

8. Cultural Heritage

8.1. Introduction

8.1.1. This Chapter addresses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon cultural heritage assets (e.g. buildings and extant historic landscape features) and has been prepared by GHC Archaeology and Heritage Limited. Both designated and non-designated heritage assets are considered within the Site and its wider area. Potential buried archaeology has been scoped out of this Chapter as agreed with Knowsley Council.

8.1.2. This Chapter is supported by the following appendix:

- **Appendix 8.1** –Heritage Statement¹

8.1.3. This Chapter, and its associated appendices, is intended to be read as part of the wider Environmental Statement (ES) with particular reference to the introductory chapters (Chapter 1 to Chapter 4).

8.2. Assessment Approach

Methodology

8.2.1. The Heritage Statement (**Appendix 8.1**) used to inform this Chapter was produced using information from Historic England's National Heritage List for England (NHLE), the Merseyside Historic Environment Record (HER), Knowsley Council, the Lancashire Record Office and various online sources. Production of the baseline heritage assessment was also informed by site visits.

Assessment of Significance

Receptor Sensitivity (Value)

8.2.2. The sensitivity of the receptor refers to its importance, namely its environmental value/attributes. The value of a heritage asset (its heritage significance) is defined as *the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting* (NPPF Annex 2, Glossary)². Each identified heritage asset can be assigned a value in accordance with the criteria set out in **Table 8.1**, below, which is also guided by their designated status in accordance with national or international criteria.

8.2.3. Using professional judgment and as the result of consultation, heritage assets are also assessed on an individual basis and regional variations and individual qualities are taken into account where applicable.

¹ GHC, 2026. *Heritage Statement: Foxwood Phase 3, Merseyside*.

² DLUHC, 2024. *National Planning Policy Framework*.

Cultural Heritage

Table 8.1. Criteria for the Assessment of the Value of Heritage Assets

Value	Designation
Very High (International)	World Heritage Sites
High (National)	Scheduled Monument Grade I and II* Listed Buildings Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens Registered Battlefields Archaeological sites of schedulable quality and significance
Medium (Regional)	Grade II Listed Buildings Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens Conservation Areas Archaeological sites that can be shown to have demonstrable regional importance
Low (Local)	Locally Listed Buildings Archaeological sites that can be shown to have demonstrable local importance Assets where the significance is limited by poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations

Magnitude of Impact

- 8.2.4. Once the value of heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development are assessed, the next step will be to appraise the magnitude of any possible impacts arising from the Proposed Development. Impacts can potentially be caused during the construction and operational phases and can be direct (affecting the physical fabric of a heritage asset) or indirect (affecting the significance of a heritage asset through the contribution made by its setting). Impacts can be short, medium or long term, permanent or temporary and can be positive or negative.

Table 8.2. Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Development Impacts on Cultural Heritage

Impact Magnitude	Example
Major	Total or substantial loss of the significance of a heritage asset. Substantial harm to a heritage asset's setting, such that the significance of the asset would be totally lost or substantially reduced (e.g. the significance of a designated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its designation would be questionable or the significance of a non-designated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its categorisation as a heritage asset would be questionable).
Moderate	Partial loss or alteration of the significance of a heritage asset. Considerable harm to a heritage asset's setting, such that the asset's significance would be materially affected/considerably devalued, but not totally or substantially lost.
Minor	Slight loss of the significance of a heritage asset. This could include the removal of fabric that forms part of the heritage asset, but that is not integral to its significance (e.g. the demolition of later extensions/additions of little intrinsic value). Some harm to the heritage asset's setting, but not to a degree that it would materially compromise the significance of the heritage asset. Perceivable level of harm, but insubstantial relative to the overall interest of the heritage asset.
Negligible	A very slight change to a heritage asset. This could include a change to a part of a heritage asset that does not materially contribute to its significance. Very minor change to a heritage asset's setting such that there is a slight impact but not materially affecting the heritage asset's significance.

Significance of Effect

- 8.2.5. In order to determine the significance of effects, the predicted magnitude of change is combined with the sensitivity (value) of the receptor (heritage asset) as set out in **Table 8.3**, below. The matrix is not intended to 'merchandise' judgement of the significance of effect but acts as a check to ensure that judgements regarding value, magnitude of impact and significance of effect are reasonable and balanced in order to allow for professional judgement.
- 8.2.6. In some cases, the matrix allows a choice of significance of effect when a magnitude of impact and a value are combined. In these cases, the individual attributes of a specific asset, along with any relevant site-specific factors and consideration of other influencing elements, will be taken into account, when considering which is the most appropriate significance of effect to apply.
- 8.2.7. Based on professional judgment, a 'significant' effect in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is considered to be one of Moderate significance or above.

Cultural Heritage

Table 8.3. Criteria for Assessing the Significance of Development Impacts on Cultural Heritage

Magnitude of Impact		Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Value of Heritage Asset	Very High	Major	Major	Major	Neutral
	High	Major	Major	Moderate	Neutral
	Medium	Major	Major/Moderate	Moderate	Neutral
	Low	Major	Moderate	Minor	Neutral

Legislative and Policy Framework

- 8.2.8. A summary of applicable legislation, planning policy and other guidance documents against which the Proposed Development will be considered in relation to Cultural Heritage is set out here. Further details are provided in **Appendix 8.1**.

National Legislation

- 8.2.9. The applicable legislative framework is summarised as follows:
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (P(LBCA)) Act 1990³;
 - Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) 1990⁴;
 - Levelling-up and Regeneration Act (LuRA) 2023⁵
- 8.2.10. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 1990 Act) provides for the protection of listed buildings and conservation areas and is largely expressed in the planning process through policies in regional and local planning guidance, as outlined below. This act is the primary legislative instrument addressing the treatment of listed buildings and conservation areas through the planning process. The Site is not within a conservation area or within the setting of one. There are listed buildings within its wider area.
- 8.2.11. Section 66 of the 1990 Act states that *in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.*
- 8.2.12. The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 has introduced changes to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to provide statutory duty for the determining authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the asset or its setting.

³ Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990

⁴ Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA), 1990

⁵ Levelling-up and Regeneration Act (LuRA), 2023

National Planning Policy

- 8.2.13. Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF⁶) entitled 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets.
- 8.2.14. Section 16 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term.
- 8.2.15. Paragraph 207 states: *In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.*
- 8.2.16. The Framework stipulates (paragraph 213) that 'great weight' should be given to the asset's conservation and that substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or garden should be exceptional, whilst substantial harm to or loss of assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, grade I and II* listed buildings and grade I and II* registered parks or garden, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.
- 8.2.17. Impacts to the significance of non-designated heritage assets will require a balanced judgement based on the level of significance and the scale of harm (paragraph 216).
- 8.2.18. A Designated Heritage Asset comprises a World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.

Planning Practice Guidance

- 8.2.19. The Planning Practice Guidance is a web-based resource which is to be used in conjunction with the NPPF. The relevant section is entitled 'Historic Environment' (MHCLG 2019⁷). It provides clear definition of the terms used to identify heritage interest and how this applies to understanding 'significance' in reference to heritage-related planning policy, i.e. archaeological interest, architectural and artistic interest, and historic interest (Paragraph: OO6 Reference ID: 18a-OO6-20190723).
- 8.2.20. Additionally it defines a non-designated heritage asset: *Non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified by plan-making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets.*

Professional Guidance

- 8.2.21. The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA⁸) provides guidelines and recommendations for best practice in undertaking archaeological desk-based research and assessment.

⁶ MHCLG, 2024. *National Planning Policy Framework*

⁷ MHCLG, 2019. 'Historic Environment', *Planning Policy Framework*

⁸ CIfA, 2020. *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment*

Cultural Heritage

- 8.2.22. Historic England's Planning Note 2 (2015)⁹ outlines a seven-stage process for the assembly and analysis of relevant information relating to heritage assets potentially affected by a proposed development. Planning Note 3 (2017)¹⁰ provides guidance on the setting of heritage assets, which is separate to issues of curtilage, character or context.
- 8.2.23. The Historic England Advice Note 12 (2019)¹¹ brings together the relevant guidance in an analysis of an appropriate approach for applicants for heritage and other consents in providing an understanding of the significance of heritage assets in line with NPPF.

The Development Plan

- 8.2.24. The relevant development plan framework is provided by the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy (January 2016)¹². Policy CS20: Managing the Borough's Historic Environment states that development proposals should 'preserve or enhance' historic and architectural assets and the Council require *preservation of the local distinctiveness and character of historic assets through sensitive design of new development, including appropriate integration with their setting and immediate landscape*. The policy also notes that the Council will prevent development resulting in substantial harm or the loss designated heritage asset or its setting, *unless the proposal would result in substantial public benefits which clearly outweigh the harm or loss*.
- 8.2.25. The Halsnead Garden Village Masterplan SPD identified both designated and non-designated heritage assets and opportunities to *retain, integrate and (where appropriate) create a buffer between new development and these features*. Additionally, the potential for repair of the historic landscape features is noted, such as the estate boundary walls and the reinstatement of semi-natural historic landscape features (ponds, trees, etc.).
- 8.2.26. The Site forms part of a wider allocation under Policy SUE2 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy for a SUE known as 'South of Whiston and Land South of M62'.

EIA Scoping Process

- 8.2.27. As discussed in Chapter 2, a request for a Scoping Opinion was submitted on behalf of the Applicant to Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council (KMBC) on 30th January 2025, which set out the proposed scope of assessment (see **Appendix 2.1**). KMBC issued their Scoping Opinion on 27th March 2025 and is summarised in Chapter 2 and included in full at **Appendix 2.2**. At that time, the intention was to submit one planning application for 2 parcels of land, referred to as Phase 2b and Phase 3. However, the planning application, which this ES supports, is now seeking planning permission in relation to Phase 3 only at this time.

⁹ Historic England, 2015. *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 2 – Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment*.

¹⁰ Historic England, 2017. *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 3 (second edition) – The Setting of Heritage Assets*

¹¹ Historic England, 2019. *Historic England Advice Note 12 – Statements of Heritage Significance. Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets*.

¹² Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, January 2016

- 8.2.28. It is considered that the Scoping Opinion provides relevant information to ensure a robust assessment in relation to the Phase 3 site, and has therefore been used to guide the scope of this Chapter and ES as a whole.
- 8.2.29. With regards to Cultural Heritage matters, relevant responses were received from the consultees including Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service (MEAS) and Knowsley Council Conservation and Design Officer and comments have been addressed accordingly, as follows in **Table 8.4** below.

Table 8.4: Relevant EIA Scoping Consultation Comments

Consultee	Summary of Comment	Response or location within the ES where comments are addressed
MEAS	A geophysical survey (September 2018) has assessed the potential for archaeological remains to be present within the southern half of Phase 3. The results suggest archaeological remains relating to the parkland, historic quarrying or coal mining activity.	Archaeology has been scoped out as a programme of archaeological investigation will be conditioned and need to be undertaken prior to development as agreed with Knowsley Council.
Knowsley Council Conservation and Design Officer	The wider settings of four Grade II listed buildings (Barn at Snape Gate, Old Halsnead, Carr House Farmhouse, Paddock and Stables to Carr House Farmhouse) are considered to be sensitive to the Proposed Development.	These designated heritage assets have been assessed in the Heritage Statement (Appendix 8.1), two of which have been scoped out of further assessment (Carr House Farmhouse, Paddock and Stables to Carr House Farmhouse). The Barn at Snape Gate and Old Halsnead are assessed within Section 8.4 of this Chapter.
Knowsley Council Conservation and Design Officer	Two non-designated heritage assets (Halsnead Park Wall, Halsnead Park Landscape) are considered to be sensitive to the Proposed Development.	These non-designated heritage assets have been assessed in the Heritage Statement (Appendix 8.1), one of which has been scoped out. Halsnead Park is assessed within Section 8.4 of this Chapter.

Limitations to the Assessment

- 8.2.30. Designated heritage assets within 1km of the study site were listed within the accompanying Heritage Statement (**Appendix 8.1**). All but two were scoped out of further assessment. The two remaining heritage assets that have been considered within this Chapter are those that have been requested to be scoped in by Knowsley Council Conservation and Design Officer.

Cultural Heritage

- 8.2.31. The HER data was obtained approximately a year ago and has been used to inform the assessment regarding non-designated heritage assets. Additional monuments and events may have since been added. However, as archaeology has been scoped out of this assessment, further information regarding this is not required.
- 8.2.32. The Local Heritage List for Knowsley, Sefton and Wirral, normally used to provide information regarding non-designated heritage assets, was unavailable for public use at the time of this assessment.

8.3. Baseline Conditions

Site Description and Context

- 8.3.1. The locations of the designated and non-designated heritage assets referred to below are contained within **Appendix 8.1**.

Designated Heritage Assets

- 8.3.2. There are no designated heritage assets recorded within the Site. Eight Grade II listed buildings are recorded within a 1km radius of the Site, including the four identified by KMBC Conservation and Design Officer. None of the listed buildings shared any intervisibility with the Site due to the intervening built environment, mature vegetation and topography. However the Barn at Snape Gate (NHLE 1253250), c.400m to the east, and Old Halsnead (NHLE 1261787), c.165m to the south-east of the Site, are considered to be sensitive to the Proposed Development due to their former historic association. All but these two listed buildings have been scoped out of further assessment (**Appendix 8.1**).

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 8.3.3. Two heritage assets recorded on the HER were deemed as non-designated heritage assets by KMBC to be scoped into this assessment: Halsnead Park (MME15147) and Halsnead Park Wall (MME15681). Halsnead Park is extensive and incorporates the whole of the Site and the area to the north, east, west and south of the M62, around which stretches of the Halsnead Park Wall are extant, the nearest being over c.400m to the east of the Site along Fox's Bank Lane. For these reasons, Halsnead Park will be considered further within this assessment but the wall has been scoped out of further assessment as it is not considered to be sensitive to this Proposed Development.

Baseline Survey Information

- 8.3.4. A detailed analysis of the historical development of the Site, which is also informed by historical maps, is provided at **Appendix 8.1**, which should be referred to.
- 8.3.5. This also includes a detailed assessment of the significance of the three heritage assets and how setting may contribute to this significance. In brief this relates to:

Barn at Snape Gate (1253250)

- 8.3.6. This is a Grade II listed threshing barn located on the west side of Fox's Bank Lane, now converted for residential purposes. There is intervening residential development under construction as part of the Halsnead Garden Village. It is further screened from the Site by the topography to the north, west and south-west of the barn which rises from the level of the roadside and the property boundary which is lined with mature vegetation.

8.3.7. The list entry dates the barn to the 18th century, although it is not shown on any late 18th or early 19th century maps until the Tithe map of 1842 which also shows that the barn was owned and occupied by Richard Willis Esq. of Halsnead Hall and Park. Although not formally a parkland feature, it still has a residual historic association: the purpose of the barn was to serve Halsnead Estate and was abutted to the north and west by the park boundary wall, which is still extant. It would have been screened from within the parkland by a surrounding plantation but the west elevation entrance provided access straight off the estate. Its position on the east boundary of the park with its east entrance on the roadside and away from any park or estate farm suggests that it was also used by tenant farmers occupying land owned by the Willis family within the surroundings of Halsnead Park.

8.3.8. The Phase 2a development to the west has served to sever any meaningful connection with its original parkland setting. In turn, the agricultural land to the east now contributes more to its understanding and appreciation of its form and function, with any such experience of its historical estate setting having been eroded and limited to only the estate wall providing any potential understanding.

Old Halsnead (1261787)

8.3.9. Old Halsnead is a Grade II listed dwelling illustrative of a late 17th century rural house of some status with a high quality built-form and use of decorative architectural features. It is set within its own grounds and surrounded by dense tree planting that provides a private and enclosed immediate setting. The wider setting of this asset is now dominated by modern developments, with the area to the south being commercial with a large, prominent distribution centre, and the M62 is located less than 100m to the north of the grounds of the asset.

8.3.10. It was formerly part of the Halsnead Estate and, according to the 1842 tithe map, it was owned and occupied by Richard Willis, the owner of Halsnead Hall. However, the construction of the M62 has severed any physical connection and all but removed the asset from the rest of the parkland landscape. As such, the wider setting no longer contributes to the significance of Old Halsnead.

Halsnead Park (MME15147)

8.3.11. The extents of the park incorporates Halsnead Hall and parkland features, such as the park wall (MME15681), driveways, an ornamental lake (Big Water), and lodge buildings. Place-name evidence indicates that it may have medieval origins, although there are no documentary records referring to it until 1684 when it came into the possession of the Willis family. Late 18th century mapping evidence shows that there was a hall annotated as 'Red Hall' owned by Thomas Willis, although by the early 19th century, Halsnead Hall and park had been established by Richard Willis.

8.3.12. The significance of this asset is largely derived from its historic interest as a former estate and its constituent parts. The parkland features, such as the wall, driveways, associated lodges, and the ornamental pond, are of historic value to the asset and provide a sense of place. The remains of the parkland that are still open farmland provide some moderate historic value to the understanding of the long vistas once appreciated across the Estate. However, since the loss of the focus to the Estate, i.e. Halsnead Hall, and given the parcelling up of the parkland landscape for the purposes of development, the open expanse of the parkland is being gradually infilled which serves to isolate the individual features and remove the appreciation of how it once functioned as a whole.

Cultural Heritage

8.4. Assessment of Likely Significant Effects

- 8.4.1. This section identifies potential impacts arising during the construction and operation phases of the Proposed Development.
- 8.4.2. No designated heritage assets will be directly impacted by the Proposed Development.
- 8.4.3. Indirect impacts to the setting of heritage assets will be assessed here for the receptors scoped into this assessment: Barn at Snape Gate and Old Halsnead. As Grade II Listed Buildings, these are not considered to be of the highest significance in NPPF terms (para 213, NPPF 2024).
- 8.4.4. Halsnead Park, as a non-designated heritage asset, incorporates the Site and, therefore, will be directly impacted as a result of the Proposed Development. Developments within the park since the loss of Halsnead Hall, including the construction of the M62 motorway and recent developments, have had a significant detrimental impact on the coherence of the asset.

Construction

Indirect Impacts to Designated Heritage Assets

- 8.4.5. Construction operations associated with the Proposed Development would potentially impact the settings of two Grade II Listed Buildings (Barn at Snape Gate and Old Halsnead), in terms of the impact that would arise through changes in the wider landscape setting of these assets.
- 8.4.6. The immediate setting of the Grade II listed Barn at Snape Gate (NHLE 1253250) will remain unaffected as it will be screened from the Proposed Development by mature vegetation, intervening built environment and topography. It is this immediate setting, in its roadside position next to Fox's Bank Lane and overlooking fields to the east, from where it is currently experienced and from where its form and function can be most understood. The views into the park, and west towards the Site, are screened with intervening built development still in construction as part of the Halsnead Garden Village. Whilst there is a historic association with the wider Halsnead Park landscape, this is no longer legible except in its immediate direct physical link to a section of park wall. As such, the impact to the setting from Phase 3 is considered to be **negligible**. As a Grade II Listed Building, its importance/value is **medium**. The significance of effect would be **neutral**.
- 8.4.7. Whilst Old Halsnead (NHLE 1261787) lies the closest to the study site, its views and setting are interrupted by the M62 motorway. It is also surrounded by dense mature vegetation and, as such, there is no intervisibility between the asset and the Site. The wider historic landscape setting has been disrupted by the construction of the motorway and there is no understanding of its former landscape that can be experienced from the asset. As a Grade II Listed Building, its importance/value is **medium** and the impact on the setting is considered to be **negligible**. As such, the significance of effect would be **neutral**.

Direct and Indirect Impacts to Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 8.4.8. The non-designated heritage asset, Halsnead Park, incorporates the Site, although the Site comprises around 5% of the whole Halsnead Park. The principal significance of the park's character and setting is derived from the parkland features, such as the driveways, the wall, the Big Water ornamental lake, none of which lie within the Site. The vistas that the remaining open parkland offers also contributes. With the ornamental lake, Big Water, adjacent to the west of the Site, the infilling by the Proposed Development will physically and visually sever this parkland feature eastwards, although any vistas are curtailed by the caravan park and the west edge of

the Phase 2a development. Big Water will be retained and enhanced, however, as part of the wider Halsnead Garden Village development.

- 8.4.9. The gradual infilling and reuse of the parkland landscape since the 1930s when Halsnead Hall was demolished has had the effect of eroding its understanding and appreciation of how it once functioned with its constituent parts. The Proposed Development will have an urbanising effect on formerly open agricultural parkland. The harm to this non-designated heritage asset has been previously accepted as part of the Halsnead Garden Village proposals and the public benefits it will provide.
- 8.4.10. As a non-designated heritage asset, its importance/value is considered to be **low** and the impact is **minor** with a **minor** significance of effect. This is not considered to be significant in EIA terms.

Operation

Indirect Impacts to Designated Heritage Assets

- 8.4.11. The impact during the operational phase of the Proposed Development on the two Grade II listed buildings (Listed Barn at Snape Gate and Old Halsnead) is considered to be the same as during the construction phase. As such all the designated heritage assets have a **medium** importance/value, and the impact is considered to be **negligible** due to lack of intervisibility and lack of changes to their immediate settings. The significance of effect is **neutral**.

Direct and Indirect Impacts to Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 8.4.12. The impact during the operational phase on the non-designated heritage asset of Halsnead Park is considered to be the same as during the construction phase. As such, this asset has a **low** importance/value, and the impact is considered to be **minor** with a **minor** significance of effect. Mitigation following the construction phase will reduce the significance of effect to **neutral**.

8.5. Mitigation, Enhancement and Residual Effects

Mitigation by Design

- 8.5.1. Given the Site's limited contribution to the setting of the designated heritage assets other than a former historic association, there is no required mitigation effect.
- 8.5.2. In order to mitigate the loss of the historic landscape associated with the non-designated Halsnead Park, the wider proposals within the Halsnead Garden Village have included incorporation and enhancement of the park features. These include the Ride into Halsnead Park, and the retention of features such as Fox Clump and Big Water which will be enhanced. However, none of these features are included within the Site but Big Water is located to the immediate west. A buffer and landscaping have set back the built line from its eastern edge.

Additional Mitigation

- 8.5.3. No additional mitigation is considered to be necessary.

Cultural Heritage

Table 8.5: Mitigation

Ref	Measure to avoid, reduce or manage any adverse effects and/or to deliver beneficial effects	How measure would be secured		
		By Design	By S.106	By Condition
1	Tree planting and a green buffer around the Site	X		

Enhancements

- 8.5.4. There are no enhancements required concerning Cultural Heritage.

Residual Effects

- 8.5.5. As noted above, the identified impacts will be mitigated through landscaping design measures, which have been incorporated into the Proposed Development and the effects remain as above.

8.6. Cumulative and In-Combination Effects

- 8.6.1. As set out in **Chapter 2 and depicted on Figure 2.1**, the cumulative and in-combination effects have been considered where appropriate, which include:

- Intra-Project Cumulative Effects: The combined effect of individual effects on a single receptor where deemed potentially significant; and
- Inter-Project Cumulative Effects; The combined effects of development schemes, which may, on an individual basis be insignificant, but cumulatively, have significant effect.

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

- 8.6.2. No other effects have been identified in relation to the heritage assets referred to in this assessment and there is, therefore, no potential for intra-project cumulative effects.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

- 8.6.3. There are six developments within the boundary of the Garden Village that may potentially provide a cumulative impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets. These comprise Fox's Bank (Phase 2a) (1), Land South of Lickers Lane and Site of Former Saunder's Nursery (Phase 1b/1c/2c) (2), Land North of M62 Motorway off Windy Arbor Road (Phase 1a) (3), Land to the South of Lickers Lane (Phase 2c) (4), Former Site of Cronton Colliery (5), and Land North of Cronton Road and South of the M62 (6).
- 8.6.4. The first development (1) lies adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Site and close to the listed buildings of the Barn at Snape Gate and Old Halsnead. However, the Barn at Snape Gate has already been assessed as part of that development (RPS 2021)¹³. The construction of the current proposed development will not create any additional harm to the Barn at Snape Gate due to the lack of intervisibility and intervening built environment. Old Halsnead will also similarly remain unaffected due to its enclosed setting within mature vegetation and lack of intervisibility. Whilst it will create additional infilling of the parkland landscape as a non-designated heritage asset,

¹³ RPS, 2021. *Halsnead Garden Village: Heritage Addendum*.

features within the parkland, such as The Ride and Big Water, will be retained and enhanced. As such, there will be negligible impact on the listed buildings and a minor adverse impact on Halsnead Park. This will result in a **neutral** significance of effect for the listed buildings and a **minor adverse** significance of effect for Halsnead Park.

8.6.5. The second and fourth developments (2, 4) are located to the north/north-east of the Site and will have no impact on the designated heritage assets. Again, it will reduce the openness of the former parkland, although key features, such as The Ride and Big Water, will be retained and enhanced causing only a minor adverse impact on Halsnead Park. This will result in a **neutral** significance of effect for the listed buildings and a **minor adverse** significance of effect for Halsnead Park.

8.6.6. The third development (3) lies to the north-west of the Site and views towards this will be largely obscured by existing mature vegetation as well as the proposed landscaping surrounding the Site. There will be no impact on the listed buildings due to the distance and the intervening vegetation and built environment. Whilst this will result in the infilling of the parkland landscape, important features, such as The Ride and Big Water, will be retained and enhanced. This will result in a **neutral** significance of effect for the listed buildings and a **minor adverse** significance of effect for Halsnead Park.

8.6.7. The latter two (5, 6) lie to the south of the M62 motorway, which no longer forms part of the historic parkland due to the construction of the motorway. As such, there will be no impact to Halsnead Park resulting in a **neutral** significance of effect. Old Halsnead listed building also lies within this area to the south and will not be impacted by the proposed developments due to its enclosed setting within mature vegetation. There will also be no impact on the Barn at Snape Gate. As such the significance of effects for the designated heritage assets is **neutral**.

8.6.8. Following mitigation through tree planting and a green buffer, the minor effect on Halsnead Park non-designated heritage asset will be reduced to **neutral**.

8.6.9. There is not considered to be any potential cumulative effect with regard to the approved and proposed developments within 1km of the Application Site.

8.7. Summary

Introduction

8.7.1. The assessment has considered the indirect effects of the Proposed Development on the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets considered to be sensitive to the design proposals. It has assessed the overall effect and the significance of these predicted effects.

8.7.2. The assessment was informed by a Heritage Statement (Appendix 8.1). The likely impacts were assessed during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development.

Baseline Conditions

Designated Heritage Assets

8.7.3. There are no designated heritage assets recorded within the Site. There are eight Grade II listed buildings recorded within 1km of the Site, two of which were considered to be potentially sensitive to the Proposed Development due to the former historic association, comprising Barn at Snape Gate and Old Halsnead. These are considered to be of medium importance/value.

Cultural Heritage

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 8.7.4. There is one non-designated heritage asset located within the Site comprising Halsnead Park. This asset incorporates the whole of the Site, although it does not contain any parkland features from which this asset derives much of its significance. The Big Water ornamental lake is located immediately to the west of the Site, however, although this is being retained and enhanced as part of the wider development within Halsnead Garden Village. The Proposed Development will infill one of the remaining areas of open rural agricultural landscape within the park. This non-designated heritage asset is considered to be of low importance/value.

Likely Significant Effects

- 8.7.5. The assessment established that there are two Grade II listed buildings, the Barn at Snape Gate (1253250) and Old Halsnead (1261787) which may be sensitive to the Proposed Development within their wider setting. Whilst the listed buildings form part of the former Halsnead Estate, there is no intervisibility with the Site and it has been assessed that there will be no effects as a result on their importance/value.
- 8.7.6. The Site is situated within a non-designated heritage asset, Halsnead Park (MME15147). The value of this asset is derived from its open character and views across the landscape, together with its component parkland features, none of which lie within the Site. One parkland feature lies to the west of the Site, the Big Water ornamental lake, which will be retained and enhanced as part of the wider Halsnead Garden Village scheme. The built line will be set back from the area of the Big Water by a buffer and an area of landscaping. The adverse effect resulting from the Proposed Development to the non-designated heritage asset will be in terms of the infilling of one of the remaining open parkland areas. This will result in a change of character to this part of the parkland has been previously accepted to be a consequence of the Halsnead Garden Village scheme, outweighed by the public benefits.
- 8.7.7. Based on the above, the assessment did not identify any significant effects in EIA terms for the designated or non-designated heritage assets during either the construction or operational phases of the Proposed Development.

Mitigation and Enhancement

- 8.7.8. Design measures have been incorporated into the Proposed Development to reduce any potential impacts to the non-designated heritage parkland, in terms of the Big Water ornamental lake to the west of the Site. This includes landscaping and a buffer to set back the built line.

Conclusion

- 8.7.9. It is considered that the Proposed Development will not result in any significant effects in EIA terms for the designated or non-designated heritage assets during either the construction or operational phases. **Table 8.6** provides a summary of effects, mitigation and residual effects.

Table 8.6: Summary of Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Potential Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effects	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Construction								
Designated Heritage Assets (Barn at Snape Gate and Old Halsnead)	Change to wider setting	Indirect/Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Regional	Neutral	None	Neutral
Non-Designated Heritage Asset (Halsnead Park)	Change to character and setting	Indirect/Temporary	Low	Minor	Local	Minor Adverse	Mitigation by design comprising tree planting and a green buffer. Retention and enhancement of parkland features as wider Halsnead Garden Village development	Minor Adverse

Cultural Heritage

Operation								
Designated Heritage Assets (Barn at Snape Gate and Old Halsnead)	Change to wider setting	Indirect/Permanent	Medium	Negligible	Regional	Neutral	None	Neutral
Non-Designated Heritage Asset (Halsnead Park)	Change to character and setting	Indirect/Permanent	Low	Minor	Local	Minor Adverse	Mitigation by design comprising tree planting and a green buffer. Retention and enhancement of parkland features as wider Halsnead Garden Village development	Neutral
Cumulative and In-Combination								
Designated Heritage Assets (Barn at Snape)	Change to wider setting	Indirect/Permanent	High	Negligible	Regional	Neutral	None	Neutral

Gate and Old Halsnead)								
Non-Designated Heritage Asset (Halsnead Park)	Change to character and setting	Indirect/Permanent	Low	Minor	Local	Minor Adverse	Mitigation by design comprising tree planting and a green buffer	Neutral