

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited

HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

The Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Development Consent Order

Project reference TR050007

Environmental Statement Volume 1: Main Statement

Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage

Document reference: 6.1.13

Revision: 03

November 2022

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009
Regulation 5(2)(a)

The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017
Regulation 14

This document forms a part of the Environmental Statement for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange project.

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited (TSH) has applied to the Secretary of State for Transport for a Development Consent Order (DCO) for the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI).

To help inform the determination of the DCO application, TSH has undertaken an environmental impact assessment (EIA) of its proposals. EIA is a process that aims to improve the environmental design of a development proposal, and to provide the decision maker with sufficient information about the environmental effects of the project to make a decision.

The findings of an EIA are described in a written report known as an Environmental Statement (ES). An ES provides environmental information about the scheme, including a description of the development, its predicted environmental effects and the measures proposed to ameliorate any adverse effects.

Further details about the proposed Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange are available on the project website:



The DCO application and documents relating to the examination of the proposed development can be viewed on the Planning Inspectorate’s National Infrastructure Planning website:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/east-midlands/hinckley-national-rail-freight-interchange/>

Chapter 13 ◆ Cultural Heritage

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

- 13.1 This Chapter sets out the assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development (as described in Chapter 3 (document reference 6.1.3)) on cultural heritage.
- 13.2 Cultural heritage includes a wide range of features recognised in policy as ‘heritage assets’ resulting from human intervention in the landscape, varying in scope from buried archaeological remains, up to late 20th century industrial structures. Heritage assets include the following:
- World Heritage Sites – An international designation reflecting an asset’s ‘outstanding universal value’;
 - Scheduled Monuments – A national designation applied to archaeological sites of ‘national importance’;
 - Listed Buildings (Grades I, II* and II) – A national designation applied to buildings of ‘special architectural and historic interest’;
 - Registered Parks and Gardens (Grades I, II* and II) – A national designation applied to parks and gardens of ‘special historic interest’;
 - Registered Historic Battlefields – A national designation applied to “important English battlefields”;
 - Conservation Areas – Areas designated by the Council as the local planning authority for their ‘special architectural and historic interest’; and
 - Non-designated heritage assets – Buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes, identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which are not formally designated heritage assets.
- 13.3 This Chapter describes the methods used to establish baseline conditions currently existing at the Development Consent Order (DCO) Site and its surrounding study areas; the methodology used to determine potential impacts and the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset (where possible) any significant adverse impacts and the likely effects after these measures have been implemented.
- 13.4 This Chapter should be read in conjunction with the following Appendices and other pertinent documents submitted with the DCO application:
- Appendix 13.1 – Archaeological Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.1);

- Appendix 13.2 – Heritage Assessment (document reference 6.2.13.2);
- Appendix 13.3 – Geophysical Survey Report (Phase 1) (document reference 6.2.13.3);
- Appendix 13.4 – Geophysical Survey Report (Phase 2) (document reference 6.2.13.4);
- Appendix 13.5 – Evaluation Report (Phase 1) (document reference 6.2.13.5);
- Appendix 13.6 – Evaluation Report (Phase 2) (document reference 6.2.13.6);
- Appendix 13.7 - Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (document reference 6.2.13.7);
- Figure 13.1 - DCO Site Boundaries and Off-site Junction Locations (document reference 6.3.13.1);
- Figure 13.2 - Designated Heritage Assets and Zone of Theoretical Visibility (document reference 6.3.13.2);
- Figure 13.3 - Historic Built Form within the Main Order Limits (document reference 6.3.13.3);
- Figure 13.4 - Known Heritage Assets (document reference 6.3.13.4);
- Figure 13.5 – Extracts from Historic Maps (document reference 6.3.13.5); and
- Figure 13.6 – Cultural Heritage Images (document reference 6.3.13.6).

13.5 The extents of the DCO Site are identified on Figure 13.1 (document reference 6.3.13.1), while the extents of the Main Order Limits, the A47 Link Road Corridor and the M69 Junction 2 Works are each identified on Figure 2.1 (document reference 6.3.2.1).

METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Opinion

13.6 An EIA Scoping Opinion (document reference 6.2.6.2) was received from the Planning Inspectorate in December 2020 which included comments in relation to the Cultural Heritage section of the Scoping Report submitted in November 2020 (document reference 6.2.6.1), the comments are included in Table 13.1 and Table 13.2 below with an explanation of how each comment has been addressed.

Table 13.1: Planning Inspectorate’s Comments from EIA Scoping Opinion in relation to Cultural Heritage (December 2020).

Heritage		
Planning Inspectorate	Comments	Responses
ID 4.7.2; Ref 12.20-12.37, 12.47	Despite the changes to the red line boundary, this aspect of the Scoping Report focuses on the previous draft Order Limits (scoped in 2018). The ES should apply the same approach and study area, unless otherwise agreed, to the new larger development area (including off-site works). New searches of the Historic Environment Record (HER) and the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) may be required to ensure the most up-to-date and accurate data on the historic environment informs the ES.	The Assessment of the DCO Site has applied the same approach to the study area as previous data gathering and study areas have been amended accordingly to account for revisions to the DCO Site, taking account of the nature of the Proposed Development including the location of off-site works.
ID 4.7.3	<p>The ES should be undertaken in line with the most up-to-date Historic England (HE) standards and guidance, including (but not limited to):</p> <p>Advice Note 12: Statements of Heritage Significance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets (October 2019); • The Foundation for Success – Modern Infrastructure and the Historic Environment (November 2019); • Piling and Archaeology Guidance and Good Practice (March 2019); and 	Noted and latest guidance has been utilised in the ES as appropriate

Heritage		
Planning Inspectorate	Comments	Responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserving Archaeological Remains guidance (first published in November 2016). 	
ID 4.7.4; Ref 12.46; 12.65 – 12.66	<p>The Scoping Report states that the effects on receptors can be mitigated by a suitable programme of investigation and recording in advance of development. An appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy is also intended to be implemented to offset potential effects.</p> <p>All mitigation measures required for the Proposed Development should be fully described and justified and the means by which these will be secured through the DCO should be fully detailed.</p>	<p>Proposed mitigation for archaeological remains has been agreed with the Leicestershire County Council (LCC) Archaeologist and is outlined in the assessment and the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy, at Appendix 13.7 (document reference 6.2.13.7). These measures will be secured through DCO requirements.</p>
ID: 4.7.5; Ref: 12.47 – 12.64	<p>The Scoping Report refers to agreement reached with HE and the LCC Archaeologist on the methodology. This consultation appears to have covered the Proposed Development main site only. The Applicant should ensure that the assessment methodology for heritage assets (both designated and non-designated) is agreed for the development in its entirety. It should be clear in the ES how consultation has informed the assessment.</p>	<p>The assessment methodology has been agreed with the LCC Archaeologist across the whole of the DCO Site.</p> <p>HE confirmed, in response to the PEIR, that the submitted PEIR included a comprehensive assessment of the impact upon the historic environment (see Table 13.3: Summary of s42 consultation responses below).</p>

Heritage		
Planning Inspectorate	Comments	Responses
ID: 4.7.6; Ref: 12.50	The Scoping Report states that additional assets beyond the 5km study area for designated assets will also be assessed as appropriate. It is not clear what criteria would be used to identify additional assets. The inclusion of additional assets should be fully explained in the ES.	No additional assets beyond the 5km study area have been identified for inclusion by consultees.
ID: 4.7.7	The Scoping Report includes figures indicating the location of heritage assets. Photomontages should also be produced for key viewpoints where significant heritage assets are affected, including views towards heritage assets in which the Proposed Development would be visible; views from designated heritage assets; and views between contemporaneous or otherwise associated heritage assets in which both assets and the Proposed Development would be visible.	The locations of photomontages in respect of heritage assets has been agreed with consultees including HE (see Table 13.3: Summary of s42 consultation responses below) and LCC (28.01.21 – Email response from LCC Landscape Officer and Archaeologist confirming agreement on photoviewpoint locations and additional suggested locations).
4.11.2	The Scoping Report states that liquid waste such as wastewater from dewatering operations is covered in Chapter 14: Surface Water and Flood Risk. Wastewater and dewatering operations are not mentioned in Chapter 13: Cultural heritage. This should be addressed in the ES.	Dewatering is considered within Chapter 15: Hydrogeology Recommendations for the management of wastewater are set out in Chapter 15: Hydrogeology (document reference 6.1.15). No heritage assets beyond the Main Order Limits are considered susceptible to change in respect of any de-watering and wastewater operations.

Table 13.2: Consultee Comments from EIA Scoping Opinion in relation to Cultural Heritage (December 2020).

Heritage		
Consultee	Comments	Responses
Burbage Parish Council	<p>CULTURAL HERITAGE</p> <p>As noted above, the Applicant has not acknowledged any Cultural significance to Burbage Common. The ES should specifically consider the Cultural Heritage of the common and associated woods. The Applicant has listed Landscape Designations in the area which does not include Burbage Common. The Applicant states “no Registered Parks and Gardens lie within the 5km search area”. This clearly shows no consideration of Burbage Common has been made.</p>	<p>The HE 'Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England', established in 1983, currently identifies over 1,600 sites assessed to be of particular significance at a national level. The emphasis of the Register is on gardens, grounds and other planned open spaces, such as town squares. Burbage Common is not a registered park and garden and it is not identified as a heritage asset at either a local or national level. Burbage Common is however a Country Park and area of Open Access Land and is considered as such in this ES and at Chapter 11 (document reference 6.1.11).</p>
Elmesthorpe Parish Council	<p>Response notes absence of reference to all listed buildings at Elmesthorpe in scoping report.</p>	<p>The assessment has addressed all listed buildings within the defined study area, which includes the listed buildings at Elmesthorpe.</p>
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC)	<p>Chapter 13- Cultural Heritage</p> <p>The section ‘Other Planning Policy’ correctly identifies the HBBC Local Plan but doesn’t specify the relevant policies and spatial objective, which include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic 	<p>Noted and included in this ES Chapter.</p>

	<p>Environment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DM 12: Heritage Assets; • Policy DM13: Preserving the Boroughs Archaeology; • Core Strategy Spatial Objective 10: Natural Environment and Cultural Assets; and • Core Strategy Spatial Objective 11: Built Environment and Townscape Character. 	
<p>Historic England</p>	<p>We note that the Draft DCO Order Limits (Page 36) are different and larger than the area previously consulted on as part of the 2018 Scoping Report. It is important the cultural heritage assessments relate to this current scheme, with the 5km study area based on this redline (or the most up-to-date at the time of the assessment). The same approach should apply to the proposals at M1 Junction 21. New searches of the Historic Environment Record and the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) may be required to ensure the most up-to-date and accurate data on the historic environment informs the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).</p> <p>For example, the current redlines suggest more consideration may now need to be given to the settings of the Sapcote Castle and Lubbesthorpe medieval settlement scheduled monuments. Cumulative impact may be an important consideration at Lubbesthorpe. Similarly, the historic landscape, inter-visibility and interconnection</p>	<p>The Assessment of the DCO Site has covered the agreed study areas including the Main Order Limits, extending to the A47 Link Road, Junction 2 works as well as other offsite highways works. The assessment has included up to date searches of the Historic Environment Record (HER) and the NHLE for the DCO Site.</p>

	<p>between the historic settlements (and heritage assets) at Sapcote, Aston Flamville and Sharnford may need more thought than would have been needed with the DCO Order Limits noted in the 2018 scoping report.</p>	
<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>	<p>CULTURAL HERITAGE</p> <p>Table 12.1, Point 3: The site boundary has been extended with the inclusion of the Off-Site Highways Works, it does not appear that the developer has attempted to update the heritage baseline data in respect of this extended area. We would expect this includes both designated and non-designated heritage assets, as well as other heritage assets, such as ridge and furrow earthworks and historic landscape character areas.</p> <p>Table 12.1, Point 5: It is unclear how the concerns raised by the Planning Inspector, in respect of HE’s comments (engaging with the significance of Heritage Assets) are to be addressed.</p> <p>Para. 12.23: In respect of designated HAs, see above Table 12.1, Point 3.</p> <p>Para. 12.31: As above.</p> <p>Para. 12.35: Two discrete areas of archaeological potential, comprising a ring ditch (and associated features/finds) immediately west of Hobbs Hays Farm and a separate Roman settlement site located to the north of Aston Firs/Elmesthorpe Plantation.</p>	<p>The Assessment includes up to date baseline data for the DCO Site.</p> <p>As requested by HE, the assessment includes a proportionate narrative in respect of the significance of heritage assets affected and does not rely solely on a tabular matrix.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>No additional assets beyond the respective 5km or 1km study areas</p>

	<p>Para. 12.50: What criteria will be used to identify additional assets outside the 5km study area for designated heritage assets? The same/similar criteria should be used to include consideration of non-designated heritage assets outside the respective 1km study area.</p> <p>Para. 12.65: As above (Table 12.1, Point 3).</p> <p>Para 12.70: The assessment of the low sensitivity of heritage assets identified to date is premature. In the absence of submission of the results of the completed surveys, it would be safer to assume that evaluation of the Main Site has revealed remains of low to medium sensitivity. It should also be recognised that this level of sensitivity cannot be assumed for the area as yet unevaluated, specifically those areas affected by the off-site highways works.</p>	<p>have been identified by consultees to require assessment.</p> <p>This Chapter presents the results of the completed surveys of the DCO Site.</p>
--	--	---

13.7 A summary of the s42 consultation (2022) responses is included in Table 13.3 with an explanation of how each comment has been addressed.

Table 13.3: Summary of s42 consultation (2022) consultation responses.

Consultee	ID/Ref	Consultee comment	Response
BDC	Overall Summary	"Overall, it is considered that no substantive harm would result to any heritage assets, subject to completion of all necessary work (trial trenching; visual appraisal once finalised information produced) and subsequent assessments	It is acknowledged that adverse effects on heritage assets in EIA terms translates to harm in terms of the National Planning Policy

		<p>on the impacts of light, noise, vibration and odour to all designated and non-designated assets. However, this conclusion cannot be confused with ‘no harm’. The conclusions of this Chapter therefore require any decision maker to consider the balance of benefits versus harm in accordance with the NPS, NPPF and Planning and Listed Building Act.</p> <p>One Listed Building appears to have been missed off the list – Hillfoot Farmhouse, Station Lane, Croft."</p>	<p>Framework (NPPF) and National Policy Statement (NPS). This is addressed and made clear in the Summary and Conclusions section of this ES Chapter, in terms of defining the level of harm in NPPF and NPS terms to relevant heritage assets.</p>
BDC	"Para 13.8 – 13.19"	Largely agree with the methodology selected to assess assets and the relative impacts.	Noted, no action required.
BDC	"Para 13.42; Appendix 13.2"	One Listed Building appears to have been missed off the list – Hillfoot Farmhouse, Station Lane, Croft.	Hill Foot Farmhouse is considered and determined not to be a sensitive receptor in para 1.190-1.191 of Appendix 13.2 (document reference 6.2.13.2).
BDC	"Paras 13.46 – 13.101"	In principle no issue with the conclusions provided for the relationship to each asset. However, the impacts of light, noise, vibration and odour should be considered for all designated and non-designated assets. The assessment undertaken is largely a visual relationship only.	These aspects are addressed in the ES accordingly. The impacts of light have been considered with respect to the findings of the Landscape and Visual Effects Chapter (document reference 6.1.11) and Lighting Strategy (document reference 6.2.3.2), while the conclusions of Noise and Vibration Chapter (document reference 6.1.10) and Air Quality Chapter (document reference 6.1.9) have also

			informed the assessment of each heritage asset.
BDC	"Paras 13.124 – 13.125"	The conclusions on archaeology are written in a finalised manner. Trial trenching is on-going and thus these conclusions cannot be made until this work has been completed. Once complete, comment can be provided on archaeological matters.	The results of the completed archaeological investigations have been incorporated into the ES as Appendices 13.3-13.6 (document references 6.2.13.3-6).
BDC	"Paras 13.156 – 13.159"	<p>"Mitigation is proposed in the form of landscape planting. The suggested additional landscape mitigation within the comments to Chapter 11 if implemented would offer additional mitigation protection to the heritage assets (excluding archaeology on the site itself).</p> <p>However, harm to the setting of three Listed Buildings would still be occurring as these are not to be mitigated. Whilst this harm is not significant it cannot be conflated with 'no harm'. A balance of benefits versus harm will need to be undertaken by PINS to determine whether the proposal is acceptable against the NPS, NPPF and Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990."</p>	Agreed, it is not considered that any landscape mitigation could meaningfully mitigate or reduce the effects arising in respect of the effect of the Proposed Development on designated heritage assets, through change to their settings. The ES does not conflate non-significant effects with 'no harm' in terms of the NPPF or NPS. This is made clear in the Summary and Conclusions to this ES Chapter.
HBBC	13.42	The assessment set out in Technical Appendix 13.2 identifies that there are three designated heritage assets within the HBBC administrative area (the grade I listed building Church of St Mary, Barwell; the grade II* listed building Church of St Simon and St Jude, Earl Shilton; and the grade II* listed building Church of St Catherine, Burbage) which are considered to be sensitive receptors, due to the potential for development within the Main HNRFI Site to affect the appreciation of these churches from the	Agreed, No Action.

		wider landscape and erode their historical wider agricultural setting in views from the churchyard.	
HBBC	13.135	<p>13.135 takes this initial assessment further and predicts that the significance of each of the three churches will be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site through change within their wider setting. In regard to the Church of St Mary and the Church of St Catherine the predicted visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site will adversely affect the ability to appreciate these two churches in context with their historical agricultural setting. For all three churches the appreciation of their significance will also be affected to a negligible extent by the loss of localised views towards the church tower and/or spires from parts of the land within the Main HNRFI Site.</p> <p>The PEIR concludes that these impacts, while representing a noticeable change in the setting of the assets, are expected to result in negligible change to the significance of the listed churches, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on these assets of high sensitivity, which is not significant. Section 13.164 of the PEIR concludes that no mitigation measures are identified to further offset the minor adverse significance of effect to the identified heritage assets.</p> <p>Whilst HBBC agree that there will be adverse effects resulting from the Proposed Development within the Main HNRFI Site that cannot be mitigated, and agree with the resulting level of impact identified, care should be taken to not conflate a 'not significant' impact as concluded within the PEIR (in EIA terms) with no harm. The Proposed</p>	<p>The ES does not conflate non-significant effects with 'no harm' in terms of the NPPF/NPS. This is made clear in the Summary and Conclusion to this Chapter, where the level of harm in terms of the NPPF/NPS is articulated for each relevant asset.</p>

		<p>Development within the Main HNRFI Site will result in harm to three designated heritage assets in terms of national and local planning policy; in my opinion and based on the impacts identified within the PEIR this level of harm would be less than substantial. The following statute, national and local policies (the latter in this case is a material consideration) should therefore be applied by the decision-taker when determining this proposal.</p>	
HBBC		<p>Policy Context and Review</p> <p>Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on the local planning authority, or as the case may be, the Secretary of State, when determining applications for development which affects a listed building or its setting to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural and historic interest which it possesses. Section 16 of the NPPF provides the national policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.</p> <p>Paragraphs 199-202 of the NPPF require great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets when considering the impact of a proposed development on its significance, for any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset to have clear and convincing justification, and for that harm to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal.</p> <p>Paragraph 200(b) recognises that grade I and grade II* listed building are heritage</p>	<p>Agreed, no action required.</p>

		<p>assets of the highest significance.</p> <p>Paragraph 202 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.</p> <p>Policies DM11 and DM12 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD seek to protect and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets. Policy DM11 states that the Borough Council will protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment throughout the borough. This will be done through the careful management of development that might adversely impact both designated and non-designated heritage assets. All development proposals which have the potential to affect a heritage asset or its setting will be required to demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) An understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, b) The impact of the proposal on the significance of the asset and its setting, including measures to minimise or avoid these impacts; c) How the benefits of the proposal will outweigh any harm caused; and d) Any impact on archaeology in line with Policy DM13. <p>Policy DM12 states that all proposals for development affecting the setting of listed buildings will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that the proposals are compatible with the</p>	
--	--	--	--

		significance of the building and its setting.	
Historic England		The submitted PEIR upon which the ES will be based includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact upon the historic environment, including the setting of nearby designated heritage assets.	Noted
Historic England		The designated heritage assets within the 5km study area around the Hinckley Rail Freight Interchange Site that are of relevance to Historic England’s consultation response are the following: 1) Elmesthorpe Church ruins scheduled monument (List Entry No. 1005076); 2) Grade I Listed Church of St Mary, Barwell (List Entry No. 1074229); 3) Grade II* listed Church of St Catherine, Burbage (List Entry No. 1295212); and 4) Grade II* listed Church of St Simon and St Jude, Earl Shilton (List Entry No. 1074259).	Noted
Historic England		In respect of the above 4 assets, HE raised the following requests: • The request for additional details to be provided to better describe and evidence the impact of the proposals upon the setting of the identified designated heritage assets; and • Further assessment of how the experience of these assets change within the landscape to enable a more detailed understand of the impact of these proposals, clarifying the level harm/change to significance, and better informing any necessary	This information has been included in this Chapter in the Baseline Assessment section and Potential Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Development section, as well as through the provision of more detailed evidence in Appendix 13.2 (document reference 6.2.13.2), additional photographic images in Figure 13.6 (document reference 6.3.13.6) and additional viewpoints and

		mitigation.	annotations to photo viewpoints in Figure 11.10 (document reference 6.3.11.10).
Historic England		1. Additional descriptions and heritage specific photos and visualisations (and/or annotating and adding wireframes to existing material) could better demonstrate how the experience of the heritage assets change as one moves through the landscape. By evidencing this more kinetic experience of the heritage assets, we can better understand the level to which their settings would be effected by the Proposed Development;	Additional heritage-specific photographs, and annotations of the existing photo viewpoints are included in the ES at Figure 13.6 (document reference 6.3.13.6), as well as photo viewpoints in Figure 11.10 (document reference 6.3.11.10)..
Historic England		2. We would recommend a closer look at the footpaths around and leading up to the Church of St Mary Barwell. This is part of how the asset is approached and there will be points in which the church, landscape and development site can be experienced together. A view looking out from inside the church yard would also be useful;	Additional photographs are included in Figure 13.6 (document reference 6.3.13.6), to show the experience from the churchyard of St Mary, Barwell as well as additional photographs and analysis in respect of the experience from the Public Right of Way (PRoW) leading to the church.
Historic England		3. We would recommend more detail on how the assets are experienced from the historic footpaths, lanes and bridal ways which criss-cross the landscape south of Elmesthopre, including from within the application site itself. It is not clear from the material provided how the churches and spires are currently appreciated when moving through this area, or how would that be impacted by the new warehouses	Photo viewpoints from within the Main Order Limits and its surrounds have been annotated to illustrate this experience and how the churches are experienced in the context of the Main Order Limits, including from the PRoW to the north, in Figure 11.10 (document

		and interchange infrastructure;	reference 6.3.11.10) as well as in Figure 13.6 (document reference 6.3.13.6).
Historic England		4. Additional material to clarify the intervisibility of features would also be useful. For example, the assessment notes that the spire of St Catherine’s in Burbage is visible in some views from Elmsthorpe; but this is unclear on the photoviewpoints which have been provided. Evidence demonstrating the intervisibility (or lack thereof) between Elmsthorpe and Barwel Church, and between St Catherine’s in Burbage and St Simon & St Jude in Earl Shilton, would also be useful.	Additional photographic evidence to illustrate these relationships, experiences and intervisibility is provided in Appendix 13.2 (document reference 6.2.13.2) and Figure 13.6 (document reference 6.3.13.6). Furthermore, the Photoviewpoints in Figure 11.10 (document reference 6.3.11.10) from within the Main Order Limits and its surrounds have been annotated to illustrate how the churches are experienced in the context of the Main Order Limits.
Historic England		5. We would also request an additional photoviewpoint for the scheduled monument at Elmesthorpe. The current view is from the parcel of land southwest of the monument. A view from the scheduled area/in front of the monument (which is slightly higher land) would be of more use.	An additional photo viewpoint (Photoviewpoint 53) has been illustrated, taken from the graveyard immediately in front of the scheduled monument and provided in Figure 11.10 (document reference 6.3.11.10).
Historic England		6. It would be useful for some clarity within the Cultural Heritage Chapter on whether there is likely to be impacts from increased noise or light pollution.	The results of the Noise and Vibration Chapter (document reference 6.1.10), Lighting Strategy (document reference 6.2.3.2) and Landscape and Visual Effects Chapter

			(document reference 6.1.11) and the implications in respect of the effects on the significance of each of these heritage assets, is addressed in the Potential Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Development section of this Chapter.
Historic England		7. Finally, we note that the Cultural Heritage Chapter talks of embedded mitigation incorporated into the submitted design in order to eliminate, reduce or offset adverse effects. It notes that the landscaping strategy will seek to appropriately screen development and minimise its visual impact. More details on where and how the mitigation specifically responds to the individual designated heritage assets would be useful. It would be beneficial to highlight how the level of impacts and harm would change over time.	This Chapter sets out how and where mitigation relates to the identified heritage assets and how this would affect the level of impact, including whether this would change over time in the Proposed Mitigation section.

Summary of s47 Consultation (2022) Responses

13.8 During the consultation of the local community (document reference 5.1), a limited number of concerns were raised in respect of Cultural Heritage, although ‘environmental impacts’ in general terms were raised by the local community as a key theme. Accordingly, it is considered that potential environment impacts in respect of Cultural Heritage are fully addressed in this Chapter.

Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

Relevant Policy and Guidance

13.9 The assessment of cultural heritage assets has been conducted in line with the latest and most comprehensive guidance provided in:

- The National Policy Statement (NPS) for National Networks (2014);

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment;
- The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2 (LA104: Environmental assessment and monitoring) published by Highways England in 2020;
- Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance published by English Heritage 2008;
- Annex 1 of 'Scheduled Monuments: Identifying, protecting, conserving and investigating nationally important archaeological sites under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979';
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic England Guidance published 2015;
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic England Guidance published 2017;
- Historic England Advice Note 12: Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets (October 2019);
- Historic England's 'Heritage: The Foundation for Success - Modern Infrastructure and the Historic Environment' (November 2019);
- Historic England's 'Piling and Archaeology Guidance and Good Practice' (March 2019); and
- Historic England's 'Preserving Archaeological Remains: Decision-taking for Sites under Development' (November 2016).

13.10 These documents do not provide a prescriptive approach to assessment, but identify principles and good practice that have been applied in the methodology for this assessment.

Assessment Methodology

13.11 A series of baseline studies have been completed to inform the preparation of this Chapter. These were undertaken in accordance with the relevant guidance set out above, as well as the body of 'Standard and Guidance' produced by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), and comprise:

- An Archaeological Assessment (Appendix 13.1; document reference 6.2.13.1), that comprised examination and assessment of available archaeological and historical information, including the Leicestershire Historic Environment Record (HER), in order to clarify the archaeological potential of the DCO Site, and which incorporated the results of a walkover survey assessing the archaeological and built form within the Main Order Limits, as well as the results of a geophysical survey and archaeological trial

trench evaluation on the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road within the Main Order Limits;

- A Heritage Assessment (Appendix 13.2; document reference 6.2.13.2) including visits to all relevant designated heritage assets within the study area;
- Two programmes of geophysical survey comprising detailed gradiometer survey (magnetometry) undertaken over the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road within the Main Order Limits (Appendix 13.3; document reference 6.2.13.3 and Appendix 13.4; document reference 6.2.13.4); and
- The results of a programme of archaeological evaluation trenching undertaken over the Main Order Limits (Appendix 13.5; document reference 6.2.13.5 and Appendix 13.6; document reference 6.2.13.6).

Significance of Effect

- 13.12 In line with the National Networks NPS, and other industry standard best-practice guidance (as set out above), the assessment first identifies the heritage significance of relevant assets through a proportionate narrative analysis, and thereafter assesses the impact of the Proposed Development on that significance. Impacts are not harmful unless they adversely affect a heritage asset's significance.
- 13.13 Having established the significance of heritage assets, and those that are sensitive to change resulting from the Proposed Development, Tables 13.4, 13.5 and 13.6 set out the criteria that is then employed in attributing 'sensitivity' to archaeological and heritage assets, identifying the magnitude of any changes to them (i.e. the impact) and assessing the significance of the resulting effects in EIA terms.
- 13.14 The sensitivity of the heritage assets identified is assessed on the basis of Table 13.4. The magnitude and significance of potential effects on archaeological remains and built heritage resources, arising from the implementation of the Proposed Development, will be identified and appropriately assessed, based on Tables 13.5 and 13.6.
- 13.15 The significance of effect is assessed with reference to the receptor's (i.e., the heritage asset's) sensitivity and the magnitude of impact.
- 13.16 The criteria in Table 13.5 are based on criteria established by National Highways (NH) in its Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (2020). This document sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the effects on cultural heritage as part of the environmental assessment process, and is the only such document adopted by a government agency.
- 13.17 The attribution of the sensitivity of a heritage asset is a question of professional judgement derived from an assessment its heritage significance. The sensitivity of the receptor (heritage asset) is defined by its importance in terms of national, regional or local statutory or non-statutory protection and grading of the asset. The non-statutory criteria used by the Secretary of State for scheduled monuments provide relevant criteria to assist this process, as do the HE Listing Selection Guides and the Department for Digital, Culture,

Media and Sport (DCMS) Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings document. Table 13.4 below sets out the criteria for assessing sensitivity.

Table 13.4: Sensitivity of Receptor

Receptor	Sensitivity of receptor				
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
World Heritage Site					
Scheduled Monument					
Grade I or II* listed building					
Grade I or II* registered park or garden					
Other nationally important archaeological asset					
Grade II listed building					
Grade II registered park or garden					
Conservation area					
Other asset of regional or county importance					

	Sensitivity of receptor				
Locally important asset with cultural or educational value					
Heritage site or feature with very limited value or interest					

13.18 The classification of the magnitude of change to heritage assets is rigorous and based on consistent criteria. This will take account of such factors as the physical scale and type of disturbance to them and whether features or evidence would be lost that are fundamental to their heritage interest and therefore significance. The magnitude of change is assessed using the criteria in Table 13.5.

Table 13.5: Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of Change				
Large	Medium	Small	Negligible	None
Change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is completely altered or destroyed				
	Change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is significantly modified			

Magnitude of Change				
Large	Medium	Small	Negligible	None
		Change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is noticeably different		
			Change to the significance of a heritage asset that hardly affects it	
				No change to the significance of an asset

13.19 Following the evaluation of sensitivity for specific archaeology and cultural heritage receptors and the magnitude of impact, the significance of effect is assessed using the criteria shown in Table 13.6.

Table 13.6: Significance matrix

Magnitude of change	Sensitivity of receptor				
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Large	Severe	Major	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor

Magnitude of change	Sensitivity of receptor				
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Medium	Major	Major or Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor	Negligible
Small	Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor	Negligible	Neutral
Negligible	Moderate or Minor	Minor	Negligible	Neutral	Neutral
None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

13.20 The assessment matrix defined in Table 13.6 is not intended to be ‘prescriptive’, but rather it allows for the employment of professional judgement to determine the most appropriate level of effect for each heritage asset that is identified.

13.21 Effects have been categorised with regard to their nature (adverse, beneficial or neutral) and their permanence (permanent, temporary or reversible). For all forms of heritage asset (receptor); including archaeological sites and remains, historic buildings, places and areas; and historic landscapes; the sensitivity of the receptor is combined with the predicted magnitude of change to heritage significance to arrive at the significance of effect in EIA terms.

13.22 The combination of sensitivity and magnitude of change is undertaken with reference to the matrix in Table 13.6, with those effects defined as severe or major being deemed ‘significant’. Judgment is also to be applied to whether a moderate effect might be reported as a significant effect in certain high impact cases, on a case by case basis. The NH Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (2020) advises “*The effect on the cultural heritage resource is not significant when the impact does not substantially diminish the heritage interest of the cultural heritage resource*”. All other effects are determined to be ‘not significant’ in EIA terms.

Cumulative Effects

13.23 Cumulative effects generally occur where there might be simultaneous or sequential

effects on heritage assets of two or more developments, or where the consideration of other schemes would increase an effect identified. PINS Advice Note 17: Cumulative effects assessment relevant to NSIP (PINS, 2015c) has been taken into account in identifying cumulative schemes to be considered in conjunction with the Proposed Development.

13.24 The effects of those development sites within the near vicinity of the Proposed Development (see Figure 20.1; document reference 6.3.20.1), which have the potential to result in effects on heritage assets, have been assessed against the likely effects of the Proposed Development to determine whether cumulative effects are likely and if so their significance. This is reported in the Cumulative Effects section of this Chapter and also within Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects (document reference 6.1.20).

Surveys

13.25 The baseline assessments commenced with data trawls in 2017, consistently updated into 2022, with field assessment of the DCO Site and heritage assets in the study area undertaken by experienced heritage consultants over a series of surveys between 2018 and 2022. The programme of geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation within the Main Order Limits was undertaken in a series of phases, from April 2018 to October 2022.

Study Areas

13.26 As a result of baseline analysis, together with an understanding of the nature and scale of the development, and the likely extent and distribution of effects on heritage assets, the assessment defines the following study areas, as represented on Figure 13.1 (document reference 6.3.13.1).

- Study area for assessment of designated heritage assets – set at 5km distance from the Main Order Limits (as requested by HE). Note in this case the boundary of the Main Order Limits is taken from the southern edge of the principal redline around the M69 Junction 2 works and does not include the separate redlines of the M69 signage works to the south; and
- Study area to inform assessment of archaeological potential – set at 1km from the Main Order Limits (excluding the separate redlines of the M69 signage works to the south) (as agreed with the LCC Archaeologist).

13.27 Following initial analysis and subsequent field work informed by the results of the Landscape and Visual Effects - Chapter 11 (document reference 6.1.11), and having an appreciation of the Proposed Development parameters, it should be acknowledged that, despite the 5km study area for consideration of the setting of designated heritage assets, it is expected that heritage assets, in common with landscape areas and features, are likely to be affected only within a 2km radius of the Main HNRFI Site.

13.28 With regard to the associated highway and railway works within the DCO Site beyond the Main Order Limits, given the limited nature of many components of the intended works and the pre-existing transport character purpose they occupy (i.e. existing roads, signs,

railway infrastructure etc), these have been considered on a case-by-case basis in terms of their potential for significant adverse effects on cultural heritage receptors, rather than adopting the wide-ranging study areas that have been applied to the Main Order Limits.

Limitations and Assumptions

- 13.29 No specific assumptions have been made in the preparation of this assessment, and neither are there any intrinsic limitations to the conclusions reached.
- 13.30 Baseline conditions have been established using existing assessments, available documentation and field assessment; it is important to note that this information may change before or during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.
- 13.31 It should be recognised that much of the data acquired and used in preparation of the baseline appendices, and this Chapter, has been supplied by public bodies, and must therefore be assumed to be accurate and robust.
- 13.32 Within reasonable limits, the assessment is undertaken in consideration of the ‘reasonable worst case’ scenario for the Proposed Development i.e. those potential outcomes, situations or locations which would result in the most profound effect on cultural heritage receptors. It therefore identifies the greatest degree of change likely to accrue and may be subject to mitigating factors or alternative conditions which might reduce those effects.
- 13.33 The assessment applies a pre-determined methodology to arrive at conclusions (as outlined above). This procedure brings a degree of objective, procedural rigour into what otherwise might be judged to be ‘professional opinion’. Certainly, professional judgement still plays its part, but the purpose of adopting the industry best-practice methodology is to make the process as clear and logical as possible.
- 13.34 In common with Chapter 11 addressing Landscape and Visual Effects (document reference 6.1.11), this Chapter of the ES identifies and assesses, in some instances, the nature and magnitude of potential effects arising from the Proposed Development in respect of views of or from heritage assets. However, whilst the consideration of these receptors may be common to both Chapters, the methodologies employed in the identification and assessment of potentially significant effects upon them are not. As a consequence, whilst the two Chapters should be read in conjunction, the conclusions reached in respect of the Proposed Development’s impact in consideration of effects in association with designated heritage assets such as listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments (and potentially other forms of heritage asset), will not necessarily be the same, and should not be assumed to be so.
- 13.35 It should also be recognised that mere intervisibility is not the sole or even prime consideration when assessing the potential indirect effect of development proposals on heritage assets.

RELEVANT LAW, POLICY AND GUIDANCE

Legislative and Policy Context

- 13.36 Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 set out the duties of Local Planning Authorities (LPA) in respect of the treatment of listed buildings and conservation areas through the planning process.
- 13.37 Section 66(1) of the Act sets out the statutory duty of the decision-maker, where proposed development would affect a listed building or its setting.
- 13.38 Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act states that: *'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area...special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'*.
- 13.39 This 'special regard' or 'special attention' duty has been tested in the Court of Appeal and confirmed to require that 'considerable importance and weight' should be afforded by the decision maker to the desirability of preserving a listed building along with its setting, or the character or appearance of a conservation area. The relevant Court judgement is referenced as *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northants DC English Heritage and National Trust* (2014) EWCA Civ 137.
- 13.40 The relevant legislation concerning the treatment of scheduled monuments is the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (HMSO 1979). This Act details the designation, care, and management of scheduled monuments, as well as detailing the procedures needed to obtain permission for works which would directly impact upon their preservation. The act does not confer any statutory protection on the setting of scheduled monuments.

Policy Framework

National Policy Statement for National Networks (2014)

- 13.41 The NPS for National Networks sets out the need for and the government's policies to deliver development of NSIPs on the national road and rail networks in England and Wales. It provides planning guidance for promoters of NSIPs on the road and rail networks, and the basis for the examination by the Examining Authority and decisions by the Secretary of State.
- 13.42 The NPS recognises the need to consider heritage assets within the application and determination process as the construction and operation of national infrastructure has the potential to result in adverse impacts on the historic environment, as stated in paragraph 5.120. The historic environment section of NPS (NPS pp. 71-75) emphasises the need for local authorities to set out a clear strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, where heritage assets are recognised as a finite and irreplaceable resource, to be preserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

13.43 Paragraph 5.127 addresses applications for NSIPs, stating that:

'The applicant should describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant Historic Environment Record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, the applicant should include an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.'

13.44 Designated heritage assets are addressed in Paragraph 5.131, which states that:

'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should give great weight to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced and their loss has a cultural, environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Given that heritage assets are irreplaceable, harm or loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II Listed Building or a grade II Registered Park or Garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated assets of the highest significance, including World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, grade I and II Listed Buildings, Registered Battlefields, and grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens should be wholly exceptional.'*

13.45 With regard to non-designated heritage assets, Paragraph 5.125 states that:

'The Secretary of State should also consider the impacts on other non-designated heritage assets (as identified either through the development plan process by local authorities, including 'local listing', or through the nationally significant infrastructure project examination and decision-making process) on the basis of clear evidence that the assets have a significance that merit consideration in that process, even though those assets are of lesser value than designated heritage assets.'

National Planning Policy Framework

13.46 The NPPF sets out the government's approach to the conservation and management of the historic environment, including both listed buildings and conservation areas, through the planning process in more general terms. The opening paragraphs of Section 16 of the NPPF (189 and 190) emphasise the need for local authorities to set out a clear strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, where heritage assets are recognised as an irreplaceable resource, to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

13.47 The NPS states that the NPPF is likely to be an important and a relevant consideration in decisions on NSIPs, but only to the extent relevant to an individual project.

Local Planning Policy

13.48 The DCO Site falls primarily across two LPA areas: Blaby District and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, the offsite highway improvements also fall across Harborough District Council and Rugby Borough Council areas. The relevant adopted local statutory planning documents include:

- Blaby District Local Plan (Core Strategy) (adopted 2013);
- Blaby District Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document (adopted 2019);
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Core Strategy (adopted 2009);
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (adopted 2016);
- Harborough Local Plan (adopted 2019); and
- Rugby Borough Council Local Plan (adopted 2019).

Fosse Villages Neighbourhood Plan (adopted 2021) Blaby District Local Plan (Core Strategy) (adopted February 2013)

13.49 The Blaby District Local Plan 2013-2029 (Core Strategy) provides the strategic planning policy framework and sets out strategic site allocations for the District to 2029. The Core Strategy forms part of the spatial plan and provides the basis for decisions on land use planning affecting Blaby District.

13.50 Policy contained within the adopted Local Plan, relevant to the historic environment, includes:

'Policy CS20: Historic Environment and Culture

Blaby District has a number of important buildings, sites and areas of historic value including Scheduled Monuments (SMs), Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, archaeological remains and other heritage assets. These (including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats) will be preserved, protected and where possible enhanced.

The Council takes a positive approach to the conservation of heritage assets and the wider historic environment through:

- a) Considering proposals for development on, in, or adjacent to historic sites, areas and buildings against the need to ensure the protection and enhancement of the heritage*

asset and its setting. Proposed development should avoid harm to the significance of historic sites, buildings or areas, including their setting;

- b) Expecting new development to make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the local area;*
- c) Ensuring that development in Conservation Areas is consistent with the identified special character of those areas, as well as working, where appropriate, to identify other areas of special architectural merit or historic interest in designating additional Conservation Areas;*
- d) Securing the viable and sustainable future of heritage assets through uses that are consistent with the heritage asset and its conservation; and*
- e) Promoting heritage assets in the District as tourism opportunities where appropriate.'*

13.51 In addition to policy CS20, Paragraphs 7.20.1 to 7.20.4 of the Local Plan make the following points:

'The East Midlands Regional Plan indicates that 'the historic environment should be understood, conserved and enhanced' in order to 'contribute to the Region's quality of life'. The above policy aims to meet this objective by protecting (and where possible enhancing) archaeological sites, historic buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and other cultural assets.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasises the importance of Local Plans setting out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment and its heritage assets, and places a heavy emphasis on the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Blaby District contains a number of important archaeological sites (including 14 Scheduled Monuments). In addition, there are numerous areas of known archaeological interest and the potential for other unexplored areas to contain important archaeological artefacts.

The District of Blaby has nine conservation areas and some 200 listed buildings. Development proposals that affect listed buildings or fall within Conservation areas need to be of very high design quality taking into consideration the principles of good design set out in Policy CS2.'

Blaby District Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document (adopted 2019)

13.52 The Blaby District Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document contains the development management policies that apply across the District, with the following of relevance to cultural heritage:

'DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICY 12

Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets

All new development should seek to avoid harm to the heritage assets of the District. Development proposals that conserve or enhance the historic environment will be supported.

All proposals affecting either a designated or non-designated heritage asset and/or its setting will need to submit a statement which includes the following:

- *a description of the heritage asset and its setting, proportionate to its significance;*
- *a clear identification of the impacts of the development proposal on the heritage asset and its setting;*
- *a clear justification as to why the impacts could be considered acceptable; and*
- *demonstrate how the proposal is consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS20.*

The Council will consider the submitted information having regard to the importance of the heritage asset(s) as follows:

Designated heritage assets

Designated heritage assets and their settings (including Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments and Conservation Areas) will be given the highest level of protection to ensure that they are conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance and contribution to the historic environment.

Where substantial harm is identified, proposals will only be supported in exceptional circumstances in accordance with national planning guidance. Where a less than substantial level of harm is identified the scale of harm will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Non-designated heritage assets

A balanced consideration will be applied to proposals which may impact non-designated heritage assets. Proposals will be supported where the benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the scale of any harm or loss, having regard to the significance of the heritage asset.'

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Core Strategy (adopted 2009)

13.53 The Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Core Strategy (adopted 2009) contains the following spatial objectives of relevance to cultural heritage:

'Spatial Objective 10: Natural Environment and Cultural Assets To deliver a linked network of green infrastructure, enhancing and protecting the borough's distinctive landscapes,

woodlands, geology, archaeological heritage and biodiversity and encourage its understanding, appreciation, maintenance and development.

Spatial Objective 11: Built Environment and Townscape Character To safeguard, enhance and where necessary regenerate the borough's distinctive built environment including its wider setting particularly that associated with Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and historic industries.'

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (adopted 2016)

13.54 The Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Site Allocations and Development Management Policies contains the development management policies that apply across the Borough, with the following of relevance to cultural heritage:

'DM11 Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

The Borough Council will protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment throughout the borough. This will be done through the careful management of development that might adversely impact both designated and non-designated heritage assets. All development proposals which have the potential to affect a heritage asset or its setting will be required to demonstrate: setting; and a) An understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its b) The impact of the proposal on the significance of the asset and its setting, including measures to minimise or avoid these impacts; c) How the benefits of the proposal will outweigh any harm caused; and d) Any impact on archaeology in line with Policy DM13.

DM12 Heritage Assets

All development proposals affecting heritage assets and their setting will be expected to secure their continued protection or enhancement, contribute to the distinctiveness of the areas in which they are located and contribute to the wider vibrancy of the borough.

All development proposals affecting the significance of heritage assets and their setting will be assessed in accordance with Policy DM11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment and will require justification as set out in this policy.

All development proposals will need to accord with Policy DM10: Development and Design.

Listed Buildings

Proposals for the change of use, extensions and alterations of listed buildings and development affecting the setting of listed buildings will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that the proposals are compatible with the significance of the building and its setting.

Conservation Areas

Development proposals should ensure the significance of a conservation area is preserved and enhanced through the consideration and inclusion of important features (as identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan) including, but not limited to the following: materials which are characteristic of the conservation area; and out of the Conservation Area; with those of the same or similar species;

- a) Appropriate boundary treatments which reflect the local style;*
- b) The preservation and enhancement of key views and/or vistas in;*
- c) The replacement of dead or dying important trees and hedgerows;*
- d) Reinforce or mirror the historic street pattern and plan form where feasible;*
- e) The use of sensitively styled street furniture;*
- f) The use of natural building materials, preferably locally sourced; and*
- g) The retention of key spaces within the conservation area.*

Proposals which seek to improve identified neutral and negative areas inside designated conservation areas, which also lead to the overall enhancement of the conservation area, will be supported and encouraged.

All applications which include the demolition of buildings and means of enclosure within a Conservation Area must propose an adequate replacement which enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area. Conditions will be imposed to ensure demolition does not occur until immediately prior to the redevelopment or remediation.

Historic Landscapes

Proposals affecting historic landscapes, their features or setting should have regard to their significance and be justified in line with Policy DM11.

Development proposals within or adjacent to the historic landscape of Bosworth Battlefield should seek to better reveal the historic significance of the area.

Proposals which adversely affect the Bosworth Battlefield or its setting should be wholly exceptional and accompanied by clear and convincing justification. Such proposals will be assessed against their public benefits.

Particular regard will be had to maintaining topographical features, archaeological remains or to the potential expansion of the Battlefield.

Proposals which seek to enhance the educational or tourism provision associated with the Bosworth Battlefield will be encouraged where they comply with other policies in the Local Plan.

Scheduled Monuments

Proposals which adversely affect a scheduled monument or its setting should be wholly exceptional and accompanied by clear and convincing justification.

Locally Important Heritage Assets

Assets identified on the Locally Important Heritage Asset List should be retained and enhanced wherever possible. The significance of the assets illustrated in the List and the impact on this significance should be demonstrated and justified in line with Policy DM11.'

DM13 Preserving the Borough's Archaeology

Where a proposal has the potential to impact a site of archaeological interest, developers should set out in their application an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where applicable, the results of a field evaluation detailing the significance of any affected asset.

Where applicable, justified and feasible the local planning authority will require remains to be preserved in situ ensuring appropriate design, layout, ground levels, foundations and site work methods to avoid any adverse impacts on the remains.

Where preservation of archaeological remains in situ is not feasible and/or justified the local planning authority will require full archaeological investigation and recording by an approved archaeological organisation before development commences.'

- 13.55 A single off-site junction within the DCO Site is also located on the boundary of Harborough District and Rugby Borough. Therefore, this ES Chapter has had regard to the relevant adopted historic environment policy within these LPA's, which includes Policy HC1 of the Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 and Policy SDC3 of the Rugby Borough Council Local Plan 2011-2031.
- 13.56 A review of planning policy is set out in Chapter 5 of this ES (document reference 6.1.5) and also within the Planning Statement accompanying the DCO application (document reference 7.1).

CONSULTATIONS

- 13.57 In addition to the consultation responses received in the Scoping Opinion (document reference 6.2.6.2) and subsequent s42 consultation (2022), the assessment has been informed by continued consultation with the LCC Archaeologist to confirm an appropriate strategy to provide a robust assessment of the archaeology of the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor. Consultation established the requirement for a proportionate programme of geophysical survey and a trial trench evaluation across the Main HNRFI Site and including the extents of the A47 Link Road Corridor and Junction 2 M69 works. The results of these surveys are included in Technical Appendices 13.3 - 6 (document references 6.2.13.3-6).
- 13.58 Consultation was also undertaken with the HBBC Senior Planning Officer (Conservation and GIS) and the LCC Conservation Officer (conservation advisor to Blaby District Council) in August 2017 in order to agree the study area and methodology for the assessment of the setting of designated heritage assets, which conform with those study areas identified in the subsequent Scoping Opinion. The subsequent s42 consultation (2022) responses confirmed HBBC and BDC's agreement to the study areas and methodology.
- 13.59 The assessment has also been informed by consultation with the HBBC Planning Officer, LCC Landscape Architect (advisor to Blaby District Council) and LCC Heritage Team Manager (the LCC Archaeologist) in January 2021 to agree the photo viewpoint selections, including those in respect of relevant heritage assets in the study area.
- 13.60 Similarly, the subsequent s42 consultation (2022) consultation responses, as set out in Table 13.3 above, confirmed Historic England's recommendations for additional information in respect of a limited number of heritage assets, which has duly been presented in this ES Chapter and accompanying Appendices (document references 6.2.13.1-6).
- 13.61 Comments received from the pre-application community consultation in 2018 and highways consultation in 2019 have also been considered in the production of this ES Chapter. A limited number of concerns were raised during these consultation exercises in respect of the impact of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage, in general terms highlighting the potential for impacts on heritage assets within and around the DCO Site. Accordingly, it is considered that these potential impacts are fully addressed in this Chapter.

BASELINE CONDITIONS

- 13.62 A general description of the DCO Site and surroundings is provided in Chapter 2: *Site Description* of this ES (document reference 6.1.2).
- 13.63 This section identifies the relevant archaeology and cultural heritage receptors (heritage assets) within the extents of the DCO Site and its wider zone of influence. It draws upon the results of the supporting baseline assessment and investigative fieldwork reports

(Appendices 13.1 to 13.6, document references 6.2.13.1-6), which address the DCO Site.

13.64 A detailed description of the baseline situation at, and around, the DCO Site is set out in Appendix 13.1 and 13.2 (document references 6.2.13.1 and 6.2.13.2). Provided below is a summary of the baseline assessment with regard to cultural heritage, with the relevant receptors identified on supporting Figures 13.1 to 13.4 (document references 6.3.13.1-4).

Designated Heritage Assets

13.65 There are 13 scheduled monuments, two Grade I, 11 Grade II*, 128 Grade II listed buildings and 10 Conservation Areas located within the 5km study area defined around the Main Order Limits (excluding the separate redlines of the M69 signage works to the south). Detailed assessment set out in Appendix 13.2 (document reference 6.2.13.2) has identified that the majority of these assets have no potential to be affected by the Proposed Development due to a lack of any visual or functional association with it. Where the Proposed Development has the potential to result in effects to designated heritage assets, they are considered further below.

13.66 No designated heritage assets are located within the DCO Site. However, the baseline assessment in Appendix 13.2 (document reference 6.2.13.2) identifies a single scheduled monument, seven listed buildings, and a single conservation area that, although not situated within the DCO Site, could potentially experience a change to their wider 'settings' as a result of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor specifically, that might affect their heritage significance, or the appreciation of that significance. These assets are summarised below.

13.67 While acknowledging that the contribution of setting to the significance of a heritage asset is most often expressed by reference to views, with the emphasis on the contribution of the visual experience of the setting of a heritage asset to its significance, this assessment has nonetheless acknowledged that the way in which an asset is experienced (i.e. its setting) can also be affected by environmental factors including noise, vibration and odour.

13.68 As such, this assessment has also given regard to the consideration of the impact of noise and vibration in respect of cultural heritage. However, no relevant heritage assets coincide with any identified noise sensitive receptors, as set out in Chapter 10, Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 6.1.10). Therefore, no likely effects are predicted or anticipated in this regard in respect of the any heritage assets set out in this assessment.

13.69 Similarly, Chapter 9, Air Quality (Document Reference 6.1.9) does not identify any likely or predicted effects in respect of odour and as such no impacts are anticipated in this respect on any cultural heritage receptors.

13.70 In consideration of the areas of the DCO Site beyond the Main Order Limits and their relationship to designated heritage assets, the changes within these areas are limited. They are, in the case of the off-site highways and junctions, only additional signage, occasional road calming measures and minor adjustments to the existing highway network. For the land south of the A47 Link Road, the changes are the conversion of the

agricultural fields to a planted county park extension. As such there is considered to be no potential for any designated heritage assets in the study area to experience a change to their wider 'settings' that might affect their heritage significance, or the appreciation of that significance as a result of works within the DCO Site beyond the Main HNRFI Site including the M69 Junction 2 Works and A47 Link Road.

13.71 As such the following assets are assessed in respect of the consideration of the potential effects of the Proposed Development within the Main Order Limits.

Elmesthorpe Church, Ruined Nave and West Tower Scheduled Monument (1005076), Elmesthorpe

13.72 The Elmesthorpe Church scheduled monument comprises a 13th century ruined nave and west tower. It is adjacent to the Grade II listed Church of St Mary. The scheduled monument and attached church are located on rising ground in the linear settlement of Elmesthorpe.

13.73 The ruins date to the 13th century, with the church having been altered from the 14th century onwards. The significance of this monument is primarily derived from its considerable archaeological interest, although the ruins also possess a high degree of historic and architectural interest.

13.74 In terms of its setting, the monument is situated within the graveyard associated with the attached Church of St Mary which provides an understanding of the historic context of the ruins. The church is set back, but highly visible, from the adjacent road to the south, which affords the most common experience of the asset (Figure 13.6, Image 13.1; document reference 6.3.13.6). From the grounds of the monument there are wide views south over the modern developments in the settlement towards the lower-lying land that formed the monument's historic parish (Figure 11.10; Photo viewpoint 19 and 53; document reference 6.3.11.10). These views also afford glimpses of the spire of the Church of St Catherine in Burbage.

13.75 In these views from the monument there is an appreciation of the north-western portions of the Main HNRFI Site, which also has an historical functional association, having formed part of the Elmesthorpe parish associated with the monument, albeit making only a very limited contribution to the significance of the asset through this association.

13.76 Furthermore, although the monument is not widely visible from the wider landscape, being located nestled into a south facing slope, the monument can be glimpsed from a number of locations within the HNRFI Site (Figure 11.10; Photoviewpoints 1 and 2; document reference 6.3.11.10 and Figure 13.6, Images 13.2- 13.4; document reference 6.3.13.6), where the monument is experienced as a component of the expanse of built form of Elmesthorpe and Barwell that occupies the ridge of high ground north of the Main Order Limits.

13.77 In accordance with the consultation advice from Historic England, this assessment has also considered other kinetic views of the monument from the surrounding landscape beyond the Main Order Limits. Views of the monument were considered from the PRow south of

Elmesthorpe, to consider the locations where the experience of the monument interacts with the Main Order Limits and therefore those locations where the experience of the monument has the potential to be affected by the Proposed Development.

- 13.78 From the PRoW south of Elmesthorpe and north of the Main Order Limits (Figure 11.13; document reference 6.3.11.13), there was found to be limited experience of the monument, due to the enclosing nature of the hedgerows defining the navigable routes, in combination with the topographic location of the monument, nestled into the rising ground. Where glimpses of the monument could be obtained from these routes, such as looking north from PRoW V50/1 (Figure 13.6, Image 13.5; Document Reference 6.3.13.6) these views do not incorporate the Main Order Limits and therefore are not considered sensitive to change.
- 13.79 This is a conclusion supported by the Landscape and Visual Baseline Report (LVA) (Appendix 11.1, Document Reference 6.2.11.1), which identifies that views from the north towards the Main Order Limits are limited to the B581 (Station Road) and dwellings along it. Beyond, a combination of gently undulating topography, mature vegetation and built form generally combines to limit inter-visibility.
- 13.80 Consideration was also given to the visibility of other churches from the Elmesthorpe monument, in accordance with the consultation advice from HE set out in Table 13.3 above, but it was determined that in this respect only the distant view of the spire of the Church of St Catherine in Burbage is a consideration, as set out above. The intervening settlement and vegetation surrounding both the Elmesthorpe Church scheduled monument and Church of St Mary, Barwell, militates against the intervisibility of these two churches, as evidenced in Figure 13.6; Images 13.6 and 13.7 (document reference 6.3.13.6).
- 13.81 In summary of these findings, the Elmesthorpe Church scheduled monument is considered to be a sensitive receptor, due to the potential for development in the Main HNRFI Site to affect the appreciation of the monument from within the site and the wider landscape and erode its historically associated wider agricultural setting, as experienced from the grounds of the monument itself.
- 13.82 The Elmesthorpe Church is deemed to be of high sensitivity based on the criteria for scheduled monuments as set out in Table 13.4.

Grade II Listed Church of St Mary (1074693), Elmesthorpe

- 13.83 The Grade II Church of St Mary (1074693) is located circa 1km north of the Main HNRFI Site within the settlement of Elmesthorpe. The church is directly associated with the scheduled remains of the medieval tower and nave (see above). The church itself has 14th century origins, though was rebuilt in 1868 in random granite rubble and dressed stone.
- 13.84 It is this historic and architectural interest which mainly contributes to the significance of this asset, along with its association with the attached monument.
- 13.85 In terms of its setting, the listed building is situated within its surrounding graveyard

alongside the attached monument, which provides an understanding of the historic context of the later listed building. The church is set back, but highly visible, from the adjacent road to the south, which affords the most common experience of the asset. From the grounds of the church there are wide views south over the modern developments in the settlement towards the lower-lying land that formed the church's historic parish (Photoviewpoint 19; Figure 11.10, document reference 6.3.11.10). These views also afford glimpses of the spire of the Church of St Catherine in Burbage.

- 13.86 In these views from the church there is an appreciation of the north-western portions of the Main HNRFI Site, which also has an historical functional association, forming part of the historic Elmesthorpe parish associated with the church, albeit making only a very limited contribution to the significance of the asset through this association.
- 13.87 Furthermore, although the church is not widely visible from the wider landscape, being located nestled into a south facing slope, the building can be glimpsed from northern parts of the Main HNRFI Site, as previously set out with reference to the scheduled monument.
- 13.88 As such, the Grade II Church of St Mary (1074693) is considered to be a sensitive receptor, due to the potential for development in the Main HNRFI Site to affect the appreciation of the church from the wider landscape and erode the appreciation of its historically associated wider agricultural setting.
- 13.89 The Church of St Mary at Elmesthorpe is deemed to be of high sensitivity based on the criteria for listed buildings as set out in Table 13.4.

Grade II Listed Wentworth Arms and Adjoining Stables (1307251), Elmesthorpe

- 13.90 The Grade II listed Wentworth Arms and Adjoining Stables (1307251) are located adjacent to the east of the Main HNRFI Site on Station Road. The building, a pub, was built in 1896 to the designs of C F A Voysey for Lord Lovelace of Kirkby Mallory, as were the Wortley Cottages. The building is a single storey brick building built alongside the road. The significance of the building is primarily derived from the historic and architectural interest of its built form.
- 13.91 In terms of its setting, the listed building was originally constructed as part of a contemporary development around the station, which included the Wortley Cottages to the north of the railway. It is likely that the Wentworth Arms pub was specifically built to serve passing trade associated with users of the road and railway. These functional associations with the highway and railway, as well as the cottages, make a contribution to the significance of the listed building. The building's prominent roadside location also contributes to the significance of the asset and allows the key view of the building, from where it was principally intended to be appreciated.
- 13.92 Although the asset is close to the Main HNRFI Site, this area of the DCO Site comprises the Burbage Common Road, proposed for conversion to a secondary access for pedestrians/cycles and as such there will be no change to Station Road itself. Nonetheless, there is the potential that the Proposed Development might lead to change to the immediate setting of the building, and specifically the presence of built form in the Main HNRFI Site behind

the asset.

- 13.93 More widely, the land within the Main HNRFI Site is not considered to make any contribution to the heritage interest of this listed building, and there are no known historic functional associations between the listed building and the wider farmland located beyond.
- 13.94 Even so, the Wentworth Arms and Adjoining Stables is considered to be a sensitive receptor, due to the potential for development in the Main HNRFI Site to affect the experience of the asset.
- 13.95 The Wentworth Arms and Adjoining Stables are deemed to be of high sensitivity based on the criteria for listed buildings as set out in Table 13.4.

Grade I Listed Church of St Mary (1074229), Barwell

- 13.96 To the north of the Main HNRFI Site, the Grade I Church of St Mary (1074229) is located on the southern edge of Barwell, on the ridge of high ground c.1.8km north-west of the Main HNRFI Site.
- 13.97 The church dates to the 13th-14th century and was extensively restored in the 19th century. It is built of random rubblestone with freestone dressings and a 3-stage west tower. The significance of the church is primarily derived from the exceptional historic, architectural and artistic interest of its built form, which also has value due to its archaeological interest.
- 13.98 In terms of its setting, the church is located within its walled churchyard containing a raised graveyard. It is situated on the edge of the historic core of the settlement of Barwell, which was formally a small linear village based around the current high street. However, the church is set away from the high street, and is now almost entirely surrounded by late 20th century residential development, such that the relationship between the church and the historic core of the settlement is difficult to appreciate from the church.
- 13.99 More widely, there are glimpsed views from the churchyard over the lower-lying land to the south, albeit visibility is constrained by the vegetation enclosing the churchyard and the built form of the surrounding settlement (Figure 13.6, Images 13.7 and 13.8; document reference 6.3.13.6). Photoviewpoint 25 depicts the wide-ranging vista, including the Main HNRFI Site, that can be appreciated from the footpath immediately south of the church and its enclosing graveyard. Although not key to the appreciation of the significance of the asset, these views from the churchyard and its immediate environs allow some appreciation of the wider landscape setting of the church.
- 13.100 The spires of the Church of All Saints in Sapcote (1177924) and the Church of St Michael in Stoney Stanton (1074704) can also be glimpsed in the distance, albeit they do not form prominent skyline features and are more incidental views of these churches, given the extensive landscape and variety of settlement features that are also visible.
- 13.101 In these views from the immediate environs of the church there is an experience of parts

of the Main HNRFI Site, in the context of the wider expanse of low-lying land, although there is no apparent functional connection between the church and the Main HNRFI Site.

13.102 The church is visible from many areas within and outside Barwell, and as such it is experienced in a wider landscape context as a focal point and landmark of the settlement.

13.103 This assessment has therefore considered kinetic views of the monument from the surrounding landscape. As such, in accordance with the consultation advice from HE, views of the church tower were assessed from the PRoW in the Main HNRFI Site and south of the church, to consider the locations where the experience of the listed building interacts with the Main HNRFI Site and therefore those locations where the experience of the church has the potential to be affected by the Proposed Development.

13.104 From the PRoW south of Barwell and north of the Main HNRFI Site, there was found to be limited visibility of the church, due to the well vegetated nature of the PRoW themselves, as well as the settlement and vegetation enclosing the church, in combination with the falling topography.

13.105 As set out above, from the churchyard of St Mary's itself, outwards views are limited by enclosing vegetation (Figure 13.6, Images 13.7 and 13.8; Document Reference 6.3.13.6), such that the clearest views in the direction of the Main HNRFI Site in the immediate environs of the church are obtained from the public footpath immediately to the south, where Photoviewpoint 25 (Figure 11.10; Document Reference 6.3.11.10) shows the outwards views south towards the Main HNRFI Site.

13.106 Outwards views further south along this footpath rapidly diminish as one moves downslope to the southern edge of the field (Figure 13.6, Image 13.11; document reference 6.3.13.6). Indeed, the flat, well vegetated landscape south of Barwell and north of the Main HNRFI Site militates against any experience of the church or Main HNRFI Site as one moves through the landscape, either when moving away from the church and towards the Main HNRFI Site, or vice versa. Where glimpses of the church could be obtained from these routes; i.e., from the footpath (U46/1) through the field immediately south of the church (Figure 13.6, Image 13.12; document reference 6.3.13.6), none of these experiences incorporate the Main HNRFI Site.

13.107 This is a conclusion supported by the Landscape and Visual Baseline Report (LVA) (Appendix 11.1, document reference 6.2.11.1), which identifies that while there is visibility of the Main HNRFI Site from elevated positions at the edge of the settlement of Barwell, views from the west and north within 1km of the Main HNRFI Site are generally limited by mature vegetation within and on the periphery of Burbage Common Country Park, as well as by mature vegetation forming field boundaries and alongside roads across the lower-lying land north-west of the Main HNRFI Site.

13.108 However, due to the church's location on the higher ground to the north, there are some glimpsed views available of the tower from the more open parts of the Main HNRFI Site, notably looking north from Burbage Common Road (Figure 13.6, Image 13.13; document reference 6.3.13.6), or from the public footpaths on the southern edge of the site (Photoviewpoint 2; Figure 11.10, document reference 6.3.11.10). The Church of St Mary

can also be glimpsed in the distance in views from the landscape east of the Main HNRFI Site, as illustrated by Photoviewpoints 9 and 22 (Figure 11.10, document reference 6.3.11.10).

13.109 As such, the Church of St Mary (1074229) at Barwell is considered to be a sensitive receptor, due to the potential for development in the Main HNRFI Site to affect the appreciation of the church from the Main HNRFI Site itself and the wider landscape, and erode its historical wider agricultural setting in elevated views from the environs of the churchyard.

13.110 The Church of St Mary at Barwell is deemed to be of high sensitivity based on the criteria for listed buildings as set out in Table 13.4.

Grade II* Listed Church of St Simon and St Jude (1074259), Earl Shilton

13.111 The Grade II* Church of St Simon and St Jude (1074259) is located circa 2.4km north of the Main HNRFI Site in the settlement of Earl Shilton. The earliest surviving part of the church dates to the 15th century though it was largely rebuilt in 1855. The significance of this asset is primarily derived from its considerable architectural and historic interest within its built form. In terms of its setting, the church is located on a ridge of high ground within the historically long linear settlement of Earl Shilton, within the centre of a large walled churchyard. The church is also located adjacent to the scheduled remains of a motte and bailey castle, which suggests it was founded on the site of an earlier church, and as such it has some archaeological interest.

13.112 The church is not itself located within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) (Figure 13.2; document reference 6.3.13.2) and, therefore, from the church there is no appreciation of the Main HNRFI Site (Figure 13.6, Image 13.14; document reference 6.3.13.6). Neither is there any apparent functional connection between the church and the Main HNRFI Site. However, due to the church's location on higher ground, the spire is visible from the wider area to the south, and as such there are some glimpsed views available from parts of the Main HNRFI Site towards the distant spire, most notably as one moves along the Burbage Common Road (Figure 13.6, Images 13.15 and 13.16; document reference 6.3.13.6). There are also glimpses of the distant spire from the PRoW in the south of the Main HNRFI Site (Photoviewpoints 1, 2 and 37; Figure 11.10, document reference 6.3.11.10), as well as the fields immediately east of the main HNRFI Site (Photoviewpoints 9 and 11; Figure 11.10, document reference 6.3.11.10).

13.113 As such, the Church of St Simon and St Jude is considered to be a sensitive receptor, due to the potential for development in the Main HNRFI Site to affect the appreciation of the church from the wider landscape.

13.114 The Church of St Simon and St Jude is deemed to be of high sensitivity based on the criteria set out in Table 13.4.

Grade II Listed Church of All Saints (1177924), Sapcote

13.115 The Grade II Listed Church of All Saints at Sapcote (1177924) is located circa 2.1km south-

east of the Main HNRFI Site. The church dates to the mid-14th and 15th century and was restored in the 19th century. The significance of the building is primarily derived from the considerable historic, architectural and artistic interest of its built form. Its setting in the historic core of the settlement on the southern edge of Sapcote allows an appreciation of its context in relation to the surrounding historic buildings and space, as well as agricultural land to the south.

13.116 The church also forms a visible landmark within the settlement, reinforced by its high tower and spire. It is widely visible from many areas within and outside Sapcote, and as such it is experienced in a wider landscape context as a focal point and landmark of the settlement. There are some glimpsed views available from parts of the Main HNRFI Site which feature the spire in the distance, albeit these are incidental, distant views from the eastern edge of the site. Similarly, the church spire also features in views from the environs of the Grade I Church of St Mary at Barwell to the north, where it can be glimpsed in combination with the land within the Main HNRFI Site in the wide-ranging vista from the footpath immediately south of the church (Photoviewpoint 25; Figure 11.10, document reference 6.3.11.10). Views from the churchyard of the Grade I Church of St Mary at Barwell are more constrained, due to its enclosure by vegetation and built form of the surrounding settlement (Images 13.7 and 13.8; Figure 13.6, document reference 6.3.13.6), such that there is no clear view of the Church of All Saints at Sapcote in this context.

13.117 The Church of All Saints at Sapcote is notionally within the ZTV albeit, in reality, from the church there is no appreciation of the Main HNRFI Site due to the intervening built form of the modern Sapcote settlement. Nonetheless, the Main HNRFI Site has an historical functional association, having formed part of the Sapcote parish associated with the church, albeit making only a very limited contribution to the significance of the asset through this association.

13.118 As such, the Church of All Saints at Sapcote is considered to be a sensitive receptor, due to the potential for development in the Main HNRFI Site to affect the appreciation of the church from the wider landscape and erode its historically associated wider agricultural setting.

13.119 The Church of All Saints at Sapcote is deemed to be of high sensitivity based on the criteria for listed buildings as set out in Table 13.4.

Grade II Listed Church of St Michael (1074704), Stoney Stanton

13.120 The Grade II* listed Church of St Michael at Stoney Stanton (1074704) is located c.2km east of the Main HNRFI Site. It dates to the late 14th and 15th century and was restored in the 19th century. The significance of the building is primarily derived from the considerable historic, architectural and artistic interest of its built form, including its random granite rubble construction and west tower with spire. Its setting, prominent position in the core of the settlement, enclosed by its surrounding churchyard and green spaces allows an appreciation of its context in relation to the wider surrounding historic buildings and spaces of Stoney Stanton.

- 13.121 The church forms a visible landmark within the settlement and it is widely visible from many areas within and outside Stoney Stanton as a focal point and landmark of the settlement. There are some glimpsed views available from parts of the Main HNRFI Site which feature the spire in the distance, albeit these are incidental, glimpsed distant views from the eastern edge of the Main HNRFI Site looking over the adjacent motorway. Similarly, the church spire also features in views from the environs of the Grade I Church of St Mary at Barwell to the north, where it can be viewed in combination with the land within the Main HNRFI Site in the wide-ranging vista from the footpath immediately south of the church (Photoviewpoint 25; Figure 11.10, document reference 6.3.11.10). Views from the churchyard of the Grade I Church of St Mary at Barwell are more constrained, due to its enclosure by vegetation and built form of the surrounding settlement (Images 13.7 and 13.8; Figure 13.6, document reference 6.3.13.6), such that there is no clear view of the Church of St Michael at Stoney Stanton in this context.
- 13.122 The church is not itself located within the ZTV and, therefore, from the church environs there is no appreciation of the Main HNRFI Site due to the intervening built form of the modern Stoney Stanton settlement, and there is no apparent functional connection between the church and the Main HNRFI Site.
- 13.123 As such, the Church of St Michael at Stoney Stanton is considered to be a sensitive receptor, due to the potential for development in the Main HNRFI Site to affect the appreciation of the church from the wider landscape.
- 13.124 The Church of St Michael at Stoney Stanton is deemed to be of high sensitivity based on the criteria for listed buildings set out in Table 13.4.

Grade II* Listed Church of St Catherine (1295212), Burbage

- 13.125 The Grade II* listed Church of St Catherine (1295212) is located on the east side of Church Street, where the building, and the large yew trees in the surrounding churchyard, are defining elements of the street scene in the historic core. The church was built in 1842 but incorporates earlier medieval fabric and post-medieval monuments.
- 13.126 The immediate setting of the church is defined by the stone wall surrounding the church yard, within which lies a raised burial ground beyond the frontage to Church Road. The church yard extends east where it is enclosed by modern residential development and farm buildings. More widely, east from the churchyard, there are glimpsed views past modern development to the lower, predominantly agricultural land east of Burbage, also incorporating numerous elements of the settlements in the distance.
- 13.127 The significance of the building is primarily derived from the considerable historic, architectural and artistic interest of its built form, which also has value due to its archaeological interest. Its setting in the historic core of the settlement allows an appreciation of its context in relation to the surrounding historic buildings and spaces. The church also forms a visible landmark within the settlement, reinforced by its high three stage tower and recessed spire. It is widely visible from many areas within and outside Burbage, and as such it is experienced in a wider landscape context as a focal point and

landmark of the settlement.

- 13.128 From the church there is no appreciation of the Main HNRFI Site (Figure 13.6, Image 13.9; document reference 6.3.13.6), and there is no apparent functional connection between the church and the Main HNRFI Site. However, due to the church's location on higher ground, the spire is visible from the wider landscape to the north and east. There are some extremely limited glimpsed views available from the north portion of the Main HNRFI Site towards the spire (Figure 13.6, Image 13.10; document reference 6.3.13.6), although for the most part, the presence of the expanse of woodland beyond the boundary of the Main HNRFI Site prohibits and outwards views to the south in the direction of the church spire.
- 13.129 In accordance with the consultation advice from Historic England, this assessment has also considered other kinetic views of the church from the surrounding landscape beyond the Main HNRFI Site.
- 13.130 In this regard, it has been established that the Main HNRFI Site features as part of the wider agricultural land in views from the Church of St Mary (1074693) and Scheduled Monument at Elmesthorpe towards the spire of the Church of St Catherine at Burbage (Photoviewpoint 19 and 53; Figure 11.10, Document Reference 6.3.11.10).
- 13.131 Views of the church spire were also considered from the PRoW south of Elmesthorpe, to consider the locations where the experience of the church interacts with the Main HNRFI Site and therefore those locations where the experience of the monument has the potential to be affected by the Proposed Development.
- 13.132 From these rights of way south of Elmesthorpe and north of the Main HNRFI Site, there was found to be limited experience of the church, due to the enclosing nature of the hedgerows defining the navigable routes and the effects of intervening woodland and settlement features. However, a view of the church spire is identified from the higher ground on the PRoW south of Elmesthorpe (U52/11), which is recorded as Photoviewpoint 18 (Figure 11.10, document reference 6.3.11.10), where the Main HNRFI Site is located to the left (south) of this view. It was found that as one follows the right of way downhill to the south, the view of the spire is subsequently screened by distant woodland and the presence of intervening agricultural buildings.
- 13.133 A more distant view of the church spire is also noted as Photoviewpoint 34 (Figure 11.10, document reference 6.3.11.10), taken from over 1km to the north-east of the Main HNRFI Site and looking south-west towards Burbage and the distant spire, over the lower-lying land that forms the Main HNRFI Site.
- 13.134 As such, the Church of St Catherine is considered to be a sensitive receptor, due to the potential for development in the Main HNRFI Site to affect the appreciation of the church from the wider landscape.
- 13.135 The Church of St Catherine is deemed to be of high sensitivity based on the criteria for listed buildings as set out in Table 13.4.

Aston Flamville Conservation Area

- 13.136 Aston Flamville Conservation Area is located circa 50m south-east of the Main HNRFI Site (where the land inside the DCO Site covers the highway of the M69). The conservation area encompasses the historic core of the small rural settlement with medieval origins. The settlement is focussed around the principal roads of Lychgate Lane and Hinckley Road and contains a number of historic listed buildings, as previously set out above. Aside from modern infill north of Lychgate Lane and the small development at Manor House Close, the settlement has undergone very little development since the post-medieval period and the historic layout and relationships between the historic buildings, including the manor house, church and farmhouses are still legible and contribute greatly to its character and appearance.
- 13.137 The conservation area appraisal of 1975 notes that the village contains a number of well-maintained historic buildings, which are the main contributors to its character and appearance. It also notes that the visual links with the countryside are key to the experience of the area, along with the open spaces within the village. In this respect, the conservation area designation takes in a large swathe of undeveloped agricultural fields to the west of the properties on Lychgate Lane, that form the historical rural setting to the properties in the settlement.
- 13.138 The setting of the conservation area is largely defined by its low-lying position and its enclosure on all sides by surrounding agricultural land, that reinforces the historic context of the settlement as a rural hamlet and makes a positive visual contribution to the conservation area.
- 13.139 The M69, forming a hard boundary to the north-west of the conservation area limits the appreciation of the wider setting of the conservation area in this direction. The motorway also creates a hard boundary and area of separation between the conservation area and the Main HNRFI Site north of the M69 Junction 2.
- 13.140 While parts of the agricultural fields in the western portion of the conservation area are notionally located within the ZTV, in reality, a ridge of intervening high ground to the north of the settlement screens the Main HNRFI Site north of the M69 Junction 2. As such, from within the conservation area, there is currently no appreciation of the Main HNRFI Site due to the intervening built form within the settlement and the rising agricultural land beyond. While the conservation area is located in the same historic parish as the southern part of the Main HNRFI Site, there are no evident functional or visual associations that can be appreciated, as the Main HNRFI Site does not form part of the conservation area's wider agricultural setting, and has furthermore been physically and visually severed from this wider land by the hard boundary of the M69 motorway to the east.
- 13.141 Nonetheless, the proximity of the conservation area to the arm of the Main Order Limits within the M69 Junction 2 Works means there is some limited potential for the Proposed Development to alter the contribution of setting to the heritage interest of this conservation area, and the ability to appreciate its significance. Therefore, Aston Flamville Conservation Area is considered to be a sensitive receptor.

13.142 The Aston Flamville Conservation Area is deemed to be of medium sensitivity based on the criteria for conservation areas set out in Table 13.4.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

Archaeology

Main Order Limits

13.143 The baseline archaeological assessment (Appendix 13.1; document reference 6.2.13.1) established that the Leicestershire HER records only two non-designated heritage assets within the boundary of the Main Order Limits, comprising an undated ditch recorded as a cropmark (MLE68) and a 18th century barn (MLE20555).

13.144 Geophysical survey and archaeological trial trench evaluation (Appendices 13.3 – 6; document references 6.2.13.3-6) undertaken within the Main HNRFI Site and the A47 Link Road Corridor has identified few non-designated heritage assets in the form of below ground remains.

13.145 The geophysical survey and trial trenching completed in the A47 Link Road Corridor did not indicate the presence of any archaeological remains predating medieval agricultural activity and 18th century enclosure of the land.

13.146 Within the extents of the Main HNRFI Site south of the railway, the archaeological investigations recorded activity ranging from the late Iron Age to 20th centuries, including most notably evidence for dispersed rural settlement activity. This included evidence of Late Iron Age to Romano-British field systems to the east of the Elmesthorpe Plantation and settlement activity focused on a probable roundhouse located west of Hobbs Hayes Farm.

13.147 The Late Iron Age to Romano-British activity was overlain by the remains of a medieval landscape consisting of ridge and furrow which was superseded in turn by an enclosed system of 18th century fields focused on a newly constructed farmstead and the alignment of Burbage Common Road. The final episodes of significant change occurred with the construction of the railway between Hinckley and Leicester in the 1860's, and the M69 Motorway in the 1970's.

13.148 The results of these investigations indicate that the remains that are present within the Main Order Limits are likely to be of no more than low to medium sensitivity.

The DCO Site beyond the Main Order Limits

13.149 Within the remainder of the DCO Site beyond the Main Order Limits, a number of these areas of Proposed Development such as highways works within the historic cores of the settlements of Stoney Stanton and Sapcote, are located in proximity to areas of archaeological potential. However, in reality the proposed changes within these areas are so limited; involving only additional signage, occasional road calming measures and minor adjustments to the existing highway or railway network, that there is considered to be no

potential for any works in these areas to interact with significant archaeological remains or result in any significant adverse effects in this respect.

Built Form

13.150 The assessment of the built form within the Main HNRFI Site as part of the baseline Heritage Assessment (Appendix 13.2; document reference 6.2.13.2) identified three post-medieval farmsteads within the Main HNRFI Site. The significance of these farmsteads can be attributed primarily to the standing remains of the principal farm buildings and barns of late 18th century date within them, rather than their archaeological potential.

13.151 Even so, the three identified buildings of heritage interest within the Main HNRFI Site, comprising a former farmhouse at Woodhouse Farm (HB1 on Figure 13.3; document reference 6.3.13.3), a converted barn at Hobbs Hayes (HB2 on Figure 13.3; document reference 6.3.13.3) corresponding to the barn identified as (MLE20555) by the HER, and a former stable range at Freeholt Lodge (HB3 on Figure 13.3; document reference 6.3.13.3) are each considered to be heritage assets of, at most, of low importance.

13.152 The Burbage Common Road bridge is also located within the Main HNRFI Site (Figure 13.3; document reference 6.3.13.3), where it carries the Burbage Common Road over the railway line that defines the western boundary of the Main HNRFI Site. The significance of the bridge is derived from the fabric of its built form and its limited architectural interest as a late 19th century structure associated with the railway. The Burbage Common Road bridge is considered to be a heritage asset of low importance, based on the criteria set out in Table 13.4.

Historic Landscape

13.153 The Main HNRFI Site is identified as lying within a landscape created predominantly as a result of parliamentary enclosure of the 18th century, which has experienced subsequent reorganisation in 19th and 20th centuries.

13.154 Whilst the Main HNRFI Site is not situated within a landscape of significant historic landscape value, it still contains a number of internal field boundaries that reflect its pattern of enclosure since the 18th century. Nonetheless, the historic landscape of the Main HNRFI Site is considered to be of no more than low sensitivity.

13.155 The historic landscape of the landscape in the location of the A47 Link Road Corridor, is similarly a result of parliamentary enclosure of the 18th century, which has experienced subsequent reorganisation in 19th and 20th centuries and of no more than low sensitivity.

13.156 The remainder of the areas of the DCO Site beyond the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor, are defined by off-site highways and junctions within the extents of the modern highways network, or located within the existing railway infrastructure. Accordingly, they have no historic landscape value.

POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

13.157 The following paragraphs identify and describe each effect that is predicted to arise, as a result of the Proposed Development, on both designated and non-designated heritage assets. These have been assessed in terms of effects during construction, where direct physical impacts may be anticipated, and also the operation phases where impacts, in terms of an asset's setting, may be anticipated; and whether these effects are adverse or beneficial. None of the reported potential effects cross the applicable threshold of EIA significant effects, having regard to embedded mitigation. Despite this threshold not having been crossed, measures to be taken to mitigate or reduce those sub-threshold effects are nonetheless subsequently recommended.

13.158 Once more, it should be acknowledged that in respect of the effects of the Proposed Development, the potential change and effects to designated heritage assets in the surrounds of the Main HNRFI Site is anticipated to arise most commonly from visual change to their setting at both construction and operation phase. Nonetheless, due regard has been given to the potential for non-visual effects through consideration of the findings of matters set out in Chapter 8, Traffic and Transport (document reference 6.1.8) Chapter 10, Noise and Vibration (document reference 6.1.10) and Chapter 9, Air Quality (document reference 6.1.9).

13.159 However, no likely or predicted effects at construction or operation phase were identified in respect of any heritage assets in terms of traffic and transport effects, noise and vibration, or air quality and odour and no heritage assets were identified as sensitive receptors in relation to these considerations. As such, it is considered that effects set out in Chapter 8, Traffic and Transport (document reference 6.1.8), Chapter 9, Air Quality (document reference 6.1.9) and Chapter 10, Noise and Vibration (document reference 6.1.10) have no potential to affect any Cultural Heritage receptors. Therefore, consideration of the potential effects of traffic, noise, vibration, air quality and odour on the heritage assets in the following paragraphs has been scoped out of this assessment.

Construction Impacts and Effects

13.160 The following section provides an assessment of the effects on cultural heritage receptors likely to arise as a result of the construction phase of the Proposed Development.

13.161 It addresses only the direct, physical effects of construction activities contained within the DCO Site and does not cover potential changes to the wider settings of heritage assets. As set out above, no effects on the significance of heritage assets are predicted to arise in respect of Traffic and Transport, Noise and Vibration or Air Quality considerations and therefore the potential changes to the wider settings of heritage assets will result from the visual change brought about by the presence of the Proposed Development in the landscape. As such, this is addressed under the operation phase because, even though it is recognised that the effects on heritage assets through visual change to their settings will first arise during construction (with the installation of and gradual construction of the built form and infrastructure in the DCO Site), they will emerge over time and will ultimately reach their fullest extent following the completion of the Proposed Development. Given that the operational impacts of the Proposed Development at its fullest extents are not predicted to result in any significant effects on any cultural heritage receptors in terms of

change to their settings, it is clear that no significant effects are likely or expected in terms of any short term, temporary and more discrete impacts that may arise during the construction phase.

13.162 In short, it is expected that any setting effects during construction will either be short-lived because of the temporary and dispersed nature of the activity or lower magnitude versions of effects which will be captured and assessed in respect of the completed development anyway.

13.163 Therefore, whilst the potential for construction activities in the DCO Site to have indirect (setting) effects on both designated and non-designated heritage assets is not dismissed, the Chapter identifies and assesses them at the operation phase in order to capture the reasonable worst-case scenario; in other words when they have reached their maximum extent.

13.164 The construction activities within the bulk of the Main HNRFI Site currently occupied by agricultural land are considered to have clear potential for physical effects on heritage assets in this location. The proposals for an extension to the country park across the land south of the A47 Link Road, and the A47 Link Road itself, has similar potential for comparable impacts.

13.165 In contrast, the remaining elements of the Proposed Development beyond the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor and M69 Junction 2 Works; i.e., the off-site highways and junctions and railway infrastructure; are not considered to have any implications for direct construction effects on any heritage assets. They are focused largely on the highways or railway extents, with limited additional land required. None of the proposed works are within conservation areas, or physically affect listed buildings or other designated or non-designated heritage assets. Therefore, the following sections do not include or require reference to these off-site works, instead focussing on the effects of construction activities within the Main HNRFI Site and adjoining A47 Link Road Corridor and M69 Junction 2 Works.

Designated Heritage Assets

13.166 There will be no direct impacts arising from the construction of the Proposed Development on the one scheduled monument, seven listed buildings and one conservation area that are identified as sensitive receptors. Any indirect effects are likely to arise through changes within their setting resulting from the visibility of the Proposed Development in the landscape, and as such, are described within the operation impacts and effects section in order to capture the worst-case scenario; in other words when they have reached their maximum extent. On this basis, there will be no change and the potential significance of the effect of the construction phase on these receptors has been assessed as neutral and not significant.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

Archaeology

13.167 The primary effect of the Proposed Development on the archaeological resource is likely to result from direct truncation and/or removal of remains during groundwork. All of the archaeological remains identified within the Main HNRFI Site – whether previously recorded or hitherto unknown - are potentially subject to direct impact during development. This is likely to result in substantial or total destruction of archaeological remains which is considered a large magnitude of change.

13.168 As previously established, the baseline assessment has established that it is unlikely that any archaeological assets present within the Main HNRFI Site - whether previously recorded or hitherto unknown - will be of greater than low to medium sensitivity. As such, the large magnitude of change to these receptors, if left unmitigated, will result in, at most, a moderate adverse effect, which is not significant.

Built Form

13.169 The baseline assessment has established that the Main HNRFI Site contains three non-designated heritage assets of low sensitivity associated with late post-medieval to modern agricultural exploitation across the Main HNRFI Site, comprising two historic barns and a historic farmhouse. The Proposed Development will require the demolition of these assets, thereby resulting in a large magnitude of change during the construction phase. On this basis, the Proposed Development would result in a direct moderate adverse significance of effect to each of these assets, which is not significant.

13.170 The Burbage Common Road bridge is also located within the Main HNRFI Site, where it carries the Burbage Common Road over the railway line that defines the western boundary of the Main HNRFI Site. The Proposed Development will require the demolition of the bridge, thereby resulting in a large magnitude of change to this asset of low importance during the construction phase. On this basis, the Proposed Development would result in a direct moderate adverse significance of effect to this receptor, which is not significant.

Historic Landscape

13.171 The land use change of the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor from predominantly open fields to a national rail freight interchange and associated road infrastructure will fundamentally alter the character of the Main HNRFI Site and the land within A47 Link Road Corridor and the construction of the Proposed Development will require the removal and/or partial loss of most hedgerows and extant ridge and furrow earthworks. However, the land within these areas of the DCO Site is of low sensitivity in terms of its historic landscape character. A large magnitude of change from the construction of the Proposed Development in these areas is therefore predicted, resulting in a moderate adverse effect overall on this low sensitivity receptor, that is not significant.

Operational Impacts and Effects

13.172 The following section examines the effects of the Proposed Development on Cultural Heritage receptors during the operational phase.

Designated Heritage Assets

Elmesthorpe Church Scheduled Monument

13.173 The significance of the Elmesthorpe Church Scheduled Monument is predicted to be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development through change within its wider setting, specifically the visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site in views towards the ruined church from the wider landscape, through the loss of elements of its historically associated wider agricultural setting, and the erosion of the appreciation of a component of its distant, but historically associated wider agricultural setting from the monument itself.

13.174 The Proposed Development within the Main HNRFI Site is predicted to be visible in views south from the scheduled monument towards the Church of St Catherine in Burbage, adversely affecting the ability to appreciate the ruined church in context with part of its historically associated agricultural setting (Photoviewpoint 19 and 53 of Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.10 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16). A limited change in the setting of the monument would also be appreciable at night (Figure 11.12, Photoviewpoint 19; document reference 6.3.11.12), albeit it is not considered that outward views from the church at night make any contribution to its significance.

13.175 Furthermore, the appreciation of the significance of the church will also be adversely affected to a negligible extent by the loss of localised glimpsed views towards the ruined tower from parts of the land within the Main HNRFI Site i.e. the loss of views captured in Photoviewpoints 1 and 2 of Figure 11.10 (document reference 6.3.11.10) and Figure 11.16 (document reference 6.3.11.16) and Figure 13.6, Images 13.2-4 (document reference 6.3.13.6).

13.176 These impacts, while representing a noticeable change in the setting of the asset, as per the criteria set out in Table 13.5, are expected to result in a small change to the significance of the scheduled monument overall, given that the overwhelmingly majority of the significance of the asset is derived from the fabric of its remains, which would remain unaffected. As such it is predicted that the Proposed Development would result in a permanent minor adverse effect on this asset of high sensitivity, that is not significant.

Grade II listed Wentworth Arms and Adjoining Stables (1307251)

13.177 The significance of the Grade II listed Wentworth Arms and Adjoining Stables (1307251) is predicted to be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development through change within its wider setting, specifically the visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site when viewing the listed building from its roadside setting.

13.178 The Proposed Development is predicted to result in minor change to the highway to the north of the listed building. However, it is expected that there would be no material change to the current experience of the listed building through the operation of these works and similarly, the elements of the setting of the public house, that contribute most to its significance; i.e. its location on the road and relationship to the adjacent railway line, would remain unaffected. The loss of agricultural land which cannot be appreciated from

or in combination with the listed building, and the views of the built form of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site beyond the public house from the adjacent road (Photoviewpoint 49 of Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.10 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16) are predicted to result in no more than a negligible magnitude of effect, which will result in a permanent minor adverse significance of effect, which is not significant.

Grade I Listed Church of St Mary (1074229)

13.179 The significance of the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary (1074229) at Barwell is predicted to be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site through change within its wider setting, specifically the visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site in views towards the church from the wider landscape, and through the loss of elements of its historical wider agricultural setting in views out from the church.

13.180 The Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site is predicted to be visible in views south from the church, adversely affecting the ability to appreciate the church in context with its historical agricultural setting (Photoviewpoint 25, Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.9 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16). Furthermore, the appreciation of the significance of the church will also adversely affected to a negligible extent by the loss of localised views towards the church tower from parts of the land within the Main HNRFI Site and to its immediate east (Photoviewpoints 2, 9 and 22 of Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.9, Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16 and Figure 13.6, Image 13.13; document reference 6.3.13.6).

13.181 These impacts, while representing a noticeable change in the setting of the asset, are expected to result in at most only a small change to the significance of the listed church, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on this asset of high sensitivity, that is not significant.

Grade II Listed Church of St Mary (1074693)

13.182 The significance of the Grade II Listed Church of St Mary (1074693) at Elvesthorpe is predicted to be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site through change within its wider setting, specifically the visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site in views towards the church from the wider landscape, and through the loss of elements of its historically associated wider agricultural setting, and the erosion of the appreciation of its historically associated wider agricultural setting from the church itself.

13.183 The Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site is predicted to be visible in views south from the church towards the Church of St Catherine in Burbage, adversely affecting the ability to appreciate the church in context with part of its historical associated agricultural setting (Photoviewpoint 19 and 53; Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.10 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16). Furthermore, the appreciation of the significance of the church will also be adversely affected to a negligible extent by the loss of localised views towards the church tower from parts of the land within the Main HNRFI

Site; i.e. the loss of views captured in Photoviewpoints 1 and 2 Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.10, Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16 and Images 13.2-4, Figure 13.6; document reference 6.3.13.6.

13.184 These impacts, while representing a noticeable change in the setting of the asset, are expected to result in small change to the significance of the listed church, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on this asset of high sensitivity, that is not significant.

Grade II* listed Church of St Simon and St Jude (1074259)

13.185 The significance of the Grade II* listed Church of St Simon and St Jude (1074259) at Earl Shilton is predicted to be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site through change within its wider setting, specifically the visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site in views towards the church from the wider landscape.

13.186 The appreciation of the significance of the church is expected to be adversely affected to a negligible extent by the loss of localised views towards the church spire from parts of the land within the Main HNRFI Site and to its immediate east; i.e. the loss of views captured in Photoviewpoints 1, 2, 9, 11 and 37; Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.10 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16, as well as Figure 13.6, Images 13.15-16; document reference 6.3.13.6.

13.187 These impacts, while representing a noticeable change in the setting of the asset are, given the long-range nature of these views, expected to result in negligible change to the significance of the listed church, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on this asset of high sensitivity, that is not significant.

Grade II listed Church of All Saints (1177924)

13.188 The significance of the Grade II Listed Church of All Saints at Sapcote (1177924) is predicted to be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site through change within its wider setting, specifically the visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site in views towards the church from the wider landscape, and through the loss of elements of its historically associated wider agricultural setting.

13.189 The Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site is predicted to be visible in views towards the church from the Church of St Mary at Barwell, adversely affecting the ability to appreciate the church in context with part of its historical agricultural setting (Photoviewpoint 25; Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.9 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16). Furthermore, the appreciation of the significance of the church will also be adversely affected to a negligible extent by the loss of incidental localised views towards the church spire from parts of the land within the Main HNRFI Site.

13.190 These impacts, while representing a noticeable change in the setting of the asset are, given the long-range nature of these views, expected to result in negligible change to the significance of the listed church, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on this

asset of high sensitivity, which is not significant.

Grade II listed Church of St Michael (1074704)

13.191 The significance of the Grade II Listed Church of St Michael at Stoney Stanton (1074704) is predicted to be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site through change within its wider setting, specifically the visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site in views towards the church from the wider landscape.

13.192 The Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site is predicted to be visible in views towards the church from the environs of the Church of St Mary at Barwell, adversely affecting the ability to appreciate the church in context with part of its historical agricultural setting (Photoviewpoint 25 Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.9 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16). Furthermore, the appreciation of the significance of the church will also adversely affected to a negligible extent by the loss of localised views towards the church spire from parts of the land within the Main HNRFI Site.

13.193 These impacts, while representing a noticeable change in the setting of the asset are, given the long range nature of these views, expected to result in negligible change to the significance of the listed church, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on this asset of high sensitivity, which is not significant.

Grade II* listed Church of St Catherine (1295212)

13.194 The significance of the Grade II* listed Church of St Catherine (1295212) at Burbage is predicted to be affected by the operation of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site through change within its wider setting, specifically the visibility of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site in views towards the church from the wider landscape.

13.195 The Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site is predicted to be visible in views towards the church from the Church of St Mary (1074693) at Elmesthorpe (Photoviewpoint 19 and 53 Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.10 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16), adversely affecting the ability to appreciate the church in context with part of its historical agricultural setting, as well as featuring in views from the wider landscape, such as in Photoviewpoints 19 and 34 Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.10 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16). Furthermore, the appreciation of the significance of the church will also adversely affected to a negligible extent by the loss of localised views towards the church spire from parts of the land within the Main HNRFI Site; i.e. the loss of the distant view of the spire as illustrated in Figure 13.6, Image 13.10 document reference 6.3.13.6.

13.196 These impacts, while representing a noticeable change in the setting of the asset, are expected to result in no more than a small change to the significance of the listed church, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on this asset of high sensitivity, which is not significant.

Aston Flamville Conservation Area

13.197 The significance of the Aston Flamville Conservation Area, a receptor of medium sensitivity, has the potential to be affected through changes to the part of the DCO Site within the M69 highway boundary to the west of the conservation area, the loss of historically associated agricultural land and through potential distant glimpses of the built form of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site beyond the rising ground to the north.

13.198 However, in terms of the proposed changes to the M69, it is expected that there would be no material change to the current experience of the conservation area through the operation of these elements of the Proposed Development. The loss of historically associated agricultural land, which cannot be appreciated from the conservation area, and any potential glimpsed views of the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site beyond the ridge to the north (Photoviewpoint 39, Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.9 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16), or changes to the already extant motorway infrastructure to the north-west are predicted to result in no more than a negligible magnitude of effect, which will result in a permanent negligible adverse significance of effect, that is not significant.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

13.199 All effects on non-designated archaeological assets, non-designated built form and the historic landscape, within the DCO Site will occur during the construction phase; therefore, there are no effects during the completed/occupation phase.

PROPOSED MITIGATION

13.200 The hierarchical approach towards mitigation (prevent, reduce, offset) has been to avoid, where possible, any effects through the overall design of the proposals, the disposition of its elements (prevent), and, subsequently through careful siting of the different elements of the proposals and its required infrastructure (reduce).

13.201 Embedded mitigation provides a form of preventative mitigation and has been considered as an integral part of the overall design and locational strategy for the Proposed Development. It is not an 'add-on' measure to ameliorate significant environmental effects, but part of the positive and pro-active approach whereby mitigation has been assessed and considered at all stages of the project to prevent or reduce the occurrence of potentially significant environmental effects.

13.202 Potential adverse effects on cultural receptors have been identified at the design stage and as a consequence mitigation measures have been considered incorporated into the submitted Landscape Strategy design (Figure 11.20, document reference 6.3.11.20) to eliminate, reduce or offset any adverse effects, as far as possible, in the context of the form of the Proposed Development.

13.203 The Proposed Development provides for the implementation of a Landscape Strategy

Figure 11.20; document reference 6.3.11.20 for the Main HNRFI Site, which includes proposed bunding and structured landscaping around the boundary of the Main HNRFI Site. This landscaping strategy seeks to appropriately screen development and minimise its visual impact on the surrounding landscape and cultural heritage receptors, albeit the limitations of such an approach are acknowledged in the context of the scale of built form that the Proposed Development of the Main HNRFI Site would deliver.

13.204 None of the reported potential effects set out in the section above cross the applicable threshold of EIA significant effects, having regard to embedded mitigation. Despite this threshold not having been crossed, measures to be taken to mitigate or reduce those sub-threshold effects are nonetheless recommended wherever reasonably practicable and are set out in the paragraphs below.

Construction

13.205 The baseline assessments have demonstrated that buried archaeological remains are present within the Main HNRFI Site. To mitigate the permanent direct effects of construction on buried archaeological remains, the Applicant will carry out a further programme of post-consent archaeological mitigation works to be undertaken in advance of site clearance, preparation and construction, in accordance with NPS policy, and secured by a DCO Requirement.

13.206 The LCC Archaeologist has agreed the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (Appendix 13.7; document reference 6.2.13.7) which sets out the outline mitigation strategy for the identified heritage assets in the DCO Site.

13.207 For the Main HNRFI Site the mitigation for the moderate significance of effect on the buried remains will comprise targeted areas of archaeological excavation of the two discrete areas of archaeological interest. These works will be carried out under Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) that conform to recognised standards and guidance and which will be prepared in consultation with and approved by the LCC Archaeologist.

13.208 For the A47 Link Road Corridor, the mitigation for the moderate significance of effect on the buried remains will comprise a programme of further trial trenching and targeted areas of archaeological excavation, as necessary. These works will be carried out under WSI that conform to recognised standards and guidance and which will be prepared in consultation with and approved by the LCC Archaeologist.

13.209 Furthermore, in accordance with the recommendation of the LCC Archaeologist, the surviving ridge and furrow earthworks in the Main HNRFI Site will be subject to a programme of archaeological survey and recording in advance of site clearance, preparation and construction to mitigate the moderate significance of effect.

13.210 The moderate significance of effect from the Proposed Development on the three non-designated farm buildings within the centre of the Main HNRFI Site will be appropriately mitigated through a programme of building recording in advance of demolition.

13.211 Similarly, the moderate significance of effect from the Proposed Development on the Burbage Common Road railway bridge resulting from the demolition of this structure on the western boundary of the Main HNRFI Site will be appropriately mitigated through a programme of building recording in advance of demolition.

13.212 The measures are set out in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (Appendix 13.7; document reference 6.2.13.7) agreed with the LCC Archaeologist and secured through a DCO Requirement

Operation

13.213 It is anticipated that all necessary mitigation relating to archaeological remains within the DCO Site will be undertaken prior to, or during, the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Therefore, no further mitigation will be required during the operation phase as all adverse effects will already have been mitigated as far as reasonably practicable.

13.214 In terms of the identified effects on the setting of designated heritage assets beyond the Main HNRFI Site, it has been established that these negligible to minor adverse (and non-significant) effects will arise either through the loss of views of these assets from the Main HNRFI Site, or through the visibility of the Proposed Development from or in combination with an experience of these assets in the wider landscape. No effects are identified in respect of Traffic and Transport, Noise and Vibration, or Air Quality.

13.215 In respect of the loss of views from and across the Main HNRFI Site which allow appreciation of the designated heritage assets beyond; specifically, the church towers of the surrounding churches, there is no specific mitigation that can be employed to limit these effects, given the nature of the Proposed Development resulting in an extensive spread of warehouse buildings across the Main HNRFI Site.

13.216 With regard to views from heritage assets beyond the Main HNRFI Site, where the effects on these assets will derive from the visibility of the Proposed Development in outward views, the Landscape Strategy (Figure 11.20, document reference 6.3.11.20) for the Main HNRFI Site seeks to screen development and minimise its visual impact on the surrounding landscape and cultural heritage receptors. Once more, the limitations of such an approach are acknowledged in the context of the scale of built form that the Proposed Development in the Main HNRFI Site would deliver.

13.217 As such, given the elevated nature of the heritage assets at Barwell and Elmesthorpe to the north, where views from these assets look down on the Main HNRFI Site, there is considered to be no opportunity for this mitigation to respond to these individual designated heritage assets.

13.218 The Landscape Strategy (Figure 11.20, document reference 6.3.11.20) will deliver landscaped areas around the boundaries of the Main HNRFI Site. These are designed to help integrate the development into the surrounding landscape, with the subsidiary functions of noise attenuation and provision of biodiverse corridors of wildlife habitat. The boundary landscape areas would incorporate bunds of up to 3 metres in height, species-

rich native tree and shrub planting, areas of wet grassland and wildflower grassland and balancing ponds and swales. The boundary areas would incorporate security fencing and, where necessary, acoustic fencing.

13.219 The Illustrative Landscape Strategy (Figure 11.20, document reference 6.3.11.20) and Chapter 11 (document reference 6.1.11) set out how landscape planting and bunding around the north-western edge of the Main HNRFI Site would assist in breaking up views of built form from the adjacent lower-lying areas to the north around Burbage Common and south of Elmesthorpe. The area of the A47 Link Road Corridor which is to be converted from agricultural land to a naturalistic character, with wildflower meadow, woodland and scrub planting, will also assist in limiting views from Burbage Common towards the Proposed Development. Additionally, planted woodland belts along the western edge of the Main HNRFI Site would provide additional visual mitigation.

13.220 However, it is acknowledged that the implementation of bunding and tree screening as part of the Landscape Strategy (Figure 11.20, document reference 6.3.11.20) for the Main HNRFI Site would not be capable of screening visibility of the Proposed Development from the environs of sensitive heritage assets to the north, such as the Church of St Mary at Barwell (Photoviewpoint 25) or Elmesthorpe Church Scheduled Monument (Photoviewpoints 19 and 53; Figure 11.10; document reference 6.3.11.10 and Figure 11.16; document reference 6.3.11.16).

13.221 Accordingly, while there would be screening of the activity and built form of the Main HNRFI Site at ground level following implementation of the Landscape Strategy (Figure 11.20, document reference 6.3.11.20), which would gradually increase over time as the planting matures, this mitigation is not expected to result in any notable reduction in the effects on the surrounding sensitive heritage receptors, given that the upper storeys of the built form of the Proposed Development would remain visible and therefore the visual change to the setting of these designated heritage assets would not be notably reduced.

13.222 As such, it is considered that no further mitigation measures can be identified to offset the minor adverse significance of effect to the identified designated heritage assets.

RESIDUAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

13.223 It is anticipated that, with the adoption of mitigation measures for the on-site archaeological features and built form in the Main HNRFI Site to address the identified sub-threshold effects, the Proposed Development will continue to result in no significant residual environmental effects on cultural heritage receptors. This finding acknowledges the conclusion that the implementation of the Landscape Strategy (Figure 11.20, document reference 6.3.11.20) for the Main HNRFI Site would not be capable of notably reducing the effects on off-site designated heritage assets in terms of changes to their settings.

13.224 Implementation of mitigation works to investigate and record archaeological remains across the Main Order Limits is expected to result in a reduced residual effect identified as neutral (and non-significant), as this mitigation would realise the archaeological

potential of these features and make that information available in the public record.

- 13.225 The mitigation to record the non-designated farm buildings and Burbage Common Road bridge within the Main HNRFI Site prior to their removal by construction, is expected to result in a reduced residual effect identified as minor adverse (and non-significant). This is because although the buildings would be destroyed, a permanent record of their heritage interest would be produced and made publicly available.
- 13.226 Residual effects on designated heritage assets resulting from changes to their settings is unlikely to change following mitigation implemented in the form of an Illustrative Landscape Strategy (Figure 11.20, document reference 6.3.11.20), however the significance of effect to all such assets is considered to be at most minor adverse and not significant.
- 13.227 The mitigation to record the ridge and furrow earthworks within the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor will reduce the moderate adverse effect on the historic landscape of the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road Corridor. A residual environmental effect from the Proposed Development will remain that is identified as permanent minor adverse, and not significant.

Table 13.7: Assessment of Likely Residual Environmental Effects.

Receptor	Sensitivity of Receptor	Nature of Impact	Impact Magnitude	Significance	Additional Mitigation	Residual Impact Magnitude	Residual Significance of Effect
Construction Effects							
Known and unknown non-designated archaeology receptors within the DCO Site	Negligible to low	Direct impact on fabric during construction	Large adverse	Minor to Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of archaeological mitigation in advance of the construction phase	Negligible adverse	Neutral (non-significant)
Non-designated farm buildings within the DCO Site	low	Demolition during construction	Large adverse	Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of building recording mitigation in advance of the construction/ demolition phase	Medium adverse	Minor adverse (non-significant)
Non-designated Burbage Common Road bridge	low	Demolition during construction	Large adverse	Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of building recording mitigation in advance of the construction/ demolition phase	Medium adverse	Minor adverse (non-significant)

Receptor	Sensitivity of Receptor	Nature of Impact	Impact Magnitude	Significance	Additional Mitigation	Residual Impact Magnitude	Residual Significance of Effect
Historic landscape	low	Direct impact on fabric during construction	Large adverse	Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of recording mitigation in advance of the construction/ demolition phase	Medium adverse	Minor adverse (non-significant)
Operation Effects							
Scheduled monument, listed buildings x7 and conservation area identified as sensitive receptors	High to medium	Potential impact on setting	Negligible to small adverse (non-significant)	Negligible to minor adverse	Implementation of landscape design strategy	Negligible to small adverse	Negligible to minor adverse (non-significant)
Cumulative Effects							
Effect	Description				Mitigation	Significance	

Receptor	Sensitivity of Receptor	Nature of Impact	Impact Magnitude	Significance	Additional Mitigation	Residual Impact Magnitude	Residual Significance of Effect
N/A	N/A				N/A	N/A	
Impact of Climate Change							
Effect	Description				Mitigation	Significance	
	N/A				N/A	N/A	

CUMULATIVE AND IN COMBINATION EFFECTS

13.228 A full consideration of the likely effects on heritage assets from the identified short list of cumulative and in combination effects is reported in this ES in Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects (document reference 6.1.20). This has been undertaken on the understanding that cumulative and in-combination effects will generally occur where there might be simultaneous or sequential effects on heritage assets of two or more developments or where the consideration of other schemes would increase an effect identified.

13.229 This assessment has considered the cumulative effect of the Proposed Development alongside the effect of other developments in the geographical area as set out in Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects (document reference 6.1.20) and identified on Figure 20.1 (document reference 6.3.20.1).

Construction

13.230 The effects of those development sites within the near vicinity of the Proposed Development (see Figure 20.1; document reference 6.3.20.1), which have the potential to result in effects on heritage assets, have been assessed in Chapter 20 *Cumulative and in-combination effects* (document reference 6.1.20) against the likely effects of the Construction Phase of the Proposed Development to determine whether cumulative effects are likely, and if so, their significance.

13.231 In light of the findings that the construction phase of the Proposed Development would result in impacts only on assets within the DCO Site, there is accordingly expected to be no change in the significance of effects on any archaeological or built heritage receptors in the DCO Site, when considered alongside any other plans and projects set out in Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects (document reference 6.1.20).

Occupation

13.232 The assessment of the Proposed Development has determined that the occupation phase will result in adverse effects, of no greater than minor adverse significance, on nine designated heritage assets beyond the DCO Site, comprising a single scheduled monument, seven listed buildings and a single conservation area.

13.233 Consideration of other developments in the geographical area as set out in Chapter 20 Cumulative and in-combination effects (document reference 6.1.20) and identified on Figure 20.1 (document reference 6.3.20.1) has identified that in most instances, these schemes are too far removed from the Proposed Development or of a differing form and scale, to share any receptors or result in any potentially significant effects.

13.234 However, a number of schemes have been identified where there is the potential for cumulative effects on the designated heritage assets identified above, in combination with the operation of the Proposed Development.

- 13.235 Scheme 1 (comprising mixed use development including 1,500 dwellings) and 54 (comprising the mixed-use, minimum 1,600 dwellings Earl Shilton Sustainable Urban Extension) (Figure 20.1; document reference 6.3.20.1), are considered to have the potential to affect the Grade II* listed Church of St Simon and St Jude, Earl Shilton. The Proposed Development is predicted to result in a negligible change to the significance of the listed church through change to its setting, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on this asset of high sensitivity, that is not significant.
- 13.236 There is no detailed assessment available for Scheme 1 or Scheme 54, although, due to their distance from the asset, it is considered unlikely that any effects on the Grade II* listed Church of St Simon and St Jude, arising from the operation of a mixed used development within the Scheme 1 and Scheme 54 sites, would be greater than a negligible change to the significance of the listed church. As such it is anticipated that any effects in this asset arising from these schemes would result in, at most, a permanent minor adverse effect on the asset of high sensitivity, that is not significant. It is also considered that mitigation may well be implemented in due course in the design of Scheme 1 and Scheme 54 to remove any potential adverse effects.
- 13.237 As such, the permanent minor adverse effect of the Proposed Development, in combination with the likely reasonable worst case permanent minor adverse effect of Scheme 1 and Scheme 54, is not expected to result in any cumulative increase in the level of effect to this asset; i.e. the cumulative effect of the operation of the Proposed Development and Scheme 1 and Scheme 54 on the Grade II* listed Church of St Simon and St Jude is considered to be permanent minor adverse; and not significant.
- 13.238 Scheme 65 (comprising 5,000 dwellings as part of garden village proposal) (Figure 20.1; document reference 6.3.20.1) is considered to have the potential to affect the significance of the Grade II* Listed Church of St Michael at Stoney Stanton and Grade II Listed Church of All Saints at Sapcote through changes to its setting. The Proposed Development is predicted to result in a negligible change to the significance of these listed churches, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on these assets of high sensitivity, that is not significant.
- 13.239 There is no detailed assessment available for Scheme 65, although it is expected that views towards the Grade II* Listed Church of St Michael at Stoney Stanton and Grade II Listed Church of All Saints at Sapcote, from this scheme are likely to be affected. It is considered that any such change to views of the churches would result in no more than a negligible change to the significance of each listed church, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on these assets of high sensitivity, that is not significant. It is also considered that mitigation may well be implemented in due course in the design of Scheme 65 to remove any potential adverse effects.
- 13.240 As such, the permanent minor adverse effect of the Proposed Development, in combination with the likely reasonable worst case permanent minor adverse effect of Scheme 65, is not expected to result in any cumulative increase in the level of effect to these assets; i.e. the cumulative effect of the operation of the Proposed Development and Scheme 65 on the Grade II* Listed Church of St Michael at Stoney Stanton and Grade II

Listed Church of All Saints at Sapcote is considered to be permanent minor adverse; and not significant.

13.241 Scheme 66 (a potential Local Plan Option site for 1,100 dwellings) (Figure 20.1; document reference 6.3.20.1) is considered to have the potential to affect the significance of the Elmesthorpe Church Scheduled Monument and attached Grade II Listed Church of St Mary (1074693), as well as the Grade II* Listed Church of St Catherine (1295212) at Burbage and Grade I Listed Church of St Mary (1074229) at Barwell through change to their settings. The Proposed Development is predicted to result in a negligible change to the significance of these heritage assets, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on each of these assets of high sensitivity, that is not significant.

13.242 There is no detailed assessment available for Scheme 66, although it is expected that views towards and from the Elmesthorpe Church Scheduled Monument and attached Grade II Listed Church of St Mary (1074693), as well as the Grade II* Listed Church of St Catherine (1295212) at Burbage and Grade I Listed Church of St Mary (1074229) at Barwell, are likely to be affected. It is considered that any such change would result in no more than a negligible change to the significance of each heritage asset, resulting in a permanent minor adverse effect on these assets of high sensitivity, that is not significant. It is also considered that mitigation may well be implemented in due course in the design of Scheme 66 to remove any potential adverse effects.

13.243 As such, the permanent minor adverse effect of the Proposed Development, in combination with the likely reasonable worst case permanent minor adverse effect of Scheme 66, is not expected to result in any cumulative increase in the level of effect to these assets; i.e. the cumulative effect of the operation of the Proposed Development and Scheme 66 on the Elmesthorpe Church Scheduled Monument and attached Grade II Listed Church of St Mary (1074693), as well as the Grade II* listed Church of St Catherine (1295212) at Burbage and Grade I Listed Church of St Mary (1074229) at Barwell is considered to be permanent minor adverse; and not significant.

13.244 In summary, there is considered to be no potential for significant adverse effects on heritage assets to result from the construction or occupation of the Proposed Development in combination with any of the other sites under consideration.

CLIMATE CHANGES

13.245 The impact of climate change on cultural heritage receptors is assessed through consideration of a potential future baseline scenario.

13.246 However, for cultural heritage, it is anticipated that the future baseline under a climate change scenario would not lead to any greater, or different, effects to those predicted.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 13.247 This Chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development in terms of Cultural Heritage, i.e. heritage assets.
- 13.248 A baseline assessment, in the form of desk-based assessment and investigative fieldwork and field surveys has identified potentially sensitive cultural heritage receptors (heritage assets) within the DCO Site and its wider zone of influence.
- 13.249 The assessment established that the DCO Site contains no designated heritage assets. However, one scheduled monument, seven listed buildings, and a single conservation area located in the wider area are considered to be potentially sensitive heritage assets, where change to the setting of these assets as a result of the Proposed Development has the potential to adversely affect their heritage interest.
- 13.250 The DCO Site does not contain any known non-designated assets or archaeological deposits which are considered to be of greater than low to medium sensitivity.
- 13.251 However, it is possible that the Main HNRFI Site may contain hitherto unidentified archaeological features and deposits. Whilst these could include evidence for activity dating from the prehistoric to modern periods, the majority of activity is most likely to derive from the medieval and later agricultural exploitation of the landscape; i.e. field boundaries and plough-soils. It is unlikely that any previously unidentified archaeological assets present within the site will be of greater than low to medium sensitivity.
- 13.252 The historic landscape of the Main HNRFI Site is characterised by re-organised 18th century fieldscapes, which are considered to be of no greater than low sensitivity.
- 13.253 Three historic farm buildings have been identified within the farmsteads of Woodhouse Farm, Hobbs Hayes and Freeholt Lodge, within the Main HNRFI Site. These non-designated buildings are considered to be of low sensitivity. The Burbage Common Road bridge on the western boundary of the Main HNRFI Site is also a non-designated building of low sensitivity.
- 13.254 In terms of the scheduled monument, seven listed buildings, and conservation area in the wider area that are identified as sensitive receptors, mitigation will be incorporated into the design to reduce the potential adverse impact of the Proposed Development through change to the setting of these assets. Therefore, there is predicted to be, at most, only a minor adverse effect on each of these heritage assets.
- 13.255 In terms of the potential impact of the Proposed Development proposals on known and unknown non-designated archaeological receptors, this is expected to be contained to within the Main HNRFI Site and A47 Link Road. It is expected that further mitigation, in the form of archaeological investigation and recording, will be set out in a DCO requirement should consent be granted, in advance of or during construction. This will extend to a programme of appropriate field investigation and mitigation, incorporating publication of the results and deposition of the archive with the relevant museum. The results of these mitigation works will be submitted as a DCO Requirement.

- 13.256 In general terms, the implementation of the construction and operation phases of the Proposed Development, incorporating mitigation, is predicted to have at most a minor or moderate adverse effect on the designated and non-designated heritage assets identified within the DCO Site and wider study area.
- 13.257 None of the predicted adverse effects on designated or non-designated archaeology and built heritage assets, either during the construction or operation phases of the Proposed Development, are deemed to be of greater than moderate significance and, therefore, are not considered to be 'significant' in EIA terms.
- 13.258 In policy terms, all the potential adverse effects on designated heritage assets identified in this ES Chapter (i.e. the permanent minor adverse effects on the Elmesthorpe Church Scheduled Monument and attached Grade II Listed Church of St Mary (1074693), the Grade II* listed Church of St Catherine (1295212) at Burbage, the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary (1074229) at Barwell, the Grade II* listed Church of St Simon and St Jude (1074259) at Earl Shilton, the Grade II Listed Church of All Saints at Sapcote (1177924), the Grade II Listed Church of St Michael (1074704) at Stoney Stanton and the Grade II listed Wentworth Arms and Adjoining Stables (1307251); and the permanent negligible adverse effect on the Aston Flamville Conservation Area) each equate to 'less than substantial harm' to each asset at the low end of this scale of harm.

Table 13.8 - Summary of effects

Description of impact	Inherent mitigation measures adopted as part of the project	Magnitude of impact	Sensitivity of receptor	Significance of effect	Additional mitigation measures	Residual effect	Proposed monitoring
Permanent construction impact on known and unknown non-designated archaeology receptors within the DCO Site	n/a	Large adverse	Negligible to low	Negligible to Minor to Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of archaeological mitigation in advance of the construction phase	Neutral (non-significant)	n/a
Permanent construction impact on non-designated farm buildings within the site	n/a	Large adverse	low	Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of building recording mitigation in advance of the construction/ demolition phase	Minor adverse (non-significant)	n/a
Permanent construction impact on non-designated Burbage Common Road bridge	n/a	Large adverse	low	Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of building recording mitigation in advance of the	Minor adverse (non-significant)	n/a

Description of impact	Inherent mitigation measures adopted as part of the project	Magnitude of impact	Sensitivity of receptor	Significance of effect	Additional mitigation measures	Residual effect	Proposed monitoring
					construction/ demolition phase		
Permanent construction impact on non-designated historic landscape within the DCO Site	n/a	Large adverse	low	Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of recording and investigation of ridge and furrow earthworks mitigation in advance of the construction/ demolition phase	Minor adverse (non-significant)	n/a

Description of impact	Inherent mitigation measures adopted as part of the project	Magnitude of impact	Sensitivity of receptor	Significance of effect	Additional mitigation measures	Residual effect	Proposed monitoring
Permanent operation impact on Scheduled monument, listed buildings x7 and conservation area identified as sensitive receptor, through change to their settings.	n/a	Negligible to small adverse	High to medium	Negligible to minor adverse (non-significant)	Implementation of landscape design strategy	Negligible to minor adverse (non-significant)	n/a

Table 13.9 – Summary of mitigation

Description of impact	Effect	Mitigation measures adopted as part of the project	Secured by	Responsible party
Permanent construction impact on known and unknown non-designated archaeology receptors within the DCO Site	Negligible to Minor to Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of archaeological mitigation in advance of the construction phase	requirement within the DCO	TSH
Permanent construction impact on non-designated buildings within the site (farm buildings and bridge)	Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of building recording mitigation in advance of the construction/demolition phase	requirement within the DCO	TSH
Permanent construction impact on non-designated historic landscape within the DCO Site	Moderate adverse (non-significant)	Completion of recording and investigation of ridge and furrow earthworks mitigation in advance of the construction/ demolition phase	requirement within the DCO	TSH
Permanent operation impact on Scheduled monument, listed buildings x7 and conservation area identified as sensitive receptor, through change to their settings.	Negligible to minor adverse (non-significant)	Implementation of landscape design strategy	requirement within the DCO	TSH

