

6 Archaeology & Cultural Heritage

6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 This chapter of the ES considers the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on elements of the archaeological and cultural heritage resource ('heritage assets'). The scale, scope, survival and value of identified and potential sub-surface archaeological remains are addressed, as are the elements of the built heritage and historic landscape resource.
- 6.1.2 This chapter describes the assessment methodology, the baseline conditions currently existing within the site and surroundings, the likely significant environmental effects during the construction and operation phases of the Proposed Development, the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects and the likely residual effects after these measures have been employed.
- 6.1.3 This chapter is informed by survey work carried out in 2013 and 2014. The results of these surveys are summarised in this chapter, with more detailed information included in the following appendices:
- **Appendix 6.1:** Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (Cotswold Archaeology 2013)
 - **Appendix 6.2:** Geophysical Survey (Archaeological Services WYAS 2014)
 - **Appendix 6.3:** Documentary Records Assessment (Anthony Breen 2014)
 - **Appendix 6.4:** Archaeological Fieldwalking Survey (Cotswold Archaeology 2014)

6.2 Assessment Approach

Methodology

- 6.2.1 The aim of this chapter is to address the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage resource, including archaeological remains, built heritage and historic landscape remains. This assessment has been carried out with reference to the following professional guidance documents:
- 'Standard and Guidance for Desk-Based Assessment' (Institute for Archaeologists 2012)
 - 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment' (English Heritage 2008)
 - 'The Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance' (English Heritage 2011);
 - Planning Policy Guidance: Environmental Impact Assessment (Department for Communities and Local Government 2014)
- 6.2.2 The methodology for the assessment of development effects has been informed by 'The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2: Cultural Heritage' (Highways Agency document referred to as HA 208/07), which provides the most recent, suitable and widely-acknowledged guidance on heritage impact assessment (Highways Agency 2007).

Archaeological Surveys Methodology

- 6.2.3 The Desk-Based Assessment, Geophysical Survey, Documentary Assessment and Fieldwalking were carried out to inform the baseline of this chapter.
- 6.2.4 The Desk-Based Assessment has been carried out within the remit of current national policy and guidance. The aims of this report were to assess the known cultural heritage resource within the site and a 500m study area around it, to assess the significance of this resource, as well as to establish the archaeological potential within the site through the examination of available resources.
- 6.2.5 The Geophysical Survey, which was carried out in February 2014, comprised a detailed gradiometer survey, using Bartington Grad601 magnetic gradiometers. The aim of the survey was to provide

information about the nature and possible interpretation of any magnetic anomalies within the site and therefore to determine the presence/absence and extent of any buried archaeological features.

- 6.2.6 The Documentary Records Assessment was prepared in order to examine the potential relevance of the archives of Queen's College, University of Oxford and provide additional information for the archaeological assessment of the site.
- 6.2.7 The Fieldwalking was carried out in May 2014. The aim of the fieldwalking was to provide information about the likely archaeological resource within the western part of the site within which the previous fieldwalking survey noted an assemblage of prehistoric finds. Due to the presence of crops and grass within part of the site, only approximately 8ha of the 14.6ha selected for fieldwalking were subject to the investigation.
- 6.2.8 The methodology employed to undertake the abovementioned surveys is presented in full in **Appendices 6.1 – 6.4** and is not repeated here.

The Value of Heritage Assets

- 6.2.9 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012, see below) discusses archaeology and cultural heritage in terms of "heritage assets." These are defined by the NPPF as: 'a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest'. Heritage assets may be designated (i.e. protected by further legislation, such as listed buildings, scheduled monuments or historic battlefields) or undesignated. The significance of the heritage asset is defined as the value of the asset to this and future generations. In this chapter, the significance of a heritage asset is termed 'value' to avoid potential confusion with the term 'significance of effect' (see below).
- 6.2.10 The assessment of value has been primarily guided by the policies and guidance contained in the 'Conservation Principles' (English Heritage 2008). The value of a heritage asset is defined with reference to four aspects:
- Evidential value, derived from "the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity" and primarily associated with physical remains or historic fabric;
 - Historical value, derived from "the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present". This can derive from particular aspects of past ways of life, or association with notable families, persons, events or movements;
 - Aesthetic value, derived from sensory and intellectual stimulation and including design value, i.e. "aesthetic qualities generated by the conscious design of a building, structure or landscape as a whole". It may include its physical form, and how it lies within its setting. It may be the result of design, or an unplanned outcome of a process of events; and
 - Communal value, derived from "the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it". Communal value derives from the meanings that an historic asset has for the people who relate to it, or for whom it's in their collective experience or memory. It may be commemorative or symbolic, such as meaning for identity or collective memory.
- 6.2.11 The value of some cultural heritage assets may already be formally recognised through designations. The guidelines included in the HA 208/07 indicate that where there is no former assessment of value, criteria taken into consideration by the relevant authorities for designating archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes should be considered, including:
- The Secretary of State's non-statutory criteria for the selection of monuments for scheduling; and
 - The Secretary of State's principles for the inclusion of buildings of the statutory list.
- 6.2.12 The value of individual elements of the cultural heritage resource (archaeological, built heritage and historic landscape assets) is presented on a six point scale. **Table 6.1** (after HA 208/07) illustrates the approach employed to assess the value of heritage assets.

Table 6.1 Value of heritage assets (sensitivity of receptors)

Value	Archaeology	Built Heritage	Historic Landscape
Very High	<p>World Heritage Sites inscribed for their archaeological or built heritage qualities.</p> <p>Sites of international importance.</p>	<p>Standing remains inscribed as of universal importance as World Heritage Sites.</p> <p>Other buildings of recognised international importance.</p>	<p>World Heritage Sites inscribed for their historic landscape qualities.</p> <p>Historic landscapes of international importance.</p> <p>Extremely well preserved historic landscape, with considerable coherence, time-depth or other factors.</p>
High	<p>Scheduled Monuments or monuments in the process of being Scheduled.</p> <p>Undesignated sites and monuments of schedulable quality and importance.</p> <p>Heritage assets or groups of assets that can contribute substantially to acknowledged national research objectives.</p>	<p>Grade I and II* Listed Buildings.</p> <p>Other Listed Buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association not adequately reflected in the Listing.</p> <p>Conservation Areas containing very important buildings.</p> <p>Undesignated assets of clear national importance</p>	<p>Designated historic landscapes of outstanding interest.</p> <p>Undesignated landscapes of outstanding interest.</p> <p>Undesignated landscapes of high quality and importance, and of demonstrable national importance.</p>
Medium	<p>Assets that contribute to regional research objectives.</p> <p>Local Authority designated heritage sites.</p> <p>Previously unknown and undesignated sites that would justify Local Authority designation (i.e. sites of regional importance).</p> <p>Sites with specific and substantial importance to the local community.</p>	<p>Grade II Listed Buildings.</p> <p>Historic buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities or historical association.</p> <p>Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Historic townscapes or built-up areas with historic integrity in their buildings, or built setting.</p>	<p>Designated special historic landscapes.</p> <p>Undesignated historic landscapes that would justify special historic landscape designation.</p> <p>Landscapes of regional importance.</p> <p>Historic landscapes with specific and substantial importance to the wider community.</p>
Low	<p>Undesignated sites of local importance.</p>	<p>'Locally Listed' Buildings.</p>	<p>Robust undesignated historic landscapes.</p>

	Sites with specific and substantial importance to local interest groups, but with limited wider importance. Archaeological sites whose importance is limited by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associates. Sites and features of limited value in themselves but with potential to contribute to local research objectives	Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association. Historic Townscape or built-up areas of limited historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings.	Historic landscapes with importance to local interest groups. Historic landscapes whose value is limited by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations.
Negligible	Sites with no surviving archaeological interest	Buildings of no architectural or historical merit. Buildings of an intrusive character	Landscapes with little or no significant historical interest
Unknown	The importance of the resource has not been ascertained.	Buildings with some hidden (i.e. inaccessible) potential for historic significance	The importance of the resource has not been ascertained.

Assessment of Magnitude of Impact

- 6.2.13 The impact is defined as the change resulting from the proposed development that affects the cultural heritage resource. The classification of the magnitude of impact on heritage assets is rigorous and based on consistent criteria. This takes account of such factors as the physical scale and type of disturbance anticipated to affect them and whether features or evidence would be lost that are fundamental to their historic character and integrity. Changes may be adverse or beneficial. Depending on the nature of the change and the duration of development, effects can be temporary and/or reversible or permanent and irreversible.
- 6.2.14 The descriptions of change describe the ways in which an asset or elements of its setting may be modified or removed by the proposed development, and will include the consideration of such issues as which and how many elements of an asset are affected; whether the change physically modifies the asset or whether it comprises changes in visual aspects, noise or access that would alter its setting; and whether the change in the significance of an asset will be adverse or beneficial.
- 6.2.15 The magnitude of impact (summation of direct and indirect impacts) on each individual heritage asset is assessed using the criteria in **Table 6.2** below (based on HA 208/07).

Table 6.2 Assessment of Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of impact	Description
Major	Change to most or all key archaeological or historic building elements, such that the asset is totally altered. Total changes to setting of archaeological or historic building assets. Change to most or all key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; extreme visual effects; gross change of noise or change to sound quality; fundamental changes to use or access; resulting in total change to the

	character of a historic landscape area.
Moderate	<p>Changes to many key archaeological or historic building elements, such that the asset is noticeably modified.</p> <p>Changes to setting of archaeological or historic building assets, such that it is noticeably modified.</p> <p>Changes to many key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; visual change to many key aspects of the historic landscape; noticeable differences in noise or sound quality; considerable changes to use or access; resulting in moderate changes to the character of a historic landscape area.</p>
Minor	<p>Changes to key archaeological or historic building elements, such that the asset is slightly modified.</p> <p>Changes to setting of archaeological or historic building assets, such that it is slightly altered and noticeably changed.</p> <p>Change to few key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; slight visual changes to few key aspects of historic landscape; limited changes to noise levels or sound quality; slight changes to use or access; resulting in limited changes to the character of a historic landscape area.</p>
Negligible	<p>Very minor changes to archaeological or historic building elements or their settings.</p> <p>Very minor changes to key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; virtually unchanged visual effects; very slight changes in noise levels or sound quality; very slight changes to use or access; resulting in very small change to the character of a historic landscape area.</p>
No change	No change to heritage assets or their settings

Determination of Significance of Effects

6.2.16 The significance of effect upon any heritage asset is a product of the value/significance of the resource and the magnitude of impact upon it. This is illustrated in **Table 6.3** below (after HA 208/07). Where two alternatives are given in the table, professional judgment is used to decide which best reflects the significance of effect upon the heritage asset.

Table 6.3 Significance of Effect upon cultural heritage resource

Value of resource	Magnitude of impact				
	No change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
Very High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate or Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
High	Neutral	Slight	Slight or Moderate	Moderate or Large	Large or Very Large
Medium	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate or Large
Low	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Neutral or Slight	Slight	Slight or Moderate
Negligible	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Neutral or Slight	Slight
Unknown	Neutral	Neutral	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

- 6.2.17 The significance of effect is then discussed. Key principles that are considered are whether the effect comprises substantial harm or total loss and whether the asset is of a value that such a change should be exceptional or indeed wholly exceptional. In Environmental Impact Assessment terms, 'significant' effects are considered to be of Moderate significance of effect or higher for the purposes of the cultural heritage assessment. When a significant effect is identified, it may be appropriate to propose suitable mitigation measures in order to remove, reduce or offset the level of impact.
- 6.2.18 The significance of effect can be adverse or beneficial. They may also be temporary and/or reversible or permanent and irreversible. The final significance of any effects arising from the Proposed Development is therefore evaluated using a seven point scale, as outlined in **Table 6.4**. The criteria given within this table take account of the guidance documents outlined above as well as the current legislation and planning policy (see below).

Table 6.4: Qualitative Description of the Significance of Effect

Significance	Criteria
Large Adverse	Substantial harm or total loss of the value of a designated heritage asset (or asset worthy of designation) such that Development should not be consented unless substantial public benefit is delivered by the Development. Total loss of a non-designated heritage asset of medium value (i.e. which may contribute to regional research objectives) without compensatory mitigation measures agreed with statutory consultees
Moderate Adverse	Less than substantial harm or total loss of the value of a designated heritage asset (or asset worthy of designation) such that the harm should be weighed against the public benefit delivered by the Development to determine consent. Total loss of a non-designated heritage asset of medium value (i.e. which may contribute to regional research objectives) with compensatory mitigation measures agreed with statutory consultees Harm to a non-designated heritage asset, of a greater degree than that perceived of as Minor Adverse, which should be taken into account in determining an application.
Slight Adverse	Harm to a non-designated heritage asset that can be adequately compensated through the implementation of a programme of industry standard mitigation measures. Less than substantial harm to the value of a designated heritage asset, of a lesser degree than that perceived as Moderate Adverse, but which should still be weighed against the public benefit delivered by the Development to determine consent.
Neutral / not significant	Effect that is nil, imperceptible and not significant.
Slight Beneficial	Development will deliver a positive contribution and / or better reveal the value of a non-designated heritage asset.
Moderate Beneficial	Development will deliver a positive contribution and / or better reveal the value of a designated heritage asset (or asset worthy of designation) such that an application should be treated favourably.
Large Beneficial	Development will deliver a positive contribution and / or better reveal the value of a heritage asset of recognised international value such that an application should be treated very favourably.

The Setting of Heritage Assets

- 6.2.19 The English Heritage 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' (2011) provides guidance on setting and development management, including assessing the implication of development proposals. A staged approach is recommended for the latter, the first step of which is to identify the heritage assets affected and their setting. Step 2 is to assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a positive contribution to the significance of the heritage asset. This includes a consideration of the key attributes of the heritage asset itself, the physical surroundings of the asset, the way in which the asset is appreciated and the asset's associations and patterns of use.

- 6.2.20 The third step (where appropriate) is to assess the effect of the proposed development on the value of the asset through the consideration of the key attributes of the proposed development in terms of its location and siting, form and appearance, additional effects and permanence.
- 6.2.21 The fourth step is to maximise enhancement and minimise harm, which may be achieved through appropriate design and Step 5 is making and documenting the decision and monitoring outcomes.

The Setting Assessment

- 6.2.22 As part of the Desk-Based Assessment, designated heritage assets within 1km radius around the site, and a Scheduled Monument located beyond this buffer, were considered for settings assessment. These include:

- Coreley Camp Univallate Hillfort Scheduled Monument (**Figure 6.2: 4**)
- Hollyfast Farmhouse, Grade II Listed (**Figure 6.2: 12**)
- Grade II Listed Akon House (**Figure 6.2: 19**)
- Grade II Listed Coundon Hall Farmhouse (**Figure 6.2: 20**)
- Grade II Listed Coundon Hall (**Figure 6.2: 21**)
- Grade II Listed Beechwood Hotel (**Figure 6.2: 22**)
- Grade II Listed Church of St. Thomas (**Figure 6.2: 30**)
- Grade II Listed Poors Farm and 110, 112, and 122 Wall Hill Road (**Figure 6.2: 56**)
- Grade II Listed Birch Tree Farmhouse (**Figure 6.2: 35**)

- 6.2.23 As part of the Desk-Based Assessment, a site visit was undertaken to assess the potential for the Proposed Development to affect the settings of these heritage assets. It was found that the site was not visible from the majority of the assets (**Figure 6.2: 12, 20, 21, 35, 56**) due to screening provided by topography, woodland, multiple densely vegetated field boundaries and areas of existing development. As a consequence, the Proposed Development will not affect the settings and value of these assets. The settings of a small group of the designated heritage assets have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Development and these are assessed in detail:

- Coreley Camp Univallate Hillfort Scheduled Monument (**Figure 6.2: 4**)
- Grade II Listed Akon House (**Figure 6.2: 19**)
- Grade II Listed Beechwood Hotel (**Figure 6.2: 22**)
- Grade II Listed Church of St. Thomas (**Figure 6.2: 30**)

Policy Framework

- 6.2.24 This chapter has been written within the remit of the following key legislative, planning policy and guidance context.
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979)
 - Town and Country Planning Act (1990)
 - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990)
 - National Heritage Act 1983 (amended 2002)
 - National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

- The Hedgerows Regulations (1997)
- NPPF Planning Policy Guidance: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment (2014)
- Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011;
- Planning Policy Guidance: Environmental Impact Assessment (Department for Communities and Local Government 2014);
- English Heritage 2008: 'Conservation Principles: policies and guidance for the sustainable management of the historic environment'
- English Heritage 2011: 'The Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance'
- English Heritage 2008 'Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation'
- Institute for Archaeologists 2012: Standard and Guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment
- Institute for Archaeologists 2012: Standard and Guidance for geophysical survey
- The Secretary of State's non-statutory criteria for the selection of monuments for scheduling; and
- The Secretary of State's principles for the inclusion of buildings of the statutory list.

6.2.25 Appendices 6.1-6.4 include full details of relevant professional guidance utilised.

National Planning Policy

6.2.26 The principal national guidance on the importance, management and safeguarding of the historic environment resource within the planning process is included in NPPF Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The aim of this section is to ensure that Local Planning Authorities, developers and owners of heritage assets adopt a holistic and consistent approach to conserving the historic environment. The NPPF is discussed in detail in the Desk-Based Assessment (**Appendix 6.1**).

Local Planning Policy

6.2.27 The relevant development plan for the purposes of the Proposed Development comprises the 'saved' policies of the Coventry Development Plan (adopted December 2001) as set out in the in the Secretary of State's direction letter from 7 September 2007. The relevant policies are discussed in the Desk-Based Assessment (**Appendix 6.1**).

6.2.28 Coventry District Council is in the process of revising its Local Plan and new policies will, in future, replace the Coventry Development Plan 2001. Core Strategy Proposed Submission document was prepared in July 2012. The document has not yet been adopted (and it was withdrawn from the examination in April 2013). However, the NPPF advises that decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans and it is likely that such weight may be given to historic environment policies included in the Core Strategy Proposed Submission 2012 document. Reference is therefore made to the emerging historic environment policies which include:

- Policy HE1: Conservation and Heritage Assets: *'In order to help sustain the historic character, sense of place, environmental quality and local distinctiveness of Coventry, development proposals will be supported where they conserve and, where appropriate, enhance those aspects of the historic environment which are recognised as being of special historic, archaeological, architectural, artistic, landscape or townscape significance (...) Proposals likely to affect the significance of a heritage asset or its setting should demonstrate an understanding of such significance in an accompanying Design and Access Statement or Heritage Statement using currently available evidence. (...) Where material change to a heritage asset has been agreed, recording and interpretation should be undertaken to document and understand the asset's archaeological, architectural or historic significance. The scope of the recording should be proportionate to the asset's significance and the impact of the development on the*

asset. The information and understanding gained should be made publicly available, as a minimum through the Coventry Historic Environment Record.

Scoping Criteria

- 6.2.29 EIA Scoping Opinion, issued by Coventry City Council in September 2013, included a requirement to address potential development effects upon the archaeological resource and cultural heritage, including the potential effect on the settings of listed buildings near the site and on the scheduled monument at Burrow Hill Fort known as Corley Camp. It was recommended that consultation with the Conservation and Archaeology Officer at Coventry City Council was carried out in order to agree the scope of archaeological assessment.
- 6.2.30 Following a meeting and further consultation with the Conservation and Archaeology Officer, and the completion of the Desk-Based Assessment, the requirement to carry out a number of additional archaeological surveys was identified. These include a detailed geophysical survey of the whole site, an assessment of potential documentary sources associated with Queen's College, University of Oxford and fieldwalking of an area where lithic scatters were previously recorded, which were carried out prior to the preparation of this chapter. The possible need for a targeted trial trench evaluation within the site has also been identified during the consultation.

Limitations

- 6.2.31 The settings assessment was carried out in October, when vegetation was reduced, but not to the minimum wintertime levels. Therefore in winter, when the vegetation screening is limited, there may be more intervisibility between the site and the designated heritage assets in the vicinity than was the case during the field assessment.
- 6.2.32 This assessment has been informed by the results of a Heritage Desk-Based Assessment, the Documentary Assessment, a programme of a geophysical survey and a fieldwalking survey. These techniques have provided information regarding the archaeological potential of the site. However, archaeology is in principle a buried resource and therefore a certain degree of uncertainty remains due to the absence of intrusive surveys at this stage.

6.3 Baseline Conditions

Site Description and Context

- 6.3.1 Detailed description of the site and the Proposed Development are contained within Chapter 2: Site Description and Proposed Development of this ES.

Baseline Survey Information

Previous Investigations

- 6.3.2 No previous intrusive archaeological work is recorded within the site. The site (**Figure 6.1: 54**) and its wider surroundings (**Figure 6.1: 55, 60, 61**) were included within the survey area for a fieldwalking survey undertaken as part of the Coventry Historic Environment Project. In order to inform this assessment, additional fieldwalking (**Appendix 6.4**) and a geophysical survey (**Appendix 6.2**) were carried out within the site.
- 6.3.3 Three desk-based assessments are recorded within the study area, including an assessment of potential urban expansion which included the site (**Figure 6.1: 75**) and two other studies (**Figure 6.1: 2** and **76**). Other archaeological investigations within the environs of the site included a resistivity survey to the east (**Figure 6.1: 65**).

Designated heritage assets

- 6.3.4 There are no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings or Conservation Areas within The site and the 500m study area. The Scheduled Monument nearest to the site comprises Corley Camp (**Figure 6.2: 4**), which is situated at Burrow Hill c. 1.3km to the north-west of the site.
- 6.3.5 There are five Grade II Listed Buildings located within the study area:

- Beechwood Hotel, located c. 30m south of The site (**Figure 6.1: 22**)
- Akon House, c. 40m to the south-east (**Figure 6.1: 19**)
- The Church of St Thomas, c. 350m to the south (**Figure 6.1: 30**)
- Coundon Hall, c. 300m to the south (**Figure 6.1: 21**)
- Coundon Hall Farmhouse, c. 210m to the south (**Figure 6.1: 20**)

6.3.6 Five Locally Listed Buildings are located within the study area, but none are situated within The site (**Figure 6.1: 25-27, 29, 31**)

Prehistoric (500,000 BC - AD 43)

6.3.7 The Coventry Historic Environment Project recorded prehistoric worked flint within The site. Within the north-western part of The site, a small assemblage of Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age tools, was recorded (**Figure 6.1: 67**). The Mesolithic assemblage, comprising eight pieces including two microliths, an adze and a scraper, has been tentatively associated with a seasonal camp. It is however considered that the Early Neolithic assemblage, comprising c. 50 pieces of worked flint (including arrowheads, burins, knives and scrapers) seems more suggestive of settlement or other activity during this period than the limited evidence from the previous period. The Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age is represented by sixteen worked flints. In addition, a solitary flint flake was recorded in the central part of the site (**Figure 6.1: 66**).

6.3.8 The fieldwalking carried out as part of this assessment (**Appendix 6.4**) revealed an apparent concentration of Mesolithic and Neolithic worked flint, which comprised two retouched blades and a small assemblage of flint working debitage, which were retrieved from the same areas as the comparable material during the earlier survey (**Figure 6.1: 67**).

6.3.9 The results of the former and recent fieldwalking suggest that this part of the site could have been the focus for activity of Mesolithic and Neolithic date. The geophysical survey (**Appendix 6.2**) did not identify any anomalies which could indicate extensive settlement at this location, however, the temporary or seasonal encampments of this period are unlikely to have left significant archaeological footprint.

6.3.10 Within the wider surroundings of the site, worked flint of Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age date was recovered as part of the Coventry Historic Environment Project (**Figure 6.1: 5, 6, 55, 61**).

6.3.11 Corley Camp Scheduled Monument (**Figure 6.2: 4**), located c. 1.3km to the north-west of the site, is a sub-square univallate hillfort of Iron Age date. Such hillforts served as stock enclosures, local economic centres, refuges or permanent settlement sites. At Corley Camp, possible stone hut circles were revealed during excavations, indicating that settlement activity is likely to have taken place there. Quantities of Mesolithic and Neolithic flint recorded at the Scheduled Monument indicate that activity in this area predated the construction of the hillfort.

6.3.12 The potential for the presence of a barrow or prehistoric defended enclosure somewhere to the east of the site has been indicated by a medieval documentary source, although the location of this monument is not known (**Figure 6.1: 53**). It may be related to an enclosure of an unknown date, recorded further east (**Figure 6.1:**

Romano-British (AD 43 - AD 410)

6.3.13 There is limited evidence for Romano-British activity within the study area. No Roman roads or towns are recorded within the vicinity of the site, although a small Roman settlement at High Cross (*Venonis*) is located 16km to the north-east, at the junction of two Roman roads: the Fosse Way and Watling Street.

6.3.14 The presence of Roman period finds within Corley Camp Scheduled Monument indicates that the settlement at the hillfort may have continued into the Romano-British period. Within the study area, ceramic building material of probable Roman period origin was collected during fieldwalking to the west of the site (**Figure 6.1: 55, 61**).

- 6.3.15 During the recent fieldwalking survey, two abraded sherds of Roman pottery were collected (**Appendix 6.4, Figure 4**). There are no known Roman sites within the vicinity and it is likely that the sherds entered the site through manuring of the fields.

Early Medieval (AD 410 - 1066) and Medieval (1066 - 1540)

- 6.3.16 There is no archaeological evidence for early medieval activity within the study area. The documentary evidence records a Saxon Charter boundary immediately to the south-west of the site (**Figure 6.1: 13**), in association with a number of place names in the area (**Figure 6.1: 24, 77**).
- 6.3.17 Historically, the site fell within the boundaries of the hamlet of Keresley, a detached part of the Parish of St Michael's, Coventry. The hamlet is not mentioned in the Domesday Survey of 1086, but it is recorded in a 12th century source as a woodland clearing. The settlement in the area was focussed on Keresley to the north (**Figure 6.1: 15**) and at Keresley Heath to the south of the site (beyond the study area).
- 6.3.18 The medieval activity within The site is represented by pottery and a fragment of carved stone (**Figure 6.1: 33**), found within the western part of The site during the the Coventry Historic Environment Project fieldwalking and further finds of pottery and floor tiles, retrieved in the central part of The site (**Figure 6.1: 18**). These results suggested the presence of a building in this area, however, no finds of medieval date were collected during the recent fieldwalking survey **Appendix 6.4**) and the geophysical survey revealed no anomalies in this area which could indicate the presence of any buildings or other structures at this location.
- 6.3.19 These finds may be associated with a settlement, however, it seems more likely that they were brought to site as a result of agricultural activity, such as manuring of arable fields. The evidence for prolonged cultivation of land within the site is provided by several areas of ridge and furrow earthworks are recorded within The site (**Figure 6.1: 1, 11, 39, 74**). The extant remains are of unknown date, however, it is likely that at least some of them are of medieval date, especially the remains within the eastern part of The site (**Figure 6.1: 39**) as the earthworks at this location are relatively widely spaced and display the characteristic reverse-S shape, indicative of medieval origin. The presence of these remains was confirmed in the Geophysical Survey (**Figure 6.4**), which also revealed the potential for associated below ground remains to be present across fields to the west and south of (**Figure 6.1: 1**).
- 6.3.20 The Desk-Based Assessment has also indicated the potential for the presence of below ground remains associated with ridge and furrow cultivation practices or former boundaries, some of which could potentially be of medieval origin (**Figure 6.1: 17, 23, 32 and 58**). Agricultural remains which could represent ridge and furrow features were identified in the Geophysical Survey at (**Figure 6.1: 58, Figure 6.4**), but the magnetometer survey failed to identify agricultural features at the other locations suggested in the Desk-Based Assessment (**Figure 6.1: 17, 23, 32**).
- 6.3.21 A 15th century Manor House is recorded at Manor Farm immediately to the north of the site (**Figure 6.1: 16**). A rectangular earthwork visible at this location on aerial photographs (**Figure 6.1: 57**) is thought to represent the site of a medieval moated manor. The Grade II Listed Beechwood Hotel (**Figure 6.1: 22**), located immediately to the south of the site, originally comprised a medieval timber-framed hall.
- 6.3.22 A number of other assets of medieval date are recorded within the study area. These include another potential moated site (**Figure 6.1: 59**), a site of possible medieval buildings (**Figure 6.1: 8**), a findspot of medieval coins (**Figure 6.1: 64**) and ridge and furrow earthworks (**Figure 6.1: 54, 60**). Within the north-western part of the study areas, a possible homestead with a number of fishponds is recorded (**Figure 6.1: 14, 52**).

Post-medieval (1540 - 1800)

- 6.3.23 The archaeological evidence for post-medieval activity within the site includes post-medieval pottery found during the Coventry Historic Environment Project fieldwalking in the north-western part of the site (**Figure 6.1: 28**). During the recent fieldwalking survey (**Appendix 6.4**), some post-medieval and modern pottery sherds were collected from the western and central parts of the site. A greater concentration was found to the south of the site, in the vicinity of features identified in the desk-based assessment (**Figure 6.1, 23**) which are considered to correspond within the 18th century field boundaries (see below). The historic mapping evidence, which clearly indicates there were no structures within the site, in conjunction with the results of the geophysical survey (**Appendix 6.2**) which

revealed no structural remains in this area, suggest that these finds were brought into this area through manuring or as a result of other agricultural activity.

- 6.3.24 It is also likely that some of the extant and buried ridge and furrow remains within the site are of post-medieval origin (**Figure 6.1: 1, 11, 39, 48, 74** and **Figure 6.4**).
- 6.3.25 The post-medieval development of the site is depicted on cartographic sources. The historic maps which are mentioned below are described in full in the Desk-Based Assessment (**Appendix 6.1**). Information for these sources has been transcribed onto **Figure 6.3**.
- 6.3.26 A 1771 estate map, which illustrates the western part of the site, records a field partially bounded by woodland within the north-western part of the site. The remnant woodland shown on the map is thought to indicate that the field had been created as a result of woodland clearance, carried out in the later medieval and early post-medieval period. The map depicts enclosed fields within the site, demarcated by a number of field boundaries, alongside which vegetation is recorded. The extant and removed field boundaries recorded on this map have been transcribed onto **Figure 6.3**. These hedgerows are considered to have statutory protection under archaeology and history criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 as they pre-date the Enclosure Act for Keresley parish.
- 6.3.27 Two stones are recorded on the map along a footpath (**Figure 6.1: A**). The origin and function of these stones are unclear and these features are not depicted on later mapping and were not observed during the site visit.
- 6.3.28 Within the study area, the post-medieval activity is represented by the surviving built heritage assets. Coundon Hall Farmhouse (**Figure 6.1: 20**) and Akon House (**Figure 6.1: 19**) are of 18th century origin. Beechwood Hotel (**Figure 6.1: 22**), which originally comprised a medieval hall, was modified and extended in the 18th century. Other assets within the study area include a farmstead (**Figure 6.1: 62**), ridge and furrow earthworks (**Figure 6.1: 34, 60**), pottery sherds (**Figure 6.1: 61**) and a meadow (**Figure 6.1: 68**).

Modern (1800 - present)

- 6.3.29 The 1843 Keresley Enclosure Map and the subsequent 1846 Keresley Tithe Map depict agricultural fields within the majority of the site, with an area of woodland to the north-west. The extant and removed field boundaries recorded on the 1843 map have been transcribed onto **Figure 6.3**. Although these hedgerows are not afforded statutory protection under the archaeology and history criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997, they may be considered to be of some interest as they mark pre-1845 field boundaries. Extant ditches corresponding with the field boundaries recorded on these maps were observed during the site visit (**Figure 6.1: B and C**).
- 6.3.30 There is no evidence of any structures on these maps, however the maps depict a number of ponds within the site, at least two of which are extant. The field name *Marl Pit Close*, recorded within the central part of the site (**Figure 6.1: D**) in the Tithe Apportionment, is thought to indicate that the pond at this location may represent a marl extraction pit. Marl was used as a soil improver in the post-medieval period and the presence of such remains within the site provides evidence for agricultural activities during this period.
- 6.3.31 A scatter comprising 19th century pottery and other debris was collected from the central part of the site during the recent fieldwalking survey (**Appendix 6.4**). These finds concentrated along linear features identified on 1940s aerial photographs (**Figure 6.1: 23**), which have been interpreted as potential field boundaries and a trackway, likely of post-medieval origin (see below).
- 6.3.32 The late 19th and early 20th century Ordnance Survey maps record limited changes within the site. By 1888, the woodland to the north-west of the site had been cleared and a small orchard had been created within the south-eastern corner of the site (**Figure 6.1: E**).
- 6.3.33 The Grade II Listed Buildings constructed in the 19th century within the study area include Coundon Hall (**Figure 6.1: 21**) and the Church of St Thomas (**Figure 6.1: 30**). There are also five Locally Listed Buildings in the study area, which are of post-medieval and modern origin (**Figure 6.1: 25-27, 29 and 31**).
- 6.3.34 The modern remains recorded within the study area include the 19th century brickyard and blacksmith's workshop, which were located in Keresley (**Figure 6.1: 71 and 73**). The 20th century anti-aircraft battery was observed on aerial photographs to have been located south of Sandpits Lane (**Figure 6.1: 36**).

Undated

- 6.3.35 Ridge and furrow earthworks were observed within the site on aerial photographs, during the site visit and in the Geophysical Survey (**Figure 6.1**: 1, 11, 39, 58, 74 and **Figure 6.4**). Although undated, it is likely that at least some of the remains could be of medieval date, due to the characteristic reverse S-shape (**Figure 6.1**: 39). Other remains could be of medieval or later date. The Geophysical Survey failed to locate any ridge and furrow remains in the central part of the site (**Figure 6.1**: 17).
- 6.3.36 Other remains within the site include a series of linear features (**Figure 6.1**: 23). These partly correspond with field boundaries marked on the Tithe Map, and could potentially represent post-medieval or modern boundaries and trackways, however, no remains were revealed at this location in the Geophysical Survey. During the fieldwalking, a concentration of 19th century pottery and other debris was collected along the probable trackway, indicating the use of this area throughout the 19th century (**Appendix 6.4**)
- 6.3.37 In the eastern part of the site, a group of features is recorded to accompany the ridge and furrow earthworks (**Figure 6.1**: 11), including ditches and a possible trackway. The trackway can be seen cutting through the ridge and furrow remains on 1940s aerial photographs, which indicates a later, probably post-medieval date of this feature. The winding trackway (**Figure 6.4**: J) was revealed in the Geophysical Survey. In the same field, a row of discrete anomalies (**Figure 6.4**: N) is considered to be indicative of a line of in-filled pits. It is not known at present whether these remains are of archaeological origin.
- 6.3.38 Feature **32** (**Figure 6.1**) was considered in the Desk-Based Assessment to represent remains associated with cultivation, probably post-medieval field boundaries. However, the Geophysical Survey revealed at this location a cluster of anomalies (**Figure 6.4**: M) which could potentially be associated with extraction, although different interpretations (an area of tipping or demolition rubble) have also been suggested.
- 6.3.39 A number of undressed sandstone blocks recorded in the centre of the site are thought to represent field clearance rather than the remains of an archaeological feature (**Figure 6.1**: 10).
- 6.3.40 Within the study area, a number of ridge and furrow remains and related features are recorded (**Figure 6.1**: 3, 7, 37, 38, 40-44, 46-49, 51, 63), some of which could potentially be of medieval origin. Other cropmarks and earthworks observed within the wider surroundings of the site may represent enclosures, field boundaries, Holloway, ponds and moated site remains (**Figure 6.1**: 9, 45, 70, 75, 57, 69, 50, 52, 61).

Summary of Geophysical Survey (Appendix 6.2)

- 6.3.41 The Geophysical Survey has identified a number of anomalies, however, none are of clear archaeological potential. Numerous anomalies associated with the geology and soils within the site are present. The majority of the anomalies reflect the predominantly agricultural practices within the site. Anomalies associated with historic ploughing within the site, due to former ridge and furrow cultivation, were recorded across the central and eastern part of the site (**Figure 6.4**). More recent agricultural activity (ploughing) is recorded to the west.
- 6.3.42 The anomalies of some archaeological potential comprise a line of pit like responses to the east of the site (**Figure 6.4**, N). Additionally, a cluster of anomalies was recorded to the south-east of the site (**Figure 6.4**, M). These could be associated with quarrying or could indicate a spread of rubble.

Summary of Documentary Assessment (Appendix 6.3)

- 6.3.43 The Documentary Assessment aimed to assess the usefulness of the documentary sources held at Queen's College, Oxford as the College acquired an estate in Keresley in the 16th century.
- 6.3.44 The review of historic maps indicated that only a small part of the site (c. 9% of the site area) formed part of the estate of the College. The reviewed cartographic sources suggest that there is little evidence for previous structures, buildings or other activity that may be archaeologically significant within this part of the site. Therefore it was concluded that a detailed assessment of the records held at Queen's College would not be appropriate as it is unlikely this would provide significant evidence for previous activity within this small part of the site.

Summary of Fieldwalking (Appendix 6.4)

- 6.3.45 The Fieldwalking Survey aimed to investigate a number of fields within the central and western parts of the site. However, as parts of the site were under crop or pasture, the survey was limited to approximately 8ha of the intended area measuring 14.6ha. It was possible to carry out the survey within the western part of area 67 (**Figure 6.1**), within which prehistoric finds had previously been found and within the fields surrounding area 18 (**Figure 6.1**) from which medieval finds had previously been collected.
- 6.3.46 An concentration of Mesolithic and Neolithic worked flint, comprising two retouched blades and a small assemblage of flint working debitage, was recovered from the northern part of the site, in an area where comparable material had been previously collected in 2011 (**Figure 6.1**: 67). It is considered probable that these finds could have been associated with seasonal activity of prehistoric date.
- 6.3.47 Pottery sherds and other debris of the 18th and 19th century date were collected from along a possible post-medieval trackway (**Figure 6.1**: 23). This material, as well as two findspots of Roman pottery sherds, is thought to have been imported onto the site through manuring or other agricultural processes.

Identification of Sensitive Receptors

- 6.3.48 The archaeological surveys carried out to inform this assessment (**Appendices 6.1-6.4**) identified a number of assets which are considered sensitive receptors likely to be affected by the Proposed Development. These comprise designated heritage assets within the environs of the site, archaeological remains and historic landscape features and are discussed below. For the purposes of this chapter, the sensitivity of the receptors has been formulated with reference to the value of heritage assets, as set out in **Table 6.1**, above. The identified sensitive receptors are presented in **Table 6.5**:

Table 6.5: Identified sensitive receptors and their value

Receptor	Value (Sensitivity)	Justification
Corley Camp Scheduled Monument (Figure 6.2 : 4)	High	Scheduled Monument, a prehistoric monument of national interest
Akon House (Figure 6.2 : 19)	Medium	Grade II Listed Building valued for its historic fabric holding evidential and aesthetic values and as a part of a group of vernacular buildings with nearby Beechwood Hotel
Beechwood Hotel (Figure 6.2 : 22)	Medium	Grade II Listed Building valued for its historic fabric holding evidential and aesthetic values and as a part of a group of vernacular buildings with nearby Akon House
Church of St Thomas (Figure 6.2 : 30)	Medium	Grade II Listed Building valued for its historic fabric holding evidential and aesthetic values and due to its importance for the local community
Extant hedgerows along boundaries depicted on 18th century map (Figure 6.3)	Medium	Hedgerows considered to be historically 'important as they define field boundaries pre-dating the Enclosure Act
Mesolithic to Bronze Age finds found during fieldwalking (Figure 6.1 : 67; Appendix 6.4) indicating prehistoric activity	Medium (if confirmed)	The flint scatter at this location is thought to indicate the potential for the presence of remains associated with prehistoric settlement activity. As no features of archaeological potential were revealed in the Geophysical Survey, it is likely that this activity would have been transient in character and the features would not have left a significant archaeological footprint. However, further finds may be present beneath the topsoil and such remains would contribute to regional research objectives
A complex of features comprising ditches, a possible trackway and	Low	A complex of features of local interest. Although undated, the ridge and furrow could be medieval or later, with the trackway post-dating these remains. These

poorly preserved ridge and furrow earthworks, (Figure 6.1: 11)		remains are associated with agriculture and they would have been located at a periphery of a settlement (extremely low potential for presence of settlement remains).
Poorly preserved ridge and furrow earthworks (Figure 6.1: 1, 39, 74 and Figure 6.4)	Low	Features of local interest compromised by poor preservation
Extant ponds at least of 19th century origin	Low	Features of limited archaeological interest
Extant hedgerows along boundaries depicted on 19th century map (Figure 6.3)	Low	Hedgerows not statutorily protected but of some local interest as they pre-date 1845
Findspot of a single worked flake found during fieldwalking (Figure 6.1: 66)	Negligible	Asset no longer within the site (isolated artefact found within topsoil – following its removal from the site it retains no additional value).
Medieval and later finds found during fieldwalking (Figure 6.1: 18, 28, 33)	Negligible	These findspots are considered to be associated with medieval and later farming and not related to other (i.e. settlement) activity
Buried ridge and furrow remains and extant remains of post-medieval field boundaries and trackways (Figure 6.1: 17, 23, 58, B, C and Figure 6.4)	Negligible	Features of limited archaeological interest. Features unconfirmed in geophysical survey.
Undressed stone blocks (Figure 6.1: 10)	Negligible	Feature of limited archaeological interest
Stones recorded on 18th century map (Figure 6.1: A)	Negligible	Assets no longer within the site (cannot be impacted upon)
19th century orchard (Figure 6.1: E)	Negligible	Feature no longer within the site (cannot be impacted upon)
Pit alignment of unknown date and origin (Figure 6.4: N)	Unknown	Features potentially of archaeological origin identified as anomalies in the geophysical survey. The date, origin and function cannot be confirmed at present
Cluster of anomalies (Figure 6.4: M)	Unknown	Anomalies potentially associated with quarrying or demolition rubble. Date, origin, function at present unconfirmed
Potential archaeological remains	Unknown	There is a low potential for the presence of as yet unknown archaeological features within the site. The value of these assets cannot be established at present

6.4 Key Impacts & Likely Significant Effects

Identification of Key Impacts

Construction (direct impacts)

- 6.4.1 Full details of the Proposed Development are provided in Chapter 2: Site Description and Proposed Development of this ES.
- 6.4.2 The development will involve the construction of residential, commercial and school buildings and associated services, the construction of access routes and the creation of green open spaces, which will include ponds and attenuation areas. The impacts upon archaeology may arise from stripping or excavation associated with any of these activities.

6.4.3 The construction activities will impact directly upon the land within the site and, consequently, upon earthworks and any below ground deposits. This has the potential to impact upon buried archaeological remains within the site. These impacts are anticipated across the majority of the site. These impacts may be limited within areas proposed as green open space. At present, the details of any construction activities within these areas are not known. It is anticipated that the archaeological resource within these areas is unlikely to experience major impacts, but any excavation associated with landscaping or creation of attenuation areas would impact upon the archaeological resource.

Operation (indirect impacts)

6.4.4 The Proposed Development may also result in indirect effects upon heritage assets, which include visual alterations to the settings of designated heritage assets. The construction of new buildings within the site will result in a permanent alteration of the landscape, visually impacting upon the settings of the designated heritage assets located in the vicinity. The potential contribution of setting to the value of heritage asset is identified in the NPPF (Section 12) and in heritage guidance 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' (English Heritage 2011).

Likely Development Effects

6.4.5 The anticipated impacts and effects of the Proposed Development are summarised in **Table 6.6**.

Construction

6.4.6 The impacts upon the archaeological resource as a result of construction activities would be direct, permanent and irreversible and are likely to result in complete or partial loss of an archaeological feature or deposit. It is considered that, prior to mitigation (see below), the predicted magnitude of impact on any archaeological remains lying within the site where construction or associated activities are to be undertaken will be **Major Adverse**. This applies to buried remains identified during the previous surveys as well as to any as yet unidentified remains (if present) which may survive within the site.

6.4.7 The **Major Adverse** impacts upon known archaeological remains of **Medium Value** would result in **Moderate Adverse** significance of effect prior to mitigation.

6.4.8 The **Major Adverse** impacts upon known archaeological remains of **Low Value** would result in **Moderate Adverse** significance of effect prior to mitigation.

6.4.9 The significance of effect with regard to archaeological remains of **Negligible Value** would be **Slight Adverse**.

6.4.10 Due to the **Unknown Value** of some of the known and the potential archaeological remains within the site, it is not at present possible to assess the significance of effect of **Major Adverse** impacts upon this resource and it remains **Unknown**.

6.4.11 No impacts are anticipated with regard to heritage features which are known to have been removed from site (**No Change**), which leads to a **Neutral** significance of effect.

6.4.12 The Proposed Development could impact upon extant ponds of Low value. However, the Proposed Development Design includes the retention of these features and their inclusion within landscaped open spaces. As a result of the lack of physical effects upon these features, the predicted magnitude of impact in **No Change**, leading to a **Neutral** significance of effect.

6.4.13 The construction activities have the potential to impact upon historically 'important' hedgerows of **Medium Value** and hedgerows which may be considered of local interest of **Low Value**. The Proposed Development design includes the retention of and improvements to the majority of the hedgerows within the site. As a result, the magnitude of impact upon the retained features would be **No Change**, leading to a **Neutral** significance of effect. A small number of hedgerows will be removed, which will result in **Major Adverse** impacts upon these assets, leading to **Moderate Adverse** significance of effect with regard to hedgerows of **Medium Value** and **Slight Adverse** significance of effect with regard to hedgerows of **Low Value** (prior to mitigation).

Operation

6.4.14 The potential effect to the value of designated heritage assets within the surroundings of the site has been considered under the Operation phase of the development as the extent of the potential alteration to the settings of these assets will be at its greatest during this phase. The Desk-Based Assessment (**Appendix 6.1**) concluded that the Proposed Development has the potential to affect the

settings of a small number of Grade II Listed Buildings and a Scheduled Monument located within the environs of the site. This assessment is summarised below and is presented in full in **Appendix 6.1**.

Corley Camp Scheduled Monument (Figure 6.2: 4)

- 6.4.15 The Scheduled Monument, located c. 1.3km to the north-west of the site, is considered to be a heritage asset of **High Value**. It comprises an Iron Age sub-square slight univallate hillfort covering approximately 4ha. The Scheduled Monument is located on north-west/south-east ridgeway and its setting is formed by the surrounding agricultural landscape of arable fields, with pockets of woodland and mature vegetation along field boundaries, with wide-ranging views allowed across the landscape to the east and north-east of the hillfort. Views in the south-easterly direction, towards the location of the site, are largely screened by Bunsons Wood, although partial views over the forested landscape in the south-easterly direction are possible.
- 6.4.16 Corley Camp derives its value from the historical value of its surviving aboveground earthwork remains and from its evidential value as it has the potential to yield information about the prehistoric period. Due to the ridge-line location of the asset, its setting is also considered to contribute to the value of the Scheduled Monument, as this elevated location was probably one of the major factors in its original siting. The extensive views to the east also contribute to the historical value of the asset as they enable its function as a defensive fortification and its relationship with the surrounding landscape to be understood.
- 6.4.17 During the site visit, the site was not visible from the hillfort due to the screening effect of multiple intervening areas of vegetation. It is possible, however, that partial, distant views of the buildings within the site, following the completion of the Proposed Development, may be visible in winter, when the vegetative screening is somewhat reduced. However, as the site falls within an area that does not contribute to the asset's value, due to the screening, it is considered that any potential limited visibility of the Proposed Development will not alter the character of the important elements of the Scheduled Monument's setting.
- 6.4.18 The Proposed Development will not introduce change to the important parts of the asset's setting, comprising its ridge-line location and wide-ranging views to the east and north-east. Therefore the magnitude of change is considered to be **Negligible**, leading to a **Slight Adverse** significance of effect.

Grade II Listed Akon House (Figure 6.2: 19)

- 6.4.19 Akon House is a Grade II Listed Building of **Medium Value** located c. 50m to the south-east of the site. It comprises a 16th century timber-framed house, with later repairs and modifications. Its setting is formed by the nearby Beechwood Hotel and associated gardens and grounds, as well as modern structures in Sandpits Lane to the east.
- 6.4.20 The value of the Listed Building derives from the historical, evidential and aesthetic value of its historic fabric. The most important element of its setting is the adjacent Beechwood Hotel, which forms part of its historic setting, and has strong group value with Akon House. The associated grounds also contribute to the historical and aesthetic value of the asset as they form part of its historic setting and allow Akon House to be appreciated in its historic context. The field to the west of the asset makes a minor contribution to the historical significance of the asset as it forms a surviving element of the rural setting.
- 6.4.21 The vast majority of the site is not visible from Akon House due to topographical and vegetative screening. However, the fields immediately to the west of Akon House are visible. Partial views of the closest field to the north in the proposed development site may be possible in the winter, when vegetation screening is reduced.
- 6.4.22 The Proposed Development incorporates mitigation measures aiming to reduce the potential adverse effects upon this asset and therefore the effects discussed below are residual. The Development includes the retention of open space within the fields to the west of the heritage asset, through the creation of water meadows, and the retention and improvements to the hedgerow field boundaries, thus creating a buffer between the Listed Building and the proposed residential development.
- 6.4.23 The Proposed Development will not affect the key elements of the asset's important setting and will mitigate the impacts upon the wider setting of limited importance. The magnitude of predicted impact is considered to be **Negligible**, resulting in an at most **Slight Adverse** significance of effect on this asset.

Grade II Listed Beechwood Hotel (Figure 6.2: 22)

- 6.4.24 Beechwood Hotel is a Grade II Listed Building of **Medium Value** located c. 30m to the south of the site. It comprises a red brick 18th century building encasing an earlier core, with later extensions. Its setting is formed by associated gardens to the south and west and the Grade II Listed Akon House. Modern development, including car parks, and structures in Sandpits Lane and Bennetts Road South also form part of this setting. The views towards farmland to the west and north-west form the wider setting of the asset.
- 6.4.25 The value of the Listed Building derives mainly from the historical, evidential and aesthetic value of its built fabric. The associated grounds and the nearby Akon House form setting which also contributes to the value of the asset. Together, these buildings form a strong vernacular group, with a close visual relationship. The surviving agricultural land to the north and west also contributes to the historical value of Beechwood Hotel, as it was originally a farmhouse. However, later extensions and changes of use of the building have obscured its origins as a farmhouse, which reduces the value of the contribution of the agricultural land to its significance.
- 6.4.26 The vast majority of the site is not visible from the Beechwood Hotel due to topographical and vegetation screening. However, a small area of the south-eastern corner of the site is visible from the upper floors of the Hotel. Partial views of the fields immediately to the north and north-west of the Listed Building may also be afforded, particularly in the winter.
- 6.4.27 The Proposed Development includes changes to the wider setting of the asset from rural to residential which could have an adverse impact upon this heritage asset. However, the proposals incorporate mitigation measures aiming to reduce the adverse effects of the Proposed Development, including the retention and improvements to field boundaries in the vicinity of the asset and the creation of green open space to the west. This, in conjunction with the reduced contribution of the rural setting to the value of the asset, is considered to lead to **Negligible** magnitude of impact and, as a consequence, to a **Neutral** significance of effect on the value of this heritage asset.

Grade II Listed Church of St Thomas (Figure 6.2: 30)

- 6.4.28 Church of St Thomas is a Grade II Listed Building of **Medium Value** situated approximately 360m to the south of the site. It comprises a small red sandstone church set within the surrounding churchyard containing a large number of mature trees.
- 6.4.29 The church derives its value from its historic fabric, holding aesthetic, historic and evidential values. The churchyard setting of the building is also considered to contribute to its value, as is its roadside location, which allows for passers-by to appreciate this dominant feature.
- 6.4.30 The site is completely screened from the church at ground level due to the intervening trees and buildings. However, the steeple of the church can be glimpsed from some areas in the southern part of the site. However, the site is not considered to form part of the asset's setting contributing to its value and the Proposed Development will not affect the asset's significance. Therefore the magnitude of impact upon the Church of St Thomas is considered to be **No Change**, leading to a **Neutral** significance of effect.

6.5 Mitigation, Enhancement and Residual Effects

Construction

- 6.5.1 It is considered that the loss of or damage to the archaeological resource as a result of construction could be satisfactorily mitigated by way of a standard archaeological condition, ensuring preservation by record of the archaeological remains at an appropriate stage in the development process. The mitigation could include a combination of archaeological monitoring and excavation, as appropriate.
- 6.5.2 The value of the potential archaeological remains within the site, and some of the remains identified in the geophysical survey, is currently largely **Unknown**. Therefore the need for a programme of a targeted trial trench evaluation within the site has been identified during consultation with the Conservation and Archaeology Officer. The aim of the evaluation would be to establish the presence/absence, character and value of archaeological remains within selected parts of the site where previous surveys identified the potential for archaeological features.
- 6.5.3 Following the consultations with the Conservation and Archaeology Officer, it has been established that further evaluation of the potential prehistoric remains within the western part of the site (**Figure**

6.1, 67) is likely to be required. It is proposed that this survey should comprise test pitting and trial trenching aiming to identify any potential prehistoric remains, including artefact scatters.

- 6.5.4 The results of the evaluation would allow for an appropriate programme of mitigation to be agreed prior to construction. The scope and methodology of these works will be agreed within a written scheme of investigation approved by the Conservation and Archaeology Officer prior to development. Should the presence of archaeological remains be confirmed in the evaluation, a programme of archaeological investigation, comprising the full investigation, recording, analysis and publication and/or a watching brief of all excavations, will be implemented before the development. If archaeological features of highest value are revealed, it may be appropriate for the mitigation to include preservation in situ which would remove the adverse impacts of the development (**No Change**).
- 6.5.5 It is considered that the archaeological remains of **Negligible Value** identified within the site are adequately understood and no mitigation is proposed with regard to these remains.
- 6.5.6 No mitigation is required with regard to the extant post-medieval ponds within the site of **Low Value** as the Proposed Development includes the retention of these features.
- 6.5.7 The Proposed Development includes the retention of the majority of the extant hedgerows which are 'historically important' or which are considered to be of historic interest. However, it is necessary to remove a small number of the features of **Medium** and **Low Value** as part of the development. It is considered that the loss of or damage to these heritage assets as a result of construction could be satisfactorily mitigated through preservation by record, which could include archaeological monitoring of the removal works.

Operation

- 6.5.8 In order to reduce any potential impacts upon the settings of two Listed Buildings of **Medium Value** located in the vicinity of the site (**Figure 6.2: 19, 22**), mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design.
- 6.5.9 The Proposed Development includes the retention of the open space within the fields immediately to the west of the Listed Buildings and it is proposed to create green landscaped space in this area, comprising water meadows. It is also proposed to retain and improve the hedgerows alongside the boundaries of the site, improving the screening of the buildings which are to be constructed within the site from the designated heritage assets. It is considered that this approach reduces the adverse effects on these assets.

Residual Effects

- 6.5.10 Table 6.6 (below) summarises the incorporated and proposed mitigation measures and the residual significance of effect for the identified sensitive cultural heritage receptors.
- 6.5.11 Following the implementation of the mitigation measures, the significance of effect upon the buried archaeological remains within the site will be substantially reduced. It is considered that, following the archaeological recording, the residual significance of effect upon archaeological remains of **Medium** and **Low Value** will be **Slight Adverse**.
- 6.5.12 Although the significance of this effect on the potential archaeological remains within the site of **Unknown Value** cannot be at present established, the residual significance of effect is unlikely to exceed **Slight Adverse**.
- 6.5.13 As no mitigation is proposed with regard to the archaeological remains of **Negligible Value** within the site, the residual significance of effect upon these assets will remain **Slight Adverse**.
- 6.5.14 As the post-medieval ponds of **Low Value** are to be retained within the site, no mitigation is required and the residual significance of effect remains **Neutral**.
- 6.5.15 Following the implementation of archaeological mitigation, which is to include monitoring during removal, it is considered that the residual significance of effect on historic hedgerows of **Medium** and **Low Value** which are to be removed will be **Slight Adverse**. As the majority of these heritage assets will be retained, no mitigation is required with regard to these hedgerows and the residual significance of effect remains **Neutral**.

- 6.5.16 The mitigation measures incorporated into the development design are considered to reduce the development effects upon the Listed Buildings located in the vicinity of the site and therefore the effects discussed above, which take into account the incorporated mitigation, are considered to be residual. The proposal to create green open spaces in the vicinity of Akon House reduces the impacts upon this asset and the resultant residual significance of effect on this Listed Building is **Slight Adverse**. The creation of open space and improvements to the hedgerows at the edges of the site lead to a **Neutral** residual significance of effect upon Beechwood Hotel.
- 6.5.17 No mitigation is proposed with regard to Church of St Thomas as the Proposed Development will not affect the value of this heritage asset. As a consequence, the resultant residual significance of effect on this heritage asset will be **Neutral**. It is not considered necessary to mitigate the limited, non-significant potential **Slight Adverse** effect upon the Corley Camp Scheduled Monument and the residual significance of effect upon this asset would remain **Slight Adverse**.

Table 6.6: Summary of Likely Development Effects upon Cultural Heritage Receptors

Receptor	Value (Sensitivity)	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect	Mitigation	Residual Significance of Effect
Corley Camp Scheduled Monument (Figure 6.2: 4)	High	Negligible	Slight Adverse	None required	Slight Adverse
Akon House (Figure 6.2: 19)	Medium	Negligible	Slight Adverse (including mitigation by design)	By design: retention of open space within fields to the west of the asset and of hedgerow boundaries	Slight Adverse
Beechwood Hotel (Figure 6.2: 22)	Medium	Negligible	Neutral (including mitigation by design)	By design: retention of open space within fields to the west of the asset and of hedgerow boundaries	Neutral
Church of St Thomas (Figure 6.2: 30)	Medium	No Change	Neutral	None required	Neutral
Extant hedgerows along boundaries depicted on 18th century map (Figure 6.3)	Medium	No change (for retained assets);	Neutral	None required	Neutral
		Major Adverse (for assets removed)	Moderate Adverse	Preservation by record	Slight Adverse
Mesolithic to Bronze Age finds found during fieldwalking (Figure 6.1: 67; Appendix 6.4) indicating prehistoric activity	Medium (if confirmed)	Major Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Preservation by record	Slight Adverse
A complex of features comprising ditches, a possible trackway and poorly preserved ridge and furrow earthworks, (Figure 6.1: 11)	Low	Major Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Preservation by record	Slight Adverse
Poorly preserved ridge and furrow earthworks (Figure 6.1: 1, 39, 74)	Low	Major Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Preservation by record	Slight Adverse

and Figure 6.4)					
Extant ponds at least of 19th century origin	Low	No change	Neutral	None required	Neutral
Extant hedgerows along boundaries depicted on 19th century map (Figure 6.3)	Low	No change (for retained assets);	Neutral	None required	Neutral
		Major Adverse (for assets removed)	Slight Adverse	Preservation by record	Slight Adverse
Findspot of a single worked flake found during fieldwalking (Figure 6.1: 66)	Negligible	No change	Neutral	None required	Neutral
Medieval and post-medieval finds found during fieldwalking (Figure 6.1: 18, 28, 33)	Negligible	No change	Neutral	None required	Neutral
Buried ridge and furrow remains and remains of post-medieval field boundaries and trackways (Figure 6.1: 17, 23, 58, B, C and Figure 6.4)	Negligible	Major Adverse	Slight Adverse	None required	Slight Adverse
Undressed stone blocks (Figure 6.1: 10)	Negligible	Major Adverse	Slight Adverse	None required	Slight Adverse
Stones recorded on 18th century map (Figure 6.1: A)	Negligible	No change	Neutral	None required	Neutral
19th century orchard (Figure 6.1: E)	Negligible	No change	Neutral	None required	Neutral
Pit alignment of unknown date and origin (Figure 6.4: N)	Unknown	Major Adverse	Unknown	Preservation by record	Unknown (likely Slight Adverse at most)
Cluster of anomalies (Figure 6.4: M)	Unknown	Major Adverse	Unknown	Preservation by record	Unknown (likely Slight Adverse at most)
Potential archaeological remains	Unknown	Major Adverse	Unknown	Preservation by record	Unknown (likely Slight Adverse at most)

6.6 Cumulative Impacts

6.6.1 The Proposed Development, and other on-going and planned developments in the vicinity of the site, will continue to lead to a loss of buried archaeological remains, which, in line with the NPPF, are viewed as a finite and irreplaceable resource. However, following the results of the surveys undertaken within the site, no archaeological features of highest value, and certainly no more than might be expected within such landscape in the region, are anticipated to be present within the site. Consequently, the likely impacts upon the archaeological resource of national or regional interest are considered to be minimal.

6.6.2 The cumulative impact upon the archaeological resource is regarded as **Slight Adverse** if a programme of archaeological mitigation is implemented, resulting in the preservation of the assets by record, contributing to the advancement of understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost.

6.6.3 The development within the site, in conjunction with other developments in the vicinity of designated heritage assets, could lead to a degradation of the settings of these assets. It is considered that this deterioration of the settings could be mitigated by appropriate design, such as mitigation measures included in the Proposed Development, and thoughtful location of the development, reducing potential visibility and impacts.

6.7 Summary

Introduction

6.7.1 This chapter has considered the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development in terms of archaeology and cultural heritage.

6.7.2 The baseline survey included the consultation of archaeological and historic information from documentary and cartographic sources, as well as a programme of archaeological surveys including a geophysical survey and fieldwalking.

Baseline Conditions

6.7.3 There is a potential for the presence of remains associated with prehistoric activity within the site as scatters of worked flint of Mesolithic to Bronze Age date were recorded during fieldwalking.

6.7.4 The majority of the archaeological remains recorded within the site include ridge and furrow remains and other features associated with medieval and post-medieval farming and field divisions. It has been established that there is a very low potential for remains associated with settlement dating to these periods.

6.7.5 The designated heritage assets within the study area include five Grade II Listed Buildings and five Locally Listed Buildings. Two of the Grade II listed structures, Akon House and Beechwood Hotel, are located in close proximity to the site.

Likely Significant Effects

6.7.6 Ground disturbance associated with the Proposed Development is likely to permanently damage or remove any below ground archaeological remains present within the site. However, the significance of any development effects upon the archaeological resource of the Application Site will be dependent upon the nature, date and state of preservation of any archaeological remains present.

6.7.7 The Proposed Development will introduce change within the wider setting of Listed Buildings located in close proximity to the site. However, the development design incorporates mitigation measures which include the retention of vegetation and open spaces in close proximity of the heritage assets which reduce the severity of the effect.

Mitigation and Enhancement

6.7.8 Proposed mitigation measures with regard to the archaeological resource include preservation by record which could include, as appropriate, archaeological monitoring and excavation. However, as the archaeological resource within the site is not fully understood, targeted trial trench evaluation, including test pitting within the area with prehistoric potential, will be required in order to establish the presence/absence and value of archaeological remains within the site. The results of the evaluation would allow for an appropriate programme of mitigation to be agreed prior to construction. The scope and methodology of these works will be agreed within a written scheme of investigation approved by the Conservation and Archaeology Officer prior to development.

6.7.9 In order to reduce any potential impacts upon the settings of two Listed Buildings of located in the vicinity of the site, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design. The Proposed Development includes the retention of the open space within the fields immediately to the west of the Listed Buildings and it is also proposed to retain the hedgerows alongside the boundaries of the site, improving the screening of the site from the designated heritage assets.

Conclusions

- 6.7.10 The residual effects of the Proposed Development upon below ground archaeological remains will be Slight Adverse following the implementation of the agreed archaeological mitigation.
- 6.7.11 No significant effects upon designated heritage assets located within the surroundings of the site are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development. As a result of the mitigation proposals incorporated into the development design, the residual effects upon designated heritage assets in the study area will be Neutral or, at most, Slight Adverse.