
7.0 Cultural Heritage

7.1 Introduction

This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared by The Environmental Dimension Partnership (EDP) and assesses the potential effects of the proposed development in terms of archaeology and cultural heritage resources (the historic environment).

EDP are a Registered Organisation with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. This chapter was prepared by Robert Skinner, Senior Archaeology and Heritage Consultant, and was reviewed for Quality Assurance purposes, by Andrew Crutchley, Director. Robert Skinner is an Associate of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Andrew Crutchley is a Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

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 occupation phases of the proposed development, the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects and likely residual effects after these measures have been employed. The chapter assesses the development as described in *Chapter 4* of this ES.

This chapter is informed by desk-based assessment and site survey work carried out in 2018. The results of these surveys are summarised in this chapter, with more detailed information included in *Appendix 7.1* which comprise an Archaeological and Heritage Desk-Based Assessment and geophysical survey report.

7.2 Scoping, Consultation and Overview of Potential Effects

The scope of the assessment includes the following:

- The potential direct impacts of the proposed development on previously recorded heritage assets located within the site;
- The potential direct impacts of the proposed development on hitherto unknown or unrecorded heritage assets located within the site;
- The potential indirect impacts of the proposed development on designated heritage assets, outwith the site, through change within their setting; and
- The potential indirect impacts of the proposed development on non-designated heritage assets, outwith the site, which are included on Coventry Council's Local List of Buildings, through change within their setting.

A geophysical survey was requested by Chris Patrick, Conservation and Archaeology Officer at Coventry City Council following initial consultation via telephone in December 2017. The scope and method of this survey were agreed with Chris Patrick via a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) submitted in February 2018.

The results of the geophysical survey did not identify anomalies thought to represent archaeological remains and informed further consultation with the current archaeological advisor for Coventry City Council, Graham Tait.

Following communication with Mr Tait via email in June 2018, it was established that, in light of the results of the desk-based assessment and geophysical survey at that time, no further archaeological works would be required, either to inform the planning application or as a condition attached to planning permission.

A consultation response was received from the Conservation Officer at Coventry City Council on 23rd July 2018. The response highlighted the potential for impacts on the locally listed building Keresley Manor, its lodge and outbuildings, and gives recommendations for reducing these effects. These effects, and proposed mitigation, have been taken into consideration in the ES Chapter and are discussed in *Section 7.5*.

7.3 Assessment Methodology

The assessment has been informed by a baseline Archaeological and Heritage Assessment (*Appendix 7.1*) carried out in line with the *Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment* issued by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA, 2017).

Appendix 7.1 forms the basis of the assessment within the ES. It drew on prior research carried out at the site, including the results of a Heritage Topic Paper (EDP, 2017) prepared on behalf of Bellway Homes.

The assessment also includes the results of a geophysical survey which was carried out in March 2018 (ASWYAS, 2018). This survey consisted of detailed magnetometry across the entirety of the site.

The Archaeological and Heritage Assessment utilised baseline information derived from the following sources:

- Citations and supporting documentation acquired from Historic England for archaeological and/or heritage designations within the site, or located within the site's wider zone of influence;
- Information held by the Coventry City Historic Environment Record (HER) and the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record (HER) on known archaeological sites, monuments and findspots within the site and within a wider study area;
- Information describing the site's archaeological and historical background, including published and unpublished maps, books and periodicals, drawn from a wide variety of sources including the Coventry History Centre;
- Aerial photographs depicting the site and its environs, which are held by the Historic England Archive in Swindon;
- Observations regarding the presence or absence of above ground archaeological sites, features and/or remains within the redline boundary, as well as the likely survival and condition of below ground features in light of past and present land use, made during site walkover surveys carried out in January 2017 and January 2018; and
- The results of the March 2018 Geophysical Survey (ASWYAS, 2018).

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the following designated and non-designated heritage assets have been considered:

- Registered Parks and Gardens;
- Listed Buildings;

- Scheduled Monuments;
- Conservation Areas;
- Previously recorded or hitherto unknown non-designated archaeological remains; and
- Non-designated standing buildings including buildings on Coventry City Council's Local List of Buildings of architectural or historical interest.

The baseline assessment focused on a study area extending for 1km from the boundary of the site, as that was considered to be appropriate to understand the historic environment context for a proposed development of this size/scale and in this topographical location.

The available information has been checked and augmented through site walkover/field surveys. This also aimed to determine the contribution made by the settings of designated heritage assets to their significance, in addition to determining the relationship (if any) to the proposed development site. This aspect of the assessment was carried out in accordance with the Historic England guidance as set out in *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning, Note 3 (Second Edition), The Setting of Heritage Assets* (HE 2017).

7.3.1 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

In terms of effects on the historic environment, the principal legislative instruments and planning policy framework is described in full in Section 3 of the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment at *Appendix 7.1*.

7.3.2 Guidance

The heritage baseline assessment and this ES chapter follow, where relevant, the heritage-specific guidance documents listed below:

- The baseline review of archaeological and heritage issues has been completed with recourse to the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment* (CIfA 2017);
- The identification and assessment of potential 'setting' effects has been undertaken with regard to Historic England's *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets* (Second Edition) (HE 2017); and
- The assessment of the significance of heritage assets references Historic England's *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment*: (HE 2015).

7.3.3 Assessment Methodology

The evaluation of potential significant effects on a heritage asset depends on a combination of its designation, the heritage significance or sensitivity of the asset and the magnitude of change that is predicted to result from the development. The assessment of likely significant effects as a result of the development takes into account both the construction phase and the completed occupation phase.

The assessment attributes 'sensitivity' to archaeological and cultural heritage assets, as shown in *Table 7.1*.

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					
Locally important asset with cultural or educational value					
Heritage site or feature with very limited values or interests					

The classification of the magnitude of change to heritage assets is based on consistent criteria and takes account such factors as the physical scale and type of disturbance and whether features or evidence would be lost that are fundamental to their historic character, integrity and therefore, significance.

Both physical and nonphysical (e.g. visual) changes to heritage assets are considered. The magnitude of impact is assessed using the criteria in *Table 7.2*.

Magnitude of Change	Description
Large	Change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is completely altered or destroyed.
Medium	Change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is significantly modified.
Small	Change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is noticeably different.
Negligible	Change to the significance of a heritage asset that hardly affects it.
None	No change to the significance of an asset.

Following the evaluation of the sensitivity of specific cultural heritage receptors, and the magnitude of the impact upon them, the significance of the effect will be assessed using the criteria outlined in *Table 7.3* below.

It should be noted that there are no receptors of 'Very High' sensitivity within the scope of the assessment and therefore, this is not included in the matrix in *Table 7.3*.

Magnitude of Change	Sensitivity of Receptor			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Large	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Negligible
Medium	Substantial	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Small	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible
Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

7.4 Baseline Conditions

This section of the ES chapter identifies the relevant archaeological and cultural heritage receptors (heritage assets) within the extents of the site and its wider zone of influence. It draws upon the results of the supporting baseline assessment (*Appendix 7.1*) and investigative fieldwork.

A detailed description of the baseline situation at and around the site is set out in *Appendix 7.1*. Provided below is a summary of the baseline assessment with regard to archaeology and cultural heritage, with the relevant receptors identified on supporting figures within the assessment report.

7.4.1 Designated Heritage Assets

No designated heritage assets are located within the site. The baseline assessment in *Appendix 7.1* identified the following designated heritage assets within the 1km study area, which were assessed in accordance with Step One of the Historic England guidance (HE, 2017), as to whether their settings are likely to be changed as a result of the proposed development. The assets comprise:

- One scheduled monument, comprising Corley Camp hillfort, situated c. 1km north of the site, (NHLE: 1007718); and
- 12 listed buildings.

The baseline assessment identified that none of the listed buildings are located close enough to the site, that they could experience a change to their wider 'settings' as a result of the proposed development. The nearest of the twelve buildings is c.580m to the west of the site. In each case, the building's functions, forms and locations were deemed to be such that they do not possess historic or other inter-relationships with the site. Indeed, on completion of the site visit/walkover in January 2018, it was determined that due to intervening settlement (built form), infrastructure, vegetation and/or topography, none of these buildings can be 'experienced' from within the site, nor does the site form part of the experience of the listed buildings themselves.

As such, and considering the definition of setting as “*the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced*” (Annex 2 of the NPPF), it is clear that the site does not form part of their settings and therefore, their significance would not be harmed through the site’s development. The lack of harmful impacts to listed buildings is reflected in the site’s allocation within the Keresley SUE allocation and on this basis, effects on these assets were scoped out at this stage of the assessment.

In terms of the scheduled monument, Corley Camp hillfort (1007718), the baseline assessment determined that the setting of the hillfort mostly comprises agricultural land and farm buildings in the near vicinity, with Keresley on the south eastern horizon. The setting is also framed to the north, south and west by pockets of woodland including Lord’s Wood and Hall Yard Wood. Views of the site are obscured by Hall Yard Wood and the surrounding intervening trees. The contribution to the significance of the monument from its setting is described in the baseline assessment report (*Appendix 7.1*).

The 1km distance between the site and the hillfort, and the proliferation of features such as woodland, buildings and hedgerows in between, ensures that visibility of the site from the hillfort is not possible and vice versa. Furthermore, the site makes no specific contribution to the significance of the monument, historical, or otherwise. As such, development within the site would not represent a change to the setting of the monument and would therefore, result in no harm to its significance. On this basis, effects on the hillfort were scoped out at this stage of the assessment.

None of the designated heritage assets described above are considered to represent potentially sensitive receptors to the proposed development and are not considered further in this chapter. More detailed justification is set out in *Appendix 7.1*.

7.4.2 Non-Designated Heritage Assets

The following paragraphs summarise the results of the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment (*Appendix 7.1*) as they relate to non-designated heritage assets.

Keresley Manor (MCT411)

The assessment identified that the site is located in close proximity to Keresley Manor, a building registered on the City of Coventry Local List of Buildings of architectural or historical interest. The building is located adjacent to the site’s southern boundary.

The building’s significance is described in detail in *Appendix 7.1*. With reference to *Table 7.1*, as an ‘*asset of regional or county importance*’, it is considered to comprise a heritage asset of **Medium** sensitivity.

As described in *Appendix 7.1*, with reference to Step 2 of HE (2017), the asset’s wider setting of post-medieval fields reflects the house’s historical setting, and contributes to its significance to a small degree in so much as the house is experienced from it. This experience is restricted to a small part of the site; a field situated at the very south-west, where the house is experienced from the field across a gap in the hedged boundary. Given this experience, and that this part of the site represents part of the house’s historic setting of post-medieval fields, it is considered that this part of the site makes a small contribution to the significance of the house.

Ridge and Furrow Earthworks

During the site walkover survey, parts of several fields were found to contain slight, denuded ridge and furrow earthworks. All of the earthworks are heavily eroded, probably as a result of having been subjected to ploughing or rolling. Also apparent is a possible lynchet, thought likely to represent the edge of a former field or furlong. This feature is shown on the Tithe Map as a field boundary. The locations of these features are shown on Plan EDP 5 within *Appendix 7.1*.

With reference to *Table 7.1*, given their fragmented and denuded state, as a '*heritage site or feature with very limited value or interest*', it is considered that the earthworks comprise a heritage asset of **Negligible** sensitivity.

19th Century Stable Block

The site walkover also identified a number of agricultural and stable buildings within the site. As indicated by historic mapping, only one of these buildings pre-dates the 1980s. This comprises a stable block to the north of Keresley Manor (shown on Plan EDP 5 within *Appendix 7.1*). The stable block is present on the 1882 OS mapping, indicating that it is originally a 19th century building, although the roof is considered likely to date to the 20th century.

With reference to *Table 7.1*, although the building is modified it is considered to represent a '*locally important asset with cultural value*', illustrating the function and appearance of the land at the site in the 19th century. As such, the stable is considered to comprise a heritage asset of **Low** sensitivity.

Second World War air raid bunker

The site visits also identified a small brick built bunker on the edge of a field (shown on Plan EDP 5 within *Appendix 7.1*). The bunker is accessed via a flight of steps. Its small size suggests that it may have been built to accommodate a family rather than representing a military structure. It is likely that the bunker dates from the Second World War.

With reference to *Table 7.1*, although the building's condition has deteriorated, it is considered to represent a '*locally important asset with cultural value*', reflecting the history of the local area during the war. As such, the bunker is considered to comprise a heritage asset of **Low** sensitivity.

Important Hedgerows

A number of hedgerows within the site are visible on 18th century maps. As such, they meet the criteria to be considered "important" within are considered 'important' within *Schedule 1 – Additional Criteria for Determining Important Hedgerows – Part II – Archaeology and History* of the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations. This does not necessarily indicate that the hedgerows represent individual heritage assets in their own right, however as a group they do reflect the post-medieval layout of fields within the site, and as such, are accorded a degree of heritage significance. The 'important' hedgerows are illustrated on Plan EDP 5 within *Appendix 7.1*.

With reference to *Table 7.1*, the site's hedgerows are considered to represent a '*locally important asset with cultural value*', reflecting the post-medieval agricultural history of the local area. As such, the hedgerows are considered to comprise a heritage asset of **Low** sensitivity.

Unrecorded Archaeological Remains

The assessment considered evidence for the site to contain previously unrecorded archaeological remains. Evidence from the study area identified low potential for remains dating from the prehistoric and Roman periods, with moderate potential for unrecorded medieval remains, and high potential for later remains of post-medieval or modern date. Cropmarks are recorded within the site on the Coventry City HER, consisting of two rectangular enclosures and an oval feature considered to reflect the presence of a former pond.

The cropmarks recorded within the site may indicate that buried archaeological remains are present. However, consultation of aerial photographs did not identify these features, and more importantly, they were not identified by the geophysical survey, which suggests that they do not reflect archaeological remains, or that related remains, recorded as cropmarks in the past, have since been ploughed away.

The geophysical survey did not identify possible archaeological features within the site, and concluded that the site has only a low potential to contain remains from any period.

7.4.3 Summary of Baseline Information

The site does not contain any designated heritage assets.

Designated heritage assets in the wider area are not considered to represent potentially sensitive receptors to the proposed development of the site.

The baseline assessment noted the following non-designated heritage assets which represent potentially sensitive receptors to the proposed development of the site:

- Keresley Manor (MCT411) - considered to comprise a heritage asset of **Medium** sensitivity;
- Ridge and Furrow Earthworks - considered to comprise a heritage asset of **Negligible** sensitivity;
- 19th century Stable Block - considered to comprise a heritage asset of **Low** sensitivity;
- Second World War air raid bunker - considered to comprise a heritage asset of **Low** sensitivity;
- Important Hedgerows - considered to comprise a heritage asset of **Low** sensitivity.

7.5 Mitigation Measures

7.5.1 Inherent Mitigation Measures

Embedded mitigation provides a form of preventative mitigation and is considered as an integral part of the overall design of 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.

Potential adverse effects on archaeology and built heritage receptors have been identified at the design stage and as a consequence mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design to eliminate, reduce or offset adverse effects, as appropriate.

The proposed development will retain the majority of the 'important' historic hedgerows, as identified on the historic mapping, within the development parameters.

Development of the south western part of the site represents a potential effect to the setting of Keresley Manor and this has been taken into consideration within the design of the proposed development. It is proposed to enhance the boundary in this location with additional planting, in order to screen the site, in keeping with the wooded boundary which exists around the house elsewhere. This would accord with the recommendations made by the Conservation Officer; for the retention of the boundary treeline, the integrity of the woodland, and the creation of a buffer between the two sites.

7.5.2 Standard Mitigation Measures

The assessment has identified, during the construction phase, a significant adverse effect on the 19th century Stable Block and the Second World War air raid bunker as these are to be demolished in order to facilitate development.

A requirement to mitigate this effect will be established through consultation with the LPA following submission of the application. It may be that the effect can be reduced through the implementation of a programme of building recording of the two heritage assets, prior to their demolition. It is anticipated that, given the low value of the assets that this could be restricted to no more than Level Two building recording (as defined by Historic England, in *Understanding Historic Buildings – A Guide to Good Recording Practice*, 2016). This would result in the preservation of the buildings by record.

The recording programme would be undertaken by an archaeological contractor, to a methodology outlined in a Written Scheme of Investigation and will be under the curatorship of the Coventry City Council Archaeology Service. It is likely that this recording, if required, would be formally secured by a condition attached to planning permission.

7.5.3 Actionable Mitigation Measures

No actionable mitigation measures are required and, as such, none are proposed.

7.6 Assessment of Environmental Impacts

7.6.1 Impact Assessment

The following paragraphs assess the likely significant effects of the proposed development on non-designated heritage assets. These have been assessed in terms of effects during construction, where direct impacts may be anticipated, and also the occupational phases where impacts, in terms of an asset's setting, may be anticipated; and whether these effects are adverse or beneficial.

The extent and form of the proposed development is described in detail in *Chapter 4*.

Construction Phase

The following section provides an assessment of the effects on archaeological and cultural heritage receptors during the construction phase.

It addresses only the direct, physical effects of construction activities contained within the boundary of the site and does not cover potential changes to the wider settings of heritage assets. These are addressed under the 'occupation' phase because, even though it is recognised that they will first arise during construction (with the potential installation of cranes etc.), they will emerge over time and will ultimately reach their fullest extent following the completion of the proposed development.

It is expected that effects on settings during construction will either be short-term because of the temporary nature of the activity or lower magnitude versions of effects which will be assessed in respect of the completed development.

The magnitude of change is viewed in conjunction with the sensitivity of the heritage assets, to appreciate its overall significance. Assessing the significance of effects uses the matrix illustrated in *Table 7.3*.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

Ridge and Furrow Earthworks

The ridge and furrow earthworks and lynchett, will be located within the footprint of development and therefore, development would result in the complete loss of these features.

With reference to *Table 7.2*, this would result in a Large magnitude of change. With reference to *Table 7.3*, a Large magnitude of change to an asset of Negligible sensitivity would result in a **Negligible** effect.

19th century Stable Block

The 19th century stable block would be located within the footprint of development and therefore, development would result in complete loss of this feature, which would be demolished prior to development.

The loss of this building would be in part mitigated through a programme of building recording, to a methodology outlined in a Written Scheme of Investigation and under the curatorship of the Coventry City Council Archaeology Service.

With reference to *Table 7.2*, this would result in a Large magnitude of change. With reference to *Table 7.3*, a Large magnitude of change to an asset of Low sensitivity would result in a Moderate Adverse effect. Following the mitigation outlined above this would be reduced to a **Minor Adverse** effect.

Second World War air raid bunker

The Second World War air raid bunker would be located within the footprint of development and therefore, development would result in complete loss of this feature, which would be demolished/infilled prior to development.

The loss of this building would be in part mitigated through a programme of building recording, to a methodology outlined in a Written Scheme of Investigation and under the curatorship of the Coventry City Council Archaeology Service.

With reference to *Table 7.2*, this would result in a Large magnitude of change. With reference to *Table 7.3*, a Large magnitude of change to an asset of Low sensitivity would result in a Moderate Adverse effect. Following the mitigation outlined above this would be reduced to a **Minor Adverse** effect.

Important Hedgerows

As described above, the important hedgerows would be partially retained, as illustrated on plans in *Chapter 4*. As such, development would only result in a partial loss of these features. However, the character of the fields which the hedgerows bound would be entirely changed and would no longer be recognisable as field boundaries.

Given this effect, with reference to *Table 7.2*, it is considered that development would result in '*change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is significantly modified*'. This would result in a Medium magnitude of change. With reference to *Table 7.3*, a Medium magnitude of change to an asset of Low sensitivity would result in a **Minor Adverse** effect.

Unrecorded Archaeological Remains

The geophysical survey concluded that the site only has a low potential to contain archaeological remains. Given these results, as described previously, following consultation, the LPA archaeologist has not indicated a need to carry out further archaeological works within the site, including works aimed at mitigating effects on archaeology.

As such, it is concluded that the proposed development will be unlikely to have an impact on archaeological remains and effects on unrecorded remains will not be considered further within this ES Chapter.

Table 7.4 - Summary of Impact Assessment – Construction Phase						
Receptor	Sensitivity/ Importance/ Value	Description of Impact	Inherent & Standard Mitigation Measures	Nature of Effect	Type of Effect	Significance of Effect
Ridge and furrow	Negligible	Direct impact on fabric		Large adverse	Direct	Negligible
19 th century stable block	Low	Direct impact on fabric/ demolition	Building recording prior to demolition	Large adverse	Direct	Minor adverse
Second World war air raid bunker	Low	Direct impact on fabric/ demolition	Building recording prior to demolition	Large adverse	Direct	Minor adverse
Historic hedgerows within site	Low	Direct impact on part of fabric	Retention of the majority of historic hedgerows	Medium adverse	Direct	Minor adverse

Occupation Phase

This section assesses the likely significant environmental effects of the proposed development following completion, with embedded design mitigation and good practice in place. It defines the sensitivity of heritage assets that are receptors to the indirect effect of development, i.e. changes to their setting, such that its contribution to their significance is affected. It then defines the significance of the effect on these receptors.

This part of the ES Chapter represents Steps 3 and 4 of the Settings Assessment Process (HE, 2017) as it relates to the effect of the proposed development on heritage receptors.

The magnitude of change is viewed in conjunction with the sensitivity of the heritage assets, to appreciate its overall significance. Assessing the significance of effects uses the matrix illustrated in *Table 7.3*.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

Keresley Manor (MCT411)

At present, Keresley Manor and its grounds are enclosed from the surrounding landscape by their densely wooded boundaries. Due to a gap in the boundary, the house overlooks a small part of the south-west corner of the site, which currently comprises an agricultural field. From this field the house can be experienced from its original Victorian countryside surroundings, as described in detail in *Appendix 7.1* and summarised in *Section 7.4*. As such, the field is considered to contribute to the house's value to a small degree.

Development would result in this part of the field being changed in character to housing, with an emergency access entrance to the site proposed in this area. As described, inherent mitigation would result in an enhanced wooded boundary being planted between the site and the house's grounds, which would serve to screen the development from the house.

The house would cease to be experienced from within the site, it would be entirely enclosed from its wider setting. This is not considered to represent a substantial change to the current character of its setting, which as described in *Appendix 7.1*, comprises gardens enclosed by a dense hedgerow, deliberately planted to screen the house from its wider surroundings. Therefore, the proposed planting would be in keeping, in terms of its character and appearance, with this existing boundary.

However, although the development would be screened, it would still result in an unavoidable loss of part of the house's original Victorian countryside surroundings, resulting in change to the setting of the house. It is considered that this change, which would result in the house and its grounds being located adjacent to modern housing rather than fields, albeit screened from the house, would represent a small degree of harm to its historical value.

With reference to *Table 7.2*, this change is considered to amount to a Small magnitude of change. A Small magnitude of change to a heritage asset of Medium sensitivity is considered to result in a **Minor Adverse** effect.

Table 7.5 - Summary of Impact Assessment – Occupation Phase						
Receptor	Sensitivity/ Importance/ Value	Description of Impact	Inherent & Standard Mitigation Measures	Nature of Effect	Type of Effect	Significance of Effect
Locally listed Keresley Manor and lodge	Medium	Impact through change to setting	Complete screening of the house from the wider countryside including the site	Small	Indirect	Minor Adverse

7.6.2 Residual Impact Assessment

As no actionable mitigation measures are proposed, residual effects on archaeology and built heritage receptors are the same as those outlined in *Section 7.6.1*.

7.7 Cumulative Impact Assessment

This assessment has considered the cumulative effects of the proposed development with development of the wider Keresley SUE, including the adjacent Lioncourt proposal (OUT/2014/2282).

No other applications were identified as likely to produce a cumulative effect on cultural heritage in combination with the current development.

7.7.1 Keresley Sustainable Urban extension (SUE)

The Keresley SUE is allocated under Policy H2 of the Coventry Local Plan for the following development:

- 3,100 residential dwellings;
- At least one local centre providing retail uses;
- A 2 forms of entry primary school;
- A new distributor road between Long Lane and Winding House Lane;
- Landscaping and public open space, including a green corridor along Hall Brook.

The assessment of cumulative effects is based on a consideration of the draft Indicative Masterplan for the Keresley SUE.

The current proposal has identified effects on non-designated heritage assets within the footprint of the development, through construction impacts. These effects are localised, and development elsewhere within the allocation would not have an impact upon them, as they do not extend beyond the current site.

The locally listed building Keresley Manor would be very unlikely to be subject to significant effects from development elsewhere within the wider allocation, as it is only located adjacent to the current site, and the Lioncourt development discussed below. The remaining part of the allocation is to the north of the current site, beyond Fivefield Road. This would be very distant from the house, and furthermore entirely screened from it by its garden boundaries. As such, it is anticipated that the Manor House would only be subject to effects from adjacent areas, such as the **Minor Adverse** effect identified from the current proposed development.

7.7.2 Lioncourt Proposal (OUT/2014/2282)

Outline planning permission was granted in February 2018 for up to 800 residential dwellings, a Local Centre and a Primary School within the Keresley SUE to the south of the application site (ref: OUT/2014/2282). This application included an ES which has been referenced in this section.

The Lioncourt assessment only identified effects to the following heritage assets, which correspond with those identified for the current site:

- Poorly preserved ridge and furrow – Slight Adverse significance of effect
- Extant hedgerows depicted on 19th century maps – Slight adverse significance of effect to hedgerows proposed for removal

The ridge and furrow within the Lioncourt site is not the same as that recorded within the current site, however it is likely to represent a remnant of the same wider landscape of medieval or later cultivation which produced these earthworks. As such, the Slight Adverse effect (the equivalent of a Minor Adverse effect within the current assessment) is in combination with the Negligible effect recorded by the current assessment. Together these effects would be considered to represent a **Minor Adverse** effect on the wider landscape of ridge and furrow earthworks present in the locality.

Likewise, the extant 19th century hedgerows are part of the same landscape-wide enclosure as that recorded within the current site. As such, effects are on parts of a wider landscape in which the heritage value of these feature is enshrined. Given this, the Slight Adverse effect (the equivalent of a Minor Adverse effect within the current assessment) is in combination with the Minor Adverse effect recorded by the current assessment. In combination, these effects are considered to represent a **Moderate Adverse** significance of effect to the wider landscape of 19th century enclosure across which the two sites are situated.

The Lioncourt assessment did not identify significant effects on other heritage assets which were also identified as subject to an effect by the current assessment. As such, no other cumulative effects are assessed.

7.8 Summary

This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the proposed development in terms of archaeology and cultural heritage.

A baseline assessment, in the form of a desk-based assessment and a geophysical survey (*Appendix 7.1*) has identified potentially sensitive archaeological and cultural heritage receptors (heritage assets) within the site and its wider zone of influence.

The assessment established that the site contains no designated heritage assets and that there are no designated heritage assets in the wider environs of the site with settings that would be subject to change from the proposed development of the site.

The assessment identified the following non-designated heritage assets within or, in the case of Keresley Manor, adjacent to the site, such that the site represents a part of its setting:

- Locally Listed Building Keresley Manor (MCT411) - considered to comprise a heritage asset of Medium sensitivity
- Ridge and Furrow Earthworks - considered to comprise a heritage asset of Negligible sensitivity.
- 19th century Stable Block - considered to comprise a heritage asset of Low sensitivity.
- Second World War air raid bunker - considered to comprise a heritage asset of Low sensitivity.
- Important Hedgerows - considered to comprise a heritage asset of Low sensitivity.

The latter four assets were deemed sensitive to impacts during the construction phase of the development. Following proposed mitigation of effects on the 19th century Stable Block and Second World War air raid bunker, the significance of effect on three of the assets was assessed at **Minor Adverse**. The significance of effect on the ridge and furrow earthworks was assessed at **Negligible**.

Keresely Manor was deemed sensitive to effects during the occupation phase of the proposed development. This was understood as resulting in change to the setting of the locally listed building, such that an impact on its significance was incurred, although due to inherent mitigation (boundary planting) this effect was assessed as **Minor Adverse**.

The assessment considered evidence for the site to contain previously unrecorded archaeological remains, with the site's archaeological potential assessed as low. Furthermore, the geophysical survey did not identify possible archaeological features within the site, and concluded that the site has only a low potential to contain remains from any period.

Given these conclusions, following consultation, the LPA's archaeologist has not required further works within the site to mitigate effects on archaeology. As such, it is concluded that the proposed development will not have an impact on archaeological remains within the site and effects on unrecorded remains were not considered further within this ES Chapter.

None of the predicted, residual adverse effects on archaeology and cultural heritage assets, either during the construction or occupation phases of the proposed development, are deemed to be greater than **Minor Adverse**.

Cumulative effects have been assessed, and it was identified that there would be an in-combination effect on poorly preserved ridge and furrow and 19th century hedgerows, as a result of the proposed development and the adjacent Lioncourt proposal (OUT/2014/2282). This would result in a **Minor Adverse** effect on the ridge and furrow and a **Moderate Adverse** effect on the wider historic landscape represented by the hedgerows.