

RH/1/A

Appeal by Redrow Homes Ltd

Land to east and west of Warburton Lane, Trafford

PINS reference APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720

LPA reference 98031/OUT/19

Summary Proof of Evidence of Helena Kelly, BSc MCIfA

Built Heritage and Archaeology



Qualifications and scope of evidence

- 1.1. This Proof of Evidence has been prepared by Helena Kelly. I am a Director of Heritage Archaeology Ltd. I have a degree in Heritage Conservation and have been a heritage professional for over 25 years, having worked as a local government officer for over eight years and as a consultant for the last 17 years. I am a full member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) and conduct my professional duties to the standards required by the Institute's Code of Conduct (CIfA, 2014, Code of Conduct). I am fully conversant with national policy and guidance relating to planning for the historic environment. Throughout my career I have frequently assessed the impact of development proposals on the significance of heritage assets (archaeology and built heritage).
- 1.2. I was appointed by Redrow Homes Limited in February 2020, after the appeal against the non-determination by a local planning authority of application ref. 98031/OUT/19 had been made. I have undertaken a detailed review of the documents associated with the planning application and subsequent planning appeal, made site visits and undertaken my own assessment.
- 1.3. My evidence has been prepared in accordance with the guidance of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.
- 1.4. My evidence relates to built heritage, archaeology and historic landscape character (including historic hedgerows). It addresses Trafford Council's putative reason for refusal 1.

Assessment of baseline conditions

Designated heritage assets

- 1.5. There are nine grade II listed buildings within a 1km area of search, buffered from the Appeal site boundary. There are no conservation areas within the 1km area of search. Warburton Conservation Area is immediately to the south of the 1km buffer, at its closest point. There are no grade I or II* listed buildings, scheduled monuments, registered battlefields, world heritage sites or registered parks and gardens within the 1km area of search. There are no designated heritage assets are within the Appeal site.

Non-designated heritage assets

- 1.6. The Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record (HER) identifies 63 non-designated heritage assets within a 1km area of search. Of these 25 relate to built heritage and historic

landscape character; only one is within the Appeal site, namely Warburton Park. The remaining 24 built heritage assets relate to historic buildings.

- 1.7. There are 38 non-designated heritage assets within archaeological interest. One recorded asset is within the Appeal site; kiln field, place name evidence for the site a former kiln. Two built heritage assets also have archaeological interest; Warburton Park and Birch Cottage, recorded as one of a pair of cottages, the westernmost of which is no longer extant and lies within the Appeal site. Geophysical survey has identified evidence for a former track, agricultural activity, and former field boundaries within the Appeal site.
- 1.8. In relation to archaeology, I find that the evidence provided by the desk-based sources and geophysical survey is adequate to make a professional judgement of the heritage significance of the assets to be affected and an assessment of the archaeological potential of the Appeal site. These sources indicate that there is some potential for as yet unknown heritage assets within the site. I conclude that this potential is low prior to the medieval period and then moderate to high, in relation to evidence associated with known assets of local significance dating to the medieval and post medieval period.
- 1.9. The ES Addendum has identified 'Important' hedgerows within the Appeal site. I accept the results of that assessment and note that these hedgerows are retained within the parameters plan and would not therefore be impacted by the Appeal proposal. I do not consider these hedgerows to be 'heritage assets'.
- 1.10. The historic landscape character of the land to the east of Warburton Lane is that of fields formed during the later 19th and 20th century from the reorganisation of fields created by planned enclosure during the 18th century. This historic landscape character area is much larger than the Appeal site and is of low heritage value.
- 1.11. The historic landscape character of the land to the west of Warburton Lane is also that of fields formed during the later 19th and 20th century from the reorganisation of fields created by planned enclosure during the 18th century. This planned enclosure took place within the extent of a former parkland, originally the documented medieval or early post medieval deer park and later potentially an ornamental parkland associated with the former manorial site at Warburton Park Farm. This historic landscape character area and extent of the non-designated heritage asset Warburton Park are the same and extend beyond the Appeal site.

Conclusions

- 1.12. I find that the Appeal proposal would result in a minor or negligible effect in relation to four grade II listed buildings, a minor or negligible effect in relation to five non-designated built heritage assets and a minor effect in relation to Warburton Park (a non-designated heritage with historic and archaeological interest). I also conclude a moderate or low significance of effect in relation to 'kiln field', the site of a cottage adjacent to Birch Cottage, and the track, agricultural activity and former field boundaries identified through geophysical survey.
- 1.13. Taken together the steps outlined by the NPPF (paragraph 196, in relation to the designated assets, and paragraph 197 in relation to the non-designated assets) provide the framework for the decision maker. It is not in my remit to make that balance, which I leave to evidence provided by Mr Hann.
- 1.14. I do not find that any of the non-designated heritage assets are of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument, including Warburton Park. The former parkland boundary can still be traced in part in the landscape but the park is otherwise not well preserved. Therefore, the impacts on non-designated heritage assets should be considered against paragraph 197 of the NPPF and not 195 or 196 (as directed by the footnote 63, paragraph 194 (b)).
- 1.15. I do not find that the Appellant's assessment provided in the Heritage Impact Assessment, Archaeological Desk-based Assessment or ES Addendum does not adequately address the requirements of the NPPF. Conversely, I find that both are drawn from appropriate sources and correctly reference best practice and guidance. I broadly concur with the conclusions reached by both.
- 1.16. No objection to the Appeal proposal has been raised by Historic England and I note that Trafford Council recognises in their statement of case that the harm in this case is less than substantial in relation to designated heritage assets. I note that the archaeological advisors to Trafford Council, Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service accepted that in principal further archaeological evaluation and mitigation could be secured by condition.
- 1.17. I find a very low degree of harm to the built heritage assets within the vicinity of the Appeal site. In relation to archaeological impacts, I find that the proposed approach is reasonable and proportionate to the significance of the affected assets; that being provision of a desk-based assessment and field survey (geophysical survey), with a condition to secure a further phase of field evaluation and agreement of the scope of any necessary mitigation prior to the determination of a detailed application.