

## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	12-1
Legislation and Planning Policy .....	12-1
Methodology .....	12-4
Consultations.....	12-4
Scope and Sources .....	12-5
Impact Assessment .....	12-6
Referencing .....	12-9
Study Area baseline .....	12-10
Assessment of Impacts .....	12-15
Relevant Aspects of the Proposed Development.....	12-15
Assessment of Direct Impacts .....	12-16
Indirect Impacts.....	12-18
Visual Impacts: General Appraisal.....	12-18
Potentially Affected Assets .....	12-18
Bishopfield.....	12-20
Mattersey Hill.....	12-21
The Mantles.....	12-22
Torworth .....	12-23
Blyth Law Hill.....	12-24
Barnby Moor.....	12-25
Cumulative Effects .....	12-27
Summary and Conclusions .....	12-28
Baseline .....	12-28
Effects .....	12-28

## Appendices

Appendix 12/1	Designated Heritage Assets
---------------	----------------------------

## Drawings

Drawing TL12/1	Prehistoric and Roman Heritage Assets
Drawing TL12/2	Medieval, Post Medieval, Modern and Undated Assets
Drawing TL12/3	Designated Heritage Assets and Viewpoints

### INTRODUCTION

- 12.1 This Section assesses the potential effects of the proposed development on cultural heritage including archaeology.
- 12.2 The term ‘**cultural heritage**’ includes all aspects of the physical historic environment, together with intangible aspects such as associations with famous people or cultural perceptions, sacred sites and place-names, local customs and craft industries.
- 12.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (‘NPPF’) provides a number of definitions which have been used in this report<sup>5</sup>. The **historic environment** is defined as “*all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora*”.
- 12.4 Among the complete range of historic environment elements, the term ‘**heritage asset**’ denotes “*a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest*”. Heritage assets can be either designated or non-designated; the term ‘designated heritage assets’ comprises the following: world heritage sites, scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields and conservation areas.<sup>6</sup>
- 12.5 The term ‘**significance**’ in respect of heritage policy is “*the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest*”, and may include a contribution from its setting. This ‘heritage significance’ is quite distinct from ‘significance of effect’, which is not defined in the NPPF, and is used in this report to denote the overall significance of effect of the proposed development on the historic environment.

### Legislation and Planning Policy

- 12.6 Designated heritage assets within the study area comprise listed buildings, scheduled monuments and conservation areas. Assets of these types are given protection through legal statutes and planning policy. The measures most relevant to the current application are described in the remainder of this sub-section.

#### Legislation

#### Listed Buildings

- 12.7 Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Secretary of State is required to compile a list of buildings of ‘special architectural or historic interest’. Listed buildings are protected by law, and

---

<sup>5</sup> DCLG 2012: National Planning Policy Framework, Annex 2. The whole document is referred to hereinafter as ‘NPPF’.

<sup>6</sup> Following the NPPF: Annex 2 - Glossary.

any alteration of a listed building requires Listed Building Consent administered by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). An obligation of the Secretary of State and the LPA (as appropriate) to preserve the settings of listed buildings is stated in the Act<sup>7</sup>. With regard to planning determinations, Section 66(1) of the Act states:

*“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”*

### Conservation Areas

- 12.8 Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, local planning authorities are required from time to time to designate as conservation areas those parts of their area which are ‘of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’<sup>8</sup>.
- 12.9 The Act requires that ‘special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that conservation area’<sup>9</sup>. A recent court judgement has held that the setting of conservation areas can be part of their character or appearance<sup>10</sup>.

### National Policy

- 12.10 Protection from harmful effects resulting from change in the setting of designated heritage assets is provided through national and local planning policy. Not all changes are harmful and there is also recognition of the potential for beneficial change.
- 12.11 The Government's planning policy relating to the historic environment is included in the *National Planning Policy Framework*<sup>11</sup> ('NPPF'; the bracketed numbered references which follow refer to the paragraphs in the NPPF). At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which includes protecting and enhancing our historic environment (7, 14). The planning process should:
- “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” (17).*
- 12.12 In the NPPF, Section 12 deals with the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. In that Section, it is required that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset, and that the heritage significance of such an asset can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the asset or from development within its setting.

<sup>7</sup> Sections 16(2) when determining applications for listed building consent, and 66(1) when determining planning applications.

<sup>8</sup> Act, 69(1)

<sup>9</sup> Act, 72

<sup>10</sup> IFA 2008, Working Group on The Setting of Cultural Heritage Features, 28

<sup>11</sup> DCLG 2012: *National Planning Policy Framework*; the whole document is referred to hereinafter as 'NPPF'.

Substantial harm to, or loss of, a Grade II listed building or registered park or garden should be exceptional, and wholly exceptional to assets of the highest significance (notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings parks or gardens, and World Heritage Sites) (133). For a development which had such an effect to obtain planning permission, it would need to provide substantial public benefits which outweighed the effect, or fulfil a number of other specific criteria (Paragraph 133). Less than substantial harm should be weighed against the wider public benefits of the proposed development (Paragraph 134).

- 12.13 Both direct and indirect effects on the heritage significance of non-designated heritage assets should be taken into account when determining an application (135); significance derives from an asset's physical presence and also from its setting (Annex 2: '*significance (for heritage policy)*'). Information gained about the significance of the historic environment during plan-making or development management should be made publicly accessible by the Local Planning Authority. Developers should be required to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be wholly or partly lost in a manner proportionate to their significance and the impact. The evidence gained should be made publicly accessible by the developer. The ability to form the record should not be a factor when determining the application (141).

### Local Policy

#### Bassetlaw Local Development Framework

- 12.14 Policy DM8 outlined in the *Publication Core Strategy and Development Management Policies* is concerned with the protection of the historic environment. It states:

*"Support will be given to development proposals or regeneration schemes...that protect and enhance the historic environment and secure its long-term future, especially the District's Heritage at Risk. Such proposals must recognize the significance of heritage assets as a central part of the development. They will be expected to be in line with characterisation studies, village appraisals, conservation area appraisals, archaeological reports and other relevant studies."*

- 12.15 It continues:

*"There will be a presumption against development, alteration, advertising or demolition that will be detrimental to the significance of a heritage asset. Proposed development affecting heritage assets, including alterations and extensions that are of an inappropriate scale, design or material, or which lead to the loss of important spaces, including infilling, will not be supported. The setting of an asset is an important aspect of its special architectural or historic interest and proposals that fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a heritage asset will not be supported. Where appropriate, regard shall be given to any approved characterisation study or appraisal of the heritage asset. Development proposals within the setting of heritage assets will be expected to consider."*

- *Scale;*
- *Design;*
- *Materials;*
- *Siting;*
- *Views away from and towards the heritage asset."*

## METHODOLOGY

### Consultations

12.16 Consultation advice and comments received in relation to Cultural Heritage<sup>12</sup> and the responses provided in this assessment are set out in Table 12-1.

**Table 12-1**  
**Consultation Advice in Relation to Cultural Heritage and Responses in the ES**

Responder	Comment / advice	Response in ES
<b>Historic England</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a study area of greater than 2km around the application site should be used</li> <li>• consideration should be given to potential effects on a number of specific grade I and grade II* assets within 5km of the application site</li> <li>• consideration should be given to grade II listed buildings, conservation areas and non-designated heritage assets, some of which can be of national importance</li> <li>• consultation should be carried out with Bassetlaw District Council's Conservation Officer and Nottinghamshire County Council's archaeological staff</li> <li>• use of a ZTV and visualisations is recommended</li> <li>• consideration of use of a crane or tethered balloons to assist in predicting the visibility of the proposed development</li> <li>• consideration of non-visual effects such as construction, servicing, maintenance, traffic and alteration of drainage patterns</li> </ul>	<p>Study area considers designated assets up to 5km from the centre of the application site and HER records up to 2km</p> <p>Bassetlaw DC – no response on heritage; see below for NCC</p> <p>ZTV used (Drawing TL12/3 and LVIA)</p> <p>Alternative means of assessment used (Table 12-4)</p> <p>There are predicted to be not significant (Paragraph 12.36)</p>
<b>Nottinghamshire County Council</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cultural heritage assets identified in the baseline study should be analysed during the landscape and visual assessment;</li> <li>• designated assets within the ZTV should be considered visual</li> </ul>	<p>These are analysed in the cultural heritage Section including recorded views</p>

<sup>12</sup> Historic England: letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> November 2015; Nottinghamshire County Council: responses dated 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2015 and undated but received by SLR 14<sup>th</sup> December 2015

Responder	Comment / advice	Response in ES
	<p>'receptors' in views prepared as part of the LVIA assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarification is required of the credentials of the specialists carrying out the assessment</li> <li>• nearby assets are parts of an extensive Roman field system</li> <li>• geophysical survey and possibly trial trenching initially suggested; later agreed in consultation to post-determination programme of archaeological work secured by planning condition</li> <li>• the level of archaeological investigation should be proportionate to the extent of ground disturbance</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraph 12.41-12.44</p> <p>Noted in Paragraph 12.56 and elsewhere</p> <p>Noted in Paragraphs 12.104-12.106</p>

## Scope and Sources

- 12.17 This assessment addresses heritage assets and designated heritage assets in land within 2km and 5km respectively of the centre of the application site.
- 12.18 Baseline data for the study areas have been acquired from the following sources:
- Nottinghamshire County Council Historic Environment Record ('HER');
  - Landscape Character Assessment – Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire 2009<sup>13</sup> ('LCA');
  - National Heritage List for England (for designated heritage assets);
  - Bassetlaw District Council website for conservation area details;
  - on-line and facsimile historic mapping;
  - Historic England's National Mapping Programme air-photographs plots;
  - current Ordnance Survey mapping;
  - on-line aerial photography;
  - client information on proposed development;
  - zone of theoretical visibility ('ZTV') calculated by SLR's landscape architect; and
  - site inspection.
- 12.19 Heritage assets within the 2km study area are mapped in order of archaeological period in Drawings TL12/1 and TL12/2. Buildings in the historic building record supplied by the HER have not been mapped as they are all located in the close vicinity of listed buildings which are considered in detail in the assessment process.
- 12.20 All designated heritage assets within the 5km study area are shown in Drawing TL12/3. Asset lists including direction and distance from the application site are provided in Appendix 12/1.

<sup>13</sup> Bassetlaw District Council 2009

- 12.21 The data located within 500m of the application site have been assessed to identify any recorded archaeological features which have the potential to extend within the application site and thus be subject to direct impacts. Heritage assets within the wider 2km study area have been analysed to assess the potential for currently unknown assets to exist within the application site.
- 12.22 The ZTV has been mapped in relation to designated heritage assets and any non-designated heritage assets related to them, in order to identify potential visual effects from the proposed development.
- 12.23 Locations and descriptions of designated heritage assets have been obtained from the National Heritage List for England<sup>14</sup> and non-designated assets from the HER.

### Impact Assessment

#### Overall Structure

- 12.24 Assessment of impact on heritage assets has been considered in terms of potential direct and indirect impacts.
- 12.25 Assessment has been carried out using professional judgement set out in a structured narrative with reference to tabulated quantifications to assist with consistency and clarity.
- 12.26 The overall structure of impact assessment has been carried out according to appropriate guidance<sup>15</sup> in the following steps:

**Step 1:** identify which assets and their settings are affected;

**Step 2:** for indirect impact assessments, assess whether, how and to what degree the settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage assets (assessment of heritage significance and contribution to that significance from setting);

**Step 3:** assess the effects of the proposed development (beneficial or harmful) on that significance (assessment of magnitude of impact on the contribution from setting and the resulting significance of effect);

**Step 4:** explore ways to maximise enhancement or avoid or minimise harm; and

**Step 5:** make and document the decision and monitor outcomes (this step is for determining authorities and is outside the scope of this assessment).

#### Heritage Significance

- 12.27 The heritage significance of potential heritage assets has been assessed with reference to English Heritage (now Historic England) guidance<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> at <http://services.english-heritage.org.uk/NMRDataDownload>, and <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx>.

<sup>15</sup> Historic England July 2015, *The Setting of Heritage Assets - Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning*.

<sup>3</sup>

<sup>16</sup> English Heritage 2008: *Conservation Principles*, 72



- evidential value – deriving from the potential of a place to yield primary evidence about past human activity;
- historical value – deriving from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present;
- aesthetic value – deriving from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place; and
- communal value – deriving from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

- 12.28 Quantification of significance has been provided using professional judgement and with reference to Table 12-2 which has been devised by SLR with reference to terms used in NPPF in relation to the historic environment (NPPF paragraph 132).
- 12.29 The table shows the potential levels of heritage significance of an asset related to designation status and grading, and, where non-designated, to a scale of highest to negligible importance. This table acts as an aid to consistency in the exercise of professional judgement and provides a degree of transparency for others in evaluating the conclusions reached by this assessment.

**Table 12-2**  
**Levels of Heritage Significance**

Heritage Significance	Explanation
<b>Highest</b>	World heritage sites Scheduled monuments Grade I and II* listed buildings Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens Designated battlefields Protected wrecks Non-designated assets of equivalent significance
<b>High</b>	Grade II listed buildings Grade II registered parks and gardens Conservation areas Non-designated assets of equivalent significance Archaeological sites which are of particular individual importance within the regional archaeological resource
<b>Medium</b>	Archaeological sites / buildings etc. of local importance
<b>Low</b>	Sites / buildings etc. of minor importance or with little remaining to justify a higher category
<b>Negligible</b>	Sites / buildings etc. of negligible or no heritage significance
<b>Unknown</b>	Further information is required to assess the potential of these sites



### *Contribution of Setting to Heritage Significance*

- 12.30 This is not quantified on a scale but used to assist the assessment of the magnitude of impact.

### *Magnitude of Impact*

- 12.31 Magnitude of impact has been assessed using professional judgement and with reference to the criteria set out in Table 12-3, which has been devised by SLR, with reference to English Heritage 2011 page 22 Table 3. The magnitude has been attributed to the most closely applicable category in the Table.

**Table 12-3:  
Magnitude of Impact**

Magnitude of impact	Definition
<b>High beneficial</b>	The development would considerably enhance the heritage significance of the affected asset or the ability to appreciate it
<b>Medium beneficial</b>	The development would enhance to a clearly discernible extent the heritage significance of the affected asset or the ability to appreciate it
<b>Low beneficial</b>	The development would enhance to a minor extent the heritage significance of the affected asset or the ability to appreciate it
<b>Very low beneficial</b>	The development would enhance to a very minor extent the heritage significance of the affected asset or the ability to appreciate it
<b>Neutral / Nil</b>	The development would not affect, or would have harmful and enhancing effects of equal magnitude on, the heritage significance of the affected asset or the ability to appreciate it
<b>Very low adverse</b>	The development would erode to a very minor extent the heritage significance of the affected asset or the ability to appreciate it
<b>Low adverse</b>	The development would erode to a minor extent the heritage significance of the affected asset or the ability to appreciate it
<b>Medium adverse</b>	The development would erode to a clearly discernible extent the heritage significance of the affected asset or the ability to appreciate it
<b>High adverse</b>	The development would severely erode the heritage significance of the affected asset or the ability to appreciate it

### *Significance of Effect*

- 12.32 The significance of effect is assessed using professional judgement with reference to Table 12-4 below. This provides a matrix that relates the heritage significance of the asset to the magnitude of impact (incorporating contribution from setting where relevant) to establish the likely significance of the direct or indirect effect which the proposed development would have on the heritage significance of the asset.

**Table 12-4:  
Significance of Effect**

Magnitude of impact	Heritage significance				
	Highest	High	Medium	Low	
High beneficial	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Enhancement
Medium beneficial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Very slight	
Low beneficial	Moderate	Slight	Very slight	Very slight	
Very low beneficial	Slight	Very slight	Negligible	Negligible	
Negligible / neutral / none	Negligible / neutral / nil	Negligible / neutral / nil	Negligible / neutral / nil	Negligible / neutral / nil	Negligible / neutral / nil
Very low adverse	Slight	Very slight	Negligible	Negligible	Harm
Low adverse	Moderate	Slight	Very slight	Very slight	
Medium adverse	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Very slight	
High adverse	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	

## Range of Potential Effects

- 12.33 The focus of this study is the assessment of potential indirect visual impacts on heritage assets due to changes within their setting caused by the proposed development, and the potential direct impact on buried archaeological remains.
- 12.34 The assessments of visual impacts use calculations of the visible vertical angle ('VVA') which the development would form when viewed from locations within the study area, in order to map Zones of Theoretical Visibility for the proposed development. This methodology is described in detail in Chapter 10 of this ES. It provides a worst case assessment of the visibility of the proposed scheme from outside the application site as it does not take into account the filtering / screening effects of existing buildings or existing vegetation or proposed planting schemes.

## Referencing

- 12.35 HER features are referenced in the text by the asset identifier field ('MONUID') in the GIS data provided, prefixed with 'H' for HER. National Heritage List numbers are distinguished with the prefix 'N'.
- 12.36 The following archaeological periods with approximate dates are referred to in this section:
- Palaeolithic (500,000-10,000BC);
  - Mesolithic (10,000-4,500BC);
  - Neolithic (4,500BC-2,500BC)
  - Bronze Age (2,500BC-700BC);

- Iron Age (700BC-43AD);
- Roman (AD43-AD410);
- Early Medieval (AD410-AD900);
- Late Saxon and High Medieval (900-1550);
- Post-medieval (1550-present).

12.37 The following abbreviations are used in the labels of assets on the drawings and in the Appendices:

e/m/l – early / middle / late, Pal – Palaeolithic, Mes – Mesolithic, Neo – Neolithic, BA – Bronze Age, IA – Iron Age, RO – Roman, EM – early medieval, XM – late Saxon or High Medieval, PM Post-medieval, MO modern (20<sup>th</sup> century or later), ND no date.

### Quality Assurance

- 12.38 Work has been carried out with reference to relevant planning policy and guidance<sup>17</sup>.
- 12.39 SLR is a Registered Organisation with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), an audited status which confirms that work is carried out to the highest standards of the profession.
- 12.40 SLR is a member of the Federation of Archaeological Managers and Employers.
- 12.41 SLR operates a quality management system to help ensure all projects are managed in a professional and transparent manner, which enables it to qualify for ISO 9001.

## STUDY AREA BASELINE

### Geology Topography and Routeways

- 12.42 The 5km study area contains higher ground tapering towards the north and ultimately ending beyond the area around Doncaster and the Humber. The higher ground is defined to the east by the Idle Valley and to the west by the lower ground west of Blyth and the Valley of the River Ryton. More localised areas of lower ground lie to the north of the application site from Blyth to Torworth (including an apparent dry valley extending south to a point 600m west of the application site), and to the south, west of Barnby Moor.
- 12.43 The application site lies at an elevation of between 29m and 32m AOD on the northern edge of a ridge defined by the localised lower ground described above, which extends east from south-east of Blyth to Blyth Law Hill (c.40m AOD) then north-east for 1.4km to the application site. The local prominence

---

<sup>17</sup> *The National Planning Policy Framework*, see Paragraph 128;  
*CIfA 2014 Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment*;  
*English Heritage 2008: Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*;  
*English Heritage 2011: Seeing the History in the View ('SHV')*  
*Historic England July 2015, The Setting of Heritage Assets - Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3*

of Blyth Law Hill is reflected in the site of a Bronze Age Barrow and undated inhumations located on the south-facing slope of the hill (H4786).

- 12.44 A number of known or potential ancient routeways are suggested by topographical considerations and historic mapping.
- 12.45 Two major north/south roads are present in the study area, one on the valley side and one a ridgeway. Firstly, the valley-side 'Great North Road' (A638) runs north from Newark through Tuxford and Retford and along the west side of the Idle Valley 900m east of the application site. 'Old London Road' forms an alternative route of part of the Great North Road, crossing higher ground between Barnby Moor and Tuxford to the south. Secondly, the 'Blyth Road' ridgeway (B6045 and A1) runs north from Nottingham passing Ranby in the south of the study area and Blyth in the northwest. There is little correlation between the features of the Roman-period 'brickwork-plan' field systems within the study area and any of these routeways. In the case of the Great North Road and Old London Road the fields clearly continue unvaried on either side of the routeway. This suggests that they are of Roman or post-Roman origin. Blyth Road does not abut the field systems with sufficient frequency for a pattern to be evident.
- 12.46 Retford Road (A634), which forms the north-eastern edge of the application site, links Blyth to the north-west and Barnby Moor to the south-east. It crosses the watershed and is likely to be a routeway of local significance and late- or post-Roman in date.
- 12.47 The area is sparsely populated: the nearest residential properties to the application site are Jubilee Farm, 670m to the north-west and Beech Farm, 630m to the west. To the east, the nearest property is College Farm at 900m and, to the north east, Billy Button Cottage is at a distance of 690m from the site boundary.
- 12.48 The application site is shown by British Geological Survey mapping to be underlain by near surface Triassic strata of the Nottingham Castle Sandstone Formation (BGS website 2015). No superficial deposits are recorded by BGS mapping. The same website shows borehole 'Torworth B.H SK68NW' was sunk in 1953, on the opposite side of the A634, south of the junction with Tinker Lane, approximately 135m north of the proposed development site. This recorded 1ft of topsoil overlaying 5ft of soft pink sand which in turn overlay 384 feet of pink sandstone.

### *Historic Landscape Development by Period*

- 12.49 The development of the historic environment is described in order of period in the remainder of this sub-section. Mapping of assets is provided in Drawings TL12/1 and TL12/2.

### **Prehistoric and Roman**

- 12.50 Prehistoric and Roman sites are mapped in Drawing TL12/1.

- 12.51 *Landscape Character Assessment – Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire*<sup>18</sup> ('LCA') puts the site within its 'Sherwood' area which it describes as being generally unoccupied during the prehistoric periods. This picture changes rapidly around the time of the late Iron Age/beginning of the Roman Period when the land began to be used for grazing. The landscape was occupied by dispersed low status farmsteads.
- 12.52 The Nottinghamshire HER contains seven records for the study area dating to the Prehistoric Period. The nearest of these features is the findspot of a Bronze Age flint flake (H11023) approximately 380m south east of the site. Three features, a Bronze Age Barrow (H4786), pits (H9608) and ditches (H9610) have been discovered at Blyth Law Hill, 1100m and 1200m to the south west of the site. A Bronze Age burial (H18585) and pottery (H4785) have been recorded approximately 1930m to the north-west of the proposed development site. A possibly prehistoric enclosure is recorded approximately 1100m to the north of the site. This is associated with what is thought to be a Roman field system.
- 12.53 A Roman field system and trackways occupying much of the 2km study area has been identified from aerial photographs and recorded by the National Mapping Programme (Drawing TL12/1).
- 12.54 The mapping includes a ditch which forms part of the field system and crosses the application site orientated east / west.
- 12.55 Related HER records comprise H4833 to the south west, H4822 and H4823 to the south, H4830 to the south east, H4829 and H8757 to the north east and H4824, H4825, H4826 and H4827 are located to the north. Four pottery finds (H11019, H11018, H11017, H5549) within the study area dating to the Roman period may be related to the manuring of these fields although finds H11017 and H11018 are located close to/within a small subdivided enclosure and may suggest a date for it.
- 12.56 The only other Roman record for the search area is a pit (H9609) identified at Blyth Law Hill 1104m to the south west.

### Early Medieval and High Medieval

- 12.57 Medieval assets are mapped in Drawing TL12/2.
- 12.58 The LCA describes the area as having been 'very quiet' in the post Roman period with people moving away to surrounding low land areas. This may have been a result of the exhaustion of the land due to its very light soils. At this time the area became Sherwood Forest with a mixture of woodland and heathland. The low value of the land attracted hunting parks and monasteries and nunneries. However from the 12<sup>th</sup> century the land was slowly enclosed in a piecemeal fashion until by the 16<sup>th</sup> century only the core woodlands of the royal estates and parks survived. Much of the woodland was gone by the late 17<sup>th</sup> century.

---

<sup>18</sup> Bassetlaw District Council, 2009: Landscape Character Assessment – Bassetlaw, Nottinghamshire

- 12.59 Early 19<sup>th</sup>-century road names (Drawing TL12/2) refer to 'Church Field Road' and 'Barnby Field Road' (now Tinker Lane) and suggest that Torworth and Barnby Moor respectively had open fields in this period.
- 12.60 Undated inhumations have been found on Blyth Law Hill (H9606, H9607) close to the site of a Bronze Age barrow and other features noted above. A barrow, quite possibly the Bronze Age barrow, was considered a significant feature in the early medieval period as the name Blyth Law Hill clearly indicates<sup>19</sup>. It is possible that the burials are of Anglo-Saxon date and represent an execution site (H17673) focused on the barrow. However the acidic soil on the Sherwood Sandstone does not normally preserve bone well suggesting a later date for these burials.
- 12.61 There are no designated heritage assets or other HER records relating to the early Medieval Period.
- 12.62 There are 3 listed buildings in the village of Blyth dating to this period. Blyth Priory Church St Mary and St Martin is the only grade I listed building (N1239182). It is in the grounds of Blyth Priory, a scheduled monument (H1006392) which also dates to this period. There are no above ground remains of Blyth Priory. Blyth School (N1006402) is a grade II listed building comprising a 15th century chapel which was converted to a school and is now two cottages known as St John's. This is also a scheduled monument. Allendale Clare Cottages (N1238967), a group of four cottages which contain 16th century elements, are collectively a grade II listed building.
- 12.63 There are two further medieval listed buildings within the study area. The Church of St Bartholomew (N1239776) is a grade I listed building in Sutton Cum Lound, approximately 3km to the east of the development site. Hodsock Priory Gatehouse and Bridge (N1187689) is also a grade I listed building located approximately 3.7km west of the development site.
- 12.64 There are seven HER records relating to the High Medieval period within the study area. The three nearest records, between 570 and 830m from the application site, are pottery finds (H11020, H11021 and H11022). These may be related to the manuring of the fields during this period. A moat (H4787) is recorded 1530m to the north east of the site while a coin and seal (H5980 and H9461) have been found approximately 1850m to the north west.
- 12.65 The small quantity of records from this period suggests that the area was not extensively inhabited.

### Post-Medieval

- 12.66 The LCA states that field systems in the area were re-planned in the 17th and 18th centuries with the focus on animal husbandry. Within the study area the regular, straight-sided field-plans are characteristic of planned enclosure of the post-medieval period. The re-planning of the fields was accompanied by the establishment of dispersed and isolated farms within them.

---

<sup>19</sup> Old English *hleaw* (meaning barrow), now *law*



- 12.67 Much of the landscape has seen relatively little change in general terms since then. These were generally run from farmhouses built around the much older existing villages. The landscape has remained similar to modern times. The fields in the study area are generally rectilinear and straight edged including the field in which the site is situated and other adjacent fields.
- 12.68 Post-medieval sites are mapped in Drawing TL12/2.
- 12.69 There are 115 listed buildings within 5km of the proposed development site dating to this period.
- 12.70 There are 3 grade II listed buildings at Barnby Moor 1.5km to the south east of the proposed site comprising a public house and two houses. Three grade II listed buildings are located in the south part of Torworth, 1.5km to the north east. Three grade II listed buildings are recorded at The Mantles, 2km NNW of the site.
- 12.71 There are 35 listed buildings dating to the post-medieval period in or around the town of Blyth. These are all grade II buildings other than Blyth New Bridge (N1238969) which is a grade I listed building and a scheduled monument.
- 12.72 There are 17 listed buildings in the village of Serlby. Most notable amongst these are the grade I listed Serlby Hall (N1045126), which has seven of the other listed buildings in its grounds, including a grade II\* listed early 18th century arch N1224495.
- 12.73 There are several further clusters of listed buildings within 5km of the site. Ranby Hall (N1045110) which is a grade II\* listed building, is located 2.2km to the south with three grade II listed outbuildings.
- 12.74 There are four grade two listed buildings at Ranskill 2.2km NNE of the site, four at Mattersey Hill, five at Lound and five at Ranby.
- 12.75 The three post-medieval non-designated heritage assets within the search area are two pottery finds (H11024, H11025), which probably relate to the manuring of fields, and a culvert (H10957) in Torworth, 1500m north east of the proposed development site.

### Modern

- 12.76 Modern sites are mapped in Drawing TL12/2.
- 12.77 There are four grade II listed buildings dating from this period within the study area. Three of these are war memorials (Lound, Ranby and Blyth) and the fourth is a telephone box in Blyth (N1222657). The only non designated heritage asset recorded on the Nottinghamshire HER is wind pump H4897, 950m south east of the site.

### Undated

- 12.78 Undated sites are mapped in Drawing TL12/2.



- 12.79 Three undated assets within the study area are cropmarks of field systems or enclosures. These may be a continuation of the Roman field systems in the area. Undated human remains (H9606 and H9607) have been recovered from Blyth Law Hill 1150m to the south west (see Paragraph 12.63).

### Historic Landscape Character and Historic Environment Character

- 12.80 Chapman's map of 1774 shows little detail of the site itself. Blyth and Barnby Moor are noted to the north-west and south-east with Torworth to the north east. Land to the south and east of the site appears to be depicted as marsh or rough ground. Tinker Lane is not depicted suggesting that either it did not exist at that time, or was probably of limited significance as a routeway in this period.
- 12.81 On Sanderson's map of 1835 Tinker Lane is now shown in its current position as is a track on the opposite side of the Retford Road (A634) leading to College Farm.
- 12.82 The First Series OS map of 1840 depicts the area much the same as Sanderson. A stream is depicted running along the south western border of the site.
- 12.83 The 1886 First Edition Ordnance Survey map shows the site within a similar agricultural landscape but in much more detail. The parish boundary is now shown running along the south eastern boundary of the site along the edge of the field. This boundary separated the parishes of Sutton Cum Lound and Blyth St Mary and St Martins. This boundary may have been moved in recent times and is depicted on <http://www.achurchnearyou.com/parishfinder>, as running further north, following the line of Tinker Lane. The straight sided fields and their similar alignments suggest they have been laid out in the post-medieval period.
- 12.84 Later Ordnance Survey maps show little change in the surrounding landscape over the following years until after the 1960's. Then the field layout at the site is altered with two field boundaries to the north removed to make a single large field. An L shaped tree belt has also been planted at the western end of the field in which the site is located.

## ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS

### Relevant Aspects of the Proposed Development

- 12.85 The **construction** of the wellsite would take three months to complete and would consist of the following:
- construction of new site access;
  - erection of gates, security fencing and CCTV;
  - stripping and storage of top soil and formation of on-site grassed bunds to be retained until completion;

- creation of the wellsite platform topped in a layer of aggregate hardstanding and the installation of a wellhead collar with associated steel conductors;
  - installation of bunded storage areas for chemicals and a lined perimeter ditch for surface water management; and
  - staff welfare accommodation and on site vehicle parking.
- 12.86 Three sets of monitoring boreholes would be drilled using equipment mounted on a 4x4 heavy duty truck.
- 12.87 **Drilling** the exploratory well would be a 24 hour, seven-day-a-week process and would last for approximately four months including the installation and removal of the drilling rig.
- 12.88 The exploratory well would be drilled using a rig of a maximum height of 60m above adjacent ground level. Around the well would be a number of power generators, pumps and storage tanks and staff welfare facilities, offices workshops stores and parking. The maximum height of the structures would be approximately 10m above ground level.
- 12.89 The subsequent **evaluation** stage could last up to two years.
- 12.90 The subsequent **decommissioning and restoration** would follow the evaluation stage and would involve the restoration of the site to its original agricultural purpose and appearance within two to three months.

### Assessment of Direct Impacts

#### *Significance of Potential Archaeological Remains*

- 12.91 The application site contains no designated heritage assets.
- 12.92 The HER contains no record located within the application site. However the NMP cropmark mapping indicates the presence of a single ditch within the site; it forms part of the 'brickwork-plan' field system which is widespread through the study area. Because it is a cropmark it cannot be seen on the surface except where there is a suitable crop at a suitable stage of development, and then chiefly from the air. The ditch is orientated north-west to south-east and there is no indication in the plots of other features within the application site.
- 12.93 The brickwork-plan field systems characteristically produce no or very few finds except where enclosures – presumably indicating settlement – are known. Even at settlement locations finds are sparse. The settlements are indicated by smaller and more complex enclosures: such enclosures are indicated within the study area between Torworth and Barnby Moor, and east of Torworth (H11018 and H4829 on Drawing TL12/1). There is no indication of an enclosure within or adjacent to the application site.
- 12.94 The HER contains no records which are sufficiently close to the application site to suggest they might extend within it. Post-medieval pottery finds H11024 and H11025 are both recorded to the east of the site and are

presumed to represent manuring. A Bronze Age flint flake was found to the south east.

- 12.95 There is nothing to suggest that other archaeological features are present within the application site.
- 12.96 The long-term and continued arable use of the application site indicates that any archaeological features present are likely to have been eroded by ploughing.
- 12.97 There is no evidence to suggest that any archaeological remains present are likely to be of greater than local significance. Their heritage significance is predicted to be no greater than medium.

### *Magnitude of Impact*

- 12.98 Any form of ground disturbance associated with the construction of the proposed scheme (such as the topsoil stripping, construction of the wellhead, utilities, access roads and drainage) has the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological features present.
- 12.99 The application site is small and only a small part of the extensive Roman brickwork-plan field system is contained within it. The unmitigated magnitude of direct impact from development is therefore predicted to be up to low adverse and permanent on the field system as a whole, though it would be high adverse and permanent on the field-system ditch within the affected area of the application site.

### *Significance of Effect*

- 12.100 The unmitigated significance of effect is predicted to be moderate and permanent harm to the field system ditch within the application site and very slight harm to the overall field system within the study area and beyond.
- 12.101 In consultation, following the Scoping Opinion, Nottinghamshire County Council's County Archaeologist agreed that direct impacts on buried archaeological remains could be addressed in a satisfactory manner through a post-determination programme of archaeological investigation and reporting secured by a planning condition.
- 12.102 A programme of archaeological survey and - if appropriate – excavation carried out prior to construction, with attendant recording, assessment, analysis, archiving and reporting placed in the public domain, would have the potential to provide a beneficial effect through advancement of knowledge and understanding of the brickwork plan field system. This effect would partly balance the harm caused by the loss of the asset within the site.
- 12.103 Assuming that such a programme were to be implemented, the significance of direct effect from development is predicted to be no greater than slight but permanent harm on the ditch within the site and negligible on the wider brickwork-plan field system.

### INDIRECT IMPACTS

#### Visual Impacts: General Appraisal

- 12.104 Two ZTVs of the proposed development have been created, one for the top of the main structures at the site and one for the rig, up to 60m above adjacent ground level. The latter is incorporated into Drawing TL12/3.
- 12.105 Views of and from designated heritage assets within the study area theoretically include views of the rig over most of the 5km study area (Drawing TL12/3). Views including the other structures on the application site (up to approximately 10m in height) would be much more limited in extent and would not include any designated heritage assets of the highest significance (i.e. scheduled monuments, listed buildings and registered parks / gardens of grade I or II\* and registered battlefields; (Drawing TL12/3).

#### Potentially Affected Assets

- 12.106 The designated assets within the 5km study area are summarised in Table 12-5, with comments on their setting based on consideration of air-photographs and other images<sup>20</sup> and modern mapping.
- 12.107 Assets having potential visual effects from the proposed development, based on the observations in Table 12-5, are identified in the final column and have been subjected to a detail impact assessment presented in the subsequent sub-sections.

---

<sup>20</sup>Google Earth and Streetview consulted during the week 7-11<sup>th</sup> December 2015

**Table 12-5:**  
**Designated Heritage Assets with Potential Intervisibility with the Rig**

Name	Approximate distance of asset or group from application site centre, and designations / other significant assets present	Setting	Assessment proposed
Serlby	3.9-4.8km. LBI hall with LBII* arch and eleven LBII structures in non-designated grounds including lodge to SE and ornamental and ancillary buildings and three bridges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hall appears to face towards the proposed development but there is substantial screening from tree belts (and forthcoming from plantations) within the park at same elevation</li> <li>There may be a view of historic landscape of 'planned enclosure' type beyond the screening towards the proposed development, due to rising ground in that area</li> </ul>	No
Bishopfield	3.3km. LBII house	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally open views towards application site but if visible, houses on Blyth Road would form a nearer (1km) focus very close to line of view</li> </ul>	Yes
Scrooby Top	3.6km. LBII cottages and staging post	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focus of buildings is the Great North Road, particularly the 'staging post'</li> <li>screening from non-designated house to south</li> </ul>	No
Mattersey Grange	4.8km. LBII house	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View south-west across large planned enclosure fields to Mattersey Wood on skyline (380m)</li> <li>Proposed development beyond that (4.8km)</li> </ul>	No
Mattersey Hill	4.5km. LBII cottages, house and outbuildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View over falling then rising ground, planned enclosure fields then restored workings and woodland</li> <li>Proposed development may be visible beyond</li> <li>Site not publicly accessible but proxy view from footpath 700m to south-west (this view is 6m lower than the assets)</li> </ul>	Yes
Blyth	2.3-3.8km. CA, SM and LBI bridge and priory (church and site); SM and LBII hospital later school; LBII 38 buildings mainly houses, farmhouses and cottages with inns/hotels, toll cottage and milestone, phone box, bridges, a war memorial; non-designated parkland with tree avenue between hall and bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Probable view of proposed development from the church tower</li> <li>Most buildings in the village, and churchyard at ground level, are enclosed by the developed area with no outlook</li> <li>Traffic on A1 plainly visible in near view (300m) towards proposed development from south end of settlement</li> <li>Outlying assets to SE at Spital Farm and Mill Farm screened towards site by trees within property and nearby on road</li> </ul>	No
The Mantles	2.0km. LBII house and stables in non-designated vestigial parkland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal approach from north leads to stables</li> <li>Screening towards application site woodland block</li> <li>Open views towards the application site on the skyline beyond the assets and grounds (proxy view from Moor Lane 300m to SE)</li> </ul>	Yes
Ranskill	2.3-2.5km. LBII hall and pigeoncote; 2 farmhouses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hall pigeoncote and one farmhouse enclosed in village buildings and trees;</li> <li>Farmhouse to south-west faces to the west but has a partly open out from the garden in front and from upper floors; the view is over planned enclosure fields towards the application site</li> </ul>	No
Torworth	1.6km. LBII three listed farmhouses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The three farmhouses are enclosed within the village buildings; this is likely to provide screening but there could be a view of the rig over the tree tops</li> <li>There is an open view over planned enclosure fields towards the application site from the south-west edge of the village</li> </ul>	Yes on grounds of proximity
Hodsock Priory	3.9km. LBI priory gatehouse and bridge LBII hall and bridge on the approach road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade I gatehouse/bridge and grade II house set in parkland with woods and dispersed trees mainly to NE beyond the alignment of the proposed development from the gatehouse</li> <li>Alignment of gatehouse and country house is NE over the parkland</li> <li>There is a low VVA from the gatehouse site at ground level</li> <li>Probably some screening from Hodsock Plantation (1.3km) along the sightline</li> <li>views from the bridge are screened by trees though the open out as the B6405 (to the NE) is approached</li> <li>the top of the rig could still be visible over the Plantation trees from the gatehouse</li> </ul>	No
Hodsock Manor Farm	2.9km. LBII farmhouse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Views north-east across apparent enclosed medieval fields and planned enclosure fields</li> <li>Screening along sight-line from two woodland blocks; with low VVA the rig may not be visible or may be barely visible</li> </ul>	No
Blyth Law Hill	1.2km. Non-designated BA barrow, undated human remains and Anglo-Saxon wapentake meeting-place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the recorded location of the finds is slightly dispersed to west and east of the A1(M) on the south-facing side of the hill close to, but 350m south-east of, the highest point</li> <li>no views of the application site from west of the road or from the road itself at the location due to woodland screening</li> <li>probably open and very extensive views towards the application site from east of the road in the fields flanking Tinker Lane where human burials and Bronze Age features found</li> <li>large pylons prominent in this view</li> <li>proxy view from A1(M) immediately north of Tinker Lane junction</li> </ul>	Yes
Barnby Moor	1.6km. LBII two houses and public house	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focus is on the junctions of the A634 which passes the application site and the northern Great North Road</li> <li>View across generally open planned enclosure fields with dispersed trees and pylons prominent in view</li> </ul>	Yes
Sutton Cum Lound	3.1km. LBI church, LBII gate and piers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Churchyard mostly enclosed by mature trees; setting of gates the road and the drive which they stand on</li> </ul>	No
Lound	4.0-4.4km. CA, LBII houses/farmhouses and war memorial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CA focused on built up area</li> <li>LBs all enclosed within the village built-up area and vegetation</li> <li>Most westerly is Highfield House – screening from trees within the property</li> </ul>	No
Bilby Farm	2.6km. LBII house	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short view over adjacent planned enclosure fields possibly including more ancient boundaries with woodland block beyond</li> <li>Additional screening from trees on A1</li> </ul>	No
Ranby Hall	2.4km. LBII* hall, with non-designated garden; LBII farmhouse with outbuildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trees screening north side of property</li> <li>Beyond the trees is open planned enclosure fields up to the application site boundary</li> </ul>	No
The Barracks	3.1km. LBII house, outbuildings and lodge with small wood to north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The woodland to the north makes this a very enclosed property with no views out towards the application site</li> </ul>	No
Ranby	4.2-4.6km. LBII bridge, public house war memorial cottages, country house and lodge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings generally enclosed within village buildings and vegetation</li> <li>Country house (now school) grounds well wooded to north</li> </ul>	No

- 12.108 Six assets or groups of assets have been identified as requiring further assessment as the assessment indicated potential wide visibility from and of the asset. Their locations are:
- Bishopfield;
  - Mattersey Hill;
  - The Mantles;
  - Torworth;
  - Blyth Law Hill; and
  - Barnby Moor.
- 12.109 The assessment of The Mantles and Torworth has utilised nearby views recorded for the LVIA Section of this ES (Section 10). The Drawings referred to include an indication of the proposed rig superimposed over the recorded view at the appropriate scale and location.
- 12.110 Assessment of Bishopfield, Mattersey Hill, Blyth Law Hill and Barnby Moor has been carried out through direct inspection in the field. Recorded Viewpoints are numbered Viewpoints 1 to 4 and shown on Drawing TL12/3. There is no estimate of the rig height in these illustrations, but LVIA Drawings of equivalent distance which do show it are referred to in order that the relative size of the rig when viewed from the assets under assessment may be appreciated.

### **Bishopfield**

#### *Heritage Significance and Contribution from Setting*

- 12.111 Bishopfield House is a grade II listed house of early 19<sup>th</sup>-century date (N1239871). Taking into account the designation the heritage significance is considered to be high. It is an isolated building set within a landscape of planned enclosure fields towards the application site. The building and its surroundings were inspected from the road to the north (Viewpoint 1).
- 12.112 The modern mapping indicates that there are no significant woodland blocks between the house and the proposed development. The landscape in the recorded view has changed little since the enclosure period though telegraph poles and lines are visible on the horizon.
- 12.113 The setting preserves to a degree the landscape features which were present when the asset was constructed and contributes to its heritage significance by facilitating understanding of its function and appreciation of the aesthetic qualities of its relatively isolated rural location. No particular focus within the setting has been identified. The primary contribution lies in the immediately neighbouring areas and the more distant contribution from setting in the vicinity of the development is limited to its general rural nature.

#### *Impact Magnitude and Significance of Effect*

- 12.114 The inspection and recorded view, and consideration of modern mapping and air photographs, suggests that there might be an open view of the rig and possibly the structures within the application site from the house at a distance of approximately 3.4km.



- 12.115 The approximate scale of the rig at this distance may be appreciated from LVIA Viewpoint 10 (Drawing TL10/13), taking into account the greater distance of Bishopfield from the rig site. The rig would appear as a distant linear vertical modern intrusion forming a very small part of the general outlook from the house and in views past the house, for a duration of four months.
- 12.116 Taking into account the scale, distance, nature and duration of the visible infrastructure, and the contribution to the heritage significance of the asset from its setting, the magnitude of impact is predicted to be very low adverse.
- 12.117 The significance of effect is predicted to be very slight harm.

### **Mattersey Hill**

#### *Heritage Significance and Contribution from Setting*

- 12.118 There are four post medieval grade II listed buildings at Mattersey Hill (N1239192 house, N1239193 two cottages, N1239287 farm buildings, and N1273784 cart shed). The assets lie 4.5km north east of the development site.
- 12.119 Taking into account the designations the heritage significance of the assets is considered to be high. The assets form an isolated group of buildings set within a landscape of planned enclosure fields and apparent restored extraction areas towards the application site (Viewpoint 2). The buildings were inspected from the road to the north-east.
- 12.120 The modern mapping indicates that there are significant woodland blocks between the buildings and the proposed development but also some areas of open skyline to either side. The landscape in the view has changed little since the enclosure period but in the middle distance it has apparently been restored from mineral extraction. Telegraph poles and lines are visible on the horizon in the view.
- 12.121 Each asset forms part of the setting and contributes to the significance of the others in this group, which are buildings of a farm complex of rural and agricultural nature. The wider setting around the settlement also contributes to the significance of these assets by preserving to a degree the landscape features which were present at their construction, permitting understanding of the inter-relation of the assets and their agricultural hinterland. This relationship applies primarily to the nearer vicinity of the assets and no particular more distant focus within the setting has been identified. The more distant contribution from setting in the vicinity of the proposed development is limited to its general rural nature.

#### *Impact Magnitude and Significance of Effect*

- 12.122 The recorded viewpoint and consideration of modern mapping and air photographs suggest that woodland would provide screening and a nearer



visual focus in any view of the rig and structures within the application site from the buildings at a distance of approximately 4.5km.

- 12.123 In any view which there might be of the rig would appear as a very distant linear vertical modern intrusion forming a very small part of the general outlook from the house and in views past the house, for a duration of four months. Existing telegraph poles would reduce the perception of change.
- 12.124 Taking into account the scale, distance, nature and duration of the visible infrastructure, and the contribution to the heritage significance of the asset from its setting, the magnitude of impact is predicted to be effectively nil.
- 12.125 The significance of effect is predicted to be effectively nil.

### The Mantles

#### *Heritage Significance and Contribution from Setting*

- 12.126 The Mantles is a small estate approximately 1.9km north-west of the application site. The assets comprise a post-medieval house (N1239777), lodge (1045122) and stable outbuildings (N1222617) with a formal approach from the north-west. Taking into account the designations the heritage significance of the group is considered to be high.
- 12.127 Modern mapping and air-photographs indicate that there is partial screening / filtering from a woodland block within the property but beyond it the landscape towards the application site is one of planned enclosure fields. LVIA Viewpoint 2 provides a proxy viewpoint at a similar distance from the application site but located further south of The Mantles.
- 12.128 The landscape in the view has changed little since the enclosure period though pylons and lines are clearly visible on the skyline.
- 12.129 The assets form a functionally-related group and each asset forms part of the setting and contributes to the significance of the others. The wider setting contributes to their significance by preserving to a degree the landscape features which were present at the time of their construction, permitting understanding of their function and appreciation of their relationship with the surrounding rural hinterland. Locations from where these qualities may be appreciated lie primarily within the near vicinity of the asset group. No key focus within the setting beyond the asset group itself has been identified and the contribution from setting in the vicinity of the more distant development is limited to its general rural nature.

#### *Impact Magnitude and Significance of Effect*

- 12.130 The recorded viewpoint and consideration of modern mapping and air photographs suggests that there might be a view of the rig and possibly the structures within the application site from the assets at a distance of approximately 1.9km.

- 12.131 The approximate scale of the rig at this distance may be appreciated from LVIA drawing TL10/5. The rig would appear as a distant linear vertical modern intrusion forming a very small part of the general outlook from the assets and in views past the assets, for a duration of four months.
- 12.132 Taking into account the scale, distance, nature and duration of the visible proposed infrastructure, and the contribution to the heritage significance of the assets from their setting, the magnitude of impact is predicted to be very low adverse.
- 12.133 The significance of effect is predicted to be very slight harm.

### Torworth

#### *Heritage Significance and Contribution from Setting*

- 12.134 There is a cluster of three post medieval grade II listed farmhouses (N1222654, N1239779 and 1273559) in the village of Torworth, approximately 1.5km to the north-east of the site.
- 12.135 Taking into account the designations the heritage significance of the assets is considered to be high.
- 12.136 The village and the designated assets within it lie within a landscape of planned enclosure fields including the land towards the application site. The assessment of the setting and the impact has been carried out with reference to LVIA Viewpoint 4, located south of the south end of the village.
- 12.137 The proposed development would be at least partly screened from the designated assets in this group by intervening adjacent vegetation and buildings within the village.
- 12.138 The recorded view shows a largely open landscape looking over enclosure period fields and showing the farm of Torworth Grange to the north of the viewpoint and the extensive tree belt beyond the application site. The landscape in the view has probably changed little since the enclosure period though pylons and overhead lines are visible on the horizon.
- 12.139 The village setting makes an important contribution to the heritage significance of the assets, while each asset also forms part of the setting and contributes to the significance of the others. The rural setting outside and around the village contributes to the heritage significance of these three farmhouses by preserving to a degree the landscape features which were present at the time of the construction, and formed their rural hinterland. Locations from where the relationship of assets and hinterland may be appreciated are located primarily in the near vicinity of the asset group and no particular focus within the setting beyond the village has been identified. The more distant contribution from setting in the vicinity of the development is limited to its general rural nature.

### *Impact Magnitude and Significance of Effect*

- 12.140 The recorded viewpoint and consideration of modern mapping and air photographs suggest that there might be an open view of the rig and possibly the structures within the application site from the listed buildings within the south part of the village at a distance of approximately 1.5km or more.
- 12.141 The approximate scale of the rig at this distance may be appreciated from LVIA Viewpoint 4 (Drawing TL10/7). The rig would appear as a linear vertical modern intrusion forming a very small part of the general outlook from the buildings and in views past the buildings towards the application site, for a duration of four months. The rig is likely to appear significantly taller than adjacent features within the view. The on-site accommodation and other structures would also be visible.
- 12.142 Taking into account the scale, distance, nature and duration of the visible infrastructure, and the contribution to the heritage significance of the asset from its setting, the magnitude of impact is predicted to be very low adverse.
- 12.143 The significance of effect is predicted to be very slight harm.

### **Blyth Law Hill**

#### *Heritage Significance and Contribution from Setting*

- 12.144 The location was chosen for a Bronze Age barrow and other features present indicate contemporary activity whose nature cannot be deduced from the available information. A Roman pit is also of uncertain significance.
- 12.145 An execution site is also indicated; the date is uncertain but there is no doubt that the location was chosen due to the elevated position and wide-ranging views including views towards the application site as well as its location on a significant historic routeway.
- 12.146 Taking into account the current information and the lack of designation, the heritage significance of the assets is considered to be up to high.
- 12.147 The view east towards the application site was inspected from the eastern roadside verge, both north and south of Tinker Lane (Viewpoints 3A and 3B respectively). The recorded assets lie in adjacent land to the east and the west of the road, the barrow site being to the west. Modern mapping indicates that the western assets lie in, or screened by, woodland. There is no surface indication of the assets in the arable fields to the east, either north or south of Tinker Lane.
- 12.148 The recorded views both illustrate the long distance and wide-ranging nature of the outlook. 3A shows the arable field with Beech Farm and the more distant Jubilee Farm at the far end. The nearer landscape in the view has changed significantly due to boundary removal.
- 12.149 The assets reflect very long-term continuing significance of the location. A key aspect is the long-distance views, which must reflect the importance of

intervisibility between the assets and a wide-ranging hinterland. No doubt long-distance views both from and of the assets were important in their usage.

- 12.150 The landscape has changed greatly since the assets were formed, but two key aspects remain in general terms: the wide-ranging views and the historic routeway (now the A1). These must have been important factors in the location of the assets and are therefore important currently to their understanding and appreciation. What may have been a further key characteristic - remoteness - has now been lost due to the busy nature of the adjacent road. The setting's contribution to the significance of the assets lies in its retention of the ability to see and understand the assets in relation to the surrounding land over long distances and in the proximity to the routeway.

### *Impact Magnitude and Significance of Effect*

- 12.151 LVIA Viewpoint 9 is at a similar distance from the application site to the assets at Blyth Law Hill, and therefore provides an indication of the scale of the rig when viewed from the Hill.
- 12.152 From 3A the rig would be in line with Beech Farm and partly screened by it. From 3B the hedgerow along Tinker Lane would be in the foreground and also provide some further screening. The existing pylons would reduce a viewer's perception of change introduced by the rig. It would form a very small part of the general wide-ranging outlook from the assets, for a duration of four months.
- 12.153 Taking into account the scale, distance, nature and duration of the visible proposed infrastructure, and the contribution to the heritage significance of the asset from its setting, the magnitude of impact is predicted to be very low adverse.
- 12.154 The significance of effect is predicted to be very slight harm.

## **Barnby Moor**

### *Heritage Significance and Contribution from Setting*

- 12.155 The designated assets at Barnby Moor are all listed grade II and comprise two post-medieval houses (N1045117 and 1207452) and a public house (N1370399). The buildings lie within the western part of the village at a distance of approximately 1.5km from the south east side of the application site.
- 12.156 Taking into account the designations the heritage significance is considered to be high.
- 12.157 The two houses stand on the lane leading west and then south out of the village. The name of this lane is 'Old London Road'.

- 12.158 The White Horse Inn stands on the main street which is also the Great North Road, close to its junction with Old London Road and much of its business must have come from travellers on these roads.
- 12.159 The village lies in a landscape of planned enclosure fields with extensive woodland blocks, in the direction of the application site. A view has been recorded from the assets (Viewpoint 4).
- 12.160 The landscape in the view has changed little since the enclosure period though pylons, telegraph poles and overhead lines are visible in the middle distance.
- 12.161 Each asset forms part of the setting, and contributes to the significance of, the others, while experiencing and understanding their relationship with surrounding village is another important part of appreciating their heritage significance. A key relationship, which is more spatially focused, is that of the assets to the A638 Great North Road which passes through Barnby Moor. This is particularly true of the public house, as the road must have brought a large part of its trade and no doubt continues to do so.
- 12.162 The rural setting around the village also contributes to the heritage significance of the assets by preserving to a degree the landscape features which were present at their construction, and formed part of their rural hinterland. Places from where the contribution to significance may be experienced are located primarily in the near vicinity of the asset group where the detail of the landscape may be experienced. The more distant contribution from setting in the vicinity of the development is limited to its general rural nature.

### *Impact Magnitude and Significance of Effect*

- 12.163 The recorded viewpoint and consideration of modern mapping and air photographs suggest that there might be an open view of the rig and possibly the structures within the application site from the house at a distance of approximately 1.5km.
- 12.164 The approximate scale of the rig viewed from a similar distance to that of Barnby Moor may be appreciated from LVIA Viewpoint 6 (Drawing TL10/9). The rig would appear as a linear vertical modern intrusion at a distance of approximately 1.5km from the buildings, with a building and woodland adjacent to the line of sight but not providing screening. It would form a very small part of the general outlook from the houses, for a duration of four months.
- 12.165 Taking into account the scale, distance, nature and duration of the visible infrastructure, and the contribution to the heritage significance of the asset from its setting, the magnitude of impact is predicted to be very low adverse.
- 12.166 The significance of effect is predicted to be very slight harm.

### CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

- 12.167 This part of the assessment addresses the potential cumulative effects of the proposed development on cultural heritage assets in conjunction with the recently-consented solar farm on 14ha land off A634 to the north of Jubilee Farm. This development is located approximately 0.7km north of the proposed development at its nearest point.
- 12.168 The historic-environment components of the application were an archaeological desk-based assessment and a geophysical survey prepared by Archaeological Project Services (in September 2013 and February 2015 respectively).
- 12.169 The archaeological desk-based assessment identified a field system, probably of Romano-British date which lies close to the solar farm development site and could extend within it, though there is no direct evidence of any such extension. Subsequent geophysical survey identified a rectangular enclosure within the development site which might also be Roman period, but there was no evidence of its having been physically joined to the field system.
- 12.170 The desk-based assessment noted the range of potential impacts on archaeological remains from the solar farm but offered no quantification of either heritage significance or impacts upon that significance. Because permission was granted, evidently direct impacts (incorporating the archaeological work required by Condition 4 of the consent) were not considered sufficiently adverse to refuse permission.
- 12.171 The field system near the solar farm is the same one as that addressed in the current assessment. However the evidence suggests that the any effect from the solar farm would be on the enclosure rather than the field system, though the enclosure may be related in more general terms.
- 12.172 The effect of the current development on archaeological remains incorporating mitigation is predicted to be slight adverse but not significant. Due to the granting of permission it is assumed that the effect of the solar farm on the archaeological features was considered to be similarly less than significant. The two developments would affect different though possibly related features. Any cumulative effect is therefore predicted to be not significant.
- 12.173 The LVIA for the solar farm was prepared by LDA Design in July 2014. The LVIA considered (paragraph 6.2) that at a greater distance than 50m from the development site to the north east and south, changes to the landscape character would be of negligible scale and magnitude.
- 12.174 Any cumulative visual effect would only last for four months and it is predicted on the basis of the above considerations that any such effect formed would not be significant.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Baseline

- 12.175 Baseline data has been gathered for a study area of land within 2km of the application site with designated heritage assets mapped to 5km. The data has been derived from county and national archaeological and asset databases, on-line historic and current mapping and satellite imagery, and the Zone of Theoretical Visibility calculated by SLR's Landscape Architect.
- 12.176 There is evidence for a number of historic routeways passing the application site in its vicinity and an extensive Roman-period field system of a type known as 'brickwork-plan'. These appear to have been a relatively transient stage in landscape development and have left no visible indication of their former presence in the existing landscape. One component of the field system lies within the application site.
- 12.177 There is evidence for a medieval field system within the study area but the fields now are very largely a product of post-medieval enclosure.
- 12.178 A large number of designated heritage assets are present within the study area, located both in the villages and at isolated locations in the landscape.

#### Effects

- 12.179 Historic England Guidance<sup>17</sup> states that

*"Significance (in the context of EIA): For the purposes of EIA a significant impact can be defined as an impact which, in the judgement of the assessor, should be taken into account in the decision-making process."*

- 12.180 The assessment of the effects which follows is the professional judgement of the author of this assessment, taking into account the distance of the development from the asset, the duration of its visibility and the considerations of setting presented in the assessments.

#### Potential Direct Effects

- 12.181 According to NPPF<sup>18</sup>, local planning authorities:
- "...should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible."*
- 12.182 The small detrimental effect on the significance of a heritage asset (the ditch which forms part of the brickwork-plan field system) would not be significant.

---

<sup>17</sup> English Heritage May 2011: *Seeing the History in the View – A Method for Assessing Heritage Significance within Views*, Glossary.

<sup>18</sup> NPPF 141



- 12.183 The archaeological programme of investigation proposed, to extend the assessment of impacts and mitigate the effects of development where necessary, would comply with both national and local planning policy.

### *Potential Indirect Effects*

- 12.184 Taking into account the heritage significance of the assets, the contribution from setting to that significance, and the scale nature and duration of the proposed development, it is predicted that indirect effects though adverse would not be significant.

### *Potential Cumulative Effects*

- 12.185 Taking into account the heritage significance of the assets, the contribution from setting to that significance, the scale nature and duration of the proposed development and of the Jubilee Farm solar farm, it is predicted that any cumulative effects would not be significant.