

## CHAPTER 10: ARCHAEOLOGY AND HERITAGE

### Introduction

- 10.1 This chapter assesses the potential effects of the proposed development on the historic environment. It incorporates the results of an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (National Museums Liverpool Field Archaeology Unit 2014 Appendix 10.1) and a Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (Orion Heritage 2015 Appendix 10.2).
- 10.2 The historic environment includes a wide range of features resulting from human intervention in the landscape, varying in scope from buried archaeological remains to late 20<sup>th</sup> century industrial and military structures. It can be divided into the following two categories: archaeology, which comprises Scheduled Monuments and non-designated archaeological heritage assets; and built heritage, which includes: Listed Buildings (all grades), Registered Parks and Gardens (all grades), Conservation Areas, Historic Battlefields and World Heritage Sites.
- 10.3 This chapter describes the assessment methodology, the baseline conditions at the site and its surroundings, the potential environmental effects, the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any potential adverse effects, and the likely residual effects after mitigation measures have been employed.

### Planning Policy Context

#### National Planning Policy

##### ***Ancient Monuments & Archaeological Areas Act 1979***

- 10.4 The Ancient Monuments & Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended) protects the fabric of Scheduled Monuments, but does not afford statutory protection to their settings.

##### ***Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990***

- 10.5 The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out broad policies and obligations relevant to the protection of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas and their settings.
- 10.6 Section 66(1) 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.”
- 10.7 Section 69 of the Act requires local authorities to define as Conservation Areas any ‘areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.’
- 10.8 Section 72 gives local authorities a general duty to pay special attention ‘to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area’ in exercising their planning functions. These duties are taken to apply only within a Conservation Area. The Act does not make specific provision with regard to the

setting of a Conservation Area; that is provided by the policy framework outlined below.

### ***National Planning Policy Framework***

- 10.9 Government policy in relation to the historic environment is outlined in section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012), entitled 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment'. This provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of section 12 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:
- Delivery of sustainable development;
  - Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment;
  - Conservation of England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; and
  - Recognition of the contribution that heritage assets make to our knowledge and understanding of the past.
- 10.10 Section 12 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term.
- 10.11 Paragraph 128 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that the level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.
- 10.12 *Heritage Assets* are defined in Annex 2 as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).
- 10.13 *Archaeological Interest* is defined as: a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.
- 10.14 *Designated Heritage Assets* comprise: World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and Conservation Areas.
- 10.15 *Significance* is defined as: the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.
- 10.16 *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.

10.17 The NPPF is supported by the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). In relation to the historic environment, paragraph 18a-001 states that:

“Protecting and enhancing the historic environment is an important component of the National Planning Policy Framework’s drive to achieve sustainable development (as defined in Paragraphs 6-10). The appropriate conservation of heritage assets forms one of the ‘Core Planning Principles’.”

10.18 Paragraph 18a-002 makes a clear statement that any decisions relating to Listed Buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas must address the statutory considerations of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as well as satisfying the relevant policies within the NPPF and the Local Plan.

10.19 Paragraph 18a-013 outlines that the assessment of the impact of a proposed development on the setting of a heritage asset needs to take into account and be proportionate to the significance of the asset being considered, and the degree to which the proposed development enhances or detracts from the significance of the asset and the ability to appreciate the significance.

10.20 The NPPG outlines that although the extent and importance of setting is often expressed in visual terms, it can also be influenced by other factors such as noise, dust and vibration. Historic relationships between places can also be an important factor stressing ties between places that may have limited or no inter-visibility with each other. This may be historic as well as aesthetic connections that contribute or enhance the significance of one or more of the heritage assets.

10.21 Paragraph 18a-013 concludes:

“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 on-going conservation.”

10.22 The key tests in NPPF paragraphs 132-134 are whether a proposed development will result in substantial harm, less than substantial harm or no harm. However, substantial harm is not defined in the NPPF. Paragraph 18a-017 of the NPPG provides additional guidance on substantial harm. It states:

*“What matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a Listed Building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed.”*

10.23 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF outlines that where a proposed development results in less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, the harm arising

should be weighed against the public benefits accruing from the proposed development. Paragraph 18a-020 of the NPPG outlines what is meant by public benefits:

*"Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 7). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits."*

### **Local Planning Policy**

#### **Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy**

- 10.24 Section 8.1.76 identifies the Churnet Valley as an area of significant landscape, wildlife and heritage value.
- 10.25 Spatial Objective SO9 aims to *'conserve and improve the character and distinctiveness of the countryside and its landscape, heritage, biodiversity and geological resources.'*
- 10.26 Section 7.46 delivers the strategy for the Churnet Valley where the aim will be *'...to increase the economic contribution from sustainable tourism by enhancing the attraction of the Churnet Valley...by development of its heritage, nature based activities and outdoor recreational pursuits...and promoting opportunities for visitors to access, understand and engage with the Churnet Valley's landscape, heritage and nature conservation assets'* though *'...development must not be at the expense of the special qualities of the Staffordshire Moorlands.'*
- 10.27 Strategy SS7 Churnet Valley Area Strategy identifies the valley as an area for sustainable tourism and rural regeneration. With support given to *'...measures to enhance, protect and interpret the landscape character and heritage assets of the Churnet Valley'* and to *'...measures that support and integrate the heritage transport infrastructure of the valley, sympathetically with enhancing and developing links to strategic footpaths, cycle and horse riding routes.'*
- 10.28 Under SD1 (Sustainable Use of Resources), *'the Council will require all development to secure the future conservation of a heritage asset through appropriate enabling development in accordance with policy DC2.'*
- 10.29 Policy E3 (Tourism and Cultural Development) states that *'all development shall be of an appropriate quality, scale and character compatible with the local area, protect the residential amenity of the area, enhance the heritage, landscape and biodiversity of the area and shall not harm interests of acknowledged importance.'*
- 10.30 Section 8.6 sets out the Council's Design and Conservation Policies and policy DC2 dealing with the historic environment is reproduced in full below.

*"The Council will safeguard and, where possible, enhance the historic environment, areas of historic landscape character and interests of acknowledged importance, including in particular scheduled ancient monuments, significant buildings (both statutory listed and on a local register), the settings of designated assets, conservation areas, registered historic parks and gardens, registered battlefields and archaeological remains by:*

- *Resisting development which would harm or be detrimental to the special character and historic heritage of the District's towns and villages and those interests of acknowledged importance.*
- *Promoting development which sustains, respects or enhances buildings and features which contribute to the character or heritage of an area and those interests of acknowledged importance through the use of conservation area appraisals, design statements, archaeological assessments, characterisation studies and masterplanning.*
- *Preventing the loss of buildings and features which make a positive contribution to the character or heritage of an area through appropriate reuse and sensitive development, including enabling development, unless their retention is not viable or there would be substantial planning benefits to outweigh the loss."*

### **Churnet Valley Masterplan SPD**

- 10.31 The masterplan identifies industrial heritage as one of the key strengths of the Churnet Valley, though a weakness is that it is relatively underappreciated and not well maintained. Several of the industrial heritage sites, such as the canal, in the valley have the potential to be further developed as attractions.
- 10.32 One of the principals of the masterplan is that future development should make appropriate provision for the management of heritage by recognising the contribution of industrial historic buildings and structures and areas of special archaeological interest and by celebrating and encouraging increased awareness and understanding of the area's heritage assets.
- 10.33 Sustainable tourism should not damage heritage assets and the strategy aims to enhance the heritage of the Churnet Valley.
- 10.34 The valley is broken down into a series of character area and the site lies within the Moneystone Character Area. The concept statement for Moneystone Quarry cites the development as an opportunity to promote industrial heritage of site and educational opportunities.

### **Other relevant Strategies, Guidelines or Documents**

#### ***Historic Environment Good Practice Advice In Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England 2015)***

- 10.35 The purpose of this document is to provide information to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment policy in the NPPF and NPPG. It outlines a six stage process to the assembly and analysis of relevant information relating to heritage assets potentially affected by a proposed development:
- 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; and
  - 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.

***Historic Environment Good Practice Advice In Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England 2015)***

- 10.36 Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 provides guidance on the management of change within the setting of heritage assets.
- 10.37 The document restates the definition of setting as outlined in Annex 2 of the NPPF.
- 10.38 Setting is also described as being a separate term to curtilage, character and context; while it is largely a visual term, setting, and thus the way in which an asset is experienced, can also be affected by noise, vibration, odour and other factors. The document makes it clear that setting is not a heritage asset, nor is it a heritage designation, though land within a setting may itself be designated. Its importance lies in what the setting contributes to the significance of a heritage asset.
- 10.39 The Good Practice Advice Note sets out a five staged process for assessing the implications of proposed developments on setting:
- Identification of heritage assets which are likely to be affected by proposals;
  - Assessment of whether and what contribution the setting makes to the significance of a heritage asset;
  - Assessing the effects of proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset;
  - Maximising enhancement and reduction of harm on the setting of heritage assets; and
  - Making and documenting the decision and monitoring outcomes.
- 10.40

**Approach****Assessment Methodology**

- 10.41 The assessment has involved the following key tasks:
- Production of an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (Appendix 10.1). This involved a review of the available documentary, cartographic and photographic sources, along with a site walkover; and
  - Production of a Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (including site walkover) (Appendix 10.2). This was based upon a search radius of 1 km around the perimeter of the site. It included all designated heritage assets (including Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings [all grades], Conservation Areas, and Registered Parks and Gardens [all grades]). World Heritage Sites, Registered Battlefields and Protected Wrecks were not included in the assessment as there are no such designated heritage assets within the search area.
- 10.42 Sources reviewed during preparation of these assessments included: the Staffordshire Sites and Monuments Record, Staffordshire Records Office, The National Monuments Record, Local Museums and various online websites.

**Significance Criteria**

10.43 The criteria for assessing the magnitude of predicted change are shown below in Table 10.1.

Table 10.1: Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Change to the Setting and/or Significance of Historic Environment Receptors.

<b>Change</b>	<b>Magnitude</b>
Substantial	Total or substantial loss of the significance of a heritage asset. Substantial harm to a heritage asset's setting such that the significance of the asset would be totally lost or substantially reduced (e.g. the significance of a designated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its designation would be questionable; the significance of an undesignated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its categorisation as a heritage asset would be questionable). These effects are likely to be important considerations at a regional or borough level.
Moderate	Partial loss or alteration of the significance of a heritage asset. Considerable harm to a heritage asset's setting, such that the asset's significance would be materially affected/considerably devalued, but not totally or substantially lost. These effects, if adverse, while important at a local scale, are not likely to be key decision making issues. Nevertheless, the cumulative effect of such issues may lead to an increase in the overall effects on a particular area or on a particular resource.
Slight	Slight loss of the significance of a heritage asset. This can include the removal of fabric that forms part of the heritage asset, but that is not integral to its significance (e.g. the demolition of later extensions/additions of little intrinsic value). Some harm to the heritage asset's setting, but not to the degree that it would materially compromise the significance of the heritage asset. Level of harm perceivable, but insubstantial relative to the overall interest of the heritage asset. These effects may be raised as local issues but are unlikely to be of importance in the decision making process.
Negligible/ Neutral	A very slight change to a heritage asset. This can include a change to a part of a heritage asset that does not materially contribute to its significance. Very minor change to a heritage asset's setting such that there is a slight impact not materially affecting the heritage asset's significance.

10.44 The sensitivity of the heritage asset will depend on factors such as the condition of the asset and its perceived heritage value and significance. The sensitivity of the heritage asset receptor is defined by its significance in terms of national, regional or local statutory or non-statutory protection and grading. Table 10.2 below sets out the criteria for assessing sensitivity.

Table 10.2: Criteria for Assessing Sensitivity of Receptors.

Sensitivity	Receptor
High	World Heritage Sites Scheduled Monuments and Areas of Archaeological Importance Archaeological sites of schedulable quality and significance Listed Buildings (all grades) Registered Historic Parks and Gardens (all grades) Historic Battlefields
Medium	Local Authority designated sites (e.g. Conservation Areas and their settings) Non-designated sites of demonstrable regional importance
Low	Non-designated sites with significance to local interest groups Sites of which the significance is limited by poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations

10.45 The sensitivity of the receiving environment, together with the magnitude of change, defines the significance of the impact (Table 10.3). Impacts of ‘major’ or ‘moderate’ significance in relation to the historic environment are considered to equate to significant impacts highlighted in the context of the EIA Regulations. The impacts could potentially be adverse, negligible or beneficial.

Table 10.3: Matrix for Determining the Significance of Effects.

		High	Medium	Low	Negligible/ Neutral
Sensitivity of Receptor/Receiving Environment to Change/ Effect	High	Major	Moderate to Major	Minor to Moderate	Negligible/ Neutral
	Medium	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible/ Neutral
	Low	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor	Negligible/ Neutral
	Negligible / Neutral	Negligible/ Neutral	Negligible/ Neutral	Negligible/ Neutral	Negligible/ Neutral

**Baseline Conditions**

10.46 A detailed assessment of the baseline conditions is given in the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (Appendix 10.1) and Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (Appendix 10.2); these findings are summarised below.

**Non-Designated Heritage Assets**

10.47 There is very little recorded evidence for below ground non-designated archaeological assets within the site; they comprise: Round Mound, Cotton Monument (40 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.1) and Crowtrees Bloomery (64 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.1).

10.48 Most of the site was quarried during the late 20<sup>th</sup> century which will have destroyed any archaeological assets which may once have existed. However, some of the areas on the fringes of the quarry workings were unaffected and the potential of these is considered below.



- 10.49 Topographically, the area may have been seen as attractive for settlement during the Mesolithic to Early Iron Age periods, though sites dating to these periods are notoriously difficult to detect in the region, and other than possible chance finds of Neolithic axe heads, none are known from the study area. However, similar areas in the Pennine fringes of Cheshire and Greater Manchester have recently been found to show evidence of human occupation during those periods and there is a low potential for sites of these periods from the areas fringing the quarry site.
- 10.50 There is currently no evidence for later Romano-British or Anglo-Saxon settlement, either within the site or in the study area. The archaeology of these periods is currently poorly understood in North Staffordshire, although the elevated, almost moorland location, is unlikely to have been attractive for settlement, which in later periods seems to have been concentrated in the more fertile and less exposed valleys. Anglo-Saxon settlement in the wider area is likely to have consisted of isolated scattered farmsteads with a low level of material culture. This pattern of settlement appears to have persisted into the late 17<sup>th</sup> century. There is a low potential for sites of these periods from the areas fringing the quarry site.
- 10.51 Evidence for Medieval and Early Post-Medieval settlement in the area is primarily based upon cartographic information. This suggests that most of the site was unenclosed common land, though the presence of ridge and furrow earthworks to the west of it suggests that small areas at least were used for arable agriculture. Documentary sources and analogy with other areas imply that in the later Medieval period, the site was likely to have been used for grazing/pasture and was gradually enclosed. This process was complete within the site by 1811, when the first detailed map of the site was produced.
- 10.52 The origins of small farmsteads in the area are currently poorly understood. Most are assumed to have originated in the later Post-Medieval period, when an increase in population resulted in more marginal land being taken into cultivation. However, it appears that settlement in upland areas has long consisted of a thin scatter of dispersed settlements and therefore some may have earlier origins.
- 10.53 The origin of Park Woods (38 and 39 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.1) and its associated ponds, which are located on the boundary of the site, is not clear. Small hunting parks, usually belonging to the Lord of the Manor, were a common feature of the Medieval landscape, with over 1,900 known examples in England. The main concentrations are in wooded counties such as Staffordshire. Most were established in the 11<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> centuries and they usually, but not exclusively, had a roughly circular or elliptical plan enclosed by a bank topped by a stone wall or fence. However, Park Woods and its ponds only occur on mapping of the area after 1811, and so are likely to be between 1811 and 1839 in date.

### **Designated Heritage Assets**

- 10.54 There are no Conservation Areas, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, and Registered Battlefields either within or in the surroundings of the site.
- 10.55 2 Grade II Listed Buildings are recorded within the site boundary (Figure 1, Appendix 10.1). However, both these buildings are no longer extant. Further details are provided below.
- 10.56 There are 28 Grade II Listed Buildings (along with a possible curtilage listed barn) located within a 1 km radius of the site. All these Listed Buildings will be discussed below.

## Potential Impacts

### The Reconstructed Farmhouse

- 10.57 There are two Grade II Listed Buildings which are recorded within the site boundary (Whiston Eaves Farmhouse [15 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2] and Stable at Whiston Eaves [Figure 23 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2]. However, neither of these buildings exist. Listed Building consent was obtained in 1998 (planning permission reference number: SMD/1998/0448) for the dismantling of the Farmhouse and demolition of the Stable. This consent was attained in connection with a condition (condition 10 of planning permission reference number: SM.96935) which states as follows:

*The area delineated on Drawing No. 001/P02/07/005 shall remain unworked prior to a planning consent being issued for the relocation of the Listed Building.*

- 10.58 The location of the reconstructed Farmhouse is at Heath House Farm, Ross Road, Whiston, Staffordshire ST10 2JF (planning permission application number: 12/01340/FUL). Consideration has been given as to whether the reconstructed Farmhouse would retain the Grade II Listed Building status. The decision of Lord Justice Buxton (in refusing permission for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal) in ***Judge v The First Secretary of State*** [2005] EWCA Civ 1155 is relevant to this issue:

*10 True it is, of course, that the code in terms does not deal with the moving of a building. But I find it impossible to say that such a step is excluded from the code — that is to say, excluded from any possibility of receiving listed building permission — merely by the fact that an object of this sort is to be moved rather than left in its place. If that were the case the barn that was referred to in the Leominster District Council case<sup>1</sup> would have ceased to be covered by the code, so that permission could not have been granted under the code, as soon as any part of it was dismantled. That, in my judgement, cannot be right.*

*11 I quite accept that this is a new instance not previously covered by express authority, but nonetheless I find it impossible to say that the action proposed in this case was outside anything for which the Secretary of State could properly grant permission.*

- 10.59 Whilst not legally binding (being a decision to refuse permission to appeal), Buxton LJ's judgment indicates that where a listed building is dismantled and relocated, then it can in principle retain its listed building status. Although, it would appear that this would turn on the particular facts. Once reconstructed it is assumed that Historic England will be invited to provide a view as to whether or the building remains listed, however it seems unlikely since the building will be materially different from the original farmhouse and will use extensive new material notwithstanding the retention of much of the former listed building on pallets stored on site since the building was dismantled.
- 10.60 In any event it is reasonably assumed that for the purposes of this assessment that, at the least, the reconstructed Farmhouse constitutes a non-designated heritage asset, being in part constructed of the remnants of a formally listed building.

---

<sup>1</sup> ***R v Leominster DC Ex p. Antique Country Buildings*** (1988) 56 P&CR 240

Accordingly, the effect on the non-designated heritage asset would need to be considered, per paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

10.61 Guidance provided by Historic England sets out the concept of values when weighing the significance of heritage assets with reference to the following value criteria (bracketed terms indicate corresponding values identified in the NPPF):

- *Evidential (Archaeological) value* - Deriving from the potential of a place to yield 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. It tends to be illustrative or associative.
- *Aesthetic (Architectural or Artistic) value* - Deriving from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
- *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. Communal values are closely bound up with historical (particularly associative) and aesthetic values, but tend to have additional and specific aspects.

10.62 Even were the reconstructed Farmhouse to be treated as a listed building, the setting and significance of it will have been considerably reduced. The Farmhouse has been relocated several kilometres beyond the proposed development site boundary; hence there has been a demonstrable change to its setting. In terms of Historic England's value criteria for weighing the significance of heritage assets, the Farmhouse has no evidential (archaeological) or artistic interest; and very limited architectural and historic interest as a dismantled and subsequently reconstructed 18<sup>th</sup> century vernacular Farmhouse of a different design to that of the original building.

10.63 However, without prejudice to this position – and for the sake of robustness, the impact on the Farmhouse has been considered in this chapter as if it were a listed building, where the setting and significance were as if they were the same as the original setting and significance of the Grade II Listed Buildings. This approach has been adopted in order to consider the impact of the proposed development on the Farmhouse on a 'worst case scenario' basis.

10.64 Accordingly, applying this 'worst case scenario' approach, the proposed development would have no impact on either the setting and significance of the Farmhouse, as there is no inter-visibility between the building and the proposed development site. It follows, therefore, that there are no heritage issues that ought to be factored into the planning balance with respect to the reconstructed Farmhouse.

### **Non-Designated Heritage Assets**

10.65 Any archaeological evidence within the former quarry workings will have been destroyed by quarrying operations. Accordingly, there are no impacts identified from the proposed development in these areas.

10.66 Although the coordinates recorded on the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record for Crowtrees Bloomery (Site 64, Figure 1, Appendix 10.1) locate it within the site boundary, these are only approximate, and reflect a large degree of uncertainty around its actual location. If the Bloomery was situated within the site, it has been destroyed; if it lay outside the site boundary, the level of impact would be neutral. In either case, no further archaeological work would be needed.

10.67 Although the sites of Park Woods and ponds (38 and 39, Figure 1, Appendix 10.1) are located on the boundary of the site, they will not be directly affected by the proposed development, and therefore, the level of impact would be neutral.

10.68 There are small areas of undisturbed land which lie on the fringes of the quarry workings that are considered to have low archaeological potential. The level of impact from the development would be negligible; should any development take place within these areas.

### **Designated Heritage Assets**

10.69 There are 26 Grade II Listed Buildings (along with a possible curtilage listed barn) within a 1 km radius of the site.

10.70 A number of these Listed Buildings are considered to have settings that are limited to surrounding villages within which they are located, and consequently, the proposed development is considered to be located beyond their settings. In each of these cases, dense woodland and topography of the landscape will block views to and from the site, and as such, there will be no impacts on the settings or significance of these buildings. The buildings are as follows:

#### Whiston

- The Leys Farmhouse (5 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2);
- The Leys (6 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2);
- Barn c. 20 m east of Stable House Farmhouse (8 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2);
- Barn c. 30 m south-east of The Leys Farmhouse (11 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2);
- Moorland Cottage (3 units) (13 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2);
- Barn c. 20 m east of Stable House Farmhouse (14 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2);
- Stable House Farmhouse (22 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2); and
- Barn c. 10 m south-east of The Leys Farmhouse (24 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2).

#### Oakamoor

- Sunnyside (2 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2);
- Retaining Wall to Lime Kilns (10 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2);
- Bridge c. 100 yards south-west of First World War Memorial (17 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2);
- First World War Memorial (18 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2); and
- Church of the Holy Trinity (19 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2).

10.71 Several Listed Buildings are located beyond the settings of Whiston (Milepost [7 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2], Barn c. 25 m east of Lockers Farm [12 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2], Milepost [20 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2], Locker Farmhouse [25 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2] and Springfield Farm [26 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2]); and Oakamoor (Bolton Memorial Free Church [1 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2], Eavesford Farmhouse [3 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2], Gate House [27 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2], and Lightoaks and attached Greenhouse [28 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2]). However, dense woodland and/or topography of the landscape will block views to and from the site. Therefore, the level of impact on the settings and significance of these buildings is considered to be neutral.

10.72 Two Grade II Listed Buildings (Eavesford Farmhouse [4 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2] and Barn c. 25 m north-east of Eavesford Farmhouse [16 on Figure 1, Appendix

10.2]) are situated c. 600 m to the north-west of the site. The settings of both buildings comprise various farm outbuildings of c. 17<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> century date, beyond which is arable land which surrounds the site. Woodland is located to the south-east. The rural setting would have had a positive contribution to the significance of these buildings. It is considered that the woodland to the south-east of the buildings and topography of the landscape will block views to and from the site. Therefore, there will be no impacts on the settings or significance of these buildings.

- 10.73 The remaining two Grade II Listed Buildings (Little Eaves Farmhouse [9 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2] and Barn c. 5 m east of Little Eaves Farmhouse [21 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2]), along with the possible curtilage listed barn, are all situated c. 100 m to the west of the site. They are discussed below.

### **Little Eaves Farmhouse**

- 10.74 Little Eaves Farmhouse is an 18<sup>th</sup> century Grade II Listed Building (List Entry Number: 1038028), which was designated in 1986, at which time the quarry was in active use. The list description for Little Eaves Farmhouse was written in 1987 (at the time of listing) and has not been updated since:

*"It is an 18<sup>th</sup> century 2-storey farmhouse with minor mid-19<sup>th</sup> century alterations built to a T-shaped plan. It is constructed of fine quality coursed dressed and squared stone and has a tiled roof with verge parapets. A brick end stack and ridge stack is situated towards the right end. The front is long and low with random fenestration; three 2-light block mullioned casement windows and there are four casement windows on the ground floor. There is a gabled wing with similar details to the rear."*

- 10.75 The significance of the building lies in its historic and architectural interest as an 18<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse.
- 10.76 The Farmhouse is located near the top of an area of high ground; levels fall away from this area in all directions. The core setting of the Farmhouse is its garden which lies to the north and east, the contemporary Grade II Listed Barn c. 5 m to the east, another barn of early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century date c. 15 m to the south, and a number of modern farm buildings to the south and south-east. The modern farm buildings are an incongruous contrast to the Farmhouse, significantly compromising its historic setting.
- 10.77 Early cartographic evidence shows that part of the original core setting of the Farmhouse was an orchard which lay to the south and south-west of this building. The orchard has since been replaced by the modern farm buildings.
- 10.78 Surrounding agricultural fields form the wider setting of the Farmhouse. The wider setting has a strong positive contribution to the significance of the Farmhouse, and places it in a rural context with which it has a functional relationship.
- 10.79 The agricultural fields are of some antiquity, but have changed significantly over time (particularly in respect of the quarrying operations). Changes to these fields have compromised the wider setting of the Farmhouse. The modern access track to the east of Little Eaves Farm, which is now used as the main approach to the farm complex, compromises part of its wider setting. The historic access track which ran between Whiston Eaves Farm and Little Eaves Farm was removed (along with Whiston Eaves Farmhouse and Stable at Whiston Eaves) during quarrying operations. Removal of the historic access track has also compromised its wider setting.

- 10.80 The removal of the orchard to the south and south-west of the Farmhouse, and the subsequent replacement of part of the Farmhouse's original core setting with modern farm buildings, allied with the removal of the historic access track running between Whiston Eaves Farm and Little Eaves Farm, and replacement of this with the modern access track to the east of Little Eaves Farm, all seriously compromise the setting of the Farmhouse.
- 10.81 The core setting of the Farmhouse is its garden which lies to the north and east, the contemporary Grade II Listed Barn c. 5 m to the east, another barn of early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century date c. 15 m to the south, and a number of modern farm buildings to the south and south-east. Views from the Farmhouse to the north are restricted by mature trees and woodland, to the east by mature trees around the eastern perimeter of the farm complex, and to the south and south-east by modern farm buildings.
- 10.82 The surrounding agricultural fields which comprise the wider setting of the Farmhouse have a positive contribution to the significance of the building and place it in a rural context with which it has a functional relationship. Nevertheless, quarrying activities have significantly compromised its wider setting.
- 10.83 Prior to any mitigation, the Farmhouse will be visible from the proposed Multi Activity Hub area located to the south-east. However, views are restricted by dense vegetation and trees which run along the western perimeter of the proposed development site, and mature trees located around the eastern perimeter of the farm complex. Therefore, the core setting, and the majority of the wider setting, will be unaffected by the development.
- 10.84 The significance of the Farmhouse lies primarily in its historic and architectural interest (i.e. its form and fabric). Therefore, a negligible/neutral effect is considered from the proposed development on the contribution that the wider setting provides to the significance of the building, in limited views to and from it. The overwhelming majority of its wider setting will be maintained.

#### ***Barn c. 5 m east of Little Eaves Farmhouse***

- 10.85 Located c. 5 m east of Little Eaves Farmhouse is a Grade II Listed Barn (List Entry Number: 1294408), which was designated in 1967. The list description for the Barn was written in 1967, and has not been updated:
- "The barn was dated to the 18<sup>th</sup> century and was built in the same style and fabric as the house, suggesting that they are contemporary, i.e. of coursed dressed squared stone with a tiled roof and verge parapets. It was built to a small single-storey plan and entered from the south. The east face has a row of four vents and there is a south gable with steps up to a boarded door. The barn is located c. 5m east of the farmhouse, emphasising their historical relationship."*
- 10.86 The significance of the Barn lies in its historic and architectural interest as an 18<sup>th</sup> century farm outbuilding.
- 10.87 The Barn is located near the top of an area of high ground; levels fall away from this area in all directions. The core setting of the Barn is the Farmhouse c. 5 m to the west, the garden which lies to the north-west, another barn of early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century date c. 20 m to the south-west, and a number of modern farm buildings to the south and south-west. The modern farm buildings are an incongruous contrast to the Barn, compromising its historic setting and its significance.

- 10.88 Early cartographic evidence shows that part of the original core setting of the Barn was an orchard which lay to the south and south-west. The orchard has since been replaced by the modern farm buildings.
- 10.89 Surrounding agricultural fields form the wider setting of the Barn. This setting has a strong positive contribution to the significance of the Barn, and places it in a rural context with which it has a functional relationship.
- 10.90 The agricultural fields are of some antiquity, but have changed significantly over time (particularly in respect of the quarrying operations). Changes to these fields have compromised the wider setting of the Barn. However, the modern access track to the east of Little Eaves Farm, which is now used as the main approach to the farm complex, compromises part of its wider setting. The historic access track which ran between Whiston Eaves Farm and Little Eaves Farm was removed (along with Whiston Eaves Farmhouse and Stable at Whiston Eaves) during quarrying operations. Removal of the historic access track has also compromised its wider setting.
- 10.91 The removal of the orchard to the south and south-west of the Barn, and the subsequent replacement of part of the Barn's original core setting with modern farm buildings, allied with the removal of the historic access track running between Whiston Eaves Farm and Little Eaves Farm, and replacement of this with the modern access track to the east of Little Eaves Farm, all compromise the setting and significance of the Barn.
- 10.92 The core setting of the Barn is the Farmhouse c. 5 m to the west, the garden which lies to the north-west, another barn of early to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century date c. 20 m to the south-west, and a number of modern farm buildings to the south and south-west. Views from the Barn to the north are restricted by mature trees and woodland, to the east and south-east by mature trees around the eastern perimeter of the farm complex, and to the south and south-west by modern farm buildings.
- 10.93 Those surrounding agricultural fields which comprise the wider setting of the Barn have a positive contribution to the significance of the building and place it in a rural context with which it has a functional relationship. Nevertheless, quarrying activities have significantly compromised its wider setting.
- 10.94 Prior to any mitigation, the Barn will be visible from the proposed Multi Activity Hub area located to the south-east. However, views are restricted by dense vegetation and trees which run along the western perimeter of the proposed development site, and mature trees located around the eastern perimeter of the farm complex. Therefore, the core setting, and the majority of the wider setting, will be unaffected by the development.
- 10.95 The significance of the Barn lies primarily in its historic and architectural interest (i.e. its form and fabric). Therefore, a negligible/neutral effect is considered from the proposed development on the contribution that the wider setting provides to the significance of the building, in limited views to and from it. The overwhelming majority of its wider setting will be maintained.

### ***Curtilage Listed Barn***

- 10.96 Located c. 15 m south of Little Eaves Farmhouse is a single storey barn, which is built in a similar style and fabric as Little Eaves Farmhouse and Barn. The barn was built between 1910 and 1938. It comprises course dressed squared stone with a

- tilled roof and verge parapets. The barn was built to a small single-storey plan and is entered from the east.
- 10.97 The limited significance of the barn lies in its historic and architectural interest as an early-mid 20<sup>th</sup> century farm outbuilding.
- 10.98 The barn is located near the top of an area of high ground; levels fall away from this area in all directions. The core setting of the barn is the Farmhouse c. 15 m to the north, the Barn c. 20 m to the north-east, and a number of modern farm buildings to the immediate south and south-east. The modern farm buildings are an incongruous contrast to the barn, compromising its historic setting.
- 10.99 Early cartographic evidence shows that part of the original core setting of the barn was an orchard which lay to the west and north-west of this building. The orchard has since been removed.
- 10.100 Surrounding agricultural fields form the wider setting of the barn. The wider setting has a strong positive contribution to the significance of the barn, and places it in a rural context with which it has a functional relationship.
- 10.101 The agricultural fields are of some antiquity, but they have changed significantly over time (particularly in respect of the quarrying operations). Changes to these fields have compromised the wider setting of the barn. The modern access track to the east of Little Eaves Farm, which is now used as the main approach to the farm complex, partly compromises its wider setting. The historic access track which ran between Whiston Eaves Farm and Little Eaves Farm was removed (along with Whiston Eaves Farmhouse and Stable at Whiston Eaves) during quarrying operations. Removal of the historic access track has also compromised its wider setting.
- 10.102 The removal of the orchard to the west and north-west of the barn, and the addition of modern farm buildings immediately to the south and south-east, allied with the removal of the historic access track running between Whiston Eaves Farm and Little Eaves Farm, and replacement of this with the modern access track to the east of Little Eaves Farm, all compromise the setting of the barn.
- 10.103 The core setting of the barn is the Farmhouse c. 15 m to the north, the Barn c. 20 m to the north-east, and a number of modern farm buildings to the immediate south and south-east. Views from the barn to the north and north-east are restricted by the Farmhouse and Barn, beyond which lie mature trees and woodland, and to the east and south-east by modern farm buildings.
- 10.104 The surrounding agricultural fields which comprise the wider setting of the barn have a positive contribution to the significance of the building and place it in a rural context with which it has a functional relationship.
- 10.105 The barn will not be visible from the proposed Multi Activity Hub area located to the south-east, due to modern farm buildings blocking views to and from it. Therefore, its core setting will be unaffected by the development. Prior to any mitigation, views of the wider setting of the barn are restricted by dense vegetation and trees along the western perimeter of the proposed development site, and mature trees along the eastern perimeter of the farm complex. Therefore, the majority of the barn's wider setting will be unaffected by the development.
- 10.106 The significance of the barn, which is in any event limited, lies primarily in its historic and architectural interest (i.e. its form and fabric). Therefore, a negligible/neutral effect is considered from the proposed development on the contribution that the



wider setting provides to the significance of the barn, in limited views to and from it. The overwhelming majority of its wider setting will be maintained.

10.107

## **Mitigation Measures**

10.108 This section describes the measures which are required to mitigate any potential significant environmental impacts.

### **Construction**

#### ***Non-Designated Heritage Assets***

10.109 It has been established that any archaeological evidence within the areas of former quarry workings will have been destroyed by quarrying operations.

10.110 There are small areas of undisturbed land which lie on the fringes of the quarry workings that are considered to have low archaeological potential.

10.111 In light of this, it is considered that as the archaeological potential of the site is very limited, no further work would seem warranted; and therefore no mitigation would be needed. However, in the event that the archaeological advisor to the Local Planning Authority requests some additional work, it is suggested that any such work can be undertaken as a condition of planning consent.

#### ***Designated Heritage Assets***

10.112 The proposed development has the potential to impact the settings of Little Eaves Farmhouse (9 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2), Barn c. 5 m east of Little Eaves Farmhouse (21 on Figure 1, Appendix 10.2) and the curtilage listed barn. A negligible/neutral effect is considered from the proposed development on the contribution that the wider setting provides to the significance of these assets, in limited views to and from them.

10.113 Any negligible/neutral effect on the contribution that the wider setting provides to the significance of these designated assets can be reduced further by additional tree planting along the western perimeter of the proposed development site.

### **Completed Development**

#### ***Non-Designated Heritage Assets***

10.114 No mitigation is required on completion of the development.

#### ***Designated Heritage Assets***

10.115 The nature of the change in views to and from Little Eaves Farmhouse, Barn c. 5 m east of Little Eaves Farmhouse and the curtilage listed barn will not be significantly different during construction when compared with the completed development. No mitigation required.

## Residual Impacts

### Construction

#### *Non-Designated Heritage Assets*

10.116 It is assumed that once the mitigation measures outlined above have been implemented, It is considered that due to the very limited archaeological potential of the site, no further archaeological work will be required.

#### *Designated Heritage Assets*

10.117 The impact of the proposed development on the settings of Little Eaves Farmhouse, Barn c. 5 m east of Little Eaves Farmhouse and the curtilage listed barn is assessed to be negligible/neutral in the long-term.

### Completed Development

#### *Non-Designated Heritage Assets*

10.118 No impacts are identified.

#### *Designated Heritage Assets*

10.119 There will be no change in the negligible/neutral impact identified during construction of the proposed development on the settings of Little Eaves Farmhouse, Barn c. 5 m east of Little Eaves Farmhouse and the curtilage listed barn to that of completion.

## Conclusions

### Non-Designated Heritage Assets

10.120 It has been established that any archaeological evidence within the areas of former quarry workings will have been destroyed by quarrying operations.

10.121 There are small areas of undisturbed land which lie on the fringes of the quarry workings that are considered to have low archaeological potential.

In light of this, it is considered that as the archaeological potential of the site is very limited, no further work would seem warranted. However, in the event that the archaeological advisor to the Local Planning Authority requests some additional work, it is suggested that any such work be undertaken as a condition of planning consent.

### Designated Heritage Assets

10.122 There are no Conservation Areas, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, and Registered Battlefields either within or in the surroundings of the site.

10.123 There are 28 Grade II Listed Buildings (along with a curtilage listed barn) located within a 1 km radius of the site.

10.124 A number of the Listed Buildings are considered to have settings that are limited to the surrounding villages of Whiston and Oakamoor within which they are located,

and consequently, the proposed development is considered to be situated beyond their settings. In each of these cases, dense woodland and topography of the landscape will block views to and from the site, and as such, there will be no impacts on the settings and significance of these buildings.

- 10.125 Several Listed Buildings are located beyond the settings of Whiston and Oakamoor. However, dense woodland and/or topography of the landscape will block views to and from the site. Therefore, it is considered that there will be no impacts on the settings and significance of these buildings.
- 10.126 Two Grade II Listed Buildings are situated c. 600 m to the north-west of the site. The settings of both buildings comprise various farm buildings of c. 17<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> century date, beyond which arable land surrounds the site. Woodland is located to the south-east. The rural setting would have had a positive contribution to the significance of the buildings. It is considered that woodland to the south-east of the buildings and topography of the landscape will block views to/from the site. Therefore, there will be no impacts on the settings or significance of these buildings.
- 10.127 The Grade II Listed Little Eaves Farmhouse, Barn c. 5 m east of Little Eaves Farmhouse and the curtilage listed barn, are located c. 100 m to the west of the site. The core of the setting of these buildings is the garden and farm complex. The surrounding agricultural fields which comprise the wider setting of the buildings have a positive contribution to their significance and place them in a rural context with which they have a functional relationship.
- 10.128 The Farmhouse and Barn will be visible from the proposed Multi Activity Hub area located to the south-east. However, views are restricted by dense vegetation and trees which run along the western perimeter of the proposed development site, and mature trees located around the eastern perimeter of the farm complex. Therefore, the core setting, and the majority of the wider setting of these buildings, will be unaffected by the development.
- 10.129 A negligible/neutral effect is considered from the proposed development on the contribution that the wider setting provides to the significance of Little Eaves Farmhouse, Barn c. 5 m east of Little Eaves Farmhouse and the curtilage listed barn, in limited views to and from them.
- 10.130 Any negligible/neutral effect on the contribution that the wider setting provides to the significance of these designated assets can be reduced further by additional tree planting along the western perimeter of the proposed development site, and through the reduction in height and careful siting of the Multi Activity Hub buildings.