
Wider effects of the development	Permanence of the development
Change to the built surroundings and spaces	Anticipated lifetime/temporariness
Change to skyline, silhouette	Recurrence
Noise, odour, vibration, dust, etc.	Reversibility
Lighting effects and 'light spill'	
Changes to general character (e.g. urbanising or industrialising)	
Changes to public access, use or amenity	
Changes to land use, land cover, tree cover	
Changes to communications/accessibility/permeability, including traffic, road junctions and car parking etc.	
Changes to ownership arrangements (fragmentation/permitted development/etc.	
Economic viability	

- 9.63 Step 4 presented in the guidance identifies the opportunities for mitigation involving setting. Mitigation can enhance the significance of a heritage asset through actions such as:
- *“Removing or re-modelling an intrusive feature*
 - *Replacement of a detrimental feature by a new and more harmonious one*
 - *Restoring or revealing a lost historic feature or view*
 - *Introducing a wholly new feature that adds to the public appreciation of the asset*
 - *Introducing new views (including glimpses or better framed views) that add to the public experience of the asset, or*
 - *Improving public access to, or interpretation of, the asset including its setting.”*

Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area Appraisal³

- 9.64 The Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal was first designated as a Conservation Area (CA) in 1978. The conservation area designation covers the length of the canal, which extends

approximately 74km (46 miles) from Great Haywood in Staffordshire, to Stourport in Worcestershire. The canal runs roughly north to south through the western part of the Site.

- 9.65 At the time of designation, the canal passed through five local authorities who produced a joint Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA). The local authorities in the area have since changed, and the Conservation Area is now managed by three authorities: Stafford Borough Council, South Staffordshire District Council and Wyre Forest District Council. The Site is located to the south of Penkridge, within the administrative boundary of South Staffordshire District Council.
- 9.66 Each local authority is responsible for preparing its own appraisal and management strategy for the canal CA. South Staffordshire District Council adopted their CAA for the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal CA in April 1978. It is assumed that this once formed part of the original joint appraisal.
- 9.67 The Appraisal sets out the historical development of the canal CA and describes the various character areas along its route through South Staffordshire in sections. The CA is described in the baseline part of the chapter, and draws on this published appraisal. The Appraisal is wholly a descriptive document, and does not provide any development management policies.

South Staffordshire District Council Historic Environment Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)⁴

- 9.68 The Council adopted the Historic Environment Character Assessment SPD in January 2011. The SPD was prepared to establish the potential for the historic environment in 13 selected project areas to *“absorb new development and housing in particular”*. The 13 areas identified in the SPD are based on the “hinterlands” of three historic towns, 11 historic villages, and the late 20th century settlement at Perton.
- 9.69 The project areas closest to the Site, and therefore sensitive to its development, include Penkridge, Brewood, and Coven. The Site does not fall within the historic landscape areas which have been identified for these three project areas. The historic landscape areas generally comprise the immediate belt of land surrounding the settlements. The Site is not, therefore, considered as important to the setting of nearby historic settlements. In this assessment, the SPD assists the analysis of the historic landscape value of the Site set out in this ES chapter.

Assessment Methodology

- 9.70 The following section explains the methodologies employed for both the assessment of baseline conditions and the effect of the Proposed Development on heritage assets. The method is the product of legislation, policy and best practice guidance as set out above.

Baseline Characterisation and Scope

- 9.71 The study identifies a number of ‘heritage receptors’ that may be affected by the Proposed Development. The term ‘heritage receptor’ is used within this assessment to describe a designated heritage asset (e.g. World Heritage Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, listed buildings, conservation areas etc.) or non-designated heritage asset (e.g. identified by the local authority such as a locally listed building). Designated heritage receptors are recorded in National Heritage List for England (NHLE)⁵. Non-designated receptors can include features which are recorded locally in the South Staffordshire Local List or the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (HER).

³ South Staffordshire Council (1978) Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area Appraisal, April 1978. Available at <https://www.sstaffs.gov.uk/doc/172130/name/Staffordshire%20and%20Worcestershire%20Canal.pdf/> [Accessed 7 September 2017]

⁴ South Staffordshire District Council (2011) Historic Environment Character Assessment – Supplementary Planning Document, January 2011. Available at <https://www.sstaffs.gov.uk/doc/171672/name/South%20Staffordshire%20Historic%20Environment%20Assessment%20%28HEA%29%20Re.pdf/> [Accessed 7 September 2017]

⁵ The National Heritage List for England is maintained by Historic England and is accessible as an online resource here: <http://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/> [Accessed 8 March 2018]

- 9.72 For the purposes of this chapter, the heritage receptors are above ground only and do not include potential archaeological remains which are dealt with in Chapter 8 Archaeology (Below Ground Heritage) by Wessex Archaeology.
- 9.73 Potential heritage impacts on these built heritage receptors include direct effects, which comprise physical changes to the receptor, and indirect impacts that may result from changes to their setting.
- 9.74 Direct impacts arising from the Proposed Development on built heritage receptors involve the proposed demolition of Heath Farm (Locally Listed Grade B) and Woodside Farm (non-designated heritage asset), and effects on part of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal CA. There are no direct impacts on any other built heritage receptors. All other impacts would be indirect, comprising changes in the setting of an asset.
- 9.75 To establish the baseline conditions, this chapter draws on earlier studies undertaken as part of the scoping process which resulted in the scoping request (September 2016) and PINS response (dated October 2016), consultation with the relevant authorities, and further work by Montagu Evans as the proposals have developed.
- 9.76 The initial scope for heritage impacts was based on early studies as set out in the September 2016 scoping request, which proposed a list of 13 receptors. Since that report was written, more work on built heritage receptors established that a broader scope was required. This was informed by the Zone of Influence study (ZOI) in particular and a better understanding of the form of the Proposed Development through the design development. The scope was also informed by comments received from the Secretary of State during EIA scoping. These are summarised in Table 9.1 below:

Table 9.1 Comments Received During EIA Scoping (Built Heritage)		
Consultee	Comments Raised	Response to Comments
Secretary of State	The length of 'important' hedgerows (as defined in the Hedgerows Regulations 1997) to be retained/removed by the proposals should be quantified and measures to protect retained hedgerows during construction works should be clearly described. The impact of such hedgerow loss on historic landscape character should be considered.	Historic hedgerows, in so far as relating to cultural heritage, are considered in this assessment with regard to the Hedgerows Regulations 1997. Important hedgerows are also considered in Chapter 10: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
	The Secretary of State notes that the setting of a number of cultural heritage resources could be affected by the proposed development, including SAMs to the north-west of the site; listed and locally listed buildings adjacent to the site and the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area. The final study area for the assessment of effects on setting should be informed by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) developed for the landscape and visual impact assessment.	A study area was identified, informed by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility as described at paragraphs 9.76-9.80 of this chapter.

Table 9.1 Comments Received During EIA Scoping (Built Heritage)		
Consultee	Comments Raised	Response to Comments
	The Applicant's attention is also drawn to Canal and River Trust's (CRT) consultation response, which states that the old brick arch bridge at Gravelly Way could be affected by the proposed development.	The old brick arch bridge at Gravelly Way is assessed as a non-designated heritage receptor in this assessment.
	The Secretary of State agrees that the potential effects on designated and non-designated cultural heritage resources should be addressed in the ES, including the likelihood of loss or harm and effects resulting from changes to setting. In terms of the potential effects on the setting of cultural heritage resources, cross reference should be made to the landscape and visual impact chapter/ volume of the ES.	Non-designated heritage receptors have been included in this assessment of likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development.

- 9.77 The EIA scoping request refers to a ZOI for cumulative effects of 9km. Within 9km of the boundary of the Site, there are 564 designated heritage receptors⁶. These are primarily groups of listed buildings which are clustered at historic cores of nearby settlements, or more isolated historic buildings which represent the early agricultural use of the land in this part of the West Midlands.
- 9.78 Based on professional judgement and experience of this type of study it is unlikely that the heritage receptors beyond a 3km radius will experience significant effects arising from the Proposed Development. The Site will not fall within the setting of heritage receptors within a 3-9km radius of the Site boundary, given the lack of intervisibility, historical association and interposing landscape features (natural and man-made). Furthermore, the historical research into the Site has not revealed any evidence that the land at Four Ashes was associated with any designated heritage receptor between 3km and 9km from the Site's boundary. There is, therefore, no intervisibility or associational relationship which would mean that the development of the Site would cause a change to the setting and value of a heritage receptor in excess of 3km from the Site.
- 9.79 It is for this reason that a radius of 3km from the Site boundary has been used for this study in which to identify built heritage receptors within this study area, and based on the ZOI and an understanding of local conditions, the scoped in receptors have been further refined.
- 9.80 The visual envelope of the Site is demonstrated by the ZTV (Zone of Theoretical Visibility – see Figure 12.9, Volume of this ES). This is defined as the furthest extent from where the Proposed Development is predicted to be easily visible (from a height of approximately 1.5m (eye level) above the ground) based on building locations and heights, topography and landscape features such as woodland. The ZTV assumes that the Proposed Development has been built to the maximum parameters as set out in the Parameters Plans (Documents 2.5, 2.6 and 2.8). The ZTV demonstrates that, depending on the topography, the Proposed Development will potentially be visible over long distances when seen from high ground, but equally is likely to be invisible from many locations nearby because of intervening features.

⁶ Information from National Heritage List record on Historic England website. A 9km study radius was identified around an indicative boundary of the Application Site using the map search function.

- 9.81 The significant effects of the Proposed Development on the setting of heritage receptors are likely to be limited to a smaller area and/or in selected locations where public rights of way present particular views along a specific orientation.
- 9.82 The 3km study radius has been refined in light of relevant guidance and professional judgement. All heritage receptors within 1km of the Site have been scoped in. This includes all listed buildings, conservation areas, SAMs and other designated receptors. Locally listed heritage receptors which fall within the Site boundary have also been included.
- 9.83 Non-designated receptors, such as those included in the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record but not included in the Local List, are included in this study only where they are within to the Site boundary as these receptors have very low heritage value.
- 9.84 Between 1km and 3km, only higher graded receptors including Grade I and II* listed buildings, Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens, and all SAMs, have been scoped in. Lower graded receptors, including locally listed buildings, Grade II listed buildings and conservation areas have been scoped out beyond 1km from the Site boundary. This is considered proportionate to the lesser heritage value of these receptors and to the likelihood that effects on setting will diminish with distance.
- 9.85 This revised scope has resulted in several receptors being added to the original list of scoped in receptors, and one asset, the Grade II listed Hatherton Hall, which is approximately 2km from the Site now being scoped out. The items scoped in or out have been assessed through Site visits.
- 9.86 The receptors which are scoped in for assessment are shown on the map in Technical Appendix 9.2. As the likely effects are indirect and related to setting, the scoped in receptors have been grouped where they share similar characteristics and similar settings. These groups are listed in Table 9.2 below:

Table 9.2 Heritage Receptor Baseline					
Map Group	Cultural Heritage Receptor	Summary Description	Grade or Designation	Distance to Site (approx.)	Receptor Value (see Table 9.3)
Within Site Boundary					
A	Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area	Canal built c.1772, includes a number of historic bridges and locks, some of which are locally listed.	Conservation Area	Within and adjacent to the Site	Low
B	Heath Farm	Early 19th century farmhouse.	Locally Listed Grade B	Within Site	Low
C	Woodside Farm	Early to mid-19 th century farmhouse.	Non-designated receptor (Staffordshire HER MST17495)	Within Site	Very Low

Table 9.2 Heritage Receptor Baseline					
Map Group	Cultural Heritage Receptor	Summary Description	Grade or Designation	Distance to Site (approx.)	Receptor Value (see Table 9.3)
D	Gravelly Way Bridge	Late 18th-century brick bridge, probably built at the same time as the canal.	Non-designated receptor (Staffordshire HER MST1254)	Within Site	Very Low
E	Straight Mile Farm	Early to mid-19 th century farmhouse.	Non-designated receptor (Staffordshire HER MST17494)	Within Site	Very low
N/A	Historic Landscape Character	Largely early 19 th century Parliamentary period enclosure with one small area of possibly pre-Parliamentary enclosure in the north-west corner of the Site.	Not designated	N/A	Very low
N/A	Historic Hedgerows	Largely early 19 th century parliamentary period enclosure hedges.	Not designated	N/A	Very Low
Outside Site boundary					
A	Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area	Canal built c.1772, includes a number of historic bridges and locks, some of which are locally listed.	Conservation Area	Within and adjacent to the Site	Low
F.1	Two Roman Camps north of Water Eaton	Archaeological site of two Roman camps with no upstanding remains.	SAM	1km	High
F.2	Roman Fort west of Eaton House	Archaeological site of Roman period Fort with no upstanding remains.	SAM	700m	High

Table 9.2 Heritage Receptor Baseline					
Map Group	Cultural Heritage Receptor	Summary Description	Grade or Designation	Distance to Site (approx.)	Receptor Value (see Table 9.3)
F.3	Roman Camp, Kinvaston	Archaeological site of two Roman period camps with no upstanding remains.	SAM	700m	High
F.4	Roman camp north east of Stretton Mill	Archaeological site of Roman period camp or fort with no upstanding remains.	SAM	1.5km	High
F.5	Site of Pennocrucium east of Stretton Bridge	Archaeological site of small Roman town with no upstanding remains.	SAM	650m	High
F.6	Roman villa 300yds (270m) NW of Engleton Hall	Archaeological site of Roman villa with no upstanding remains.	SAM	1.7km	High
G	Rodbaston Old Hall moated site and fishpond	Remains of a former moated manorial complex with upstanding remains including banks, a moat and a central platform.	SAM	1.9km	High
H.1	Church of St Mary and St Chad	Large medieval church with a prominent spire, restored in the late 19 th century by G E Street.	Grade I listed building	2.9km	High
H.2	Westgate, forecourt wall and gate piers	Early 18th-century town house with attached walls and gate.	Grade II* listed building	2.9km	High
I	Somerford Hall	18th-century Palladian country house with good interiors in a park setting.	Grade II* listed building	1.5km	High

Table 9.2 Heritage Receptor Baseline					
Map Group	Cultural Heritage Receptor	Summary Description	Grade or Designation	Distance to Site (approx.)	Receptor Value (see Table 9.3)
J.1	Stretton Hall with combined service and stable wing	Country house of the 18th and 19th centuries with good interiors standing in formal gardens and parkland.	Grade II* listed building	2.8km	High
J.2	Church of St John Stretton	Small parish church with a twelfth-century chancel and a nave, tower, transepts and porch of the late 19th century.	Grade II* listed building	2.75km	High
K	Church of St Mark and St Luke Shareshill	Medieval parish church almost wholly rebuilt c.1742 in a classical style.	Grade II* listed building	2.5km	High
L	Chillington	Former early 18th-century avenue that is an outlying part of the later 18th-century park at Chillington.	Grade II* Registered Park and Garden	1.7km-3km	Medium
M.1	Round House	Late 18th-century or early 19 th century lock keeper's house, built to resemble a turreted tower.	Grade II listed building	Adjacent to site	Medium
M.2	Wharf Cottage	Late-18th century Gothick style house.	Grade II listed building	Adjacent to site	Medium
M.3	Gailey Lock and Gailey Bridge	Late 18th-century lock and (rebuilt) bridge, part of original construction of canal.	Locally Listed Grade A	Adjacent to site	Low
M.4	Gailey Wharf	Late 18th-century wharf basin and crane, built as part of construction of canal.	Locally Listed Grade A	Adjacent to site	Low

Map Group	Cultural Heritage Receptor	Summary Description	Grade or Designation	Distance to Site (approx.)	Receptor Value (see Table 9.3)
N	Aspley Farmhouse	Probably sixteenth-century manor house partially rebuilt in brick in the 18th or 19th century.	Grade II listed building	950m	Medium
O.1	Long Moll's Bridge	Partially rebuilt late 18th-century brick bridge.	Locally Listed Grade A	Adjacent to site	Low
O.2	Deepmore Bridge	Late 18th century brick bridge probably built as part of the canal construction c.1772.	Locally Listed Grade A	600m	Low
P	Calf Heath Bridge	Late twentieth century brick bridge, probably replacing an older bridge.	Locally Listed Grade A	50m	Low
Q.1	Brick Kiln Lock	Late 18th century lock on canal.	Locally Listed Grade A	360m	Low
Q.2	Boggs Lock	Late 18th century lock on canal.	Locally Listed Grade A	575m	Low
Q.3	Canal Feeder	Early-mid 19th century feeder channel formerly linking the canal to the Upper and Lower Gailey reservoirs.	Locally Listed Grade B	500m	Low

Method of Assessment

9.87 The assessment process follows a three-step process, including:

- Baseline Assessment of Value
- Assessment of Magnitude of Impacts
- Likely Significant Effects

⁷ South Staffordshire Council (1978) Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area Appraisal, April 1978. Available at <https://www.sstaffs.gov.uk/doc/172130/name/Staffordshire%20and%20Worcestershire%20Canal.pdf/> [Accessed 7 September 2017]

Baseline Assessment of Value

9.88 Heritage receptors (assets) are defined at paragraph 5.122 of the NPS as:

"Those elements of the historic environment that hold value to this and future generations because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest are called 'heritage assets'. Heritage assets may be buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes. The sum of the heritage interests that a heritage asset holds is referred to as its significance. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting."

9.89 The historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest of a heritage receptor is understood to comprise its significance. It is this definition of significance that is employed in the NPS and NPPF. Historic England's guidance document, Conservation Principles⁷ (2008), further defines significance as the *"sum of the cultural and natural heritage values of a place, often set out in a statement of significance"*.

9.90 Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (2015) sets out a framework of three inter-related key values for assessing the significance of historic buildings and places. These comprise evidential/archaeological, historical, aesthetic/architectural and communal.

9.91 The definition of a heritage receptor in paragraph 5.122 of the NPS also notes the contribution of setting to significance. Setting is defined as:

"the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral" (NPS footnote 96, and NPPF Annex 2).

9.92 Historic England's guidance note The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 3⁸ (GPA3), provides guidance on assessing the contribution made by setting to the significance of heritage receptors, including the contribution made to setting by views.

9.93 GPA3 identifies five steps towards assessing the implications of development proposals which may affect the setting of heritage receptors (it is consistent with other guidance):

- Identifying the assets affected;
- Assessing the contribution setting makes to significance;
- Assessing the effect of the proposed development;
- Maximising enhancement and minimising harm; and
- Making and documenting the decision and monitoring outcomes.

9.94 Where a proposal may affect the surroundings or setting in which the receptor is experienced, a qualitative assessment is also made of whether, how and to what degree setting contributes to the significance of heritage receptors.

9.95 To aid simple communication and avoid confusion with the term 'significance' as used in the conventional EIA sense, heritage significance is referred to from here on as 'heritage value'.

9.96 The baseline assessment includes a consideration of the heritage value of the receptor(s) in question using the heritage interests set out in relevant guidance. The contribution that the setting makes to this heritage value is then also assessed as part of the baseline. The overall heritage value is assessed against the criteria contained in Table 9.3. This is a professional judgement made separate from the context of the specific proposals.

⁸ Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets. Available at: <https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/gpa3.pdf/> [Accessed 7 December 2107]

Value	Criteria	Examples
Exceptional	Building/site/area of international significance.	World Heritage Sites.
High	Building/site/area of national significance.	Listed Buildings Grade I and II* and their settings, SAMs, and may be registered Historic Parks and Gardens Grade I and II* and their settings.
Medium	Building/site/area of national significance.	Listed Buildings Grade II and their settings, and registered Historic Parks and Gardens Grade II and their settings.
Low	Buildings/sites/areas of national and/or regional significance, or local receptors of particular significance.	Conservation areas and their settings, and buildings of local/regional interest and their settings.
Very Low	Buildings/sites/areas with some evidence of significance but in an incoherent or eroded form of local interest and generally with no statutory protection.	Often buildings of some local interest and dispersed elements of townscape merit.

Assessment of Magnitude of Impacts

- 9.97 Following the identification of baseline conditions, the effect of the Proposed Development on each of the identified heritage receptors is then considered and a judgement formed as to the duration, extent and magnitude of effect.
- 9.98 Each effect has also been considered by the nature of the effect likely to occur (hereby referred to as 'magnitude'), made up of judgements about:
- The size and scale of the effect;
 - The susceptibility of the receptor to the proposed change including the setting of the receptor;
 - The geographical extent of the area of the effect; and
 - The duration of the effect and its reversibility.
- 9.99 Direct impacts on heritage receptors and their value are likely to result from changes to the physical fabric of the receptor, or in the case of landscape-based receptors such as Registered Parks and Gardens, through change within the defined area of the receptor.
- 9.100 Indirect effects are likely to result from changes to the setting of a receptor. As set out above in regard to the baseline conditions, the setting of a heritage receptor may contribute to its heritage value. Therefore, changes to the setting of a heritage receptor may have a beneficial or adverse effect on its heritage value.
- 9.101 In considering the potential magnitude of an effect, a professional judgement is made about the receptor's susceptibility to change from the Proposed Development. Susceptibility to change is the ability of the receptor to accommodate proposals without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation. For heritage receptors, susceptibility to change

also considers the setting of the receptor in conjunction with its value and the particular nature of the proposals.

- 9.102 A professional judgement is made on the magnitude of likely effect using criteria at Table 9.4.

Magnitude	Criteria
High	Considerable change to the value of the receptor. The proposals are a new component, ranging from a notable change in receptor characteristics over an extensive area to intensive change over a more limited area. The proposals would be very noticeable. Loss of or major alteration to key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be permanent and non-reversible.
Medium	A clearly discernible change to the value of the receptor. The proposals are dissimilar to a main component of the receptor but similar to other components. The proposals would be readily noticeable. Partial loss of or alteration to one or more key elements/features/ characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be semi-permanent and partially reversible.
Low	Slight change to the value of the receptor. The proposals are similar to a main component of the receptor but dissimilar to other components. The proposals would not be readily noticeable. Minor loss of or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.
Negligible	Barely discernible change to the value of the receptor. Very minor loss of or alteration to one or more key elements/features/characteristics of the baseline.
Neutral	No change to the value of the receptor.

Likely Significant Effects

- 9.103 The likely significant effects are determined through combining judgements of value and magnitude using the matrix at Table 9.5. The effects which are considered to be 'significant' for the assessment are shaded in grey. Essentially, the effects which are medium beneficial/adverse or greater are considered significant.

Heritage Value (Sensitivity of Asset)	Magnitude of Effect (Degree of Change)				
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible	Neutral
Exceptional	Major	Major	Medium	Minor	No effect

Heritage Value (Sensitivity of Asset)	Magnitude of Effect (Degree of Change)				
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible	Neutral
High	Major	Medium	Medium	Negligible	No effect
Medium	Medium	Medium	Minor	Negligible	No effect
Low	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	No effect
Very Low	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	No effect

- 9.104 Simply combining value and magnitude of effect through a matrix may not, however, necessarily provide the appropriate category of significance of the effect. In particular, as the word-scale in Table 9.6 makes clear, effects may have an impact on “the value of the heritage receptor, landscape character area and/or its setting, or the value of the existing view”.
- 9.105 The matrix-driven judgements are, therefore, supported by qualitative assessment text which is discursive. This seeks to describe the effects and make clear the basis of the final professional judgement about the effect. This is necessary because heritage impact assessment is not a strict quantitative process. It necessarily depends on expert judgement.
- 9.106 Accordingly there is an emphasis on narrative text throughout this chapter and especially in the assessment section to describe the receptors and the judgements in regard to the significance of the identified effects. The text also draws out the key issues and ensures that the chapter is accessible to the public and to the competent authority or decision maker.

Likely significant effect	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts
Major Adverse	Considerable negative change to the value of the receptor. The proposals are a new and very noticeable component, ranging from a notable change in receptor characteristics over an extensive area to intensive change over a more limited area. Loss of or major alteration to key elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be permanent and non-reversible.	Considerable negative change to the value of the receptor though a deterioration of its setting. The proposals are a new and very noticeable component of the setting of the heritage receptor, ranging from a notable change in receptor characteristics over an extensive area to intensive change over a more limited area. Loss of or major alteration to key elements, features, or characteristics of the setting baseline. The duration of this effect may be permanent and non-reversible.
Medium Adverse	A clearly discernible negative change to the value of the receptor. The proposals are dissimilar to a main component of the	A clearly discernible negative change to the value of the receptor though a deterioration of its setting. The proposals are dissimilar to a main component of the receptor's

Likely significant effect	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts
	receptor but may be similar to other components. Partial loss of or alteration to one or more key elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be semi-permanent and partially reversible.	setting but may be similar to other components. Partial loss of or alteration to one or more key elements, features, or characteristics of the setting baseline. The duration of this effect may be semi-permanent and partially reversible.
Minor Adverse	Slight negative change to the value of the receptor. The proposals would not be readily noticeable. Minor loss of or alteration to one or more key elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.	Slight change to the value of the receptor though a deterioration of its setting. The proposals would not be readily noticeable. Minor loss of or alteration to one or more key elements, features, or characteristics of the setting baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.
Negligible/Neutral	No change or barely discernible change to the value of the receptor. No change or very minor alteration to a limited number key elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.	No change or barely discernible change to the setting and value of the receptor. No change or very minor alteration to a limited number key elements, features, or characteristics of the setting baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.
Minor Beneficial	Slight positive improvement in the value of the receptor. The proposals would not be readily noticeable. Minor improvement of one or more key elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.	Slight positive improvement in the value of the receptor though an improvement of its setting. The proposals would not be readily noticeable. Minor improvement of one or more key elements, features, or characteristics of the setting baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.
Medium Beneficial	A clearly discernible positive change to the value of the receptor. The proposals are similar to a main component of the receptor but may be dissimilar to other components.	A clearly discernible positive change to the value of the receptor though an improvement of its setting. The proposals are similar to a main positive component of the receptor's setting but may be dissimilar to other components.

Table 9.6 Qualitative assessment of likely significant effects		
Likely significant effect	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts
	Some key elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline improved and other elements, features and characteristics retained in their baseline condition. The duration of this effect may be semi-permanent and partially reversible.	Partial improvement of one or more key elements, features, or characteristics of the setting baseline, with other elements, features and characteristics retained in their baseline condition. The duration of this effect may be semi-permanent and partially reversible.
Major Beneficial	Considerable positive change to the value of the receptor. The proposals add a major and very noticeable positive component to the receptor, ranging from a notable change in receptor characteristics over an extensive area to intensive change over a more limited area. The majority of the key elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline are retained and/or enhanced. The duration of this effect may be permanent and non-reversible.	Considerable change to the value of the receptor though a deterioration of its setting. The proposals add a major and very noticeable positive component to the setting of the receptor, ranging from a notable change in setting over an extensive area to intensive change over a more limited area. The majority of the key positive elements, features, or characteristics of the baseline are retained and/or enhanced. The duration of this effect may be permanent and non-reversible.

aspects and features have been taken into account in the design of the Proposed Development and the development parameters and have therefore been assessed as part of the construction and operational stages.

Assumptions and Limitations

- 9.110 This chapter takes in the submitted, indicative design information into account, particularly in respect of landscaping. This includes the Parameters Plans, which comprise the maximum heights being achieved in the development Zones (Document 2.6). It likewise assumes that the proposals include direct contributions to the improvement of heritage receptors where their heritage value is affected.
- 9.111 As for limitations, we note the historic environment is not a finite resource capable of precisely one assessment. Practically any such assessment must rely on the Historic Environment Record and site survey, and not all features of cultural interest are known or can be discovered. That said, the sources are detailed and provide a very good basis and, in our view, results in an archive with a high degree of certainty.

Baseline Conditions

- 9.112 This section summarises the existing heritage conditions of the Site and the surrounding area.
- 9.113 The Site comprises approximately 297 hectares (ha) of land which is primarily under arable cultivation. It is generally bounded by the A5 to the north, the A449 to the west. The M6 is located to the north-east, and the Site extends just beyond Straight Mile to the south. There are other smaller roads within the Site. The railway line and the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal also form boundaries of the Site.
- 9.114 The Site is characterised by a number of smaller fields separated by hedgerows, and an area of woodland known as Calf Heath Wood. Industrial uses are also apparent within and adjacent to the Site. There is a chemical works adjacent to the south-west part of the Site, and industrial development has taken place adjacent to it outside of the Site boundary. The Calf Heath reservoir is located to the immediate north-east of the Site, and the historic canalside wharf area at Gailey Wharf is located adjacent to the northern part of the Site.
- 9.115 An approximate 4km section of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area runs through the Site, from Gailey to Long Molls Bridge near Hatherton. Also within the Site are Heath Farm (locally listed at Grade B) and Woodside Farm (non-designated heritage receptor, included in the Staffordshire HER). There are no other heritage receptors within the Site, but the development will take place within the setting of a number of other heritage receptors.

Historical Development of the Site

- 9.116 There was a small settlement at Gailey, or 'Gragelie', in the Norman period, which is recorded in Domesday Book of 1086. It had one recorded household whose medieval location is not known, but it is not believed to have been within the Site. The majority of the Site was historically part of Calf Heath and would have been open land throughout the middle ages to the early modern period. The road to the north of the Site, the A5, is the important Roman trackway known as Watling Street. It is not known when the current A449 to the west of the Site was established.
- 9.117 One of the earliest and most significant changes to the landscape was the development of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal in 1772. The canal was designed by James Brindley (1716-1772) as part of his plan for a 'grand cross' of canals linking the Mersey with the Thames, and the Trent with the Severn. The canal was constructed over a period of six years, being finally completed in 1778⁹. Several features associated with the canal exist in the area

Cumulative Effects

- 9.107 In addition to the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development, an assessment of the likely significant cumulative effects is also made. The cumulative assessment measures any additional effects of the Proposed Development under consideration, when considered in conjunction with schemes subject to material consents surrounding the Site. The details of the other developments assessed as part of this submission is provided in Technical Appendix 2.6.

Mitigation and Residual Effects

- 9.108 As part of the design process, measures have been identified and developed to prevent, reduce or where possible offset any significant adverse effects on heritage receptors. These are identified within this chapter, and the residual effects consider the effects after the incorporation of the mitigation measures.
- 9.109 In the context of the built heritage assessment, primary mitigation measures and considerations have been incorporated as an integral (or 'embedded') part of the design and layout of the Proposed Development. These include attention to the siting, heights and materials involved in the Proposed Development, landscaping, and historic building recording. All of these

⁹ South Staffordshire Council (1978) Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area Appraisal, April 1978. Available at <https://www.sstaffs.gov.uk/doc/172130/name/Staffordshire%20and%20Worcestershire%20Canal.pdf/> [Accessed 7 September 2017]

of the Site, including canal bridges and other infrastructure, and the buildings at Gailey. These features represent the 18th century industrialisation of the area.

- 9.118 Calf Heath was enclosed in 1813 under a Parliamentary Act passed in 1799¹⁰. Comparison of the existing hedgerow pattern with the enclosures shown on the early to mid-19th century maps in the historic map regression (Appendix 9.1) demonstrates that the hedgerows on the majority of the Site date to this Parliamentary enclosure period in the early-mid 19th century. This comprises late parliamentary enclosure.
- 9.119 The area in the north-western part of the site, to the west of the canal, appears to have been outside of Calf Heath and may have been enclosed at an earlier date as it retains some irregular and curving boundaries which are characteristic of early, informal enclosure. This area is distinguished as “Early Irregular Enclosure” on the Historic Landscape Character Map (see Appendix 9.5). The enclosures immediately to the west of the canal in this area may post-date the construction of the canal in the late 18th century, which would have cut this area off from the rest of the heath. The enclosure boundaries, as indicated by hedgerows, have been eroded as a result of later developments, such as new roads and quarrying.
- 9.120 Following the enclosure of the heath in the 19th century, three farmsteads were established, and parts of these farmsteads survive. Historic map evidence suggest that Heath Farm on Vicarage Road was built in the early 19th century. Another farm near to Gailey wharf, referred to as Croft Farm, was probably also built in the early to mid-19th century, and it may stand on an earlier site. In addition, Woodside Farm, to the north of Vicarage Road is presumed to also date from this period.
- 9.121 Calf Heath Wood is shown in the late 19th century OS maps, but not on the earlier maps, suggesting that it was planted after enclosure 19th century. There is also a small area of plantation woodland adjacent to the reservoir that is probably contemporaneous with the construction of the reservoir in the late 18th century as part of the development of the canal.
- 9.122 The branch of the London and North West Railway in the western part of the Site was originally constructed in the mid-19th century, bisecting the land between Calf Heath and Somerford.
- 9.123 Following the introduction of the railway, the character of the area is largely static. In the triangular parcel of land created by the canal and railway line at Four Ashes/Calf Heath Bridge, some industrial buildings had emerged by the time the 1954 OS Map was published. These included a new refinery for Midland Tar Distillers Limited, which was established in 1950. The distillery was closed down in the mid-1970s. The area remains in industrial use, however, and by 1989, this area is shown as fully developed, with some overspill of built form on the east side of the canal into Calf Heath Wood.
- 9.124 The next major change to the area was the creation of the multiple-lane M6 carriageway to the east of the Site, and the large roundabout interchange. The roundabout occupied the area previously known as the Watling Street Plantation.
- 9.125 In the 20th century, aggregate extraction was established within the Site, and this type of activity is ongoing in the eastern part of the Site. The majority of the Site is in agricultural use as arable land, with later industrial uses and road infrastructure at its boundaries. New industrial activity continues to be introduced to the area surrounding the SFRI Site, in particular at Four Ashes to the south. At the time of writing, new large-scale industrial warehousing development is underway on the east side of the canal (the Bericote Development).

Built Heritage Receptors

Existing Built Heritage Receptors

- 9.126 The baseline section confirms the following built heritage receptors that may be affected by the Proposed Development. These receptors are identified on the map at Appendix 9.2, which allocates a Map Group reference to each receptor/group:

Within the Site boundary

- Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area (part)
- Heath Farm (Locally Listed Grade B)
- Woodside Farm (non-designated heritage receptor)
- Gravelly Way Bridge (non-designated heritage receptor)
- Straight Mile Farm (non-designated heritage receptor)
- Historic landscape character (non-designated heritage receptor)
- Historic hedgerows (non-designated heritage receptor)

Outside the Site boundary

- Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area (part)
- Six Roman Period SAMs at Water Eaton
- Rodbaston Old Hall moated site and fishpond (SAM)
- Church of St Mary and St Chad (Grade I)
- Westgate, forecourt wall and gate (Grade II*)
- Somerford Hall (Grade II*)
- Stretton Hall with combined service and stable wing (Grade II*)
- Church of St John, Stretton (Grade II*)
- Church of St Mark and St Lukes, Shareshill (Grade II*)
- Chillington (Grade II* Registered Park)
- Round House (Grade II)
- Wharf Cottage (Grade II)
- Aspley Farmhouse (Grade II)
- Gailey Lock and Gailey Bridge (Locally Listed)
- Gailey Wharf (Locally Listed)
- Calf Heath Bridge (Locally Listed)
- Long Moll’s Bridge (Locally Listed)
- Brick Kiln Lock (Locally Listed)
- Boggs Lock (Locally Listed)
- Canal Feeder (Locally Listed)
- Deepmore Bridge (Locally Listed)

Built Heritage receptors within the Site boundary

Map Group A: Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area

- 9.127 The length of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal was designated as a Conservation Area (CA) in 1978. The CA has a total length of 74km. A map showing the route of the canal is reproduced at Appendix 9.3.

¹⁰ Midgley, L. M. (eds) (1959) *A History of the County of Stafford: Volume 5, East Cuttlestone Hundred*(London, 1959), pp. 126-138

- 9.128 The canal passes through three local authorities. These are Stafford Borough Council, Wyre Forest District Council, and South Staffordshire District Council. Each authority has produced a separate CAA for its section, although all three have considerable overlap. The relevant CAA for the section at Gailey was published in 1978 by what was then Staffordshire County Council.
- 9.129 A section of approximately 4.3km of the CA falls within the study area, and it is within the administrative boundary of South Staffordshire District Council. In general, the CA follows the bank of the canal and the towpath quite closely, but it widens out in some areas, such as at Gailey Wharf, where it also takes in adjacent buildings.

Historical development

- 9.130 The Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal was constructed between 1766 and 1772, and was intended to be part of a 'grand cross' of canals linking the Mersey with the Thames, and the Trent with the Severn. It was designed by James Brindley, a well-known engineer of the mid-late 18th century. It followed Brindley's preferred method of avoiding locks, embankments and cuttings where possible, although it does use tunnels.¹¹
- 9.131 The canal, which links the Severn at Stourport (Worcestershire) to the Trent and Mersey Canal at Great Haywood (Staffordshire), follows a winding course that is approximately 74km long (46 miles) and has 43 locks. It mainly carried goods from the Staffordshire Potteries, and was later used for coal. By the mid-20th century it was little used and there were proposals to close it in 1959. The canal was saved by Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Society, and is now managed by the Canal and River Trust (CRT).

Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

- 9.132 The canal has a strong linear quality, which is emphasised by its design as a 'contour canal'. A contour canal sought to maintain long level stretches of water which would avoid the need for expensive changes in level. The towpaths also contribute to preserving the linear character of the canal, which survives in large part along the banks of the canal and comprises a variety of historic surfaces such as sandstone copings and brick paving. The towpaths preserve the width of the canal, and add to its historical character and appearance.
- 9.133 There are strong visual elements which represent the character of the canal as a feature of industrial transportation. This includes the close relationship to the railway, which appears frequently along its route, and the wharves, buildings and structures. A number of these built elements were constructed at the same time as the canal and supported its early industrial function.
- 9.134 The part of the canal that passes through the Site is now well enclosed by vegetation particularly on the eastern side, bounding the Site. As a result, views are generally directed along its length and not out from it. It is the long views along the canal which contribute most to its heritage value, because they enable an appreciation of its length and engineered character.
- 9.135 An experience of the conservation area is primarily kinetic as a user travels along the water or the towpath. The character and appearance of the conservation area is varied and includes transitions between different types of environments, both urban, rural and industrial. There is not a single, consistent character. This kinetic and varied character is also reflected in the setting of the receptor. The character of the section of canal which passes through the Site and its contribution to the CA as a whole is considered in more detail below.

Heritage Value and Setting

- 9.136 As a whole, the canal has historical and architectural value as a well preserved example of an early canal by a well-known pioneer of canal design, James Brindley. There are a large number of listed and locally listed buildings along the length of the canal, and other non-

designated historic structures of interest. Many of them were built at the same time as the canal, and their survival adds to the heritage value of the CA.

- 9.137 With reference to the matrices at Table 9.4, as a conservation area the heritage value of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area is **Low**.
- 9.138 The canal and the associated CA runs through a wide variety of different landscapes, including urban, rural and industrial, with its setting often changing rapidly even in very short distances. This mixed setting reflects the history of the canal, which was not intended as a rural idyll for pleasure boaters, but rather as a busy highway to carry goods from one industrial centre to another. The setting, including the more industrial parts, therefore makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of the canal as it allows it to be understood in its historical context.
- 9.139 The Proposed Development will affect the character and setting of an approximately 4km section of canal between Gailey Wharf and Long Moll's Bridge. This part of the canal and its contribution to the CA as a whole is considered in more detail below. There may also be effects on the setting of the canal to the north and south of this section, and these are discussed later in this chapter.

Character and setting of canal CA within Site (Gailey Wharf to Long Moll's Bridge)

- 9.140 The canal CA runs roughly north to south through the western part of the Site between Gailey Wharf and Long Moll's Bridge, and the Site is part of the canal CA's setting. The redline boundary of the Site excludes the area immediately around Gailey Wharf and the section of the canal between Deepmore Bridge and Long Moll's Bridge to the south.
- 9.141 Given the complex physical and spatial relationship of the canal and the CA to the Site, and the many variations in the surrounding landscape settings, the canal CA is assessed in three sections: north (ref. A.1), central (ref. A.2) and south (ref. A.3).
- 9.142 Within the 3km study area from the Site, the wider setting of the canal includes the urban landscape in Penkridge, the M6 motorway and a railway line in several places, through the industrial area at Four Ashes, past the historic wharf area at Gailey, and also through more rural landscapes.
- 9.143 The portion of the canal within the study area is included in the 'Penkridge to Gailey' (pp. 12-13) and 'Gailey to Wolverhampton' (pp.14-16) sections of the South Staffordshire CAA (Appendix 9.4). This document describes the setting of the section of the canal between Gailey and Wolverhampton as "*The most deeply scarred by modern industry*" relative to the setting of the canal as a whole, especially around the former Midlands Tar Distillers site. The CAA also states, however, that this section also has some "*areas of tranquil beauty*".
- 9.144 It is important to consider the extent of the Penkridge to Wolverhampton (via Gailey) section of the canal, which includes parts of the canal to the north and south of the Site. These off-site areas could more reliably be understood as the areas of 'tranquil rural beauty' in this part of the section identified in the CAA, where there is considerably less industrial development. Notwithstanding this, the M6 still falls within the landscape setting providing an urbanising influence to the north.
- 9.145 The part of the canal to the south of the Site is particularly winding, as Brindley followed the contours of the land to avoid the need for tunnels or viaducts. In places it runs through open land or woodland, but it also runs near the settlement at Hatherton and is in close proximity to the sewage works at Long Moll's Bridge. Any tranquil, rural character identified when the CAA was written in 1978 has been eroded.
- 9.146 The interplay between the 'scarred' industrial setting and tranquil rurality is considered in more detail below. As before, the enclosure of the canal by vegetation means that there are

¹¹ South Staffordshire Council (1978) Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area Appraisal, April 1978. Available at <https://www.sstaffs.gov.uk/doc/172130/name/Staffordshire%20and%20Worcestershire%20Canal.pdf/> [Accessed 7 September 2017]

few views out to the surrounding landscape, and the appreciation of the setting of the canal is visually limited to a degree.

- 9.147 Overall, this section of the CA has experienced a fair amount of change, especially to the south where there is later industrial development, and the proximity to major road infrastructure. The section is not an intact or especially attractive component of the CA as a whole, and therefore makes a minor contribution to the heritage value of the CA in its entirety.

A.1 Gailey Wharf to Gravelly Way (north section)

- 9.148 The canal CA runs through the northern part of the Site. This part is located between Gailey Wharf and Gravelly Way. The area around Gailey Wharf is excluded from the Site boundary, but is within approximately 50m of the Site on three sides (east, south and west).
- 9.149 Gailey Wharf appears to have been in use since the opening of the canal in the 1770s. It is a cluster of late 18th and early 19th century buildings around a former wharf on the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal. It includes two Grade II listed buildings (Round House and Wharf Cottage) and three locally listed buildings (Gailey Wharf, Gailey Lock and Gailey Bridge). The CA extends around the wharf area on the canal and the area of adjacent cottages on Watling Street (the A5).
- 9.150 Industrial sites are part of the historic context of the canal, which includes interchanges between different types of transport. The wharf and basin at Gailey Bridge are one such point, linking what was a newly turnpiked road with the canal.
- 9.151 The wharf area as a whole has historic and architectural significance as a surviving example of a late 18th century canal wharf. The canal and the surviving buildings form a coherent ensemble that provide each other's setting and which contribute positively to the significance of the individual structures.
- 9.152 The canal passes through open land in this section and there are occasional glimpsed views across hedged fields with trees from the canal CA (waterway and towpaths). This outlook is pleasant and its attractiveness makes a positive contribution to the appearance of the canal. It is surmised that these views represent an aspect of the "areas of tranquil beauty" which are described for this part of the canal in the relevant CA appraisal. The tranquillity of the setting has been compromised, however, by later development and influences. The presence of the A5, the M6, and the railway line are urbanising influences, which contribute visual and noise interference into the experience of this part of the canal. There is also some later development on Croft Lane to the west of the canal which has diminished any wholly rural character of the setting.

A.2 Gravelly Way to Calf Heath Bridge (central section)

- 9.153 The central section of the canal CA, which has been identified for the purposes of this assessment, runs from Gravelly Way to Calf Heath Bridge. This part of the canal is included within the SFRI Site boundary.
- 9.154 In this section of the canal there is only a towpath on the west side. The towpath consists of grass, there is no original hard surface visible. The canal is bounded on its east edge by vegetation. There are no buildings associated with the canal along this section, but there are three historic bridges. In addition to the bridges, later redundant pipework from the surrounding industrial facilities crosses the canal, and there is also a later concrete bridge (referred to as 'Schenectady Works Bridge' on the map of the canal at Appendix 9.3). The later steel pipe and works bridges detract from the historic character and appearance of the canal in this section. The later industrial bridges are readily noticeable to users of the CA.
- 9.155 The canal CA runs through a heavily industrialised area, with the SI Group Chemical Works (formerly the Midlands Tar Distillers which occupied the site 1950-c.1972), and the Four Ashes industrial estate to the east of the canal. A short portion of this part of the canal to the north is adjacent to the railway line. As the CAA notes, this stretch of the canal is "deeply scarred" by present and past industrial uses, which includes the railway.

- 9.156 This part of the CA has some historical value like the rest of the canal as part of a well preserved late 18th century canal. The much degraded setting of the canal at this point, however, makes a negative contribution to its significance.

A.2 Calf Heath Bridge to Long Moll's Bridge (south section)

- 9.157 The part of the canal between Calf Heath Bridge and Long Moll's Bridge runs along the southern boundary of the Site. At this point, the setting comprises largely open land, although this includes the sewage works to the south near Long Moll Bridge. The Site forms part of the setting of the canal in the landscape to the north.
- 9.158 Like other parts of the canal, this portion of the canal CA has historical value as a late 18th century canal. The setting, which includes the parts of the industrial estate and the sewage work as well as more open land, makes only a neutral contribution to this heritage value. The later development has eroded the tranquil, rural quality of the setting, although this setting is most preserved in this part. Views of the landscape are limited by vegetation on the border of the canal, however, and the experience of the canal is tightly defined by an experience and view of the waterway.

Map Group B: Heath Farm, Vicarage Road

- 9.159 Heath Farm is an early 19th century farmhouse. It was locally listed at Grade B in 2012. It is also included in the Staffordshire HER (MST22071). It is located within the Site boundary.
- 9.160 The 19th century farm house is built of brick with slate roofs. It is two stories with an L-shaped plan with a three bay main front facing the garden, and a plainer façade to the road. The house was probably built in the second quarter of the 19th century following the enclosure of Calf Heath in 1813. It is not shown on the Ordnance Survey map of 1814, but by the late 19th century, the OS maps show the house and a group of associated farm buildings forming a three-sided courtyard.
- 9.161 The Heath Farm site comprises the primary farm house, 19th century outbuildings to the south of it, and some 20th century agricultural buildings to the east. The farm house is currently unoccupied. Some of the former 19th century barns have recently been converted into residential use (see South Staffordshire District Council planning refs: 08/00630/COU and 11/00530/REN).
- 9.162 Heath Farm has some local architectural value as a 19th century farmhouse, and some local historical value as one of the initial farmhouses built after the enclosure of Calf Heath. Its materials and appearance are characteristic for buildings of this type in the region, and it has been extended at various times, albeit the larger later range to the rear at the east has a complementary character to the original phase.
- 9.163 Its setting is generally rural to the south, but to the north it is dominated by the aggregates extraction area within the Site, and the M6 motorway is 250m away to the east. These are urbanising, industrialising influences on it. The setting makes a neutral to negative contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.164 Consent to demolish the building and build a replacement dwelling was refused twice in 2016 (16/00161/FUL and 16/00720/FUL). A cultural heritage assessment was prepared to support these applications, which concluded that the local interest of the Heath Farm was marginal. Furthermore, the interest of the buildings has been substantially diminished by the negative effects of the later changes to its setting, notably the upgrading of Vicarage Road. The decision to refuse the proposals in application ref: 16/00721/FUL was appealed, and the appeal was allowed on 3 October 2017 (APP/C3430/W/17/3169548). The Inspector considered that the historic and architectural value of Heath Farm is low, and that the weight to be afforded to the harm arising from the complete loss of the non-designated heritage asset was "modest". The Inspector found that the benefits of the proposals were more substantial, and would contribute to the wider economy.
- 9.165 The heritage value of Heath Farm is **Low**. In accordance with paragraph 135 of the NPPF, when dealing with heritage receptors which are not statutorily designated, the heritage value

of that receptor should be considered. Given that this receptor is locally listed Grade B (where A is highest), this heritage receptor is at the low end of the scale of value in this category.

Map Group C: Woodside Farm

- 9.166 Woodside Farm is an early 19th century farm probably built about the time the heath was enclosed in the early 19th century. It is not on the statutory list or the local list, but it is included in the Staffordshire HER (MST17495) and may be considered a non-designated heritage receptor. Woodside Farm is located within the Site boundary.
- 9.167 The house is built of brick, three bays with bay windows. It is architecturally undistinguished. A building is shown on or near this site on the Ordnance Survey map of 1814, but it is not clear if it is the present house. There is a group of probably 19th century farm buildings to its north but these are not included in the HER entry.
- 9.168 Woodside Farm has some local historical value as a farmhouse apparently built shortly after Calf Heath was enclosed in the early 19th century. It has no particular architectural merit or aesthetic value.
- 9.169 The setting of Woodside Farm is mixed, with some open fields, but also the aggregates extraction area to its immediate east and the industrial and former industrial areas to its west. The setting makes a neutral to negative contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.170 The heritage value of Woodside Farm is **Very Low**.

Map Group D: Gravelly Way Bridge

- 9.171 The bridge over the canal at Gravelly Way, also known as Bridge 78, is a non-designated heritage receptor. It now carries only a footpath, the road bridge function having been replaced by the modern Bridge 79A a few metres away. It is identified in the Staffordshire HER (MST1254), where it is dated to the 18th century, but it is not locally listed, unlike the other bridges along the canal, all of which are all locally listed at Grade A.
- 9.172 The bridge is built of brick, now whitewashed, but originally red in its facing. The parapet has sloping sides and a flat central section, and there is double arch over the canal not dissimilar to that at Long Moll's Bridge.
- 9.173 The Gravelly Way Bridge has local architectural and historical value as one of the original bridges built as part of the construction of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal. Its similarity to other bridges on this part of the canal adds to its interest.
- 9.174 The setting of the bridge is formed by the canal, the modern road bridge and the adjacent industrial estate. The extent of change to the historic setting means that the setting of the Bridge makes a neutral to negative contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.175 The heritage value of the Gravelly Way Bridge (Bridge 78) is **Very Low**.

Map Group E: Straight Mile Farm

- 9.176 Straight Mile Farm is a 19th century farmhouse. It is not statutorily listed or locally listed, but is included in the Staffordshire HER (MST17494) and is considered a non-designated heritage receptor. It is located within the Site boundary.
- 9.177 A smallholding in the location of Straight Mile Farm is shown on the 1836 OS map. The built form of the farm buildings is shown in more detail on the 1884 OS map. At this time, the farm is shown as having an L-plan with two outbuildings. It is likely that elements of the original farmhouse structure survive in the extant property, but there is evidence of later alteration and redevelopment on the site. This includes additional outbuildings, change to the field boundaries, and possibly a later farmhouse fronting Straight Mile to the south. The building is two bays set across two storeys, and is whitewashed with a tiled roof. The outbuildings are single storey in a mix of red brick and metal. There is a later double garage to the west.
- 9.178 Straight Mile Farm has some local historical value as a smallholding which was established during the time of enclosure in 19th century. The extent of later alteration means that the

architectural interest is limited, however, and the building is not readily perceived as a historic structure. It has no particular architectural merit or aesthetic value.

- 9.179 Straight Mile Farm is located on the north side of the T-junction between Straight Mile and Deepmore Lane and the roads form part of the setting of the non-designated heritage receptor. The setting is primarily rural, comprising agricultural land and some other buildings. Straight Mile Farm is included in the Site boundary, and the Site forms part of the immediate rural setting. There is more industrial landscape to the north, but topography and interposing landscape features means that there is no intervisibility, and industrial activity does not form part of the setting of the non-designated heritage receptor. The rural character makes a positive contribution to the setting of the receptor because it relates to its historic use as a farm.
- 9.180 The heritage value of Straight Mile Farm is **Very Low**.

Historic Landscape Character

- 9.181 The historic landscape character (HLC) is shown on the HLC map in Technical Appendix 9.5. The majority of the Site, like most of the surrounding landscape, is late 18th and 19th century Parliamentary period enclosures, with regular field boundaries that retain no evidence of any earlier features.
- 9.182 Calf Heath Wood and Reservoir Plantation are both plantation woodlands of recent date, and map evidence suggests that they date to the mid-19th century, after the enclosure of Calf Heath in 1813.
- 9.183 In the north-west corner of the Site, there is a small area of what may be pre-Parliamentary irregular enclosure, as shown on the HLC map (Technical Appendix 9.5). Earlier enclosures are not uncommon across England and the Midlands and are often found alongside later parliamentary enclosures.
- 9.184 Enclosure systems of the Parliamentary period in the later 18th and early 19th centuries are common, and that within the Site has much in common with the surrounding area, which also enclosed around the same time.
- 9.185 The pattern of the enclosure boundaries has been degraded within the Site by later industrial workings which has reduced the agricultural characteristics of the historic landscape. The presence of the motorway and the chemical works and industrial estate have a degrading effect on the historic rural character of the landscape across the Site.
- 9.186 The heritage value of the historic landscape character in the Site is **Very Low**.

Hedgerows and Trees within the Site

- 9.187 The hedgerows on the Site are generally straight and meet at right angles to enclose rectangular fields, although there are also some angled junctions and one curved boundary in the north-west part of the Site. This pattern is typical of hedgerows created during the period of Parliamentary enclosure in the later 18th and early 19th centuries.
- 9.188 Historically, the majority of the Site was part of Calf Heath, which was enclosed in 1813 under a Parliamentary Act. Before that date it would have been an area of open heath land, and as such it was likely to have been without any hedgerows or other formal boundaries.
- 9.189 The majority of the hedges on the Site are shown on a map of 1814 (Technical Appendix 9.1), made shortly after enclosure in 1813. Some of the boundaries in the centre of the Site first appear on a map of 1845, and virtually all of the rest are shown on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map of the late 1880s. This pattern of additional hedges added to the original hedges in the years shortly after parliamentary enclosure is typical, as individual landowners subdivided the larger plots that they had been allocated under the enclosure act. As such, they still form of the overall pattern of Parliamentary enclosure.
- 9.190 As noted, there is some interposing and nearby development so the transition is not clearly demonstrable, and there are no features which provide a historical context to this earlier

phase. Thus the field patterns seen here are not of any particular value and are common in any event.

- 9.191 There is a small area in the north-west part of the Site to the west of the canal near Gailey that may have been enclosed before the period of parliamentary enclosure. This area is blank on the enclosure map, but that only means that it was not included in the relevant enclosure act, and it may well have been enclosed earlier. This area is identified on the HLC map as 'Early irregular enclosures', more commonly known as 'old' enclosure. 'Old' enclosure took place before the main period of Parliamentary enclosure in the later 18th and early 19th centuries, and was generally undertaken by agreement. It is characterised by curving, irregular boundaries. One such curving boundary appears to survive in the north-west part of the Site (see Technical Appendix 9.1).
- 9.192 No early documentary or map evidence has yet emerged to provide a firm date for this enclosure, but the curved boundaries, which extend to the north of the A5, are typical of enclosures in the early modern period. The somewhat more rectilinear hedges in this north-west part of the Site, immediately to the west of the canal and around Croft Farm, are of uncertain date. Some of them have the irregular shapes characteristic of informal enclosure, while others are straighter. Given that they often appear to relate to the canal, it is likely that this particular group of hedges and field boundaries developed soon after the canal was built in the 1770s, when this parcel of land would have been severed from the rest of the heath.
- 9.193 Calf Heath Wood first appears on the map of 1845, when it is marked as a plantation. This map evidence, and the straight paths within in it, suggests that it was planted in the period between 1814 and 1845.
- 9.194 The form woodland adjacent to the reservoir is marked on the 1814 map, but it is not identified as woodland as such on this map. It is clearly marked as wooded on the 1845 map. The reservoir was built in the late 1760s or early 1770s as part of the canal system, which it served. The wood probably also dates to the late 18th century and grew up after the reservoir was created.
- 9.195 The historical value of the hedgerows on the Site is limited, as they are typical of Parliamentary period hedgerows, which survive in large numbers throughout England, especially in the Midlands. The historic field patterns survive to a degree, but have been degraded across much of the Site through later industrial workings, and they are isolated from the wider pattern of enclosure in surrounding areas by the motorway and other visual barriers such as the industrial estate and chemical works.
- 9.196 The Hedgerow Regulations 1997 sets out criteria to establish the historic interest of the hedgerow, and whether they qualify as 'Important' under the regulations. The hedgerows within the Site are assessed against the criteria below:
- At the Site, the hedgerows do not mark the boundary of a historic parish or township that existed before 1850;
 - The hedgerows within the Site are not associated with an SAM;
 - The hedgerows do not mark the boundary of a pre-1600 estate or manor;
 - The hedgerows in the Site do form part of a field system which pre-dates the 1896 Inclosure Acts; and
 - The hedgerows are not visibly related to any other building or feature associated with Inclosure, and they are not intact.
- 9.197 The biodiversity of the hedgerows, and whether or not they are considered 'Important' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 is discussed in Chapter 10: Ecology and Nature Conservation.
- 9.198 In summary, because the surviving hedgerows pre-date 1896, they are considered to be 'Important' under the terms of the Hedgerow Regulations. It is recognised, however, that whilst the hedgerows are of some local interest for their age, the hedgerows and field boundaries are not intact, having been disrupted by later developments and agricultural practice. The hedgerows within the Site have been separated from the wider historic landscape context by major later developments, such as the rail and road infrastructure, which reduces the

ability to appreciate them as features in a historic context. In any event, the hedgerows are typical examples of their age and type (of which many better preserved examples exist). It is therefore concluded that the heritage value of the hedgerows on the Site is **Very Low**.

Heritage receptors outside the Site boundary

Map Group A: Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area

9.199 See paragraphs 9.127-9.158.

Map Group F: Six Roman Period Scheduled Ancient Monuments

- 9.200 The six SAMs at Map Group E are part of a group of Roman camps clustered around Stretton Mill and Water Eaton to the north of Watling Street (the A5), an important Roman road. They are located between 650 and 1.7km from the nearest point of the boundary of the Site. Views are likely to be blocked by topography and intervening vegetation.
- 9.201 As well as the Roman military sites, this group also included a small defended town known as Pennocrucium and a Roman villa near Engleton Hall. This group occupied a strategic location and a nodal point of the Roman road system, with roads to the important Roman towns at Chester, Wroxeter, Greensforge, and perhaps Metchley.
- 9.202 Roman camps were generally roughly rectangular enclosures comprising an earthen rampart with one or more outer ditches. There were sometimes also additional enclosed areas or annexes. Many forts appear to have been used by Roman soldiers as temporary overnight bases or as practice areas, but others developed into long term garrisons or settlements. The majority were built between the mid-1st and mid-2nd century AD, but they were used throughout the Roman period.
- 9.203 Roman villas were extensive estates that had clusters of domestic, agricultural and even industrial buildings at their heart. The term villa can refer to either the estate as a whole or to the buildings, although it is more commonly used for just the buildings. Villas were occupied either by Roman officials or by Romanised natives. The houses could be quite elaborate, with tiled roofs, mosaic floors, plastered and decorated walls, and systems of services including under floor heating and heated bathing areas. They were generally occupied between the 1st and 4th centuries AD.

F.1 Two Roman camps north of Water Eaton

- 9.204 This monument comprises the remains of two Roman camps approximately 1km north-west of the Site. The more northerly of the two camps comprises a single rectangular ditch approximately 165m by 100m enclosing an area of about 1.5ha. The other camp is less well preserved, and part of the ditch is lost, but appears to have been approximately 200m by 175m and to have enclosed an area of about 3.5 hectares. It has no upstanding remains and is known from cropmarks.

F.2 Roman Fort west of Eaton House

- 9.205 This monument comprises the remains of a roughly square fort measuring about 160m with two or more ditches located about 700m from the Site. It enclosed an area of about 2ha. Some upstanding remains apparently seen in the 1960s have been lost and the monument is now known only from cropmarks. This fort was located to the south of Watling Street, near the defended settlement at Pennocrucium.

F.3 Roman Camp, Kinvaston

- 9.206 This monument comprises two Roman camps about 700m from the Site. The monument itself is in two separate areas on either side of the lane. It includes two double ditched rectangular enclosures, one enclosing about 10.5ha, the other 7.3ha. The fortifications of the smaller enclosure use part of one side of the larger enclosure. The larger enclosure, which is older, is believed to have been a vexillation fortress, a campaigning base that could have held

between 2,500 and 4,000 troops. Neither fort has any upstanding remains, both are known only from cropmarks.

F.4 Camp north east of Stretton Mill

9.207 This monument comprises a Roman fort about 1.5km from the Site. It measures about 150m by 130m and covers about 2ha. It has double ditches on three sides and a single ditch on the south-east; there are also further ditches on the south-east that appear to have been an extension to the original fort enclosing about 0.4ha. There may be a further extension to the fort to the north-east, but this is not included in the Scheduled area. Pottery from the site has been dated to AD 50 to AD 200. It has no upstanding remains and is known from cropmarks.

F.5 Site of Pennocrucium, east of Stretton Bridge

9.208 This monument comprises part of a small Roman town known as Pennocrucium. It is located approximately 650m from the Site at the nearest point. It is designated in two separate areas on either side of Watling Street (the A5). Although it has no upstanding remains, excavations have been carried out on the site, and it is known to contain well preserved buried remains. The town appears to have been enclosed by three ditches and comprised an area of about 2.5ha astride Watling Street. The excavations identified timber buildings, gardens, rubbish pits, cobbled streets and other urban features. Settlement outside the defences was noted in 1956, but is not included in the SAM.

F.6 Roman villa 300yds (270m) NW of Engleton Hall

9.209 The Roman villa 300yds (270m) north-west of Engleton Hall is the buried remains of a fortified villa occupied between the 2nd and 4th century AD. It is located approximately 1.7km from the Site. The villa was excavated in the 1930s with at least three building phases found. The house had a courtyard with wings plan, and included at least four principal rooms, a bath house and a portico. There was a defensive boundary and ditch.

9.210 The monuments in this group do not have upstanding remains and have been discovered through study of cropmarks and aerial photographs. As they have no upstanding remains, they are not easily perceived by a visitor, and there is no on site interpretation.

9.211 Their heritage value is historical and archaeological, and they comprise buried features that contain important evidence relating to Roman military history and settlement. That this is a large group of nearby monuments, including the forts, the remains of the settlement at Pennocrucium and the villa near Engleton Hall, as well as the Roman Road (Watling Street, the A5) adds historical value to the individual monuments, although the relationship between the different monuments has not been confirmed.

Setting and Heritage Value of the Group

9.212 The setting of this group is rural and comprises the surrounding fields, the former Roman road (A5), and the scattered settlement at Stretton Mill and Water Eaton. This setting makes a positive contribution to their heritage value. The presence of other monuments in the group also adds to the heritage value of each individual monument. There is no intervisibility or tangible historical relationship between the Site and the SAMs at Water Eaton, and it makes no contribution to their value.

9.213 The heritage value of all the receptors in this group is **High**.

Map Group G: Rodbaston Old Hall moated site and fishpond

9.214 Rodbaston Old Hall medieval moated site and fishpond is a SAM. It is located approximately 1.9km from the nearest point of the Site boundary.

9.215 The SAM comprises the remains of a manorial complex, expressed as a raised island about 73m square surrounded on three sides by a waterlogged moat about 8m wide. There was originally an additional outer moat, but this has been infilled at an unknown date. To the

north is a dry fishpond of unknown date. Rodbaston was linked to the hereditary forestership of Cannock Forest.

9.216 Rodbaston Old Hall moated site has considerable historical and archaeological value as the remains of a medieval moated site with upstanding earthwork remains.

9.217 The setting of the monument is rural in agricultural fields, with some scattered settlement nearby and the buildings of the agricultural college slightly further away. This setting makes a positive contribution to its heritage value.

9.218 Rodbaston Old Hall moated site and fishpond has **High** heritage value.

Map Group H: Brewood

H.1 Church of St Mary and St Chad, Brewood

9.219 The Church of St Mary and St Chad, Brewood was listed at Grade I in 1962. It is also within the Brewood Conservation Area. The spire of the church can be seen from the western edge of the Site, but the Site cannot be seen from the church. It is located approximately 2.9km from the nearest point of the Site boundary.

9.220 There was a priest, and presumably a church, in Brewood in 1086, but the earliest parts of the present church building date to the 13th century. It comprises an unusually high aisled nave, a long chancel, and a west tower. The majority of the chancel, the north aisle, and the nave arcades date to the 13th century. The north aisle was altered and raised in the 14th or 15th century, at which date larger windows were also inserted. The west tower was built in the early 16th century, and a benefaction of 1521 left money for a south porch (later removed). The church was extensively remodelled in the 18th and early 19th centuries, including altering the chancel east wall, reroofing the nave and inserting galleries. Most of this work was subsequently removed in a major restoration in 1878-80 by G. E. Street, an architect well known for his church restorations. Street remodelled the church in a 13th century style. The tower was restored in 1890, and there was further work on the chancel in 1904.

9.221 The church stands on raised ground, and the tower and spire at Brewood are an important local landmark. The large churchyard is located to the south-east of the historic town centre and may originally have been slightly isolated within its own minster enclosure, separate from the built development in the early medieval town centre. The area to the south-east of the church was developed from the thirteenth century with burgage plots, and there is twentieth-century suburban development beyond that to the east. Further north to the east of the church is another area of suburban development, with the medieval town centre to the north-east and more suburban development beyond that.

9.222 There are fine views of the church from the meadows near the Shropshire Union Canal to the south-west. To the south-east and north-east, towards the Site, the churchyard is surrounded by residential development. The extent of the surrounding development means that there are no long distance views out of the churchyard towards the Site.

9.223 The church of St Mary and St Chad has considerable architectural and aesthetic value as a medieval parish church of the 13th century and later restored in the 19th century by a well-known church restorer, G. E. Street. It also has historical value as a part of the development of the medieval town of Brewood and as a church that has served the community of the town for many centuries.

9.224 The immediate setting of the church is formed by the churchyard and by the historic development around it. The wider setting of the church includes the modern development around the town, the views of the church from the meadows by the canal, and by glimpsed views of the spire from the town and surrounding area. There are few views out of the churchyard beyond the town except towards the south-west. The setting makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of the church.

9.225 The heritage value of the church is **High**.

H.2 Westgate, Forecourt Wall and Gate Piers

- 9.226 Westgate, 10 Dean Street, Brewood was listed Grade II* in 1953. It is located approximately 2.9km from the nearest point of the Site boundary. Dated 1723, it has a five bay brick façade with stone banding and dressings. It is also said to have a well preserved interior. The gates and wall to a small front garden are also listed.
- 9.227 Its setting is urban among other terraced houses of similar date. At the front it is open to the church yard, and at the back it is open towards the slope down towards the Shropshire Union Canal. The setting makes a positive contribution to its heritage value as the historic context is preserved.
- 9.228 There are no views towards the Site because of intervening buildings in Brewood and landscape features to the east of the Church.
- 9.229 The heritage value of Westgate is **High**.

Map Group I: Somerford Hall

- 9.230 Somerford Hall was listed at Grade II* in 1953. It is located approximately 1.5km south-west of the Site boundary at the nearest point.
- 9.231 Somerford Hall is a Palladian country house of the mid-18th century now used as a wedding and conference venue. It was built in the later 1730s or early 1740s on the site of an older house for Robert Brabor, and was sold in 1779 to the Hon Edward Monkton, who rendered the house, remodelled the interior, and laid out the gardens and woodland with the aid of Humphrey Repton. Three stories and rendered with hipped slate roofs, it has a seven bay main façade and lower flanking pavilions with Venetian windows. There are several well preserved interior rooms with Adam-style plasterwork and a good contemporary staircase.
- 9.232 The house has considerable architectural, aesthetic and historical value as an elegant Palladian country house with some fine interior rooms.
- 9.233 The house stands in a landscaped park setting that makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of the house. Several associated structures in the park including a bridge, the gazebo and a Dutch barn are listed at Grade II and are not scoped in to this study; however, these also make a positive contribution to the setting of the main house.
- 9.234 The main façade of the house faces north, away from the Site. The house is separated from the Proposed Development by the woodland at Marsh Wood and Somerford Wood and the Site is unlikely to be easily visible from the house.
- 9.235 Somerford Hall has **High** heritage value.

Map Group J: Stretton

J.1 Stretton Hall and Combined Service and Stable Wing

- 9.236 Stretton Hall with the combined service and stable wing was listed Grade II* in 1953. It is located approximately 2.8km west of the Site boundary at the nearest point. It is at a considerable distance from the Proposed Development and has extensive woodland in its own parkland that presently blocks any views south-east towards the Site.
- 9.237 The house was built in the 1720s and extensively altered and extended in the 1860s. Originally the house was built of brick in a provincial baroque style. It has a nine bay main façade and seven bay garden façade and wings on the north. It also has fine interior features. The service wing is similar in style and date to the main part of the house.
- 9.238 The house has considerable architectural and historical value as a fine, well preserved early 18th century house with 19th century additions. Stretton Hall is not publicly accessible.
- 9.239 The designed landscaped setting includes attractive Italian style gardens to the east, the walls of which are listed Grade II and so scoped out of this study. The park, which has lakes and woodland, is not designated, but several other associated features in the wider landscape are listed at Grade II (again scoped out of this study), including the ice house, and the lodge,

associated gates and bridge. This setting makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of the house.

- 9.240 Stretton Hall has **High** heritage value.

J.2 Church of St John, Stretton

- 9.241 The church of St John in Stretton was listed Grade II* in 1962. It is located approximately 2.75km west of the Site at the nearest point, and stands adjacent to Stretton Hall. There are no views of the Proposed Development from the church.
- 9.242 The church is built of red sandstone, and is small, comprising a chancel, nave, small transepts and a south porch. The chancel is twelfth century and retains tiny early Norman windows on the north and south. The rest of the church was rebuilt in the late 19th century in a late 13th or early 14th century style. It retains some earlier fittings, including 17th century communion rails and a medieval piscina.
- 9.243 The church has architectural, aesthetic and historical value as a twelfth-century parish church that was partially rebuilt in the 19th century.
- 9.244 The church stands adjacent to Stretton Hall, but is otherwise isolated from settlement. The small churchyard is surrounded by trees, and beyond that is the wider landscape of the park around Stretton Hall, which forms an attractive setting for the church. This setting makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of the church.
- 9.245 The heritage value of the Church of St John Stretton is **High**.

Map Group K: Church of St Mark and St Luke, Shareshill

- 9.246 The Church of St Mark and St Luke is located approximately 2.5km south of the Site boundary at the nearest point. It was listed Grade II* in 1962.
- 9.247 There was a church on this site in 1213, but the earliest part of the present church is the west tower. The base of the tower and the tower arch are 14th century, but the upper part was rebuilt in the mid-16th century. The rest of the church was rebuilt in the mid-18th century c.1742. The tower is built of sandstone, the rest is red brick with stone dressings. Designed in a classical style, it has an apse with a Venetian window, large round headed windows in the nave, an elliptical Tuscan porch, and a partly balustraded parapet. The south side is more elaborate than the north. Inside an Ionic arcade divides the apse from the rest of the building, and it has a gallery. The fittings are also said to be largely 18th century.
- 9.248 The church has considerable architectural, aesthetic and historical as a country church rebuilt in the Georgian style in the mid-18th century, a period when relatively few churches were rebuilt. The surviving fittings add to this heritage value.
- 9.249 The church is set in a large open church yard with some open views across countryside of the north, and there are two 18th or early 19th century houses nearby including the Grade II listed Woodberry House and the former vicarage, but otherwise the church is largely surrounded by a modern housing estate, and access to the churchyard is also through this estate. Overall, the setting makes a neutral contribution to the heritage value of the church.
- 9.250 The heritage value of the Church of St Mark and St Luke, Shareshill is **High**.

Map Group L: Chillington

- 9.251 Chillington is a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) designed by Lancelot "Capability" Brown c.1760. It is also a conservation area. It is associated with the house at Chillington Hall, which was rebuilt in the mid-18th century by the Giffard family.
- 9.252 The majority of the park is outside of the 3km study area, but the Upper Avenue, lies within the study area. At the nearest point it is approximately 1.7km from the Proposed Development, but from there it runs westwards away from the Site. The Upper Avenue was made in 1727 for Peter Giffard and runs between Coven Road and Port Lane, where it enters the park proper through a set of 18th century gates that are outside of the study area.

- 9.253 The Upper Avenue, which now appears to be no more than a track, is heavily wooded on both sides. The wider setting of the drive is rural, and it is entered from country lanes. This setting makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of the Upper Avenue as part of the park as a whole. Once in the Upper Avenue, however, the sensation is likely to be enclosure within woodland so that the wider setting has no effect on the heritage value of the Upper Avenue and this part of the park more generally. There are no views from within the drive towards the Proposed Development because of this vegetation.
- 9.254 The Upper Avenue at Chillington RPG has **Medium** heritage value because, despite its high grade, it forms an outlying part of the later, main Capability Brown landscape.

Map Group M: Canal between Gailey Wharf and Gravelly Way Bridge

M.1 Round House (Grade II)

- 9.255 The Round House was Grade II listed in 1985. It is located at the northern boundary of the Site, approximately 45m from the Site boundary at the nearest point.
- 9.256 The Round House was the former lock-keeper's cottage at Gailey Wharf. It is listed as late 18th century, but in the South Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area Appraisal, it is said to date to 1804-5. It is two stories, and is built of brick in the form of a tower with a castellated parapet and a chimney in the shape of a turret. It is a picturesque example of the fanciful cottages popular in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. It forms a group with other buildings at Gailey Wharf.
- 9.257 The Round House has architectural value as an attractive example of a picturesque cottage of the late 18th or early 19th century, and it also has historical value as a part of the larger group of contemporary buildings at Gailey Wharf.
- 9.258 The setting of the Round House is primarily formed by the canal, the wharf area, and the other buildings around the wharf, which include the Grade II listed Wharf Cottage. This setting makes a positive contribution to the value of the receptor as the historic context and legibility of the former use of the area is preserved. The quality of the setting of the Round House has been substantially diminished by the modernisation of the A5, and the increased use by motor vehicles. The noise and movement generated by the traffic makes a somewhat negative contribution to the experience of the heritage receptor. That said, the view from the stretch of the canal north of the A5 of the group of heritage receptors at Gailey is particularly attractive, despite the later influences.
- 9.259 The Round House has **Medium** heritage value.

M.2 Wharf Cottage (Grade II)

- 9.260 Wharf Cottage was Grade II listed in 1985. It is located at the northern boundary of the Site, approximately 45m from the Site boundary at the nearest point.
- 9.261 Wharf Cottage was built c.1800. It is a small brick cottage of two stories and has Gothic style iron casement windows. The Cottage forms part of the larger group of contemporary buildings at Gailey Wharf.
- 9.262 Wharf Cottage has architectural value as an attractive and picturesque example of a late 18th or early 19th century cottage. It also has historical value as a part of the larger group of contemporary buildings at Gailey Wharf.
- 9.263 The setting of the Wharf Cottage is primarily formed by the canal, the wharf area, and the other buildings around the wharf, which include the Grade II listed Wharf Cottage. This setting makes a positive contribution to the value of the receptor as the historic context and legibility of the former use of the area is preserved. The quality of the setting of the Wharf Cottage has been substantially diminished by the modernisation of the A5, and the increased use by motor vehicles. The noise and movement generated by the traffic makes a somewhat negative contribution to the experience of the heritage receptor. That said, the view from the stretch of the canal north of the A5 of the group of heritage receptors at Gailey is particularly attractive, despite the later influences.

- 9.264 Wharf Cottage has **Medium** heritage value.

M.3 Gailey Lock (Number 32) and Gailey Bridge (Number 79)

- 9.265 Gailey Lock (Number 32) and Gailey Bridge (Number 79) are located approximately 50m from the Proposed Development on both east and west, and about 200m to the north of the Site. The bridge and lock form a joint entry in the Staffordshire HER (MST1232), although the lock is identified incorrectly as Number 12 in that entry. Both are locally listed at Grade A.
- 9.266 Gailey Lock (Number 32) and Gailey Bridge (Number 79) were originally built as a single unit, probably c.1772 when the canal was built. The bridge now carries the A5 and has been widened and altered to accommodate it. The bridge was rebuilt c.1952 as part of the widening of the A5 and is now red brick with a straight parapet and large, square pillars at each end. It has two openings, one over the lock, and the other over the towpath. The lock peninsula extends into the bridge. The bridge is, therefore, partly historic and partly modern.
- 9.267 The bridge and the lock have historical value as features that were built as part of the development of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal in the 1770s.
- 9.268 The bridge and the lock form a group with the other buildings at Gailey Wharf, including the listed cottages. This group of buildings, and the canal, form their setting. The setting makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of this group. The historic setting has experienced change as a result of increased use of the A5, and the associated noise which detracts from the experience of the setting.
- 9.269 The heritage value of the Gailey Lock (Number 32) and Gailey Bridge (Number 79) is **Low**.

M.4 Gailey Wharf

- 9.270 Gailey Wharf is locally listed at Grade A and is included in the Staffordshire HER (MST1237). It is located about 50m from the Proposed Development on both east and west, and about 200m to the north of the Site.
- 9.271 Gailey Wharf is located above Gailey Lock, and forms a group with the rest of the historic buildings and structures in this area. Built as part of the construction of the canal in the 1770s, it includes a basin and a wharf with a restored 18th century crane.
- 9.272 The wharf and the crane have historical and archaeological value as part of the development of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal in the 1770s and as surviving industrial structures from the later 18th century.
- 9.273 The wharf forms a group with the other buildings at Gailey Wharf, including the listed cottages. This group of buildings, and the canal, form the wharf's setting. The setting makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of this group. The historic setting has experienced change as a result of increased use of the A5, and the associated noise which detracts from the experience of the setting.
- 9.274 The heritage value of Gailey Wharf is **Low**.

Map Group N: Aspley Farmhouse

- 9.275 Aspley Farmhouse was listed at Grade II in 1985. It is located approximately 950m of the south of the Site boundary.
- 9.276 Aspley Farmhouse is said to be a sixteenth-century timber framed manor house that was partially rebuilt in brick in the 18th and 19th centuries. Of two stories, it has an H plan with cross-wings and retains evidence for the former central hall, now floored. It has a late 17th century stair and some surviving panelling.
- 9.277 The house faces primarily east-west and not north towards the Proposed Development, from which it is separated by the woodland near Saredon Brook and the industrial estate to the north of that.

- 9.278 Aspley Farmhouse has architectural value as a well preserved and attractive sixteenth-century and later former manor house with some good internal features. It also has historical value as a former manor house.
- 9.279 The setting of the house is rural and includes the surrounding fields and to the east by a large complex of its former farm buildings, which have been converted to residential use. The setting makes a positive contribution to its heritage value. The Site does not form part of the setting of Aspley Farmhouse as a result of the distance and interposing landscape features.
- 9.280 The heritage value of Aspley Farmhouse is **Medium**.

Map Group O: Canal between Long Moll's Bridge and Deepmore Bridge

O.1 Long Moll's Bridge

- 9.281 Long Moll's Bridge (Bridge 76) spans the canal adjacent to the southern boundary of the Proposed Development. It carries Deepmore Lane leading from Straight Mile to the sewage works. It is locally listed at Grade A and is identified in the Staffordshire HER (MST1252).
- 9.282 The bridge was probably built in the late 18th century as part of the original construction of the canal, but the upper part appears to have been rebuilt at a later date. The lower part is red brick and is probably original although it appears to have been whitewashed at some point, while the upper part is a different, more recent red brick, probably 20th century. It has a similar slightly triangular shape to Deepmore Bridge, but the central section rises more than at Deepmore. There is an additional stone arch above the brick arch, stone relieving slabs at the sides, and a coursed parapet. The name plates have been reset on the modern work.
- 9.283 Long Moll's Bridge (Bridge 76) has architectural and historical value as one of the original bridges built as part of the construction of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal. Although partially rebuilt, its similarity to other bridges on this part of the canal adds to this heritage value.
- 9.284 The setting of the bridge is formed by the canal, by the landscape which is generally rural in the immediate vicinity of the bridge, and by the sewage works. To the west of the bridge there is a belt of vegetation along the north side of the canal towards the Site. The setting makes a positive contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.285 The heritage value of the Long Moll's Bridge (Bridge 76) is **Low**.

O.2 Deepmore Bridge

- 9.286 Deepmore Bridge (Bridge 75) spans the canal about 600m to the south of Site. It carries a track running between Deepmore Farm and Hatherton Lane. It is locally listed at Grade A and is identified in the Staffordshire HER (MST2772).
- 9.287 The bridge was probably built in the late 18th century as part of the original construction of the canal. Of a similar form to the other bridges on this part of the canal, it is built of red brick weathered to grey and has stone capping on the pilasters at the ends. It is a single span wide enough to accommodate the towing path. It has a gently triangular shape to the parapet and a curved arch over the canal and does not appear to have been altered. It retains its number plates.
- 9.288 Deepmore Bridge (Bridge 75) has architectural and historical value as one of the original bridges built as part of the construction of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal. Its similarity to other bridges on this part of the canal adds to this heritage value.
- 9.289 The setting of the bridge is formed by the canal and the wider rural landscape, with a belt of vegetation along the north side of the canal towards the Site. The setting makes a positive contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.290 The heritage value of the Deepmore Bridge (Bridge 75) is **Low**.

Map Group P: Calf Heath Bridge

- 9.291 Calf Heath Bridge (Bridge 77) spans the canal adjacent to the southern boundary of the Site. It carries Station/Vicarage Road. It is locally listed at Grade A and is identified in the Staffordshire HER (MST1253). The bridge was built in the late 18th century as part of the original construction of the canal it has, however, been substantially rebuilt in recent years in a mix of red, white and black bricks to the north elevation where there is a replacement nameplate. On the south elevation, the material of the original bridge is evident. As a result of the later alteration, its form is different to the older bridges, with a straight parapet and a string course above the canal arch.
- 9.292 Calf Heath Bridge (Bridge 77) has some limited historical value as a replacement for the original bridges built as part of the construction of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal.
- 9.293 Beyond the green corridor of the canal, the setting of the Calf Heath Bridge is formed primarily by the chemical works and the industrial estate to its west, although the land to the east is more open and rural in character. The setting makes a neutral contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.294 The heritage value of the Calf Heath Bridge (Bridge 77) is **Low**.

Map Group Q: Canal between Gailey Wharf and the M6 Motorway

Q.3 Brick Kiln Lock (Number 33)

- 9.295 Brick Kiln Lock (Number 33) was probably built in the late 18th century as part of the construction of the canal. It has a single up gate and a double down gate. It is locally listed at Grade A and is included in the Staffordshire HER (MST1238). It is located about 360m north of the Site boundary.
- 9.296 The lock has historical value as part of the development of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal in the 1770s.
- 9.297 The lock's setting is formed by the canal and the open rural landscape around it; however, the M6 motorway and the A roads are nearby and also form a part of the setting. The setting makes a positive contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.298 The heritage value of the Brick Kiln Lock (Number 33) is **Low**.

Q.4 Boggs Lock (Number 34)

- 9.299 Boggs Lock (Number 34) was probably built c.1772 as part of the construction of the canal. It has a single up gate and a double down gate, and a peninsula but no bridge. The stone steps have been rebuilt in concrete. It is locally listed at Grade A and is included in the Staffordshire HER (MST1239). It is located about 575m north of the Site boundary.
- 9.300 The lock has historical value as part of the development of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal in the 1770s.
- 9.301 The lock's setting is formed by the canal and the open rural landscape around it; however, the M6 motorway is just over 300m away, and also form a prominent part of the lock's setting. The setting makes a positive to neutral contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.302 The heritage value of the Boggs Lock (Number 33) is **Low**.

Q.5 Canal Feeder

- 9.303 The canal feeder is a probably early to mid-19th century channel that conveyed water from the Upper and Lower Gailey reservoirs to the canal. It is located just to the north-east of Boggs Lock and is about 500m from the Site at the nearest point. It is likely that it was constructed about the same time that the reservoirs were built c.1840. It has been severed by the construction of the motorway across it. It is locally listed at Grade B and is included in the Staffordshire HER (MST1238).

- 9.304 The canal feeder has some limited historical value as part of the operational structure of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal from the mid-19th century.
- 9.305 The setting of the feeder is dominated by the motorway, although it does run through open fields and has some relationship to the canal itself. This setting makes a neutral contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.306 The heritage value of the canal feeder is **Low**.

New Built Heritage Receptors

- 9.307 No new sensitive receptors for consideration within Cultural Heritage will be introduced to the Site by the Proposed Development as any newly constructed buildings or features would not be considered part of the historic environment.

Potential Effects

- 9.308 This section assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on built heritage receptors identified in the study area. A consideration of the potential effects on below ground archaeology within the Site boundary is not included in this assessment. Below ground archaeology is considered separately in Chapter 8: Archaeology (Below Ground Heritage).
- 9.309 In assessing the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development, regard has been had to the Parameters Plans prepared by Chetwoods Architects, and other submission documents including the Design and Access Statement, and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment by FPCR (Chapter 12 of this ES).
- 9.310 Some heritage receptors within the study area will experience a negligible or nil change to their setting or heritage value, both in the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. There will be no direct effects. Notwithstanding this, these heritage receptors are described in the Heritage Baseline study, which has been used to inform the assessment below.

Demolition and Construction

- 9.311 Direct and/or indirect effects to receptors may arise from the Proposed Development in the demolition and construction phase of the Proposed Development. Potential effects are likely to relate to construction hoarding, materials and machinery, and include potential increases in activity affecting the local road network, and the potential impacts of noise, dust and vibration associated with demolition and Site preparation works required to facilitate the construction of new buildings.
- 9.312 An Outline Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (ODCEMP) has been produced for the Proposed Development and is included within Technical Appendix 2.3 of this ES. The ODCEMP has been used as to establish the minimum environmental controls that will be put in place during demolition and construction for the purposes of assessment. The ODCEMP would form the basis for detailed Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plans (DCEMP) to be implemented during each phase of demolition and construction works.
- 9.313 Demolition and construction effects are treated as less significant because they are temporary in nature and there will be no physical change to the majority of heritage receptors and their historic fabric due to lateral effects of the demolition and construction process. These effects are the necessary first steps, however, in development of this size.
- 9.314 The use of the canal CA by pleasure boaters or walkers is likely to be its highest at weekends. The construction of the Proposed Development may increase the levels of noise and alien activity in the context of the canal CA and other built heritage receptors, such as Gailey Wharf. The effects of the Proposed Development will be mitigated by construction hours being limited to weekdays, and Saturday mornings (unless by agreement with the Local Planning Authority or in emergency situations).

- 9.315 During the construction of the new road bridge at Gravelly Way, it is proposed to mitigate any effect on the locally listed 18th century footbridge to the south through careful construction. The details of methods to safeguard the historic bridge will be included in the relevant phase-specific DCEMP(s). It is anticipated that the methodology would include a survey of the current condition of the historic structure in advance of any works. In the unlikely event that the historic bridge sustains any damage as a result of the construction of the new road bridge the necessary remedial works will be undertaken.
- 9.316 There will be a high adverse effect on Heath Farm (Locally Listed Grade B) and Woodside Farm (non-designated heritage receptor) resulting from the demolition of these heritage receptors during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Given the low and very low heritage value of these receptors respectively, this will result in a negligible to minor adverse effect on the local historic environment overall. These effects at construction phase will be the same as the operational phases, and the effects are assessed below at paragraphs 9.371-9.386.
- 9.317 In accordance with paragraph 5.136 of the NPS, the demolition of these heritage receptors will not take place until the relevant development or part of development has commenced, where the loss of these heritage receptors is justified by the benefits of the Proposed Development. As secured by DCO Requirement, notification to the local authority is required prior to demolition, to state that the relevant phase of development was due to commence, and ensure that any mitigation measures are in place. To mitigate the loss of the heritage receptors, Historic Building Recording would be undertaken by qualified professionals, with a Written Scheme of Investigation agreed with the local authority.
- 9.318 The Historic Building Recording will mitigate the effects of the Proposed Development as it will ensure that a record of the earlier built agricultural history in the area is available for any future study. This is a mitigation measure which involves additional construction measures.
- 9.319 The impact of the demolition of Heath Farm and Woodside Farm, and the visual effects on the setting of built heritage receptors will begin as the Proposed Development is constructed, and will be the same as the operational phase effects. Therefore, these impacts are assessed below under operational phase effects.

Operational Development

- 9.320 The Proposed Development is expected to generate a range of potential significant direct and indirect built heritage impacts, with likely permanent effects. The impact of the likely significant effects on the heritage receptors identified in the baseline is set out below.

Heritage Receptors within the Site boundary

Map Group A: Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area

- 9.321 The Baseline section of this chapter describes the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area, and an assessment of its heritage value and setting according to best practice.
- 9.322 The Conservation Area covers a total length of approximately 74km. A 4.3km section passes through the Site, and part of this section falls within the Site boundary. In this assessment, the impact of the Proposed Development on the character of the CA sections within and nearest the Site is considered. The analysis looks, too, at the impact of the proposals on the special interest of the CA as a whole.
- 9.323 In accordance with the methodology and the values set out in Table 9.3, the heritage value of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area is **Low**.
- 9.324 The assessment of likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development on this heritage receptor makes an important distinction between the impact on the 4.3km section of the CA which runs through and near to the Site, and the CA as a whole (i.e. the 74km of canal which constitutes the CA designation). It is the impact on the heritage receptor as a

whole which is the primary consideration. The judgement is, however, informed by the effects on the stretch of canal within and nearest to the development Site, which are included here for completeness.

Direct effects

- 9.325 There will be two direct effects on the canal CA arising from the Proposed Development, i.e. works that will take place within the boundary of the CA and to features which comprise the CA.
- 9.326 The direct effects include the removal of two later and redundant pipe bridges which are associated with the SI Group that cross the canal in the central section (A.2 Gravelly Way to Calf Heath Bridge). The later SI Group access footbridge will also be removed. The removal of the later industrial infrastructure will have a beneficial effect on the canal CA by removing features which are unsympathetic to the original character and appearance of the heritage receptor. The redundant canal crossings to be removed are shown on the Development Zone Parameter Plan (Document 2.5).
- 9.327 The other direct effect on the canal CA is the creation of a new road bridge which will cross the canal at Gravelly Way. The proposed road bridge will form part of the new transport infrastructure necessary for the SFRI development (refer to Documents 2.18A-D).
- 9.328 At this part of the canal there is already later road infrastructure which provides access to the SI Group and includes a roundabout on the east side of the canal. The proposed bridge is located to the north of the existing modern road bridge which feeds into the roundabout. There is a historic bridge (Bridge No. 72) which is a non-designated heritage receptor (Map Group D). The effect of the new bridge on the setting of the historic bridge at Map Group D is described at paragraphs 9.391-9.399.
- 9.329 The proposed road bridge will introduce a new crossing over the canal and the effect of this change on the heritage value of the canal CA has been assessed.
- 9.330 The heritage value of the canal lies primarily in its character as a late 18th century canal and the historical associations with Brindley and the Industrial Revolution. Its linear quality is important to its special character as well as the original features along its length (towpaths, bridges, locks etc.). The historic character of the canal is not intact, however, where later features and influences are common along its length.
- 9.331 The proposed road bridge will not involve the physical removal of any features of the canal CA which contribute to its heritage value. At this location there is only a towpath on the west side of the canal and it will be unchanged by the Proposed Development. The height of the bridge will ensure that canal boats are able to pass underneath unobstructed. There will be no physical changes to the historic bridge to the south of the proposed new bridge.
- 9.332 Bridges are a common feature in the canal CA and the proposal will not introduce an uncharacteristic feature to the heritage receptor.
- 9.333 To manage the effect of the new bridge on the canal it has been subject of careful design to respect the historic character of the CA. It is anticipated that the road bridge will comprise exposed brick walls, internally and externally, on a concrete abutment to meet the frame (refer to Documents 2.18A-D) This design responds to the character of existing historic bridges in its materiality and accords with guidance prepared by the CRT (HS2 guidance¹²) and consultation with CRT during design development. The detailed design of the proposed canal bridge will be subject to further consultation and approval in due course.
- 9.334 There will be a change to the existing character and appearance of the canal at Gravelly Way when travelling south on the canal, and also looking north at the canal from the existing road bridge. These two aspects of the visual appreciation of the canal are considered in turn.

- 9.335 The character of the canal when travelling south to approach the new road bridge will not change because this approach already involves the later road bridge at Gravelly Way which introduces a modern element to the CA and prevents a view of the historic bridge. There will be a negligible view, if any, of the proposed road bridge from a location on the towpath south of the historic bridge. The appearance of the two modern bridges will not have a material change on the heritage value of the CA as an 18th century canal where this part of it has already been subject of later influences.
- 9.336 There is a view of the canal from the existing later road bridge from which the canal can be appreciated with its towpath and verdant edge in the context of rural surroundings. This view will be curtailed by the proposed bridge which will shorten the view and require the removal of some of the vegetation. The sense of the rural context will also be reduced. The effect of this change will cause some harm to the character and appearance of the canal CA.
- 9.337 It is important to acknowledge that this view is provided by a later bridge and it is not an original vantage point. It is an attractive view but incidental as a result of the creation of the later bridge. We assess the effect of the change to this view on the heritage value of the CA as described in the baseline and summarised at paragraph 9.328.
- 9.338 At Gravelly Way the canal meanders to the east before a gentle curve which carries the canal north again. Only a very short section of the canal can be appreciated looking north at Gravelly Way. At this location the important linear quality of the canal CA is not evident. The new bridge will not have a negative effect on the character of the CA by obstructing long views along the canal because this type of view is not possible at this location on the canal (from both the towpaths or the existing bridge crossings).
- 9.339 The best way to demonstrate this analysis is to reflect on the impact in comparable terms if a new bridge crossing was proposed on a longer stretch of the canal such as the section south of Gailey wharf before the meander, and between Gravelly Way and Calf Heath Bridge. For the avoidance of doubt, a bridge in these locations was never envisaged as part of the Proposed Development, this is simply used to draw out the meaning of the point made in paragraph 9.337. In straighter sections of the canal, of which there are many, the linear quality of the canal CA is emphasised and represented in long views of the water. If a bridge were created in such a stretch this would clearly interfere in these views and cause the loss of an aspect of its special heritage value to cause harm. Whilst some harm is identified as a result of the proposed road bridge at Gravelly Way, given the curvature of the canal at this point is clearly less harmful than a similar intervention elsewhere, and the assessment should reflect this.
- 9.340 The rural setting of the canal makes some contribution to the special interest of the CA and the introduction of the new bridge and road infrastructure will have a degree of negative impact on the character and appearance of the canal CA by changing an appreciation of the canal in this context. This view is not an important view, however: it is created by a later bridge and is not in the location of a marina or lock for example. There are no other historic features in this view and it is not unique or uncommon.
- 9.341 The potential for the new bridge to cause a sense of enclosure which is detrimental to the character of the canal CA in open land has also been considered. This would be experienced when travelling on the water or towpaths. It is concluded that the enclosing effect of the new bridge, and in association with the existing bridges, is very limited. Firstly, the vegetative boundary filters views into the countryside and enclosure already forms part of the CA from on and alongside the waterway.
- 9.342 In addition, the experience of the bridges would be for such a short period of time for a user that this would have no impact on the appreciation of the heritage value of the canal, and the curvature has already been described which compounds the limitation of the effect. In any event, Gravelly Way is not one of the more picturesque parts of the CA where its setting already includes later development. The bridges act as a marker between the industrialised

¹² Canal and River Trust (publication date unknown) HS2: Design Principles for Waterways Crossings. Available at <https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/media/library/6524.pdf> [Accessed 21 November 2017]

southern section of the canal within the Site, and the more pleasant landscape to the north which will be enhanced through the creation and maintenance of Croft Lane Community Park.

9.343 The potential for a change in the experience of the canal due to an increase in activity has also been considered. The proposed road bridge is located at a part of the canal which has already been subject of a similar type of later influence. The existing road bridge would not be able to support the type of vehicles which will be involved during the operation of the Proposed Development. The existing road bridge will be retained but closed to vehicles. This means that the new bridge will not create a 'dual carriageway' effect to intensify the experience of traffic movement in this location as a result of there being two roads in operation. There will remain only one active crossing at this location of the CA.

Indirect effects

9.344 There will be indirect effects on the heritage receptor arising from the change to its setting as a result of the Proposed Development. The proposed changes are represented in the Parameter Plans sets out a zoning strategy of areas of anticipated development. In this plan there are zones of varying height parameters to the east and west of the canal. The indirect effects which will be assessed in this section are:

- The new development in the rural setting east and west of the heritage receptor in the north part of the Site;
- The new rail infrastructure in the setting of the heritage receptor in the south part of the Site;
- The creation of country parks; and
- The effect of any changes to the setting of the heritage receptor as a result of noise, activity and visual impacts such as lighting.

9.345 The canal CA has a complex physical and spatial relationship to the Site which involves a mixed setting of both industrial development and open rural landscape. The setting of the heritage receptor has been subject of later influences such as major roads which introduce later noise and visual interference. The setting makes a positive contribution to the canal CA where the historic context is preserved, the setting is of high quality which contributes to the aesthetic appearance of the CA or historic features are present.

9.346 The part of the canal setting which is most sensitive to change is the rural countryside character which is located in the north part of the Site between Gailey wharf and Gravelly Way (section A.1). The later industrial development to the south of Gravelly Way means that setting does not contribute to the heritage value of the receptor in this location.

9.347 The experience of the canal and its setting is, importantly, kinetic. An observer would most likely be travelling by canal boat, or by foot along the canal path, with limited time at any one place. The effect of the proposals on the canal is therefore considered in the context of movement and the change to views and experience of its setting as you pass through the Site.

9.348 In the baseline, the description of the setting of the CA is provided in sections. The sections are used to structure this assessment from north to south, starting from Gailey wharf to Long Moll's Bridge.

9.349 The Proposed Development will be visible in the view of the canal from Gailey wharf, where an observer can also appreciate the two listed buildings, Round House (Grade II) and Wharf Cottage (Grade II). Here a user of the canal may pause for a longer period of time, and from this point, one will be aware of any structure east of the canal (north section of Zone A4) and perceive the scale and form of it over the planned landscaping. Any structures further south of Gailey wharf (Zone A4) may also be visible to some degree. The heritage value and relationship between the receptors at Gailey wharf as a group, however, will not change as a result of the Proposed Development which will appear as a minor feature in the backdrop to this view.

9.350 The Design and Access Statement (Document 7.5) sets out the design principles for the buildings proposed for the Proposed Development, including Zones A3 and A4. The elevations of the proposed warehousing will be designed to blend with the sky and landscape by using a natural colour palette, tonality and geometry. This is an aspect of embedded mitigation to mitigate the harmful impact of the proposals on the setting of the canal CA through high quality design and finishes to provide a pleasant aesthetic for the new structures.

9.351 Moving south along the canal from Gailey, the setting of the canal will change as a result of development in Zones A3 and A4. In order to preserve the landscape character of the setting of the CA and minimise the impact of the proposals, Zones A3 and A4 have been set back from Section A.1 (Gailey Wharf to Gravelly Way) of the canal by up to 100m and a careful Green Infrastructure scheme is proposed to further mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development (Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan Document 2.7).

9.352 The Green Infrastructure that relates to the canal corridor has been designed with the visual amenity of the canal as one of the key priorities. The mounding and planting will be maintained and managed throughout the operation of the development to ensure that the effectiveness of the screening does not diminish over time.

9.353 The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (Document 2.7) presents the landscape proposals. This plan shows that there will be a combination of 3.5m-8m bunding and planting which will screen views of the proposals for users of the towpath along the western bank, and for those in canal boats. The landscape and visual specialists (FPCR) have prepared wirelines from viewpoints agreed with Montagu Evans to illustrate the effectiveness of this screening for these users. The relevant viewpoints which have informed the assessment of the canal are 2, 5, 6, 7, 25, 26, and 27 (refer to Technical Appendix Figure 12.13).

9.354 There are occasional glimpsed views across hedged fields with trees from the canal CA (waterway and towpaths) and this outlook is pleasant. It is surmised that these views comprise an element of the "areas of tranquil beauty" which are described for this part of the canal in the relevant CA appraisal (see paragraph 9.143-9.144). The Proposed Development will curtail these views and there will be screening in place of an open landscape which has a different character however well designed and maintained. Notwithstanding those mitigating features incorporated into the Proposed Development, the visual setting of the canal will be harmed at certain points in this stretch through the construction of large buildings having an industrial character. The increase in noise arising from the Proposed Development will add to this effect. A precautionary approach has been applied to this assessment, but it is noted that canals are pieces of industrial infrastructure, and run through industrial areas. Indeed, their presence often stimulated new industries, although originally their main purpose was the shipment of commodities (and coal in particular) over long distances.

9.355 Within section A.2 of the canal CA (Gailey Wharf to Gravelly Way) the setting of the canal CA will change to the west as a result of development in Zones A1, B and C. As described above, this part of the setting of the heritage receptor makes no contribution to its heritage value and is less sensitive to change because of the later industrial development.

9.356 At this location users of the canal will be able to appreciate the cranes associated with the railway terminal to the west of the canal. The lightweight nature of the cranes, and their engineering design, are not alien to a landscape that already features industrial elements and their open quality reduces their impact. As described, the setting of this part of the canal is already industrialised and the inclusion of the cranes is not inconsistent with the existing character. In accordance with recent judgements, it is noted that intervisibility between a heritage receptor and its setting does not, by default, mean that setting makes a contribution to significance. Accordingly, the introduction of the cranes does not automatically result in an effect – harmful or beneficial – on the value of the canal. In this case there is considered to be no harm arising from the cranes because of the existing context.

9.357 Within section A.3 of the canal CA between Calf Heath Bridge and Long Moll's Bridge users of the canal may be aware of development of Zone A7, although the existing vegetation and extensive landscaping at the proposed Calf Heath Community Park will screen the Proposed

- Development from view to a significant degree and to such an extent that the special interest of the canal will not be affected.
- 9.358 The effect of the proposed country parks which will be created adjacent to the canal CA has been considered because of the change to the setting of the heritage receptor they represent and comments received during consultation. Two new country parks will be created, one in the north-west corner of the Site to the west of the canal CA (Croft Lane Community Park) and another at the southern boundary of the Site north of the canal CA (Calf Heath Community Park). The Parks form part of the Green Infrastructure strategy which has been designed to preserve and enhance the special interest of the canal CA.
- 9.359 The Community Parks will change the character of the existing agricultural land but experience of travelling through open, green areas along the canal will be the same whether that is a Community Park or a field. There is no direct link between the canal and agricultural use of the land, and this particular use is not important to the heritage value of the canal CA. The Parks will preserve open landscape where they are proposed and it is not considered that a more formal landscape plan will detract from the value of the canal CA in any way.
- 9.360 The primary use of the canal is now for public leisure and it has this character as a result. The original industrial use and character is lost. It is considered that the Community Parks will complement the character of the canal as a leisure activity, even though it differs from the historical context and use. The Community Parks will enable better public access and appreciation of the canal CA which is a benefit to the heritage value of the receptor arising from the Proposed Development.
- 9.361 The experience of the heritage receptor is already affected by acoustic interference which is industrial in nature, most notably noise from the railway line, the major road infrastructure which surrounds the Site, and existing industrial and extraction within and near to the boundary. Even where a moderate adverse noise effect has been identified (see the noise and vibration assessment at Chapter 13) it the Proposed Development will not change the existing baseline conditions for heritage receptors, when the setting and experience of the receptors is already informed by this type of interference.
- 9.362 The Lighting Strategy for the Proposed Development prepared by Vanguardia (Technical Appendix 12.8) has also been considered as part of this assessment. The Lighting Strategy is subject of careful design to minimise the light spill away from target areas. The distance between the Proposed Development and section A.1 of the canal CA means that the change to the setting of the canal as a result of new lighting will be nil to negligible. Where the Proposed Development is located in the immediate context of the canal (section A.2) this area is already affected by light sources from the existing industrial infrastructure. This setting is, therefore, less sensitive to change.
- 9.363 It has been considered whether the additional traffic generated by the Proposed Development would materially undermine the ability to appreciate the special interest of the CA and conclude it will not. The setting of the CA is already characterised by a busy road network which is used by HGVs as well as cars (the M6 to the east, A5 to the north and A449 to the west) and the scale of increase in percentage terms is relatively small such that it will not affect the perception of special interest to any material degree.
- 9.364 The effect on the structures associated with the canal CA is less, bordering on negligible because they are appreciated in a more intimate, enclosed context, or, like the listed structures at Gailey wharf, are contemplated on their own account, in a setting which already includes a busy road and some modern development. Still, the scale of development perceived at this point will cause some but less than substantial harm to their settings.
- 9.365 Discussion of likely significant effect on the canal CA within the Site.
- 9.366 With the direct and indirect effects of the Proposed Development taken into account, it is concluded that the magnitude of effect on the heritage value of the stretch of the canal CA within the Site and its immediate environs will be **medium**. The reasons for this judgement on magnitude are as follows:
- The change to the setting will be clearly discernible but screening will minimise this impact and the extent to which the development is noticeable from within the CA.
 - The industrial character of the Proposed Development is dissimilar to the open land at the north part of the CA, but similar to the development in the setting of the CA south of Gravelly Way.
 - The proposed road bridge at Gravelly Way will be clearly discernible. There are other similar features within the CA, but the proposed bridge will be dissimilar in other respects.
 - The loss of the open landscape setting between Gailey wharf and Gravelly Way will remove an element of the baseline.
 - The removal of the later industrial infrastructure which crosses the canal will benefit the character and appearance of the heritage receptor.
- 9.367 Using the matrices set out in the methodology, correlating the effect of medium magnitude on a low value heritage receptor results in a **minor effect** on the canal CA arising from the Proposed Development. The next step in the methodology is to undertake a qualitative assessment of the effect, which is considered to be a **minor adverse effect**.
- 9.368 The minor adverse effect is considered to represent some but less than substantial harm to the heritage value of the canal CA. This judgement takes into account the proposed enhancement works which will directly benefit the canal and embedded mitigation such as Green Infrastructure plan and aspects of architectural design. The further opportunities for mitigation are discussed later in this chapter before the conclusion.
- 9.369 It is important to appreciate that the minor adverse effect that is identified to the canal applies to a small part of the heritage receptor, and the effect relative to the whole is a key consideration when evaluating the less than substantial harm. An assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on the heritage receptor as a whole is provided at paragraphs 9.372-9.374 below.
- 9.370 In accordance with paragraph 5.124 of the NPS, less than substantial harm to the heritage value of a designated heritage receptor should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals as outlined in the Planning Statement (Document 7.1).
- 9.371 It is concluded that these benefits are sufficient to justify the minor adverse effect on the canal CA heritage receptor. The effects are, in any event, primarily setting impacts and the only negative direct impact is the new road bridge at Gravelly Way. Overall, the ability to appreciate the heritage value of the canal CA as a late 18th century canal will be unaffected.
- Effect on the canal CA as a whole**
- 9.372 The effect of the Proposed Development on the CA as a whole, i.e. the 74km from the Stourport, Worcestershire to Great Haywood, Staffordshire is now considered. In this case, the magnitude of effect arising from the Proposed Development is considerably less for reasons we describe now.
- 9.373 The setting and character of the CA as a whole runs through a wide variety of different landscapes, including urban, rural and industrial, with its setting often changing rapidly even in very short distances. The area of the Site has already been subject of industrialising influences, and is not an intact or especially valuable part of the wider CA. The intensification of industrial use in the setting of this part of the CA will have no effect on the heritage value of the receptor as a whole.
- 9.374 On the canal CA as a whole, therefore, the magnitude of effect on the setting and heritage value of the receptor will be **negligible** and there will be a **negligible overall effect** on the heritage receptor albeit with localised effects as described above.
- Map Group B: Heath Farm**
- 9.375 A description of Heath Farm is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. As a locally listed building, Heath Farm is a heritage receptor of **Low** value.

- 9.376 Heath Farm is a 19th century farmhouse which has some local historical interest as one of the early farmhouses built after the enclosure of Calf Heath. It is of a type common in the region. It is two stories with an L-shaped plan with a three bay main front facing the garden, and a plainer elevation to the road. The setting of the farmhouse includes some outbuildings and rural landscape to the south. To the north, the setting is dominated by industrial activity, and the M6 motorway is away to the east. The local authority has identified this structure on its local list at the lower grade, grade B.
- 9.377 The Proposed Development will involve the demolition of Heath Farm, which will have an effect of **high magnitude** on this heritage receptor. Using the matrix set out in the methodology, the Proposed Development will have a **minor adverse effect** on the local historic environment.
- 9.378 As a locally listed building, Heath Farm is considered a non-designated heritage receptor as per the definition given in paragraph 5.125 of the NPS. Notwithstanding the minor adverse effect on the local historic environment overall, the total loss of the non-designated heritage receptor does cause harm to its heritage value. The consequence of this is considered here.
- 9.379 Unlike harm to a designated heritage receptor, which is of national significance and would trigger paragraphs 5.132 and 5.133 of the NPS, harm to a non-designated receptor is local in scale. In this instance, the approach to the assessment of non-designated heritage receptors is set out in paragraph 135 of the NPPF. There is no equivalent policy in the NPS regarding harm to a non-designated heritage receptor, and so the NPPF is the relevant policy guidance in this instance.
- 9.380 The weight of that harm is clearly below what would be considered for the loss of a designated receptor, and no special consideration needs to be given to the non-designated heritage receptor. It is concluded, then, that the harm to the non-designated receptor is a material effect warranting some consideration in the decision making process and this is reflected in its sensitivity and the consequent impact.
- 9.381 In the context of the Proposed Development, it is considered that the harm to Heath Farm as a planning consideration is one of limited weight only. As noted, the structure is typical of such buildings, of this date and kind, in this part of England. Many comparable examples survive. That said, through local listing the local authority has identified it as having some interest and development plan policy seeks its retention. For this reason we rate the scale of impact as **minor adverse**.
- 9.382 The minor adverse effect arising from the demolition of Heath Farm on the local historic environment will be mitigated by a scheme of Historic Building Recording, as described at paragraph 9.317.
- 9.383 This assessment is consistent with the recent Appeal decision which permitted proposals to demolish the building (APP/C3430/W/17/3169548). In the proposals, Heath Farm will be replaced with a new farmhouse. In his report, the Inspector acknowledged that the 19th century building had limited historic and architectural interest and, whilst the demolition would result in a complete loss of heritage significance, that the value of that significance was low. The Inspector found that the planning benefits, although nearly all private accruing to the owner and occupiers, were more substantial, and would be “likely to contribute to the wider economy, as would benefits arising from the construction of the dwelling itself”. The economic benefits of the Proposed Development will be considerably more substantial than the replacement of a farmhouse, which supports the assessment that the loss of Heath Farm is significantly outweighed by the benefits of the proposals.

Map Group C: Woodside Farm

- 9.384 A description of Woodside Farm is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. As a non-designated heritage receptor which is not locally listed, Woodside Farm is a heritage receptor of **Very Low** value.
- 9.385 Woodside Farm dates from the early 19th century, and is believed to have been built following the enclosure of Calf Heath. It is architecturally undistinguished and is not included on the

local list, although is of some limited local historical interest. The setting comprises a mix of rural and industrial activity.

- 9.386 The Proposed Development will involve the demolition of Woodside Farm, which will have an effect of **high magnitude** on this heritage receptor. Using the matrix set out in the methodology, the Proposed Development will have a **negligible effect** on the local historic environment, where the receptor is not identified in the local list.
- 9.387 Notwithstanding the negligible effect on the local historic environment the total loss of the non-designated heritage receptor does cause harm to its heritage value. The consequence of this is considered here.
- 9.388 The approach to the assessment of non-designated heritage receptors is set out in paragraph 135 of the NPPF. There is no equivalent policy in the NPS, and so the NPPF is the relevant policy guidance in this instance. Unlike harm to a designated heritage receptor, the harm to this non-designated receptor is local in scale. The weight of that harm is clearly below what would be considered for the loss of a designated receptor, and no special consideration needs to be given to the non-designated heritage receptor. In other words, it is concluded that the harm to the non-designated receptor is a material planning consideration, because there is nothing in statute or policy which requires that special consideration is given to non-designated heritage receptors which are effected by development proposals.
- 9.389 In the context of the Proposed Development, it is considered that the harm to Woodside Farm as a planning consideration is one of very little weight, and consequently we conclude an impact of **negligible**.
- 9.390 The minor adverse effect arising from the demolition of Heath Farm on the local historic environment will be mitigated by a scheme of Historic Building Recording, as described at paragraph 9.317.

Map Group D: Canal Bridge at Gravelly Way

- 9.391 A description of Gravelly Way Bridge is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. As a non-designated heritage receptor the canal bridge at Gravelly Way is a heritage receptor of **Very Low** value.
- 9.392 The bridge dates to the construction of the canal in the late 18th century. It is constructed of brick and the parapet has sloping sides with a flat central section. It appears as though there has been some later remedial work where there is later brickwork lining the arch. The bridge has some local heritage interest as one of the original bridges over the canal and has group value with the similar bridges along its route. It is a typical example of an 18th century canal bridge and is of limited architectural value.
- 9.393 The setting of the bridge is formed principally by the canal. The structure of the bridge is best appreciated when using the canal or the towpath, which are sunken below road level. From this position an appreciation of the wider setting is limited. The setting has been subject to later industrialising influences, which include a modern road bridge to the north, which is seen above the parapet of the historic bridge in views from the south, and the adjacent sites of industrial development (SI/Bericote and the railway line to the west). The later features of the setting make no contribution to its heritage value.
- 9.394 There will be no direct effects on the canal bridge arising from the Proposed Development and it will remain for pedestrian use but there will be change to the setting of the receptor.
- 9.395 The indirect effects arising from the Proposed Development comprise change to the setting of the bridge. To the west it is likely that the development in Zones B and C will be perceptible from the historic bridge as glimpsed views or as noise interference. The heritage receptor is already exposed to similar influences and the presence of the Proposed Development will not interfere with the important setting relationship to the canal.
- 9.396 The road infrastructure to the north and north east of the bridge will also be redeveloped to include a new roundabout at Gravelly Way and a new road bridge. There is already a roundabout to the north east of the bridge, and the change to the setting will not introduce new

features. It is unlikely that the view of the bridge from the south will change as a result of the new bridge.

- 9.397 The new road bridge will mean that the existing road bridge immediately north of the historic bridge will be closed to vehicular traffic. The traffic moving into the SFRI Site will be transferred to the new bridge. This will mean that the later interference associated with movement, visual and noise impacts of the traffic will be moved further away from the bridge, restoring an aspect of its more peaceful original setting.
- 9.398 Overall, change to the setting of the historic bridge will not affect an appreciation of its heritage value. The magnitude of effect of the Proposed Development on the canal bridge at Gravelly Way will be **low**. The likely significant effect on the value of the heritage receptor will therefore be **negligible**.

Map Group E: Straight Mile Farm

- 9.399 A description of Straight Mile Farm is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. As a non-designated heritage receptor, Straight Mile Farm is a heritage receptor of **Very Low** value.
- 9.400 Straight Mile Farm is a smallholding which was established in the 19th century, and parts of the original structures are likely to survive. It is of some historical interest as one of the early farms in the area following enclosure. The extant farm house has an L-plan with a collection of outbuildings. It is architecturally undistinguished and is not included on the local list. The setting is primarily rural, and the farm is located at a T-junction of minor road routes.
- 9.401 There will be no direct effects on the non-designated heritage receptor as a result of the Proposed Development. There will be no physical alterations to the buildings and their use will not change.
- 9.402 The Proposed Development will take place in the setting of the non-designated heritage receptor to the north and west. To the north, the development of Zone A7 will introduce new built form to the wider landscape setting of the receptor, causing a change to its open rural character. There is likely to be some intervisibility between the Proposed Development and Straight Mile Farm. Despite the reduction of open agricultural land, a band of landscape which separates the farm from the development will be retained, which will preserve a sense of the existing context in the main public views of the building from the road, and the use of bunding and planting will screen the appearance of the development. The setting to the south and east of the receptor will not change.
- 9.403 The Site boundary includes the land to the north-west and south-west of Straight Mile Farm which will become the Calf Heath Community Park. The Proposed Development of these areas will preserve the existing green, landscape character, and provide new areas of public open space.
- 9.404 The reduction in the agricultural land will have an effect of **negligible to low magnitude**. The Proposed Development will have a **no effect** on the value of this non-designated heritage receptor.

Historic Landscape Character and Hedgerows

- 9.405 A description of the historic landscape character, including hedgerows, is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of the character of the historic landscape and the extent to which it survives. The historic landscape and hedgerows are considered to be heritage receptors of **Very Low** value.
- 9.406 The historic landscape character within the Site boundary represents late 18th and 19th century Parliamentary-period enclosure. The pattern of the enclosure boundaries, indicated by hedgerows, has been eroded within the Site by later industrial workings, notably quarrying, which has reduced the agricultural characteristics of the historic landscape. The presence of the motorway and the chemical works and industrial estate have a diminished any heritage value of the historic rural character of the landscape across the Site.

- 9.407 Given the extent of alteration and strong urbanising influences, the effect arising from the Proposed Development on the historic landscape character will be of a **neutral to low magnitude**. The landscape elements considered are also partly cut off from the larger backdrop of historic landscape by existing road and rail infrastructure, which survives more widely across the area. Using the matrices, the likely effect on historic landscape character and hedgerows will be **negligible**.

Heritage receptors outside the Site boundary

Map Group F: Six Roman Period Scheduled Ancient Monuments

- 9.408 A description of the six Roman Period SAMs at Water Eaton is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. These SAMs are of **High** value.
- 9.409 The SAMs are Roman campus clustered around Stretton Mill and Water Eaton to the north of Watling Street, which was an important Roman road. As well as the camps, there is also a small defended town (Pennocrucium) and villa near Engleton Hall. The impact of the Proposed Development on the Monuments themselves is set out in Chapter 8 Archaeology (Below Ground Heritage), and only the setting is considered here. Their setting comprises surrounding fields, the former Roman road (A5), and the scattered settlement at Stretton Mill and Water Eaton.
- 9.410 There is no intervisibility or historical association between the Site and the SAMs at Water Eaton, and therefore there will be a neutral magnitude effect on the setting or heritage value of these heritage receptors arising from the Proposed Development. The magnitude of effect is therefore **neutral**.
- 9.411 The Proposed Development will therefore have **no effect** on the heritage value of the six Roman period SAMs.

Map Group G: Rodbaston Old Hall and Moated Site and Fishpond

- 9.412 A description of Rodbaston Old Hall and moated site and fishpond is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. This SAM is a heritage receptor of **High** value.
- 9.413 The SAM at Rodbaston Old Hall comprises the remains of a medieval manorial complex. The majority of the monument is below ground, with some upstanding earthwork remains. The setting consists of agricultural land with some small scattered settlements.
- 9.414 There is no intervisibility or historical association between the Site and Rodbaston Old Hall and moated site and fishpond, and it is therefore unlikely that there will be any effect on the setting or heritage value of this heritage receptor arising from the Proposed Development. The magnitude of effect is therefore **neutral**.
- 9.415 The Proposed Development will therefore have **no effect** on the heritage value of this heritage receptor.

Map Group H: Brewood

- 9.416 A description of the heritage receptors at Brewood is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. These are Church of St Mary and St Chad (Grade I) and Westgate, forecourt wall and gate (Grade II*). The baseline description includes an assessment of their heritage value and setting. As a Grade I and II* listed buildings, both are heritage receptors of **High** value. Given their similar location, heritage value, and relationship to the Site, the impact of the operation of the Proposed Development on these receptors is assessed jointly.
- 9.417 The Church is located in the village of Brewood approximately 3km west of the Site. The Church stands on an area of raised ground and is an important local landmark, and there are some longer views which contribute to its landmark status on the approach into the village. The Site cannot be seen from the Church, although the spire of the Church can be seen in glimpsed views from the Site. This view does not make a positive contribution to the heritage

value of the Church however. There is no physical or historical association between the Site and Church, and the Site makes no contribution to its setting which is tightly defined by the churchyard and village.

- 9.418 Westgate is an early 18th century house located opposite Church of St Mary and St Chad. It is of heritage interest as an example of the early development of Brewood, and a house of relatively high status with well-preserved interior. The setting is tightly defined by Dean Street and the village settlement, including Church of St Mary and St Chad and a number of listed buildings.
- 9.419 The considerable distance between the heritage receptors at Brewood and the Site, and the very limited intervisibility between them means that it is unlikely that there will be any effect on the setting or heritage value of these receptors as a result of the Proposed Development. The magnitude of effect is therefore **neutral**.
- 9.420 The Proposed Development will therefore have **no effect** on the heritage receptor.

Map Group I: Somerford Hall

- 9.421 A description of Somerford Hall is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. Somerford Hall is a heritage receptor of **High** value.
- 9.422 Somerford Hall is an 18th century Palladian country house. The house is set within gardens and woodland which were laid out by the Hon. Edward Monkton with the aid of Humphrey Repton. The setting of the house is defined by the immediate landscaped setting which makes a positive contribution to its significance, as well as the Grade II listed ancillary structures within the surrounding landscape. Significance is also derived from the interior, where there are several well-preserved rooms containing features of architectural and historic interest.
- 9.423 There is no intervisibility or historical association between the Site and Somerford Hall, and it is therefore unlikely that there will be any effect on the setting of this heritage receptor, or its heritage value, arising from the Proposed Development. The interposing countryside includes the dense woodland at Marsh Wood and Somerford Wood which would restrict and long views. The magnitude of effect is therefore **neutral**.
- 9.424 The Proposed Development will therefore have **no effect** on the significance of heritage receptor.

Map Group J: Stretton

- 9.425 A description of the heritage receptors at Stretton is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. These are Stretton Hall with combined service and stable wing (Grade II*) and the Church of St John, Stretton (Grade II*). The baseline description includes an assessment of their heritage value and setting. Both buildings are heritage receptors of **High** value. Given their similar location, heritage value, and relationship to the Site, the impact of the operation of the Proposed Development on these receptors is assessed jointly.
- 9.426 Stretton Hall is of high architectural and historic interest as a well preserved example of a late 18th century country house with 19th century alterations. The house is in a provincial baroque style set in formal gardens which contain some Grade II listed buildings, and the wider setting consists of open countryside. The village of Stretton is located to the south.
- 9.427 Adjacent to the Stretton Hall is the Church of St John, which was rebuilt in the 19th century in a medieval style, although original fabric from the earliest 12th century building also survives. The setting includes a small churchyard enclosed by trees, and the grounds of Stretton Hall beyond.
- 9.428 There is no intervisibility or historical association between the Site and the heritage receptors at Stretton, and it is therefore unlikely that there will be any effect on the setting or heritage value of these receptors arising from the Proposed Development. The magnitude of effect is therefore **neutral**.

- 9.429 The Proposed Development will therefore have **no effect** on the heritage value of the heritage receptors at Stretton.

Map Group K: Church of St Mark and St Luke Shareshill

- 9.430 A description of the Church of St Mark and St Luke Shareshill is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. As a Grade II* listed building, this is a heritage receptor of **High** value.
- 9.431 There was originally a church at Shareshill as early as 1213, although the current building consists of a mid-18th century building, with some earlier 14th and 16th century fabric still present. The church has considerable heritage interest as a country church rebuilt in the Georgian style in the mid-18th century, a period when relatively few churches were rebuilt. The setting of the church is a mix of open countryside to the north, and later housing development.
- 9.432 There is no intervisibility or historical association between the Site and Church of St Mark and St Luke, and it is therefore unlikely that there will be any effect on the setting of the receptor arising from the Proposed Development. The magnitude of effect is therefore **neutral**.
- 9.433 The Proposed Development will therefore have **no effect** on the value of heritage receptor.

Map Group L: Chillington

- 9.434 A description of the Chillington RPG is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. As a Grade II* RPG, this is a heritage receptor of **Medium** value.
- 9.435 Only the Upper Avenue of Chillington is within the study area. The Upper Avenue was created in 1727 and now appears to be no more than a track, is heavily wooded on both sides. The wider setting of the drive is rural, and it is entered from country lanes.
- 9.436 There is no intervisibility or historical association between the Site and Church of St Mark and St Luke, and it is therefore unlikely that there will be any effect on the setting of the receptor arising from the Proposed Development. The magnitude of effect is therefore **neutral**.
- 9.437 The Proposed Development will therefore have **no effect** on the value of this heritage receptor.

Map Group M: Canal between Gailey Wharf and Gravelly Way Bridge

M.1 Round House

- 9.438 A description of Round House is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. This is a heritage receptor of **Medium** value.
- 9.439 The Round House was the former lock keepers cottage at Gailey Wharf which dates from the late 18th to early 19th century. It has architectural interest as a picturesque example of a fanciful two storey cottage with castellated parapet and turret-style chimney. It has historical value as part of the larger group at Gailey Wharf with Wharf Cottage. The setting of the Round House is tightly defined by the canal and wharf area, and the A5 to the north. The experience of the receptor is influenced by later development, including buildings, and traffic noise and movement. The later features slightly detract from the setting of the receptor.
- 9.440 The Site forms part of the wider setting of the house, and there may be some views of the Proposed Development from the house (in particular the anticipated development in Zones A3 and A4, and the proposed roundabout to the east). The landscape buffer zone to the south-east and south-west of the house on either side of the canal will limit the extent of intervisibility and experience of the Proposed Development from the listed building, however, and the proposed landscaping to the west of Croft Lane will improve the character of the rural setting of the house to the south (this will become Croft Lane Community Park). The magnitude of the effect will be **low** because it will not affect an appreciation of the relationship

between the Round House and the canal, and the setting has already been subject of later influences.

- 9.441 The Proposed Development will introduce some new infrastructure which will be perceived in the setting of the listed building. It is anticipated that there will also be an increase in traffic movement at this point on the A5 and associated noise levels (see noise assessment in Chapter 13). The experience of the Round House is already, however, influenced by road noise and modern industrial sounds, and the increase in these sounds will not be such that it will inhibit an appreciation of the building's special value. The primary, meaningful relationship between the listed building and the canal setting, where the latter makes a positive contribution to the heritage value of the listed building, will not change as a result of the Proposed Development, however. Using the matrix, and in light of the existing conditions and landscape proposals to screen the development in Zones A3 and A4, the Proposed Development will have a **negligible effect** on this heritage receptor.

M.2 Wharf Cottage

- 9.442 A description of Wharf Cottage is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. This is a heritage receptor of **Medium** value.
- 9.443 The Wharf Cottage dates to c.1800. It is a small brick building with Gothic style iron casement windows. It has architectural interest as an example of a late 18th to early 19th century cottage, and historical value as a group with the Round House. The setting of Wharf Cottage is tightly defined by the canal and wharf area, and the A5 to the north. The experience of the receptor is influenced by later development, including buildings, and traffic noise and movement. The later features detract slightly from the setting of the receptor.
- 9.444 The Proposed Development forms part of the wider setting of the cottage, and there may be some views of the Proposed Development from the house (in particular the anticipated development in Zones A3 and A4, and the proposed roundabout to the east). The landscape buffer zone to the south-east and south-west of the cottage on either side of the canal will limit the extent of intervisibility and experience of the Proposed Development from the listed building, however, and the proposed landscaping to the west of Croft Lane will improve the character of the rural setting of the house (Croft Lane Community Park). The magnitude of the effect will be **low** because it will not affect an appreciation of the relationship between the Wharf Cottage and the canal, and the setting has already been subject of later influences.
- 9.445 The Proposed Development will introduce some new infrastructure to the setting of the listed building, but it has already been exposed to modernising influences. It is anticipated that there will be an increase in traffic movement at this point on the A5 and associated noise levels (see noise assessment in Chapter 13). Similarly to the Round House, the experience of the Wharf Cottage is already influenced by road noise and modern industrial sounds, and the increase in these sounds will not be such that it will inhibit an appreciation of the building's special value. The primary relationship between the listed building and the canal setting will be unchanged. Using the matrix, and in light of the existing conditions and landscape proposals to screen the development in Zones A3 and A4, the Proposed Development will have a **negligible effect** on the value of this heritage receptor.

M.3 Gailey Lock (Number 32) and Gailey Bridge (Number 79)

- 9.446 A description of Gailey Lock and Gailey Bridge is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of the heritage value and setting of these receptors. These are heritage receptors of **Low** value.
- 9.447 The lock and bridge at Gailey Wharf were built as a single unit c.1772 when the canal was first constructed. The bridge was altered c.1952 to carry the A5, but retains local historical interest with the lock as features which were built as part of the development of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal in the 1770s. The setting of the lock and bridge is tightly defined by Gailey Wharf, including the canal and buildings associated with it.

- 9.448 The Proposed Development forms part of the wider setting of Gailey Wharf, but does not contribute to the setting and heritage value of the locally listed buildings, which is tightly defined by the canal and associated infrastructure. There may be some intervisibility with the Proposed Development, but the proposed landscape buffer will screen the development. The magnitude of the Proposed Development is therefore likely to be **negligible**. The significance of the effect will, therefore, also be **negligible**.

M.4 Gailey Wharf

- 9.449 A description of Gailey Wharf is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. Gailey Wharf is a heritage receptor of **Low** value.
- 9.450 Gailey Wharf consists of a basin and wharf with a restored 18th century crane. The wharf and the crane have historical and archaeological interest as part of the development of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal in the 1770s and as surviving industrial structures from the later 18th century. The setting is tightly defined by Gailey Wharf, including the canal and historic buildings associated with it.
- 9.451 The Proposed Development forms part of the wider setting of Gailey Wharf, but does not contribute to the setting and heritage value of the locally listed building, which is tightly defined by the canal and associated infrastructure. There may be some intervisibility with the Proposed Development, but the proposed landscape buffer will screen the development. The impact of the Proposed Development is therefore likely to be **negligible**. The significance of the effect will, therefore, also be **negligible**.

Map Group N: Aspley Farmhouse

- 9.452 A description of Aspley Farmhouse is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. Aspley Farmhouse is a heritage receptor of **Medium** value.
- 9.453 Aspley Farmhouse was originally constructed in the 16th century as a timber framed manor house. It was partially rebuilt and altered in the 18th and 19th centuries, but retains the early formal central hall, albeit now subdivided. The house faces primarily east-west away from the Site, from which it is separated by the woodland near Saredon Brook and the industrial estate to the north of that. The primary setting is its gardens and surrounding rural landscape.
- 9.454 There is no intervisibility or historical association between the Site and Aspley Farmhouse, and it is therefore unlikely that there will be any effect on the setting or heritage value of the receptor arising from the Proposed Development. The magnitude of effect is therefore **neutral**.
- 9.455 The Proposed Development will therefore have **no effect** on the heritage value of this heritage receptor.

Map Group O: Canal between Long Moll's Bridge and Deepmore Bridge

O.1 Long Moll's Bridge

- 9.456 A description of Long Molls Bridge is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. As a locally listed building, Long Molls Bridge is a heritage receptor of **Low** value.
- 9.457 Long Molls Bridge was originally built in the late 18th century when the canal was constructed, but has been subject of later alteration which has changed its form compared to other historic bridges along the canal. It has some historic and architectural value as one of the original canal bridges, however. The primary setting of the locally listed bridge is the canal, and the wider setting comprises open rural landscape. To the north west of the bridge, a belt of mature trees restricts views of the Site. There are areas of industrial development to the south and east, which has altered the historic character of the landscape.

9.458 The Site is located directly to the north of Long Molls Bridge, where a community park is proposed to the south of Straight Mile. The community park will provide an effective landscape buffer to the Proposed Development in Zone A7 to the north. The proposed community park will provide an improvement to the setting and enjoyment of this canal bridge. The magnitude of effect of the Proposed Development will be **low**. Using the matrix this results in a **negligible** effect given the very low value of the receptor which has already been subject of industrial influences in its wider setting.

O.2 Deepmore Bridge

9.459 A description of Deepmore Bridge is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. Deepmore Bridge is a heritage receptor of **Low** value.

9.460 Deepmore Bridge was originally constructed when the canal was developed in the late 18th century and its original form appears to be intact. The bridge has heritage value as one of the original bridges on the canal, and group value with other similar bridges. The setting is comprised primarily of the canal and the wider rural landscape.

9.461 The Site is located approximately 632m north of Deepmore Bridge at the nearest point and does not make a contribution to the setting or heritage value of the locally listed bridge, where this is focussed on the canal and immediate landscape. The road over the bridge is oriented to north in the direction of the Proposed Development, and glimpsed views of development in Zones A6 and A7 at the southern boundary of the Site may be possible. It is worth considering, however, the considerable distance and interposing landscape features that will restrict the perception of the Proposed Development. In any event, the Four Ashes Industrial Estate has already subjected this part of the setting of the bridge to industrialising influences, and the proposed Straight Mile community park will also act as an effective buffer.

9.462 The Proposed Development will have an effect of **negligible** magnitude on the heritage value of Deepmore Bridge. The effect is therefore **negligible**.

Map Group P: Calf Heath Bridge

9.463 A description of Calf Heath Bridge is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. This includes an assessment of its heritage value and setting. Calf Heath Bridge is a heritage receptor of **Low** value, and has been substantively altered.

9.464 The bridge at Calf Heath was originally constructed when the canal was developed in the late 18th century, although it has been substantially rebuilt in the 21st century. Its form is now different to the older bridges, which has reduced its heritage interest. The setting of the Calf Heath Bridge is formed primarily by the chemical works and the industrial estate to its west, although the land to the east is more open and rural in character.

9.465 The Site is located to the north of Calf Heath Bridge. The north-west part of the Site is separated from the bridge by the existing Four Ashes Industrial Estate, and the Proposed Development here (the new railway line and the anticipated development in Zone A1) are only likely to be very partially visible. The nearest part of the Proposed Development to the bridge will be the anticipated development in Zone A2 and the landscaping of Calf Heath Community Park. The distance and landscape screening between the bridge and these parts of the Site will reduce its impact on the heritage receptor. The setting to the south will be unchanged. The Proposed Development will therefore have a **negligible** magnitude of effect on the heritage receptor, and the significance of the effect is also **negligible**.

Map Group Q: Canal between Gailey Wharf and the M6 Motorway

9.466 A description of the heritage receptors which comprise Map Group P is provided in the Baseline section of this chapter. There are Brick Kiln Lock, Boggs Lock, and the Canal Feeder. The Baseline assessment includes an assessment of the locally listed structures' heritage value and setting. The two locks are structures of **Low** value, and the canal feeder has **Very Low** value. Given their similar location, heritage value, and relationship to the Site, the impact of the operation of the Proposed Development on these receptors is assessed jointly.

9.467 The locally listed structures were constructed as part of the canal's infrastructure in the late 18th and 19th century. The historical interest of the structures is derived from their association with the canal. The setting is formed of the canal primarily, and open rural landscape, but the M6 forms a prominent part of the setting which has changed its historic character.

9.468 The Site is located to the south of the heritage receptors in Group P, where it forms part of their wider setting. The Site does not, however, contribute to their setting or heritage value which is tightly defined by the canal. It is unlikely that the Proposed Development will be visible from the locally listed locks and canal feeder given the distance from the Site, and the containment within a 'corridor' of trees and shrubs along the canal. The only likely significant effects possible will be limited glimpse views of the roofline of development in Zone A4, predominantly during winter months when there is less foliage. The magnitude of this effect is **negligible**. The significance of the effect on the value of the heritage receptors is also **negligible**.

Mitigation and Residual Effects

Construction

9.469 The construction period involves the construction of the Proposed Development in the short to medium term (up to 5 years) and longer term (5+ years). As set out in the ODCEMP (Technical Appendix 3.2), the mitigation of likely visual effects on built heritage receptors would be through the use of appropriate hoarding during development phases, and following industry and best practice construction standards. It would be impractical to mitigate the visibility of large plant and equipment, however, and this is not proposed. This is a mitigation measure which involves additional construction techniques or measures.

9.470 The hoarding would have the greatest effect on heritage receptors in closest proximity to the Site, where the development is most likely to be visible. With mitigation, therefore, the effects on the close heritage receptors would remain the same, but these would be qualitatively **neutral**. For effects on the heritage receptors further from the Site, only the upper parts of the construction activities would be visible, this type of mitigation would be less effective and the effects of the construction of the Proposed Development would not be materially altered by mitigation.

9.471 The mitigation proposed during the operation of the Proposed Development has been included in the assessment of operational effects as mitigation measures which are embedded in the proposals. A detailed description of the embedded mitigation is set out in the ODCEMP (Technical Appendix 3.2) and not repeated here. In summary, the embedded mitigation to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on the historic environment is as follows:

- Historic building recording for Heath Farm and Woodside Farm;
- Limit working hours; and
- Construction methodology for the new bridge including provisions to protect the historic bridge at Gravelly Way.

Operational Development

9.472 There are mitigation measures included in the Proposed Development which are described as part of the assessment during the operational stage of the Proposed Development. These mitigation measures are referred to as embedded mitigation. A description of the embedded mitigation is not repeated here. In summary, the embedded mitigation to mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on the historic environment at the operational stage is as follows:

- The design of the new road bridge at Gravelly Way to respect the character and appearance of the canal CA;
- High quality design and materials applied to the elevations of the Proposed Development; and

- Landscape buffers and the creation of community parks to preserve the landscape setting of the canal conservation area and associated heritage receptors along its length, including Gailey wharf.
- 9.473 In addition to the embedded mitigation, further mitigation measures have been identified to off-set the harm identified to the canal CA. These measures are presented in a package known as the Canal Enhancement Scheme and we discuss the measures which are relevant to the heritage value of the CA below.
- 9.474 The Canal Enhancement Scheme has been developed through discussions between the design team and CRT. The obligation to produce the Canal Enhancement Scheme will be secured via the Section 106 Agreement in accordance with the Design and Access Statement. The Canal Enhancement Scheme will only apply to the canal which is located within the Order Limits for the Proposed Development.
- 9.475 It is anticipated that the scheme will involve:
- Works to improve the towpath by resurfacing it with a suitable surface (i.e bound/compacted gravel such as Breedon gravel type);
 - The creation of two new pedestrian connections to the towpath from Croft Lane Community Park;
 - Improvements to the existing pedestrian access points at the A5, Hoppe Roundabout and Station Road; and
 - The introduction of interpretation boards and signage.
- 9.476 Further details of the scheme are provided in the Design and Access Statement (Document 7.5).
- 9.477 The works to the towpaths will ensure that the towpaths are capable of dealing with increased level of use, in particular where needed for connectivity to the footpaths within the Proposed Development. This will be beneficial to the canal CA because it will ensure that there is no deterioration to the condition of the towpaths or canal banks which are integral to the character and appearance of the heritage receptor. The type of surfacing will be appropriate to the use, character and appearance of the CA and will be selected with advice from the CRT.
- 9.478 The new and improved pedestrian connection points will enhance public access and appreciation of the heritage receptor which is a benefit to its heritage value. Public appreciation of the receptor will also be improved by the introduction of interpretation boards and wayfinding signage. The information contained on the information boards will include the historical development of the canal and why it is important. The boards will be prepared in coordination with the CRT.
- 9.479 The proposed mitigation is taken into account in the final assessment of the likely significant effects on heritage receptors, in this case the canal CA. In accordance with the methodology, the assessment of the effects on heritage receptors necessarily involves a qualitative judgement on the nature of the effect of a proposed development (see paragraphs 9.104-9.106 and Table 9.6).
- 9.480 The likely significant effect of the Proposed Development on the canal CA has been assessed as minor adverse. In light of the mitigation, however, the benefits to the canal CA which are provided by the Canal Enhancement Scheme mean that the residual likely significant effect of the completed development on the canal CA as a heritage receptor is reduced to the low end of that **minor adverse effect**. As discussed, the minor adverse effect is equated to less than substantial harm in terms of the NPS. Policy and recent judgements are clear that a balancing of harm and benefit is required to understand the effect on heritage receptors. Whilst the harm consequent on the change to the setting of the heritage receptor is unchanged, the benefits that will be delivered by the Proposed Development are able to off-set this.

Summary of Mitigation Measures

Table 9.7: Summary of Proposed Mitigation and Enhancement Measures (excluding embedded mitigation)	
Potential Effects Identified	Proposed Mitigation/Control & Enhancement Measures
Construction	
Visibility of construction process	Hoarding and/or fencing as appropriate
Loss of two non-designated heritage receptors	Historic Building Recording and the results to be stored in an appropriate archive.
Completed Development	
Harm (less than substantial) to the canal CA	A Canal Enhancement Scheme for the canal within the Site boundary. It will include improvements to the towpaths, new and improved pedestrian routes and interpretation and signage.

Summary of Residual Effects

Summary of residual effects: Construction

- 9.481 At the construction stage of the Proposed Development, as before, the potential effects are likely to relate to hoarding, materials and machinery, and include potential increases in activity affecting the local road network, and the potential impacts of noise, dust and vibration associated with demolition and site preparation works required to facilitate the construction of new buildings.
- 9.482 The nature of this change will be minor adverse, albeit low on the scale of this nature of effect, and the effects will be temporary. Demolition and construction effects are treated as less significant, as there will be no physical change to the majority of heritage receptors and their historic fabric due to lateral effects of the demolition and construction process.
- 9.483 There will, however, be a **high adverse** magnitude of effect on Heath Farm (Locally Listed Grade B) resulting from the demolition of this heritage receptor during the demolition and construction phase of the Proposed Development. Given the low heritage value of this heritage receptor, this will result in a **minor adverse effect** during the construction stage.

Summary of residual effects: Completed Development

- 9.484 Table 9.8 provides a tabulated summary of the outcomes of the likely significant effects on built heritage arising from the Completed Proposed Development.

Table 9.8 Summary of Residual Effects							
Receptor	Description of Residual Effect	Nature of Residual Effect*					
		Significance**	+	D	P	R	St Mt Lt
Completed Development							
Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area (section within Order of Limits)	Change to the setting of the conservation area, with mitigation measures to improve the character, appearance, and interpretation of the heritage receptor	Minor	-	D I	P	IR	Lt
Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area (as a whole)	Change to the setting of a 4km section of the conservation	Negligible		I	P	IR	Lt
Heath Farm	Demolition of the locally listed building, which will be recorded beforehand in consultation with the local authority, and the information stored in an appropriate archive	Minor	-	D	P	IR	Lt
Woodside Farm	Demolition of the non-designated heritage receptor, which will be recorded beforehand in consultation with the local authority, and the information stored in an appropriate archive	Negligible		D	P	IR	Lt
Straight Mile Farm	Change to the setting of the non-designated heritage receptor	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Canal Bridge at Gravelly Way	Change to the setting of the non-designated heritage receptor	Negligible		I	P	IR	Lt
Two Roman Camps north of Water Eaton	No change to the setting of the SAM	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Roman Fort west of Eaton House	No change to the setting of the SAM	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Roman Camp, Kinvaston	No change to the setting of the SAM	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt

Table 9.8 Summary of Residual Effects							
Receptor	Description of Residual Effect	Nature of Residual Effect*					
		Significance**	+	D	P	R	St Mt Lt
Roman camp north east of Stretton Mill	No change to the setting of the SAM	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Site of Pennocrucium east of Stretton Bridge	No change to the setting of the SAM	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Roman villa 300yds (270m) NW of Engleton Hall	No change to the setting of the SAM	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Rodbaston Old Hall moated site and fishpond	No change to the setting of the SAM	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Church of St Mary and St Chad	No change to the setting of the Grade I listed building	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Westgate, forecourt wall and gate	No change to the setting of the Grade II* listed building	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Somerford Hall	No change to the setting of the Grade II* listed building	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Stretton Hall with combined service and stable wing	No change to the setting of the Grade II* listed building	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Church of St John Stretton	No change to the setting of the Grade II* listed building	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Church of St Mark and St Luke Shareshill	No change to the setting of the Grade II* listed building	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Chillington	No change to the setting of the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Round House	Change to the setting of the Grade II listed building	Negligible		I	P	IR	Lt
Wharf Cottage	Change to the setting of the Grade II listed building	Negligible		I	P	IR	Lt
Gailey Lock and Gailey Bridge	Change to the setting of the locally listed building	Negligible		I	P	IR	Lt

Table 9.8 Summary of Residual Effects							
Receptor	Description of Residual Effect	Nature of Residual Effect*	Significance**				
			+	D	P	R	St Mt Lt
Gailey Wharf	Change to the setting of the locally listed building	Negligible		I	P	IR	Lt
Aspley Farmhouse	No change to the setting of the Grade II listed building	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Long Moll's Bridge	Change to the setting of the locally listed building	Negligible		I	P	IR	Lt
Deepmore Bridge	Change to the setting of the locally listed building	Negligible		I	P	IR	Lt
Calf Heath Bridge	Change to the setting of the locally listed building	Negligible		I	P	IR	Lt
Brick Kiln Lock	No change to the setting of the locally listed building	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Boggs Lock	No change to the setting of the locally listed building	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Canal Feeder	No change to the setting of the non-designated heritage receptor	No effect		I	P	IR	Lt
Historic Landscape Character	Change to the character of the historic landscape character	Negligible		D	P	IR	Lt
Historic Hedgerows	Change to the character of the historic hedgerows	Negligible		D	P	IR	Lt

Notes:

* - = Adverse/ + = Beneficial; D = Direct/ I = Indirect; P = Permanent/ T = Temporary;

R=Reversible/ IR= Irreversible; St- Short term/ Mt –Medium term/ Lt –Long term.

**No effect/Negligible/Minor/Moderate/Major

Likely Significant Environmental Effects: Summary

- 9.485 Using the matrix at Table 9.6, there will be **no likely significant effects** arising from the Proposed Development on heritage receptors, primarily because of the distance and very limited intervisibility between the Site and the majority of receptors. For the sake of clarity, an effect of moderate adverse or greater is considered a 'significant effect' as used here. Essentially, all effects have been found to be **nil/negligible**, or **minor adverse**.
- 9.486 It is acknowledged that there will be a **minor adverse effect** on the local historic environment as a result of the demolition of Heath Farm, a non-designated heritage asset. The demolition of the non-designated heritage receptor would cause harm to its heritage value, but this is a planning consideration of very little weight in the context of the Proposed Development.

- 9.487 It proposed that a mitigation strategy for the loss of the receptor would be Historic Building Recording, which could be included as a condition of the consent.
- 9.488 The Proposed Development will cause harmful change to the setting of heritage receptors near to the Site, namely the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area which runs through the Site. This change will not have an effect on the appreciation of the heritage value of the receptor, however, and is not considered to be significant. In any event, the proposed mitigation measures will enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which will reduce the harm to the receptor, which is already less than substantial. This includes restoration of the towpaths, and removal of later bridges which cross the central part of the canal and detract from the character and appearance of the canal. These works are a benefit of the scheme which will enhance the special interest of the heritage receptor.
- 9.489 The Proposed Development includes proposed mitigation to preserve and enhance the special interest of heritage receptors within and near to the Site boundary. These measures include high quality landscaping and architectural design, and refurbishment of the canal towpath to improve connectivity.

Decommissioning

- 9.490 The Proposed Development is expected to be operational indefinitely, as long as it is viable and fit for purpose.
- 9.491 In the long term, it may likely to be re-developed or adapted on a piecemeal basis as operator requirements change and new occupiers move to the Site. Any such piecemeal redevelopments would be expected to be undertaken in accordance with current and future legislation and guidance in relation to Cultural Heritage – Built Heritage and would be subject to separate planning applications and planning requirements and conditions.
- 9.492 On this basis the potential effects on the Cultural Heritage – Built Heritage for decommissioning are considered to be negligible.

Cumulative Effects

- 9.493 The cumulative schemes considered for their relevance to built heritage considerations are as follows:
- Land off Gravelly Way, Four Ashes, South Staffordshire (16/00498/FUL) (Bericote Development) - At land off Gravelly Way, South Staffordshire Council granted permission for the erection of four industrial/distribution buildings comprising a total new floorspace of 105,419 sq m. This land is located to the south of the Site, adjacent to the existing Four Ashes Industrial Estate east of the canal. At the time of writing, construction has commenced. The cumulative effects of this consented scheme are considered in the context of this built heritage assessment because of the proximity to the canal conservation area, and the cumulative change to its setting arising from the scheme.
 - Calf Heath (Four Ashes) quarry allocation in the Staffordshire and Stoke Minerals Local Plan – The new Staffordshire and Stoke Minerals Local Plan was adopted on the 16 February 2017. In this local plan document, Staffordshire County Council have allocated 35ha at Calf Heath (Four Ashes) for sand and gravel extraction, with an anticipated duration of 6-8 years. The allocation falls within the Site boundary on land east of Gailey Wharf and north of Vicarage Road at Calf Heath. The cumulative effects of this allocation are considered in the context of this built heritage assessment because of the proximity to the canal CA, and potential for change to its setting arising from the allocation. It is important to note that no scheme for sand and gravel extraction has been brought forward for this land at the time of writing. There is already extraction works in the centre of the Site, between the newly allocated land.
- 9.494 The Bericote Development will introduce a new area of industrial development in the setting of the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area, and the listed and locally listed buildings within and in close proximity to the Site. The consented development will

change the immediate setting of the stretch of the canal between Gravelly Way and Calf Heath Bridge (Map Group A.2). This setting is already subject to industrialising influences, which do not make a positive contribution to the heritage value of the canal CA. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the experience of the canal will change as a result of the Bericote Development. The canal will become more enclosed, and experienced as a corridor between industrial developments. The negative quality of this part of the canal as "the most scarred by modern industry" will not change.

- 9.495 The Bericote Development will prevent views of the Proposed Development (Zones A4, A5 and A6) from this part of the canal CA, where the consented four storey warehouses will prevent views of the development proposed for WMI. The impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the CA will reduce slightly in this area of the Site because visibility will be restricted. This change is not sufficient to alter the overall magnitude or likely significant effects, however, which will be negligible.
- 9.496 With the exception of the canal as described above, the cumulative effects will not change the effect on Heath Farm, Woodside Farm, or any other heritage receptor.
- 9.497 The allocation of the land at Calf Heath for sand and gravel extraction is only expressed within policy at this stage. A quarry at Calf Heath Quarry is currently operational but if DCO consent is granted no further minerals will be excavated within the Site, including the new minerals allocation, and the existing minerals infrastructure will be removed.
- 9.498 As the quarry is regulated under an Environmental Permit, removal of the existing minerals infrastructure at Calf Heath Quarry would be expected to employ stringent mitigation measures similar to those that would be implemented during construction of the Proposed Development. It is anticipated that the current quarry workings would be left open, thereby minimising the need to rework materials during the earthworks stage of the Proposed Development, and this has been taken into account in the cut/fill models for the Proposed Development and in the baseline established for this ES. As such, it is not anticipated that there will be any cumulative effects and it is not necessary to consider the cumulative effects on the historic environment during the operation of the Proposed Development.