



NORTHAMPTON
GATEWAY
STRATEGIC RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

**LETTER RECEIVED 2 NOVEMBER 2018 AND
DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN
THE APPLICANT AND HISTORIC ENGLAND**

DOCUMENT 7.14

The Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Order 201X

Regulation No: 5 (2) (q)

LETTER RECEIVED 2 NOVEMBER 2018 AND DRAFT STATEMENT
OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN THE APPLICANT
AND HISTORIC ENGLAND | 6 NOVEMBER 2018

www.northampton-gateway.co.uk



Historic England

Our ref:
PL00045431

Telephone
01604
735460

Dear Jessica

**Re: Proposed Northampton Gateway Junction 15 Strategic Rail Freight Interchange, Northamptonshire
Planning Inspectorate Reference TR05006-000005**

Thank you for forwarding to us a revised Statement of Common Ground dated October 2018. We have now been able to access the additional information and have the following comments to make.

- We note the submission of the documents that you have referred (i-vi). We would defer to the expert opinion of the County Archaeological Adviser with regard to the competency of the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment; Geophysical Survey Reports (Junction 15, and Roade Bypass; The Archaeological Evaluation (Cotswold Archaeology).
- We agree that there are no designated heritage assets on the application site.
- The total demolition of the non-designated heritage assets (barn 1 and barn 2) on the site would in our view equate to a high level of harm. We do recognise however that in accordance with paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that a balanced judgement will be required in terms of the significance of the heritage asset, also taking into account the public benefit of the proposed scheme in terms of justification for the harm to/loss of the heritage assets. The barns should therefore be subject to a full programme of recording, which should be secured by way of a DCO requirement, prior to the commencement of any consented development.
- We note the additional photomontages that have been submitted pursuant to our recommendation of 27 November 2017. These include views from the



Historic England, 2nd Floor, Windsor House, Billing Road, Cliftonville, Northampton NN1 5BE
Telephone 01604 73 5460 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.
Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



registered Park and Garden of Courteenhall House, and of the Roade aqueduct.

Courteenhall House PAG

Whilst the photomontages show that the development is not likely to be visible from the park we note however that potential views from the upper floors of the house do not appear to have been assessed.

We note the photomontage of the views of the development from the road to the north of Courteenhall House. Whilst this seems to indicate that there will be a noticeable change in terms of the appearance of the wider setting of the Registered PAG, we believe however that this would equate to harm that is less than substantial.

Roade Aqueduct

The submitted photomontage demonstrates that the current unimpeded view of the aqueduct from the pedestrian footbridge further south along the railway track would be interrupted by the proposed by-pass road. We therefore conclude that the by-pass road would have some impact upon the setting of the listed aqueduct that we believe would equate to a level of harm that would be less than substantial.

- We recommend that you seek the expert advice and guidance of the County Archaeological Adviser with regard to the management of mitigation measures of archaeological impacts by way of imposition of requirements in the Development Consent Order.
- We agree that there are no Scheduled Monuments or World Heritage Sites that would be significantly affected by the proposed development.
- On the basis of the previously submitted and additional material and documentation, we consider that the proposed development is likely to result in a level of less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets which in accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF must be weighed against the public benefits that the development will deliver.

Yours sincerely,

14

Neville Doe
Assistant Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas

Neville.doe@historicengland.org.uk

Planning Inspectorate Ref:
TR050006

Planning Application Ref:

**PROPOSED NORTHAMPTON
GATEWAY STRATEGIC RAIL
FREIGHT INTERCHANGE**

**STATEMENT
FOR INCLUSION IN THE
STATEMENT OF COMMON
GROUND BETWEEN
HISTORIC ENGLAND &
ROXHILL DEVELOPMENTS
LTD**

**RELATING TO BUILT
HERITAGE AND
ARCHAEOLOGY**

OCTOBER 2018

NORTHAMPTON GATEWAY, NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

1. Introduction:

- 1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("Statement") sets out the Built Heritage and archaeological matters that have been agreed between Historic England ("HE") and Roxhill Developments Limited (the Applicant) in relation to the proposed Northampton Gateway Strategic Rail Freight Interchange development ("the Site").
- 1.2 This Statement covers the agreed position between HE and the Applicant in relation to Built Heritage and archaeology.
- 1.3 It responds to the suggested issues proposed for inclusion within this Statement by the Examining Authority's 'Rule 6' letter of 10th September. 2018

2. Relevant Documents comprise:

- i) Built Heritage Statement: Land off Junction 15, M1, Collingtree, Northamptonshire (CgMs, September 2017)
- ii) Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment: Land off Junction 15, M1, Collingtree, Northamptonshire (CgMs, October 2017)
- iii) Geophysical Survey Report: Junction 15 of M1, Northamptonshire (Stratascan, October 2014)
- iv) Geophysical Survey Report: Roade Bypass and Junction 15 of the M1, Northamptonshire (Stratascan, September 2017)
- v) ES Chapter: Chapter 10, Cultural Heritage (CgMs, June 2018)
- vi) Land off Junction 15, M1, Collingtree, Northamptonshire: Archaeological Evaluation (Cotswold Archaeology, June 2018)

3. Areas of agreement on technical matters:

- 1 It is agreed that the above documents, previously submitted, are technically competent and accord with the relevant professional standards and guidelines.
- 2 It is agreed that there are no designated heritage assets (including both archaeological and Built Heritage assets) on the site.

3 The Built Heritage Statement consulted The Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record, Historic England Data Sets and the South Northamptonshire data on Conservation Areas in order to identify potential built heritage assets. Using a Site visit and the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) the following heritage assets have been identified which have the potential to be impacted:

- Mortimers (Grade II)
- Church of the Holy Cross (Grade II*)
- Courteenhall Registered Park & Garden (Grade II)
- Courteenhall House (Grade II*)
- The School and School House (Grade II*)
- Courteenhall Stables (Grade II*)
- Roade Aqueduct (Grade II)
- Hyde Farmhouse (Grade II)
- Remains of Dovecote (Grade II)
- Milton Malsor Conservation Area
- Collingtree Conservation Area
- Roade Conservation Area
- Non-designated Barn Number One
- Non-designated Barn Number Two

4 The Built Heritage Statement concluded that at most the proposed development would result in a minor degree of less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets, which should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals.

5 There will be a high level of harm to the two non-designated barns at the centre of the Site, resulting from their demolition, however these are of the lowest local significance and their loss should be weighed against this low significance.

4. Areas of common ground:

In connection with built heritage and archaeological issues on land at Northampton Gateway, Historic England, the Applicant and their Built Heritage Consultant, agree that:

- 1 The Built Heritage Statement was undertaken and reported on in accordance with recognised guidance.
- 2 Any harm to designated heritage assets will be less than substantial in nature and should therefore be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.
- 3 There will be a high level of harm to the non-designated barns at the centre of the Site, however this should be weighed against the low local significance of the assets.
- 4 Having carried out further visual montages (which are included as part of the submitted ES) at the request of Historic England, it is agreed that:
 - a. There will be no impact to the Blisworth Conservation Area from the proposed development (Viewpoint 10)
 - b. There is no visibility of the proposals from Courteenhall House (Viewpoint 26).
 - c. Whilst there will be a change to the landscape from the road to the north of Courteenhall Park, this will not result in more than minor harm to the overall significance of the Registered Park and Garden (Viewpoint 25).
 - d. Whilst Viewpoint 30 demonstrates that views of the Roade Aqueduct will be impacted by the proposed bypass, this will have a less than substantial impact on the overall significance of the asset.
- 5 The likely significant archaeological impacts have been identified through the desk and field-work already undertaken and mitigation measures can be appropriately managed through the imposition of a requirement in the Development Consent Order.
- 6 There will be no significant impacts on Scheduled Monuments, or World Heritage Sites as a result of the development.

5. Planning (DCO) Requirement

An appropriately worded DCO Requirement would satisfactorily accommodate the built heritage interest of the site, notably the demolition of the non-designated heritage assets on Site. A suitable condition would be as follows:

Prior to the commencement of any works on the main site (including demolition works), a full Level 2 record of the existing barn buildings shall be organised. The record must be carried out in accordance with a written specification prepared by a competent building recorder in accordance with Historic England Understanding Historic Buildings, A Guide to good Recording Practice, 2010 and must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any works (including demolition works).

An additional appropriately worded requirement would satisfactorily deal with the archaeological interest in the land affected by the development.

6 **Areas of Disagreement**

1. None.

Signed by:

.....

Date:.....

On behalf of:

.....

.....

Date:.....

On behalf of:

.....