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1 Non-Technical Summary

This document relates to proposed development of land directly northeast of the Kettering Science Academy, on Deeble Road at Kettering in the parish of Kettering, Northamptonshire (SP 88020 78389). This report presents the results of a desk-based study of archaeological assets and information within the area of 500m of the boundary of the PDA. A wider 2km search of Designated Assets was also made to place the PDA in context with the surrounding landscape.

It is concluded that the overall impact of the proposed development should not present a material constraint to development, with no assets recorded within the PDA or none at direct risk within the 500m study.

Searches of national and county databases, have identified a total 16 heritage assets within the 500m Study Area and a further five assets within the 2km Study Area.

The key findings of the appraisal are:

- 16 non-designated heritage assets have been identified within the 500m Study Area; there are a further 5 designated assets in the 2km search area;

- The proposed development area is located within the interior of the former Saxon Charter Boundary, which might represent a direct impact on early medieval or medieval unknown assets; however, there are no other known assets of this period identified within the study area. The nearest post-medieval/Industrial assets are c.200 metres from the PDA, therefore there is no risk of any impact of the development.

- The greatest archaeological potential locally is for the post-medieval and modern period relating to former field boundaries, tracks and remnants of agricultural activity;

The direct effects of the proposed development on identified heritage assets have been assessed:

- The proposed development area does not contain any heritage assets subject to formal designation as a Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Conservation Area, Registered Historic Park and Garden or Registered Historic Battlefield.

An appropriate mitigation response to offset the direct impact of development on any such heritage assets of archaeological interest, could be a Conditioned requirement attached to any planning permission for the implementation of a programme of archaeological works to secure their preservation by record in advance of, or during, development.
2 Introduction

2.1 Project Context and Purpose of this Report

This document presents the results of an archaeological assessment in advance of a proposed development to be carried out on land at Kettering Science Academy in Kettering, Northamptonshire and considers the acceptability of the development in relation to potential impacts on the historic environment in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Paragraph 128 of the NPPF requires:

“an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.”

Paragraphs 132 to 135 of the NPPF address the need to consider how the significance of heritage assets, and their setting, may be harmed by a proposed development.

2.2 Background of the Proposed Development

2.2.1 Development and planning history

The Proposed Development Area (PDA) covers an area of approximately 950 sqm and is intended for the development of new amenities for the Kettering Science Academy, including new study, training, libraries areas as well as kitchen and dining designates spaces.

The proposed development area (PDA) lies approximately 1.5km east of the centre of Kettering in Northamptonshire within the existing Science Academy campus. The site is bounded to the north by Deeble Road and to the south by a residential area. Henry Gotch Jr School is to the west of the Science Academy while playing fields extend to the east. The area is set on the eastern outskirts of Kettering and occupies land that consists of educational buildings, trees and lawn in addition to sport amenities.

Slade Brook channel lies approximately 2.2Km to the south and 1.5km to the east is a lake and a meander of River Ise, adjacent to areas of woodland. The natural geology of the PDA consists of Whitby Mudstone Formation - Mudstone. Sedimentary Bedrock formed approximately 174 to 183 million years ago in the Jurassic Period Natural geology is overlain by deposits of alluvium related to the River Ise.
3 Methods

3.1 Aims

The aims of this Desk-based assessment are to:

1. Identify and assess the significance of those heritage assets and their settings which might be affected by the proposed development, and
2. Assess any potential harm to the significance of assets which might arise from the proposed development.

3.2 Scope of Assessment and Definitions

3.2.1 Heritage assets

A heritage asset is defined in Annex 2 of 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 asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).’

3.2.2 Designated assets

Designated heritage assets are defined by the NPPF as:

‘A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.’

Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields are not subject to specific legal protection.

3.2.3 Non-designated assets

Non-designated heritage assets include assets which have not been designated but are recorded on national or county databases (e.g. Historic Environment Records, HER) or equivalent. NPPF states that non-designated assets are a material consideration in the planning process (DCLG, 2012. National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 135).

3.2.4 Significance

The significance of a heritage asset is defined by the NPPF as,
'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.'

3.2.5 Assessing significance

Historic England’s Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment1 (henceforth referred to as ‘GPA 2’) gives advice on the assessment of significance as part of the application process. It advises understanding the nature, extent, and level of significance of a heritage asset. In order to do this, GPA2 advocates considering the heritage values an asset may hold, as identified in English Heritage’s Conservation Principles.

3.2.6 Conservation Principles

Historic England’s Conservation Principles provide a comprehensive framework for the sustainable management of the historic environment. It sets out a method for thinking systematically and consistently about the heritage values that can be ascribed to a place.

The significance of a heritage asset lies at the core of ‘Conservation Principles’. Significance is a collective term for the sum of all the heritage values attached to a place, be it an archaeological site, built heritage or an historic landscape.

The Conservation Principles shows how the ways people value historic places can be grouped into four categories:

- **Evidential value**: the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.
- **Historical value**: the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present - it tends to be illustrative or associative.
- **Aesthetic value**: the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
- **Communal value**: the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory

These four values essentially cover the heritage ‘interests’ given in the glossary of the NPPF, which comprise archaeological, architectural, artistic and historic interest. Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas are designated for their special architectural and historic interest. Scheduling is predominantly, although not exclusively, associated with archaeological interest.

Archaeological interest is defined by the NPPF as:

‘There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially may hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.’
3.2.7 Levels of significance

The NPPF articulates four levels of significance:

- Designated heritage assets of the highest significance, as identified in paragraph 132 of NPPF, comprising: Grade I and II* Listed buildings; Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens; Scheduled Monuments; Protected Wreck Sites and Registered Battlefields (and also including some Conservation Areas); Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to a Scheduled Monument should also be treated as of the highest significance, as identified in paragraph 139 of NPPF.
- Designated heritage assets of less than the highest significance, as identified in paragraph 132 of NPPF, comprising: Grade II Listed buildings and Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens (and also some Conservation Areas);
- Non-designated heritage assets, and
- Sites, buildings or areas of no heritage significance.

3.2.8 Setting

As defined in NPPF:

“Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.”

Setting is defined by Annex 2 of the NPPF as,

‘the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral’.

Therefore, setting can contribute to, detract from or be neutral with regards to heritage values, and so change to setting has the potential to diminish, enhance or leave unchanged the significance of a heritage asset through change to its values.

3.2.9 Assessing change through alteration to setting

This assessment considers how setting might contribute to those values which define significance of an asset with reference to Historic England’s 2015 document Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (henceforth referred to as GPA3), particularly the checklist given on page 9. GPA3 advocates the clear articulation of “what matters and why”.

In GPA3, a stepped approach is recommended, as follows:

- Step 1 is to identify the heritage assets affected and their settings.
Step 2 is to assess “whether, how and to what degree settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s)”. The GPA3 guidance includes a non-exhaustive check-list of elements of the physical surroundings of an asset that might be considered when undertaking the assessment including, among other things: topography, other heritage assets, land use, green space, functional relationships, degree of change over time and integrity. It also lists points associated with the experience of the asset which might be considered, including: views, intentional inter-visibility, tranquillity, sense of enclosure, accessibility, rarity and associative relationships.

Step 3 is to assess the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the asset(s).

Step 4 is ‘maximising enhancement and minimising harm’.

Step 5 is ‘Making and documenting the decision and monitoring outcomes’.

Descriptions of significance will naturally anticipate the ways in which impacts will be considered. Hence descriptions of the significance of Conservation Areas will make reference to their special interest and character and appearance, and the significance of Listed Buildings will be discussed with reference to the building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

3.2.10 Assessment of harm

Assessment of any harm will be articulated in terms of the policy and law that the proposed development will be assessed against, such as whether a proposed development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of a Conservation Area, and articulating the scale of any harm in order to inform a balanced judgement/weighing exercise as required by the NPPF.

As part of this, setting may be a consideration. For an evaluation of any harm to significance through changes to setting, this assessment follows the methodology given in Historic England’s 2015 document Planning Note 3, of which steps 1 and 2 are described above. Again, fundamental to the methodology set out in this document is stating “what matters and why”, with particular reference made to the aforementioned checklist.

It should be noted that this key document states that:

“setting is not a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation”

Hence any impacts are described in terms of how they affect the significance of a heritage asset itself through changes to setting. In order to relate to key policy, the following levels of harm may potentially be identified:

- **Substantial harm or total loss.** It has been clarified in a High Court Judgement of 2013 that this is harm that would ‘have such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced’;

- **Less than substantial harm.** Harm of a lesser level that that defined above; and
• **No harm (i.e. preservation).** A High Court Judgement of 2014 is relevant to this, in which it was held that with regard to preserving the setting of Listed building or preserving the character and appearance of a Conservation Area, preserving means doing no harm.

While ‘preservation’ does not mean no change, it specifically means ‘no harm.’ GPA2 states that: “*Change to heritage assets is inevitable but it is only harmful when significance is damaged*”.

Thus, change is accepted in Historic England’s guidance as part of the evolution of the landscape and environment, what matters is whether such change is neutral, harmful or beneficial to the significance of an asset. With regards to changes in setting, GPA3 states that: “*protection of the setting of heritage assets need not prevent change*”, and key to this is whether such change is neutral, harmful or beneficial to the significance of an asset.

### 3.2.11 Benefits

Proposed development may also result in benefits to heritage assets, and these are articulated in terms of how they enhance the heritage values and, hence, significance of the assets concerned.

### 3.2.12 Interchangeable words

For the purpose of assessment, the following terms are considered to be interchangeable:

- ‘Historic environment’ and ‘heritage’
- ‘Significance’ and ‘importance’
- ‘Values’ and ‘interests’

### 3.3 Data sources

The assessment has been informed by consulting the following sources:

- Historic England National Heritage List for England (NHLE) for information on designated heritage assets;
- Historic England Archives Monuments Information England (AMIE) for information on non-designated heritage assets and previous archaeological works;
- Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record for information on non-designated heritage assets, portable antiquity finds spots and previous archaeological works;

### 3.4 Study areas

Two study areas have been defined:

- An inner study area, 500m from the centre of the PDA, was utilised for designated and non-designated heritage assets, and
- An outer study area, 2km from the boundary of the PDA, was utilised for designated heritage assets.
Planning Policy Framework

4.1 Planning Policy Context

Legislation relating to the Historic Environment is primarily set out within the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which provides statutory protection for Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 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.”

With regards to Conservation Areas, Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act states that:

“...with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area...special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area”

Recent judgement in the Court of Appeal (Jones v Mordue Anor (2015) EWCA Civ 1243) has clarified that, with regards to the setting of Listed Buildings, where the principles of the NPPF are applied (in particular paragraph 134, see below), this is in keeping with the requirements of the 1990 Act.

Scheduled Monuments are protected by the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 which relates to nationally important archaeological sites. Whilst works to Scheduled Monuments are subject to a high level of protection, it is important to note that there is no duty within the 1979 Act to have regard to the desirability of preservation of the setting of a Scheduled Monument.

Notwithstanding the statutory presumption set out within the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Area) Act 1990 and Ancient monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

This section of the document sets out the planning policy considerations and guidance contained within both national and local planning guidance which specifically relate to the application site, with a focus on those policies relating to the protection of the historic environment.
4.2 National Planning Policy and Guidance

4.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework

National policy and guidance are set out in the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) published in March 2012.

The NPPF sets out the Government’s economic, environmental and social planning policies for England. Taken together, these policies articulate the Government’s vision of sustainable development, which should be interpreted and applied locally to meet local aspirations. The NPPF continues to recognise that the planning system is plan-led and that therefore Local Plans, incorporating Neighbourhood Plans where relevant, are the starting point for the determination of any planning application, including those which relate to the historic environment.

The overarching policy change applicable to the proposed development is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This presumption in favour of sustainable development (the ‘presumption’) sets out the tone of the Government’s overall stance and operates with and through the other policies of the NPPF. Its purpose is to send a strong signal to all those involved in the planning process about the need to plan positively for appropriate new development; so that both plan making and development management are proactive and driven by search for opportunities to deliver sustainable development, rather than barriers. Conserving historic assets in a manner appropriate to their significance forms part of this drive towards sustainable development.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and the NPPF sets out three ‘dimensions’ to sustainable development: an economic role, a social role, and an environmental role. The presumption is key to delivering these ambitions, by creating a positive predevelopment framework which is underpinned by the wider economic, environmental and social provisions of the NPPF.

The NPPF also sets out 12 no. core planning principles for delivering sustainable development. For the purposes of this Statement, particular regard should be had to the tenth core principle, which identifies at paragraph 17 of the NPPF that planning should:

“conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations”

Heritage Assets are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF (page 52) as:

“A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the Local Planning Authority (including Local Listing)”

The NPPF goes on to define a Designated Heritage Asset on page 51 as:
“World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under relevant legislation”

As set out above, significance is also defined (page 56) as:

“The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting”

Section 12 of the NPPF relates to ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ and states at paragraph 129 that:

“Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal”

Paragraph 131 goes on to state that:

“In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness”

With regard to the impact of proposals on the significance of a heritage asset, paragraphs 193 and 194 are relevant and read as follows:

“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.”

Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:
a. grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;

b. assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”

In the context of the above, it should be noted that paragraph 133 reads as follows:

“Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss or all of the following apply:

- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;
- conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.”

Paragraph 134 goes on to state:

“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use”

With regards to non-designated heritage assets, paragraph 135 of NPPF states that:

“The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”

The NPPF also provides specific guidance in relation to development within Conservation Areas, stating at paragraph 137 that:

“Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.”


4.2.2 Planning Practice Guidance

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched the planning practice web-based resource in March 2014, accompanied by a ministerial statement which confirmed that a number of previous planning practice guidance documents were cancelled. This also introduced the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which comprised a full and consolidated review of planning practice guidance documents to be read alongside the NPPF.

The PPG has a discrete section on the subject of ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ which a paragraph 009 (ID: 18a-009/20140306 revision date 06.03.2014) confirms that the consideration of ‘significance’ in decision taking is important and states:

“Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals”

In terms of assessment of substantial harm, paragraph 017 (ID: 18a-017-20140306 revision date 06.03.2014) confirms that whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgement for the individual decision taker having regard to the individual circumstances and the policy set out within the NPPF. It goes on to state:

“In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm” (our emphasis) With regard to design the PPG states at paragraph 02 (ID: 26-002-20140306 revision date 06.03.2014) that:

“Good design should:

- ensure that development can deliver a wide range of planning objectives
- enhance the quality of buildings and spaces, by considering amongst other things form and function; efficiency and effectiveness and their impact on well being
- address the need for different uses sympathetically.”

Paragraph 23 (ID: 26/023/20140306 revision date 06.03.2014) goes on to explain how to consider buildings and the spaces between them and reads as follows:
“Plans, policies and decisions can effectively manage physical form at a variety of scales. This is how planning can help achieve good design and connected objectives. Where appropriate the following should be considered:

- **layout** – the way in which buildings and spaces relate to each other;
- **form** – the shape of buildings;
- **scale** – the size of buildings; and
- **detailing** – the important smaller elements of buildings and spaces.

### 4.3 The Development Plan

Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) 2011-2031 includes a section pertaining to the Historic Environment; Kettering Borough Council Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan is currently in draft and will complement the JCS.

The JCS contains the following Policy (2) summary on the historic environment:

The *distinctive North Northamptonshire historic environment will be protected, preserved and, where appropriate, enhanced. Where a development would impact upon a heritage asset and/or its setting:*

- **a)** Proposals should conserve and, where possible, enhance the heritage significance and setting of an asset or group of heritage assets in a manner commensurate to its significance;
- **b)** Proposals should complement their surrounding historic environment through the form, scale, design and materials;
- **c)** Proposals should protect and, where possible, enhance key views and vistas of heritage assets, including of the church spires along the Nene Valley and across North Northamptonshire;
- **d)** Proposals should demonstrate an appreciation and understanding of the impact of development on heritage assets and their setting in order to minimise harm to these assets and their setting. Where loss of historic features or archaeological remains is unavoidable and justified, provision should be made for recording and the production of a suitable archive and report;
- **e)** Where appropriate, flexible solutions to the re-use of buildings and conservation of other types of heritage assets at risk will be encouraged, especially, where this will result in their removal from the ‘at risk’ register.

### 4.3.1 Local Plan Policies with regards to the NPPF and 1990 Act

With regard to Local Plan policies, paragraph 215 of NPPF states that:
“due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)”. 

Where local plan policy does not allow for the weighing of harm against public benefit for designated heritage assets (see NPPF paragraph 134) or a balanced judgement with regards to harm to a non-designated heritage asset (see NPPF paragraph 135) then policies are considered to be overly restrictive compared to NPPF, limiting the weight they may be given.

### 4.4 Legislation and Policy by Type of Designated Asset

Table 1 presents the relevant policy and legislation for each type of designated asset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of designated Heritage Asset</th>
<th>Asset Grade</th>
<th>Asset Significance</th>
<th>Relevant Legislation</th>
<th>Protected in planning process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>National or Regional</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed buildings</td>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>National in descending order of interest</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
<td>Section 12 of NPPF, specifically paragraphs 128, 132, 133 and 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>National in descending order of interest</td>
<td>National Heritage Act 1983</td>
<td>Northamptonshire County Council planning policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Battlefields</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National Heritage Act 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Monuments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Sites</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>UN Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

5.1 Introduction

This section sets out the historic environment data for the PDA and study area. It describes the PDA and the natural environment, the designated and non-designated heritage assets, the historic environment by historic periods, and the archaeological significance and potential of the PDA.

Table 2 presents the date ranges for the archaeological periods used in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earlier prehistoric:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic</td>
<td>before ca. 2400 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>2400-800 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>800 BC-AD 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>AD 43-410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>AD 410-1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>1066-1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval and Early Modern (Industrial)</td>
<td>1539-1700, 1700-1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>1939-Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Description of the PDA and natural environment

The town of Kettering lies in Kettering District in the northern area of Northamptonshire.

The PDA lies on the outskirts of the eastern side of Kettering, on land within the confines of the existing Kettering Science Academy (Figure 1). The northern boundary, adjacent to Deeble Road is grassed to its the full extent. The PDA itself comprises a flat grassed area adjacent to Kettering Science Academy. The eastern extent is adjacent to a football pitch next to River Ise.

5.3 Heritage Assets

In total, there were 21 assets identified, the majority being non-designated assets within the immediate environs of the PDA. Five listed buildings also lie within the western half of the 2km search area towards the centre of Kettering (Figure 2). Full details can be found in Appendix A. Table 3 below identifies the totals of assets by types. There are no designated assets within the 500m buffer zone in addition to sixteen non-designated assets. There were no designated or non-designated assets with the PDA itself.
Table 3 presents the total of assets by type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>0-500</th>
<th>500m-2km</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building (Grade I)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building (Grade II*)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building (Grade II)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Parks and Garden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designated Totals</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Woodland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence of Britain Project Assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment Record</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-designated Totals</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Totals</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 **Designated Heritage Assets**

In total, five designated assets within 2km of the PDA were identified in this study. There are no designated assets within the PDA nor within the 500m buffer zone.

The designated assets, totalling 5 are located within the 500m to 2km zone of the PDA. These comprise Grade II listed buildings and are mainly concentrated in the town centre of Kettering, approximately 1.5km to the west of the PDA: These include three ecclesiastic, one industrial and one hospital. There are 4 listed buildings at approximately 1km to the west (LB1391024 Shoes Factory Ken Hall Footwear ltd (formerly Newman and Sons), LB1372601 Anglican and Nonconformist Cemetery Chapel and LB1189034 AD 43-41 front block of Saint Mary’s Hospital and LB1051658 United Reformed Church. Approximately 900m to the north west there is a Grade II Church of Saint Mary, (LB1051645). at.

A full catalogue of all designated assets can be found in Appendix A.

5.5 **Non-designated Heritage Assets**

There are no non-designated assets within the PDA itself and sixteen located within the 500m buffer zone. Two consist of 19th and 20th century sewage works (MNN101163 and MNN101165); 2 19th century industrial buildings including a shoe factory (MNN100708 and MNN100774); an 18th century demolished mill (MNN103222); three Medieval mills (MNN103220, MNN103221 and MNN103226). In terms of landscape the PDA lies inside the projected Saxon Boundary.
(MNN103276) and is southwest of the likely route of a known Roman Road (MNN9831) located c.200 metres to the north-east. An area of woodland known to exist since at least the 16th century (MNN111868) lies c.250 metres to the east of the PDA. Two coins were recovered and recorded on the portable antiquity scheme database c.600m to the west of the PDA; one is late Roman (MNN152900) and one Post-Medieval (MNN152456)

A full catalogue of all non-designated assets can be found in Appendix A.

5.6 Previous Archaeological Works

No archaeological investigations have been previously undertaken within the PDA. There have been a small number of investigations within the 500m Study Area. These comprise:

- Rockingham Forest Project Survey and Heritage Statement at Barton Seagrave, Kettering, carried out by Northamptonshire County Council - Foard, Glenn - NCC Historic Environment Team between 2002 and 2003 (ENN 103148);
- Northamptonshire Boot and Shoe Survey at Kettering, carried out by Historic England between 1998 and 1999. (ENN 103909).

5.7 Prehistoric Period (c.4000 BC - AD 43)

Evidence of prehistoric activity in and around Kettering itself is limited. There are no recorded prehistoric assets within the 500m buffer itself nor within the wider area of c.1km around Kettering. The closest significant prehistoric settlement is the Iron Age Hillfort at Irthlingborough approximately 14km to the southeast. Findspots in the local area are limited to a polished stone axe found in the garden at 106 Pipers Road c. 650m to the southwest of the PDA (Monument no. 345768).

During the Iron Age the modern county of Northamptonshire included areas controlled by both the Corieltauvi and the Catuvellauni who controlled the lands around Kettering.

5.8 The Roman Period (AD43 - 410)

The Romans took over the Catuvellauni territory in c. 43 AD, including the area around Kettering. The town traces its origins to an early, unwalled medium-sized Romano-British settlement developed as a roadside settlement along the Irchester to Gartree Road (Taylor 2002). Much of this ribbon development is believed to have been destroyed by modern activity such as extensive quarrying to the north of the town and the subsequent growth and housing development alongside the development of boot making in the 19th century, with any of the Roman town likely now surviving as small pockets (ibid).
Designated assets within the 500m buffer are limited to one unstratified Roman coin (MNN101163) c. 600 metres to the west of the PDA and the proposed route of the Roman road (MNN9831) located c. 250 metres to the northeast of the PDA.

Outside of the study area, a Roman settlement, pottery kilns and cemetery were excavated in the late 1960s and early 1970s off Churchill Way c. 650m to the southeast of the PDA (Monument 345761) relatively close to the route of the Roman road. The former Roman town lies mainly to the west of the PDA outside of the study area, with further possible roadside elements potentially surviving to the northeast, east and southeast closer to the believed route of the Roman road.

5.9 Early Medieval and Medieval (AD 410 – 1540)

There is limited evidence for the Roman settlement remaining in use into the early Saxon period, mainly restricted to the 5th-6th century cemetery located to the south of the Roman town adjacent to Stamford Road and outside of the study area (Foard and Ballinger 2000).

Kettering was mentioned in a chapter from AD 963 in which Bishop Aethelwold gave Kettering as foundation grant to Peterborough Abbey. The boundary defined in the charter has been broadly correlated with the pre-19th century parish boundary of Kettering. The PDA is located within that Saxon Charter Boundary (MNN103276). In addition, the Church of Saint Mary, a listed building (LB1051645) thought to have been founded in the Saxon period, lies within the 2km study area.

The Doomsday Book survey of 1086 makes reference to Kettering: Kettering manor is listed as being held by the Abbey of Peterborough, the church owning 10 hides of land. Kettering was valued at £11, with land for 16 ploughs. There were 107 acres of meadow, 3 of woodland, 2 mills (There are three Medieval mill related assets within the 500m of the PDA; MNN103220, MNN103221, MNN103226), 31 villans with 10 ploughs and 1 female slave.

Rockingham Forest, which extended into the southeast of the 500m study area would have existed at this point and most likely existed from the earlier periods of occupation.

In 1227, The charter for Kettering’s market was granted to the Bishop of Peterborough by Henry III. This encouraged growth of the settlement, which was located on several important trade routes and was now enriched by the woollen cloth trade moving to the area.

Barton Seagrave is a small medieval settlement (MNN111868) and greenbelt formed from ancient woodland lying on east side of River Ise and lies only c.200 metres to the east of the DPA, it is believed to have in use since the 15th century.
5.10 Post-Medieval (AD 1540-1700) and Early Modern/Industrial (AD 1700-1939)

The wool trade collapsed in the late 18th century, which constricted the local economy. Today’s Kettering grew considerably in the 19th century mainly due to the development of the boot and shoe industry, for which Northamptonshire as a whole became famous. This trade expanded rapidly once the railway arrived in the mid-19th century. Many large homes were built for factory owners, while terraced streets provided accommodation for the workers. The industry has markedly declined since the 1970s with footwear-manufacturers having left the town or closed down in the face of stiff overseas competition, while others have outsourced their production to lower-cost countries. Only two smaller footwear-businesses remain: Gordon Works (MNN100708) and Ken Hall Footwear Ltd (LB1391024 Grade II listed building), these two assets are located c.1000 metres to the west of the DPA within the 2000m buffer area.

As the town grew, it rapidly engulfed former surrounding enclosed agricultural land and the village of Barton Seagrave, which lies to the southeast of the PDA.

The other Grade II listed building of this period are the Anglican Cemetery Chapel and nonconformist Cemetery Chapel (LB1044211), which lie 1000 metres to the west of the PDA within the 2000metres buffer area.

The remaining relevant assets from that period are two sewage works within the 500m buffer (MNN101163, MNN101165); a demolished Modern Mill (MNN103222) and an industrial building (MNN100774).

Nineteenth and 20th century mapping as outlined below, indicates the PDA likely lay in open enclosed fields until the modern era, with Deeble Road itself not existing until the 1968 OS mapping.

5.11 Historic Mapping

A full map regression has not been undertaken for this project. A brief review of available historic OS mapping is summarised below:

- 1886-1887 1:2,500 Ordnance Survey County Series Northamptonshire map. The PDA lies within two fields to the east of Tingle Spinney and River Ise. The farmhouse is a notable feature to the northwest, Kettering Mill lies on the next field to the north.
- 1887-1888 1:10,560 Ordnance Survey County Series Northamptonshire map. The landscape appears relatively unchanged from the 1886-1887 map.
- 1900 1: 2,500 Ordnance Survey County Series Northamptonshire map. The PDA is still within an open field, there are no substantial changes within the immediately surrounding landscape from the 1887-1888 map.
• 1901 1: 10,560 Ordnance Survey County Series Northamptonshire map. There are still no changes within the PDA.

• 1926 1: 2,500 Ordnance Survey County Series Northamptonshire map. The area appears little changed from previous mapping apart from a small plot subdivision to the east of the Farmhouse, possibly a small orchard or narrow field planted with trees.

• 1927 1: 10,560 Ordnance Survey County Series Northamptonshire map. The PDA remains within the same undeveloped field.

• 1938-52 1: 10,560 Ordnance Survey County Series Northamptonshire map. There is a substantial development of Kettering towards the East. The farmhouse adjacent to the DPA disappears and its allotments are replaced by a residential area. Henry Gotch Jr School appears for the first time.

• 1958 1: 10,560 Ordnance Survey OS map. A north-south oriented track-way joining Kettering and Cook’s Spinney is built passing through the PDA.

• 1968-73 1: 2,500 Ordnance Survey OS map. The narrow trackway going across the DPA seems to disappear (appears again in later maps), also the PDA turns into Henry Gotch playing field. In addition, Henry Gotch Secondary school is developed to the east of the Jr school and an east-west orientated drain is established to the south of the school. Deeble Road appears for the first time along other residential development to the east of River Ise.

• 1970-81 1: 2,500 Ordnance Survey OS map. No significant changes are noted. A trackway across PDA is visible.

• 1993-95 1: 10,000 Ordnance Survey OS map. The PDA is still located within the playing fields; no trackway is visible across it. A few drains are established by Ise River.

5.12 Aerial photography

No aerial photographs were reviewed for this report.

5.13 Historic Landscape Characterisation

Full Historic Landscape Characterisation has not been undertaken for this project. A summary of available data is outlined below.

The PDA lies in an area of ribbon development of 20th century date located east of Windmill Avenue. Immediately to the west lies Kettering Science Academy and its facilities. To the north lies Deeble Road, which was created in the mid-20th century. The most relevant adjacent landscape feature is River Ise to the east and Barton Seagrave woodland to the south east.

Directly east of the Academy playing fields lies the landscape associated with the River Ise, which has been classed as Fragmented Parliamentary Enclosure. Parliamentary Enclosure typically refers to all land enclosed between 1727 and 1901, rather than ancient enclosure that was created prior to parliamentary acts.
There is no evidence the PDA has been previously developed and it seems to represent a continuity of enclosed agricultural fields until conversion into landscaped grounds for the Science Academy in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.

### 5.14 Archaeological Potential

No archaeological work has been previously carried out within the PDA and only limited investigations have within the town, consequently making an accurate assessment of archaeological and environmental potential problematical.

With the presence of post-medieval assets within the environs of the PDA there is medium risk of encountering features relating to agricultural practice, former trackway and field boundaries. There is a low risk of encountering other heritage assets; with no known assets recorded in close proximity to the PDA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Boundaries</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Funerary</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Lithic-scatters</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Overall Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Prehistoric</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late prehistoric</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano-British/Roman</td>
<td>• •</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.15 Survival

When assessing archaeological potential, it is necessary to first consider any physical factors that might enhance or reduce the opportunity for the survival of archaeological remains within the PDA. There are no elements which might compromise the survival of archaeological remains within the PDA.

Alluvial deposits, which might mask buried archaeological remains and protect them from disturbance by agricultural or other activities, might be present within the PDA due to the presence of a near River (Ise). This is most likely to mask prehistoric remains; however, the risk could be considered low due to the lack of evidence for surviving artefacts or remains in the vicinity of the site.
Viewed from Deeble Road, it is clear the land the PDA is situated on appears to have been elevated above the surrounding playing fields and is likely to have been landscaped when the Science Academy was developed. There is potential that this elevated material may overlie and preserve any potential archaeological remains; however, the presence of landscaping does also suggest a level of truncation is also likely as part of previous land development.
6 Setting Assessment

6.1 Introduction

This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the methodology recommended by Historic England (GPA3) and outlined above in Section 2.

Step 1 of this methodology advocates the identification of designated heritage assets which might be affected by a proposed development. There are no designated assets which are located within the 500m study area.

Step 2 and Step 3 of the methodology is assessing the contribution made by setting to significance and assessing any potential harm to the significance of assets which might arise from the proposed development.

Table 4 Assets potentially sensitive to development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count of Assets</th>
<th>Count of Direct Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>National and International Importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Regional Importance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Local Importance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Negligible Importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Assets Not Sensitive to the Proposed Development

All of the heritage assets identified within the 2km study area are not sensitive to the proposed development, on account of intervening landform, built-form and vegetation. It is important to note that the PDA is shielded by existing academy buildings to the west.

6.3 Assets Potentially Sensitive to the Proposed Development

There are no assets sensitive to impact due to the development within the DPA, which is sited on previously landscaped made-ground created when the Science Academy was built.
7 Conclusion

This appraisal has established that the proposed development area does not contain, or lie immediately adjacent to, any heritage assets with formal designation as a Scheduled Monument, Listed Buildings, Conservation Area, Registered Historic Park and Garden or Registered Historic Battlefield. Therefore, development within the site will not adversely affect any such 'designated heritage asset' directly.

There is a high degree of confidence in the conclusions of this desk-based appraisal, though it should be noted that this appraisal does not include full map regression and aerial photographic data, or detailed site reconnaissance, which was not considered to offer additional supporting information.

The PDA lies in an area of previously enclosed land, likely related to Parliamentary Enclosure formed in the 18th century onwards with the remnants of Rockingham Forest to the southeast and the route of the probable Roman road to the east. A review of available mapping and data suggests the PDA was likely located away from the Roman town and although it lies within the Saxon Charter Boundary, there is no evidence of early medieval remains within 2km of the PDA. Development of the current Academy buildings and mid to late 20th century landscaping has likely also negatively impacted on the potential for any surviving unknown remains in the area.

Consultation has not yet taken place with the local planning authority’s archaeological advisor. Nevertheless, an appropriate mitigation response to offset the identified impacts may be a requirement for a programme of archaeological works to secure their preservation by record in advance of, or during, development.

This programme of mitigation work could be suitably secured under an appropriate planning condition, based on model condition 55 from DoE Circular 11/95, as stated below:

“No development shall take place within the application site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority."

It is therefore considered that the effect of proposed development on heritage assets should not present a material constraint to development.
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Legislative framework, national planning policy and relevant sector guidance

Legislative framework

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Section 54a of the Act requires planning decisions to be taken in accordance with policies contained in the appropriate Local Development Plan. Material considerations, including national guidelines, should also be taken into account as they provide an overall context for the consideration of planning applications and set out Government policy.

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended by the National Heritage Act of 1983)
Under this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with English Heritage, maintains a schedule of monuments deemed to be of national importance. In practice, most Scheduled Monuments fall into the category of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs), defined as ‘any Scheduled Monument and any other monument which in the opinion of the Secretary of State is of public interest by reason of the historic, architectural, traditional, artistic or archaeological interest attaching to it’ (Section 61 [12]). Scheduled Monuments also include Areas of Archaeological Importance (AAIs). Only portable items are beyond the protection of scheduling.

The present schedule of just over 13,000 sites has been compiled since the first statutory protection of monuments began in 1882. The criteria for scheduling have been published but there are many sites of schedulable quality, which have not yet received this status.

The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 gives statutory protection to any structure, building or work which is considered to be of particular historic or archaeological interest and regulates any activities which may affect such areas. Under the Act any work that is carried out on a Scheduled Ancient Monument must first obtain Scheduled Monument consent. Scheduled Ancient Monuments and their setting are a material consideration in the NPPF.
The National Heritage Act 2002
This Act enables English Heritage to assume responsibilities for maritime archaeology in English coastal waters, modifying the agency's functions to include securing the preservation of ancient monuments in, on, or under the seabed, and promoting the public's enjoyment of, and advancing their knowledge of ancient monuments, in, on, or under seabed. Initial duties will include those formerly undertaken by the Government's Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), in respect to the administration of The Protection of Wrecks Act 1973.

http://accessibility.english-heritage.org.uk/default.asp?WC1=Node&WCE=8197

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990
This Act applies special protection to buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest.

Listed buildings

Under this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with English Heritage, is responsible for the compilation of the List of Buildings (and other structures) of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. Listing gives buildings important statutory protection.

Buildings are classified in grades to show their relative importance as follows:

- Grade I Buildings of exceptional interest
- Grade II* - Particularly important buildings of more than special interest
- Grade II - Buildings of special interest, which warrant every effort being made to preserve them

The grading of listed buildings is non-statutory; the awarding of grades is simply a tool to assist in the administration of grants and consents. The list is used by local planning authorities in conjunction with PPG 15 Planning and the Historic Environment as the basis upon which decisions on the impact of development are made on historically and architecturally significant buildings and their settings.

Any work that involves the demolition, alteration or extension of a listed building (or its curtilage) requires listed building consent, which must be sought from the Secretary of State, usually via the local planning authority. Consent may be granted after a detailed application to local planning authority or the Secretary of State.

Section 66 (1) of the 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
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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”.

Conservation Areas

There are activities that may be considered inappropriate within or adjacent to Conservation Areas; for example by disrupting important views, or generating excess traffic. Development within a Conservation Area is likely to be resisted if considered inappropriate in terms of scale, setting, massing, siting, and detailed appearance in relation to surrounding buildings and the Conservation Area as a whole. High standards of design are expected in all Conservation Areas, whether for new or replacement buildings, extensions, alterations or small scale development. Planning permission is normally resisted for small scale development which could lead to a number of similar applications, the cumulative effect of which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. Demolition of unlisted structures within Conservation Areas is usually only permitted where removal or replacement would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area, or where the structure is beyond economic repair. Development which would adversely affect the character or appearance of buildings of local interest is likely to be resisted. Demolition would almost certainly only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.

The Protection of Military Remains Act 1986

This Act makes it an offence to interfere with the wreckage of any crashed, sunken or stranded military aircraft or designated vessel without a licence. This is irrespective of loss of life or whether the loss occurred during peacetime or wartime. All crashed military aircraft receive automatic protection, but vessels must be individually designated. Currently, there are 21 vessels protected under this Act, both in UK waters and abroad, and it is likely that the Ministry of Defence will designate more vessels in the future.

There are two levels of protection offered by this Act, designation as a Protected Place or as a Controlled Site.

Protected Places include the remains of any aircraft which crashed while in military service or any vessel designated (by name, not location) which sank or stranded in military service after 4th August 1914. Although crashed military aircraft receive automatic status as a Protected Place, vessels need to be specifically designated by name. The location of the vessel does not need to be known for it to be designated as a Protected Place.

Diving is not prohibited on an aircraft or vessel designated as a Protected Place. However, it is an offence to conduct unlicensed diving or salvage operations to tamper with, damage, remove or unearth any remains or enter any hatch or other opening. Essentially, diving is permitted on a ‘look but don’t touch’ basis only.
Controlled Sites are specifically designated areas which encompass the remains of a military aircraft or a vessel sunk or stranded in military service within the last two hundred years. Within the controlled site it is an offence to tamper with, damage, move or unearth any remains, enter any hatch or opening or conduct diving, salvage or excavation operations for the purposes of investigating or recording the remains, unless authorised by licence. The effectively makes diving operations prohibited on these sites without a specific licence.

**The Protection of Wrecks Act 1973**

The Protection of Wrecks Act is in two sections. Section 1 provides protection for designated wrecks which are deemed to be important by virtue of their historical, archaeological or artistic value. Approximately 56 wrecks around the coast of the UK have been designated under this section of the Act. Each wreck has an exclusion zone around it and it is an offence to tamper with, damage or remove any objects or part of the vessel or to carry out any diving or salvage operation within this exclusion zone. Any activities within this exclusion zone can only be carried out under a licence granted by the Secretary of State, who receives advice from the Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites (ACHWS). There are four levels of licences: a visitor licence, a survey licence, a surface recovery licence and an excavation licence.

Administration of this Act and associated licences is the responsibility of English Heritage in England, Historic Scotland in Scotland, Cadw: Welsh Historic Monuments in Wales and the Environment and Heritage Service in Northern Ireland. Any of these organisations will be able to provide more in depth information (see useful addresses).

Section 2 of the Protection of Wrecks Act provides protection for wrecks that are designated as dangerous by virtue of their contents. Diving on these wrecks is strictly prohibited. This section of the Act is administered by the Maritime and Coastguard Agency through the Receiver of Wreck.

**Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (Section 97 of the Environment Act 1995)**

Under these Regulations, prior to work, which may damage or remove hedgerows, it is required to categorise the hedgerows according to a number of historical and ecological criteria which are laid out in the Regulations. District Councils are required to administer the Regulations and to maintain a map of hedgerows deemed to be ‘important’ under the criteria of the Regulations.

Under the regulations, a hedgerow is regarded as ‘important’ on archaeological or historical grounds if it:

- marks a pre-1850 parish or township boundary
• incorporates an archaeological feature

• is part of, or associated with, an archaeological site [N.B. An archaeological site is defined as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) or a site recorded in a County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR)]

• marks the boundary of, or is associated with, a pre-1600 estate or manor

• forms an integral part of a pre-Parliamentary enclosure field system (DOE, 1997). [N.B. The Hedgerow Regulations define a pre-Parliamentary enclosure field system as any field boundary predating the General Enclosure Act of 1845.]

National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
The NPPF sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF provides a framework within which local and neighbourhood plans can be produced. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan. The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions.

Section 12 of the NPPF Conserving and enhancing the historic environment contains the government’s policies relating to the historic environment.

• Paragraph 126 states that local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. In doing so they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.

• Paragraph 128 states that 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 asset’s importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate Desk-Based Assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
• **Paragraph 129** states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including development affecting the setting of a heritage asset). They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

• **Paragraph 135** states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application.

In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

**Paragraph 136** states that local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset, without taking all reasonable steps to ensure that the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

**Paragraph 139** states that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments are to be considered subject to the same policies as designated heritage assets.

**Paragraph 141** states, in part, that local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost, whether wholly or in part in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible, in the relevant HER or local museum.

**Guidance Notes**


Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Planning for the Historic Environment was published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) in 2010. It was accompanied by a guide, Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide, published by Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) and English Heritage in March 2010. This provided guidance on planning policy in relation to designated and non-designated heritage assets.

The subsequent publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 replaced a wide range of previous planning policy statements including PPS5. English Heritage and the Historic
Environment Forum began preparing replacement guidance, however, in the meantime, as the intent of the NPPF was considered to be similar to PPS5 and the existing guidance remained relevant, it continued to be used and ‘government endorsed’.

On 11 July 2014, English Heritage published three pieces of draft replacement guidance for consultation:

- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Note 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Note 2: Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets

Along with additional technical advice it is intended that these will replace both the ‘Planning and the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide’ and a number of other pieces of English Heritage guidance.

The new guidance is intended to condense previous guidance and includes some new provisions, such as Certificates of Lawful Proposed Works which can be used to confirm that planning permission is not required for certain works to heritage assets.

The consultation closed on 4 September 2014, and the final documents are likely to be published early in 2015. It is expected that the existing guidance will be cancelled when the new documents are published.

**Local Planning policies**

**Cotswold District Local Plan (2001-2011),** adopted in April 2006 currently provides the local planning policy framework relating to development and the historic environment. However the Secretary of State has directed that policy 12 'sites of Interest' will not be saved with effect from the 25th April 2009. The following policies are saved and will be relevant until they are superseded by local development documents.

**Policy 11: the historic landscape**

1. Within the historic landscape, development will be permitted provided it avoids harming the character, appearance or setting of historic landscape features, including parks and gardens of special historic interest.

2. Schemes to enhance, restore and improve the management of historic landscape features will be sought in connection with, and commensurate with the scale of, any development affecting them.
The District Council is preparing a new Local Plan to replace the Cotswold District Local Plan 2001-2011. The emerging new Local Plan will cover the period 2011 to 2031 and it will be the key planning policy document which guides decisions on the use and development of land in the district.

**Registered Heritage Assets**

**The Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England**

This register was compiled by English Heritage between 1984 and 1988 and is maintained by them. Parks and gardens of special historic interest have no statutory protection.

Listed parks and gardens are classified in grades to show their relative importance as follows:

- Grade I – international historic interest
- Grade II* - exceptional historic interest
- Grade II – national historic interest

The listing and grading process is designed to draw attention to important historic parks and gardens as an essential part of the nation’s heritage for use by planners, developers, statutory bodies and all those concerned with protecting the heritage. However, no new controls apply to parks and gardens in the register, nor are existing planning controls to listed building affected in any way. It follows that structures such as fountains, gates, grottos and follies within gardens can also be listed as ‘Listed Buildings’ and whole parks and gardens can also be scheduled as Ancient Monuments.

Any work that affects the physical nature of registered parks and gardens requires consultation with the Garden History Society. English Heritage should be consulted in the case of those designated as Grade I or Grade II*.

**The Register of Historic Battlefields**

This register is maintained by English Heritage and currently includes forty sites. Registered battlefields have no statutory protection. Planning Policy Guidance note 15, however, offers a degree of protection to many of the known battle sites within England.

**Guidance**

*English Heritage’s Guidance on the Setting of Heritage Assets (2011)* sets out guidance on managing change within the setting of heritage assets, including archaeological remains and historic buildings, sites, areas, and landscapes. It provides detailed advice intended to assist Government policy.
English Heritage state that “While consideration of setting is necessarily a matter of informed judgment, the aim of the guidance is to assist effective and timely decision making by ensuring it takes place within a clear framework and is as transparent and consistent as possible.”

The document defines setting as “The surrounding in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surrounding evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.”

A development can potentially affect the setting of the heritage assets within its vicinity. The setting of a heritage asset is the surrounding in which it is experienced (not necessarily everything it is inter-visible with).

Furthermore, English Heritage state that “development affecting the setting of a heritage asset is a direct environmental effect in terms of EIA definitions and may constitute a significant effect.”

**The East Midlands Archaeology Research Framework Project**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- [http://www.le.ac.uk/ulas/publications/eastmidsfw.html](http://www.le.ac.uk/ulas/publications/eastmidsfw.html)

The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda, the printed outcome of the project, was published in March 2006 (above).

The original versions of the period overviews and the county by county papers (not included in the printed volume) are presented below as the results of the first two phases in the construction of an Archaeological Research Framework for the East Midlands, a project funded jointly by English Heritage and the local authorities of the region and co-ordinated by University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS).

The Adobe Acrobat files (PDFs) published here firstly comprise the texts of the first phase of the project, a period-by-period Archaeological Resource Assessments covering the Palaeolithic to Modern periods in Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Rutland, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire. They were originally presented at a series of seminars held at County Hall, Leicester between 1998 and 2000. The texts should be viewed as draft documents which will be augmented over time with distribution maps and
bibliographic information. For a more detailed background to the project, please consult the Introductory file (PDF).

Collectively the chapters form a document, a Draft Archaeological Resource Assessment for the East Midlands which provides the basis for the second phase of the project, the writing of a synthetic publication, entitled The Archaeology of the East Midlands: an Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda for the East Midlands (now published).

Development of a research strategy document (Stage 3 of the framework) is due to begin shortly.
Gazetteer of Heritage Assets
### List of designated assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List Entry</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>List Date</th>
<th>Amend Date</th>
<th>Legacy UID</th>
<th>NGR</th>
<th>Eastings</th>
<th>Northings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1391024</td>
<td>KEN HALL FOOTWEAR LTD (FORMERLY NEWMAN AND SONS)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>23/04/2004</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>492713</td>
<td>SP 87065 78588</td>
<td>487065.48</td>
<td>278588.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051645</td>
<td>AD 410-1066 CHURCH OF SAINT MARY</td>
<td>II*</td>
<td>14/04/1976</td>
<td>230114</td>
<td>SP 87431 79037</td>
<td>487431.00</td>
<td>279037.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051658</td>
<td>UNITED REFORMED CHURCH</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>14/04/1976</td>
<td>230086</td>
<td>SP 86895 78446</td>
<td>486894.52</td>
<td>278446.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1189034</td>
<td>AD 43-410 FRONT BLOCK OF SAINT MARY'S HOSPITAL</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>14/04/1976</td>
<td>230088</td>
<td>SP 87026 78104</td>
<td>487026.00</td>
<td>278104.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372601</td>
<td>ANGLICAN CEMETERY CHAPEL AND NONCONFORMIST CEMETARY CHAPEL (INCLUDING SHARED PORCH IN KETTERING CEMETERY)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>14/04/1976</td>
<td>230087</td>
<td>SP 86944 78346</td>
<td>486944.00</td>
<td>278346.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of non-designated assets.

| MNN9831    | ROMAN ROAD                                                             | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 88256 78531 | 488255.70 | 278530.60 |
| MNN100708  | INDUSTRIAL BUILDING, GORDON WORKS (RICE & CO)                         | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 87563 78749 | 487563.10 | 278749.30 |
| MNN100774  | INDUSTRIAL BUILDING, DURBAN ROAD / SYDNEY ROAD                        | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 87695 78808 | 487694.62 | 278807.84 |
| MNN101163  | SEWAGE WORKS                                                           | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 87492 78519 | 487492.33 | 278518.81 |
| MNN101165  | SEWAGE WORKS                                                           | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 88128 78809 | 488128.00 | 278809.00 |
| MNN103220  | INDUSTRIAL SITE                                                        | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 88162 78701 | 488162.40 | 278201.20 |
| MNN103221  | FULLING MILL                                                           | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | n/a         | n/a       | n/a       |
| MNN103222  | KETTERING MILL                                                         | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | n/a         | n/a       | n/a       |
| MNN103226  | MEDIEVAL WINDMILL                                                     | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 87704 78824 | 487704.40 | 278823.90 |
| MNN103276  | SAXON CHARTER BOUNDARY                                                | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 88203 78528 | 488203.10 | 278528.50 |
| MNN111868  | WOODLAND, BARTON SEGRAVE                                               | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | n/a         | n/a       | n/a       |
| MNN152456  | POST-MED COIN                                                          | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 87499 78499 | 487498.99 | 278498.99 |
| MNN152900  | ROMAN COIN                                                             | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 87499 78499 | 487498.99 | 278498.99 |
| ENN103148  | ROCKINGHAM FOREST PROJECT                                              | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 88292 78402 | 488297.90 | 278401.50 |
| ENN103909  | BOOT AND SHOE SURVEY                                                   | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | SP 87562 78749 | 487561.80 | 278749.20 |
| ENN103910  | NORTHAMPTONSHIRE WATERMILLS SURVEY, 2001-2002                          | n/a   | n/a       | n/a        | n/a         | n/a       | n/a       |
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Figure 1 Location of proposed development site
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Figure 2 Archaeological constraints
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