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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Irchester is a civil parish and village in the county of Northamptonshire, in the Borough of Wellingborough. The settlements of Little Irchester and Knuston also lie within Irchester parish.

The historic area has been assessed in relation to current policy and advice, using industry standard methodology with specific reference to a range of proposed development sites around the three settlements.

In terms of historic landscape character, archaeological constraints and aspects of the built heritage of Irchester village, proposed development sites IR6, IR9, IR3, IR12 and IR16 are considered to be highly sensitive to change. These sites have been assessed as having both sensitive views (i.e. uninterrupted vistas synonymous with the development of the main settlement of Irchester), and archaeological and/or built heritage considerations that make sites individually an asset to the historical character of the village.

The proposed development sites of IR5 and IR15 have been assessed as having a low overall sensitivity for change, as their position topographically would be low lying and as such would not affect the views into or out of the centre of Irchester village. However, these sites do have some archaeological considerations, with the known presence of possible prehistoric or Roman subsurface remains. Subject to an agreed mitigation strategy it is unlikely archaeological constraints would affect overall site development potential.

Site A, B, IR1, IR4, IR7, IR11, IR13 and IR14 are considered to have the lowest overall sensitivity to change and would have a low impact on the historic character and setting associated with Irchester village. In terms of archaeology, built heritage and historic character setting these sites have little or no constraints and are either within the village envelope (IR1), outside of the village centre or in a position of relatively low lying land, whereby historic views and settings would not be disturbed.
Introduction

MOLA is commissioned by The Irchester, Knuston & Little Irchester Neighbourhood Plan Group to produce a Historical Landscape Assessment of the village and general area, with specific reference to a range of proposed development sites around the settlement at Little Irchester and Knuston.

The area was visited and visual inspection undertaken on two occasions in May and July 2015 by Mark Strawbridge BA (Hons) PGDipLA PGDipTP MRTPI IHBC AIfA Lead consultant MOLA and Charlotte Mecklenburgh BA MA CPIA Archaeologist MOLA.
METHODOLOGY

The contents of this report assess the effect of the proposed development sites on: the visual environment; the townscape; and heritage assets. The following sets out the methodology which draws upon the following guidance:

- The industry standard advice on the assessment of landscape impact is the Landscape Institute’s 2013 publication Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition (GLVIA3). This makes reference to historic landscapes and refers to the need for specialist input.

ASIDOHL2

The Methodology sets out stages, a summary of which follows:

STAGE 1 Compilation of an introduction of essential, contextual information.

STAGE 2 Description and quantification of the direct, physical impacts of development on the Historic Character Area(s) affected.

STAGE 3 Description and quantification of the indirect impacts of development on the Historic Character Area(s) affected.

STAGE 4 Evaluation of the relative importance of the Historic Character Area(s) (or part(s) thereof) directly and/or indirectly affected by development in relation to:

(a) the whole of the Historic Character Area(s) concerned, and/or

(b) the whole of the historic landscape area, followed by

(c) an evaluation of the relative importance of the Historic Character Area(s) concerned in the national context, and a determination of the average overall value of all the Historic Character Areas (or parts thereof) affected.

STAGE 5 Assessment of the overall significance of impact of development, and the effects that altering the Historic Character Area(s) concerned

Extracts from the technical annexe expanding the content of these stages are included as Appendix A. As we are assessing the landscape and the impact of development on it in a broader sense, this report concentrates on stages 1 – 3. A key element of the assessment is visual.

Visual Assessment

In general terms, a visual assessment involves the measurement of environmental effects as experienced by people and, therefore, involves quantitative, qualitative and perceptual measurement. They are also assessed from a professional point of view and from a particular standpoint.

The principal role of a visual assessment is to demonstrate the effects of the proposed developments through visual means and to interpret them, as they effect environments, historic settings and people’s perceptions of them through the written word. An attempt is often made to categorise the quantum of the effect and whether or not it is beneficial, although the reader is encouraged not to transpose these categorisations into statistics as a substitute for making a balanced judgement overall.

The method of assessment used, therefore, accepts that both objective and subjective judgements are made. An attempt is made to separate the subjective judgements from the objective; as such for the more subjective aspects to be of substance the author must have the necessary skills. Mark Strawbridge, principal author of this report, has developed those skills as a Chartered Town Planner and Landscape Architect, as well as being a founder member and past Vice Chair of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation and an Associate of the Chartered Institute of Archaeologists. Mark is Lead Consultant for Built Heritage at MOLA.
The Process
A number of viewpoints were investigated and representative selection made, showing a general spread of views which illustrate the historic character and landscape settings of Irchester village, Little Irchester and Knuston; and the relationships likely to arise between proposed development sites and their surroundings, listed buildings, conservation areas and important townscape vistas. The views were chosen by the author and archaeologist and co-author, Charlotte Mecklenburgh. Each of the views chosen were projected by a combination of site visit, photographic data and by incorporation into a computer model of the study area to ascertain their relationship with each of the proposed sites.

Contextual Data
In order to set the area into its full archaeological and historical context, information was collected on the known historic environment within a study area comprising an approximate radius of 2.5km from the centre of Irchester village, as held by the Historic Environment Record (HER). The HER is managed by Historic England and includes information from past investigations, local knowledge, find spots, and documentary and cartographic sources.

The study area was considered to be appropriate to characterise the historic environment of the site. Occasionally there may be reference to assets beyond this study area, where appropriate, e.g. where such assets are particularly significant and/or where they contribute to current understanding of the historic environment.

For the purposes of this report the documentary and cartographic sources, including results from any archaeological investigations in the proposed sites and study area around it were examined in order to determine the likely nature, extent and significance of any buried or above ground heritage assets that may be present within or around the areas of proposed development.

Listed Buildings
Irchester village contains a number of Grade II/II* listed buildings, most of which are in close proximity to the principle built asset, St Katharine’s church, a Grade I listed building. For the purposes of the report, St Katharine’s church has been marked on all maps, the other listed buildings within Irchester village appear in a gazetteer at the back of this report, and have been taken into consideration as part of a whole when referring to the historic character or landscape setting.

Areas of Special Interest
Irchester, Little Irchester and Knuston do not lie within designated Archaeological Priority Areas or Conservation areas as defined by the Borough Council of Wellingborough.
History of the settlement - chronological summary

Irchester historically, was spelt Yranceaster in 973 AD and Irencestre in the 1086 Domesday Book. It is suggested that the name was formed from the Old English ‘Ira’ or ‘Yra’ with the suffix ‘ceaster denoting a Roman station. (The Roman town of Irchester is sited 1km to the north of Irchester village and a roadway is known to run north/south to the west of the middle of the settlement). An alternative place name suggestion is that of an Anglo-Saxon derivation Iren Ceastre meaning ‘iron fortress’.

In the 11th century the settlement was known as Ermcestre or Archester, before eventually becoming Erchester by the 12th century. Perhaps most noteworthy is the Ironstone and Iron ore quarries, which became a prominent feature of the landscape in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a resource which occurring in abundance in this area, may also have had an influence upon the name.

The church of St Katharine’s, the first part of which was built in the 12th century, is listed Grade I, and as such is the focal point of the settlement of Irchester village. Until the Victorian era the village consisted of only one street (now known as High Street) and it is along here that some of the oldest buildings in the village can be found, dating from the 13th century onwards. These include the Manor House and its adjoining Tithe Barn, a medieval open hall house (33-39 High Street) and the original Blacksmiths’ cottage and forge (Listed buildings in Irchester village; see Gazeteer, Appendix B).

Development of the settlement

The Enclosure Map of 1769-73 (Fig 2) shows the land apportionments allocated within the early village of Irchester with land to the north of the village marked out as ‘Glebe’ land (i.e. land given over to the church to support the parish priesthood), but as yet it does not show the church or dwellings that had built up along the High Street.

The Tithe map of Irchester parish dating to 1845 (not reproduced), shows in more detail the early layout of the village1, with the majority of plots listed for use as ‘house and garden’, the Blacksmith’s cottage and forge can be seen on the tithe map at this time as well and the surrounding area is listed for use in the most part as agricultural land.

The Ordnance Survey map of 1887–89 (Fig 3) shows an altogether different picture of Irchester. By this time the village has grown into quite a substantial settlement with a concentration of dwellings along the High Street, and now various side streets as well. At this time the smaller settlements of Little Irchester and Knuston can also be seen, but still only consist of a handful of buildings in each area. What is visible from the early Ordnance Survey map is the Midland Railway line passing from the east of Irchester south-east to northwest, with a station just to the east of Irchester village (presumably where Station Road gets its name).

There is also the Northampton and Peterborough line which runs through Little Irchester, north-west of Irchester village. At this time the land between Irchester village and Little Irchester was being quarried for Ironstone, and as such a small railway network can be seen running from three sites within the quarry pits, up to what is named on the relevant map as Wellingborough Station located at Little Irchester (not to be confused with present day Wellingborough Station).

By the time of the next Ordnance Survey map of 1927 (Fig 4) Irchester has spread a little more, although perhaps not quite as noticeably as Little Irchester, which is now a village within itself. The earlier quarry rail tracks have now gone, but to the immediate west of Little Irchester there is a new railway line called the ‘Mineral Railway’ which now services the stone pits. Irchester village has grown quite substantially and now has allotments and a recreation ground on the outskirts of the developed centre. Knuston at this time still remains relatively small in comparison and the surrounding land here more noticeably is used as woodland and parkland.

The 1958-59 Ordnance survey map (Fig 5) shows the effect the quarry pits have had on the surrounding landscape, with large quarry pits to the west of Irchester village. By the time of the production of this map however the quarry that used to have the ‘Mineral Railway’ attached to it is now disused and overgrown. The quarry to the immediate south of this however still appears to be in use at this time. The small Northampton to Peterborough branch line still passes through Little Irchester, and along the Wollaston Road can be seen a row of terraced houses, with gardens, which were built during the interwar years as ‘Homes fit for Heroes’; Farnish Road, Edward Road, Alfred Street and Gray Street were also areas that underwent development of this kind.

By the time of the 1989-93 Ordnance survey map (Fig 6) both railway stations at Irchester and Little Irchester have gone, with little trace of the branch line running through Little Irchester remaining. The larger railway track running to the east of Irchester is still extant, but there is no longer a station serving Irchester village. Perhaps the most noticeable feature on the map is the sheer size and scale of Irchester, which is no longer a village, but more of an established small town. There has been a huge increase in housing to the south of the centre of Irchester, with rows of houses leading all the way west, to Irchester Country Park (formerly the ironstone quarry). There has also been the development of the Higham Road bypass to the north of Irchester, and which passes through a much larger Little Irchester.

The 1989-93 Ordnance Survey map shows very clearly the network of footpaths that feature in the landscape around the perimeters of Irchester and lead to the Country Park, all the way to Little Irchester, and in the east Knuston.

1 By its nature, the Tithe map shows only land to which Tithing was deemed to apply; any other details shown are not as reliable.
Historic Landscape CHARACTERISATION

There have been several characterisations of the historical environment of Northamptonshire, the most relevant to setting this more detailed assessment in context is the Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) carried out for and by Northamptonshire County Council (NCC et al) in 2004. This states;

The historic character of the county has been variously described and summarised over the years. Antiquarian county histories and descriptions by such as Baker and the Victoria County History were largely based upon parish or other administrative units and “focused on the parish church and the manor house; a natural tendency arising out of their frequently clerical and genteel origins” (Steane 1974, 125). More recent surveys have taken a wider perspective presenting period based, economic and social views of the County’s history.

The objective of the 2004 Landscape Assessment was to assess the county and divide it into a series of contiguous areas of similar historic character. This was undertaken, noting that ‘compared to natural features such as geology or topography, the historic character of an area is a less precise phenomenon’. It was therefore decided that for the purposes of this historic model the most suitable result would be that which proved most useful for the task at hand. The assessment went on to say that:

Historically, Northamptonshire is an ‘enclosed landscape’. The unhedged open fields, which covered the county in the medieval period, were subject to enclosure from at least the fifteenth century onwards and after the great periods of parliamentary enclosure in the 18th and 19th centuries the county saw a landscape of hedged fields and attendant road systems established. Unlike some other areas of the country, Northamptonshire has little surviving in the way of unenclosed land such as heath, common or uncultivated areas. Examination of the Historic Landscape Character (HLC) database showed approximately 75% of the county’s area covered by ‘enclosed land’. Settlements were next highest, covering approximately 7% of the area and woodland approximately 4%. Other HLC landscape types all formed less than 1% each of the area. As such the principal defining characteristic of the Northamptonshire landscape was considered to be its ‘fieldscapes’.

Following the methodology, within the HLC model, the enclosed land was subdivided principally upon its form, degree of survival and date of origin. Consequently, it was decided to sort the fieldscapes based upon these criteria and the following Historic Landscape Character Types (HLCT) were identified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non parliamentary enclosure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre 19th Century non parliamentary enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 19th Century non parliamentary enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fragmented non parliamentary enclosure Parliamentary enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Earlier parliamentary enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 19th Century parliamentary enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fragmented parliamentary enclosure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Large modern fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reinstated mineral extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Flooded mineral extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Modern fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fragmented modern fields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Woodland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irchester falls within the ‘Large Modern Fields’ (LMF) category and is identified in the NCC study, under reference HLCT7(j) as Nene Valley Side: Irchester – Wollaston.

Key Characteristics of the Large Modern Fields (LMF) category

The key characteristics of this HLCT are:

- Clay geologies
- Large irregular fieldscapes
- Small settlements and scattered isolated farmsteads
- Few deserted medieval villages or ridge and furrow earthworks
- Few Conservation Areas
At this level it is noted that the majority of individual heritage assets are not identified.

Influences of LMF on the development of the landscape

The category suggests a process of extensive field boundary removal to create single, large fields. The process is linked to changes in post-war farming practices, increased mechanisation and the introduction of fiscal measures such as the Common Agricultural Policy.

The 1950s Ordnance Survey mapping generally shows a picture that was very similar to that of the late 19th Century, indicating that the majority of these boundary changes occurred during the 1960s and 1970s.

The NCC study suggests that ‘although agricultural needs during the Second World War may have brought more fields and marginal land into arable cultivation the essential pattern of the landscape remained the same until the onset of more intensive farming. The origins of the field systems created by these measures are varied and including both non-parliamentary and parliamentary enclosed land. Because of these diverse backgrounds, the boundaries can vary in shape and form and the main defining criteria is simply the size: Many fields, according to the study, are over 10 hectares. Although large, they do not appear to be of the same order as the ‘prairie fields’ of the southeast of England.’

Principal historic elements in LMF category

Fieldscapes

The LMF character areas in general contain little or no ancient or replanted ancient woodland – a factor presumably linked to both the location and agricultural practice.

The process of agricultural intensification and mechanisation also saw a change in the patterns of agricultural buildings. Many of the farms and field barns which had been set up away from the villages as part of the parliamentary enclosure process and Victorian agricultural improvements became derelict or changed use in the latter half of the 20th Century as they became unsuitable for the larger machinery.

Settlements

Settlement within the areas generally comprises small or significantly shrunken villages. There is also a preponderance of nucleated linear settlements (of which Irchester is one), some of which show evidence of extensive re-planning or re-location in the 19th and 20th centuries. The causes of these correlations are unclear but are probably topographically determined. The changes to settlement patterns have occasionally left the earthwork remains of deserted or shrunken villages but often these have been removed as part of the modern agricultural improvements.

Communication

Modern trunk roads comprising the A14 and A45 cross the area. The other principal communication route is the Grand Union Canal, which passes through the Hemplow Hills character area.

Ridge and Furrow

Since the fields within the Character Areas are largely arable, they contain little surviving ridge and furrow cultivation. Coupled with this, the ‘grubbing out’ of hedges and other agricultural improvements was, in some locations, accompanied by the flattening of earthwork sites. However, ridge and furrow earthworks do survive in small areas of pasture immediately around some of the villages, such as at Elkington.

Monuments

There are relatively few upstanding earthwork monuments within the character areas but examples of deserted medieval villages occur at Mallows and West cotton (Nene Valley: Little Addington to Ringstead character area) and extensive manorial fishponds survive at Stoke Albany. The Roman small town at Irchester is located within the Nene Valley: Irchester to Wollaston character area.

The NCC study concludes that ‘……….it is perhaps the historic houses that dominate the areas with examples of 17th and 18th century buildings at Great Harrowden and Orlingbury and earlier architectural examples at Dingley Hall and Apethorpe’
Nene Valley: Irchester to Wollaston Character Area (HLCT7(j)  (see Fig 7)

Considering the relevant character sub-area in more detail, the NCC document states:

'The area is located on the county border and overlooks the River Nene at the north. A deep tributary stream forms the boundary between Knuston and Irchester and flows into the Nene at the east of the area. The ground slopes gently down towards the river. At its highest point at the south, the ground is capped with Boulder Clay and Glacial sands and gravels but, as the ground slopes gently down towards the Nene, Limestone and Lias Group silts and clays are exposed. Ironstone geologies in the area have generally been quarried away and the resulting reinstated ground forms part of the large modern fields that characterise the area.

The area was originally enclosed under Parliamentary Acts in the late 18th century. These original field patterns generally survived up into the late 20th century when boundary removal created the present pattern of large modern fields. Both Irchester and Wollaston have grown substantially in the 20th century predominantly due to the rise in the shoe industry.

The A45 Nene Valley Way passes through the area and the London – Birmingham railway passes through the valley immediately to the east of Irchester. Otherwise, enclosure period roads form the main communication routes in the area but previously, Roman roads led to Irchester Roman town from both the south and the east.

The earthworks of the Roman town at Irchester survive within the area. Immediately adjacent to these are later earthworks associated with the deserted hamlet of Chester-on-the-Water. The hamlet appears to have become depopulated over a number of centuries and eventually became incorporated into the grounds of Chester House in the 18th century.

A larger hall survives at Knuston and, as at Irchester, within its 18th century grounds lay the remains of the township’s deserted medieval village but no significant ridge and furrow survives here or indeed elsewhere within the area.

Part of the area around Irchester Roman town was subject to ironstone quarrying and the remains of an extraction tramway still survive. The ground has subsequently been reinstated as both agricultural land and woodland plantation (now part of Irchester Country Park).
Fig 7 Extract from Fig 1 of the HLCA (2004) Northamptonshire Historic Character Types

The proximate landscape around the 3 settlements, where not affected by quarrying and other industrialised development, fits the above description completely.
**ARCHAEOLOGY**

**Prehistoric**

There is fairly extensive evidence for prehistoric activity within the vicinity of Irchester, with sites of prehistoric settlements to be found to the immediate north of proposed sites IR12/IR3, north-west, south-west and south-east of the village. There have also been, recorded within the HER, a number of Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age finds. There are listings within the HER for a round barrow, ditch, enclosure, ring ditch and trackway of possible prehistoric or Roman date within the proposed sites to the south of Irchester IR5/IR15. These sites also contain findspots of an undated burnt stone pit as well as a number of prehistoric flints and hand axes. Iron Age activity is limited largely to the north of Irchester, immediately north of sites IR12/IR3 there is evidence of a possible Iron Age roundhouse.

**Roman**

To the north of Irchester village is the known Roman settlement of Irchester town, located 2km south of Wellingborough. The Roman road route Durobrivae (Water Newton) to Dungee Corner is projected to run north-south to the west of modern day Irchester village, approximately in line with the Wollaston Road. The extension of the road to the north continues up towards Kettering and beyond, to the south the road appears to follow the county boundary between Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire through to the Dungee Corner. The first stretch of road running due south from the old Roman town to where it aligns with the Wollaston Road is disused and most likely marked by hedgerows, where not destroyed by the ironstone workings (Margary 1967, 188). The line of the road is projected to cross through proposed sites IR12/IR3 and can be seen on Fig 9. To the east of proposed development IR7 the HER records a possible Roman settlement and ditch system, with Roman subsurface remains also showing up in plots IR5/IR15. Irchester at this time acted as a local market, administrative focus and religious centre for one of the most affluent areas of the region and lay at a key nodal point in a wider communication network, with Irchester village falling onto the wider hinterland of the area (Taylor, 2000).

**Saxon**

There is little evidence for Saxon occupation in the area of the town (Roman Irchester), but a number of earlier discoveries suggest activity continued into the early 5th century. Little evidence has been found for continued occupation of Roman Irchester at the end of the Roman occupation except for a post late 4th century timber structure built against the interior of the southern town defences. Aside from this, the HER records possible Saxon remains within the south centre of Irchester village 200m north of IR7. This evidence could point towards some degree of post Roman occupation of the area, but not enough to have significantly affected the development of the area in the early medieval period (Taylor, 2000).

**Medieval**

Medieval activity in the area is well documented with the church of St Katharine’s, the first part of which was built in the 12th century, being the focal point. There is a record of two medieval manor houses within Irchester village, one next to the church, and another to the south of plot IR6. The HER records several scattering of medieval pottery remains throughout the village and around the peripheries, as well as extensive evidence for ridge and furrow cultivation in the western extent of proposed site IR12/IR3. Site IR6, located just to the east of the centre of Irchester village is recorded as having medieval closes and a concentration of medieval pottery within it, and immediately to the south aerial photographs have shown earthworks associated with the medieval village.

**The visual character of the village environs**

Development of the main settlement of Irchester has been predominantly to the south and south west, firstly creating in the form of ‘ribbon development’ along primary routes in the earlier part of the C20th and then infilling in depth with cul-de-sac estate development during the mid- to later part. The areas to the north-west, north, north-east and east remain undeveloped and, with the exception of the removal of hedgerows and the intervention of the A45 improvements, are largely as they were in the C19th and before.

Little Irchester is a much later settlement from which there is no visual or causal link with the main village. Knuston is a farmstead/hamlet, associated with Knuston Hall which has been the subject of conversion and minor additional development in recent times. Both settlements are detached from Irchester proper and are not wholly relevant to the development of the main settlement. Due to the topography of the area, there is intervisibility between the original linear settlement and the Knuston group but not with Little Irchester.

The wider landscape has gone through phases of change, industrialisation and urbanisation. Much of the area to the west and south-west of the village was quarried for ironstone. The land has been reclaimed to agriculture in part and the Irchester Country Park. There is very limited intervisibility between the west side of the study area and the east.

A defining urban feature of the local landscape is the spire of the Church of St Katharine’s. This study in particular seeks to establish the setting of this Grade I listed historic asset and the relationship of it to the character of the historic landscape.

---

1 [https://ulasnews.wordpress.com/2014/11/10/evidence-of-medieval-iron-production-found-at-irchester-northamptonshire/] reviews archaeological investigation suggesting medieval iron ore production in the vicinity of Station Road.
Character and connections

There was little causal or visual ink between the Roman centre and the village; the church of course was built many centuries later in the Late Medieval period.

Little Irchester is largely a modern era construct. There is no causal or actual relationship of this to the principal asset. Knuston is similarly not within the broader setting of the church.

Knuston (or Knoston) is a homestead settlement, and is mentioned as far back as the Domesday Book, the settlement along with the post-medieval manor of Knuston Hall (the oldest incarnation being Hill House, dating to the 1600s) post-dates the church (VCH, Northants, Vol. iv, 21–27). It has however expanded organically over time. Views of the historic ‘core’ of the main village are available, however, from the higher land to the north and east of Knuston (i.e. from a footpath beside the water tower). The character of all of the area to the east of Irchester contributes to the setting of the settlement and the church from this viewpoint.

The southern and western edge of Irchester proper is greatly changed from its original relationship to the village and constitutes a suburban landscape at present. Views of the church spire are limited and almost all taken over a proximate swathe of C20th estate-type development. Directly from the south (Wollaston Road area) the landscape setting (i.e. backdrop) of the village and consequently the church spire has been affected by a wind farm on the mid-horizon and the presence of some large shed structures forming an intermediate horizon further to the north and east respectively.

The immediate area to the north and north-west of Irchester has remained much the same as it is now since the place was founded3 and as such contributes greatly to the significance of the church. This part of the study area is, we suggest, very vulnerable to change and as such none of it should be developed if the historic setting and significance is to be retained.

Similarly more proximate views across from the east, e.g. off Station Road, are sensitive but some erosion has taken place in the 20th century infill in the form of Biscay Close, a rather incongruous cul-de-sac, which replaced the factory complex site opposite Parsons Road.

Views from within the historic core are not affected by peripheral development although views out could well be. The very proximate setting of the church is currently formed in part by mid-C20th development and the former farm group which is an ad hoc business park/industrial estate.

Viewpoints are shown on Fig 8

Church of St Katharine’s, Irchester

St Katharine’s is described in the national register thus:

Grade I listed church, dating to the late 12th century, with later 13th and 14th century additions. Constructed of regular coursed limestone with ironstone and ashlar dressings, the tower is banded limestone and ironstone ashlar, with lead roof. Aisled nave, chancel, south porch and west tower. South elevation chancel of three window range one with two light perpendicular window to far right and two three-light perpendicular windows with four centred heads and carved label stops. South door between windows has trefoil head and carved label stops.

Significance of Assets affected

Please see Appendix C for methodology for determining significance.

Assets likely to be affected are:

- The setting of St Katharine’s Church
- The setting of other listed buildings
- The setting of non-designated assets

It should be noted that ‘setting’, whilst an asset, does not have significance in its own right, but contributes to the significance of the asset(s) to which it refers. (NPPF2012/NPPG2014)

The significance of below ground assets would relate to individual sites to differing degrees. An assessment of this is not undertaken in this exercise.

3 Minus a few hedgerows.
Relevant Planning Policy Basis

Please see Appendix D for relevant Legislation, Policy and Advice, which includes:

- The Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended (The Act)
- Emerging Local Planning Policies
- The emerging Neighbourhood Plan
- The History in the View 2011 (Historic England)
- GPA Note No.3 The Setting of Heritage Assets 2015 (Historic England)
- Supplementary advice (Local Authority)

Development Pressure

In the process of formulating development plans for the district, a number of development sites for housing have been proposed in and around the periphery of the village, at Little Irchester and to a lesser extent at Knuston. Sites are shown on Fig 1.
STAGE 2: DIRECT, PHYSICAL IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE STUDY AREA

With the exception of the potential impact by disturbance and removal of below-ground archaeology, there will be no physical impact on heritage assets per se, as below ground heritage assets may be ameliorated by a suitable mitigation strategy. Historical character settings and vistas however can only be protected by the appropriate direction of development change.

There will be an impact on the form of the settlement, the extent of which will depend on the selected location. Historically, development of the settlement has taken place towards the south and west of the original village, with Little Irchester and Knuston as ‘satellites’. In so far as it is important in terms of the character of the place, it is considered that development should ideally follow that broad precedent.
STAGE 3: INDIRECT IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE STUDY AREA

Indirect impacts are most likely to be on the character of the settlement, the setting of the church in its context and its significance.

Assessment of the study area by view

Given the proximate and relatively enclosed nature of the surrounding landscape, it was not thought necessary to undertake the full Zone of Visual Influence ZVI process (ref: GLVIA3) to ascertain potential viewpoints and then test them.

Middle-distance viewpoints are limited to elevated views from the east. Publicly accessible viewpoints focussed on the church tower were identified by observation, map-work and site visit. Selected principal view zones are shown on Fig 8, and are numbered accordingly with the viewpoints here. A selection of photographs have been taken for areas within the view zones (excluding view zones 8 & 9, for which there was found to be no inter-visibility between the given zone and the primary built asset), and while the view zones are located approximately with a star symbol, it is noted here that this represents a zone in which a number of views may have been noted, and as such does not mark the exact location of a photograph and associated view. Moreover, they are used as a guide to show the range of views taken within a given view zone (these views can be seen in Fig 8 in black hatching).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Commentary and sensitivity to change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chester Road, facing south towards village</td>
<td>Vistas from this point extend across plot IR16, and the eastern edge of IR12 and IR3. They take in uninterrupted views of St Katharine’s church and would be highly sensitive to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Station Road facing north from the centre of the village to Knuston Lodge Farm</td>
<td>Views along this stretch of road span across proposed sites IR6 and IR9. The vista from Station Road directly north between the 2 turnings for Arkwright Road provides the most uninterrupted and complete views of St Katharine’s church. This marked set of views view is particularly sensitive to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Views looking south-west from the public footpath at Knuston (behind water tower) towards Irchester village</td>
<td>Panoramic views over open land, the church in the centre in context. This view is particularly sensitive to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Views from the public footpaths from the eastern edge of Irchester Country Park, east towards the rear of St Katharine’s church</td>
<td>Views within the country park are truncated. Emerging from the woodland and along the public footpath travelling generally in an easterly direction there is firstly a screened view of the church with undeveloped cultivated land in the foreground, then views taken in series along the footpath network. This is a traditionally open set of views and the whole view ‘zone’ in this part of the setting of the church is particularly sensitive to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>View from Farnish Road adjacent to trackway to Irchester Grange cottages looking north.</td>
<td>The church punctuates the skyline from this viewpoint, with suburban development in the foreground. The setting of the church in this view has been affected by the wind farm development beyond. Development in the foreground would not have a material impact on this view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>View from entrance to footpath off Woodland Road looking north-east</td>
<td>There is a view of the church tower in the middle distance with suburban development in the foreground, from the road. Views taken in series whilst moving north east along the footpath path align with the church tower. If the route of the footpath is retained this view would be largely unaffected, framed by development either side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Proximate view of the church looking north</td>
<td>This is the immediate setting of the church, and includes the 2 listed Manor buildings as well as C19th and C20th development. Parsons Hall Industrial Estate (IR1) if redeveloped appropriately would have a positive impact on the setting of the church. There is some limited inter-visibility with the higher land around the Water Tower, over IR1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment by Site

Proposed development sites as identified through the planning process have been assessed as follows, and can be seen on Fig 9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Assessment (Heritage)</th>
<th>Site ref. No. Site A</th>
<th>Site Address: Land off London Road, Little Irchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Potential assets which may be affected:</td>
<td>St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Significance:</td>
<td>Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Impact:</td>
<td>Low impact considered with regards to views of Irchester village and St Katharine’s church, from site visit evidence – St Katharine’s church was not visible from this site (along Gipsy Lane, view across site to north-east). Low potential for archaeological remains/buried heritage assets. Ecological setting has low to moderate impacts - possibly some wild life and hedgerow concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Conclusions:</td>
<td>Low sensitivity to change or development posing no further interruption to the historic landscape of Irchester village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Assessment (Heritage)</th>
<th>Site ref. No. Site B</th>
<th>Site Address: Knuston Home Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Potential assets which may be affected:</td>
<td>St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Significance:</td>
<td>Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Impact:</td>
<td>Impact on historic landscape setting considered to be low from site visit, mainly due to already existing buildings. Land to the north of the site with views towards Irchester are sensitive, but lie outside of the site area. Light industrial use of the land concludes that impact to local wildlife would be low. Low potential for buried heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Conclusions:</td>
<td>This site is not considered to interrupt the historical setting of Irchester or views of St Katharine’s church, and has a low sensitivity to change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Assessment (Heritage)</th>
<th>Site ref. No. IR1</th>
<th>Site Address: Parsons Hall Industrial Estate, Irchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Potential assets which may be affected:</td>
<td>St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Significance:</td>
<td>Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Impact:</td>
<td>Site IR1 is a brownfield site in commercial use. A visit to the site shows that it is within a low-lying area and as such would not adversely impact upon the historic setting of St Katharine’s church, or interrupt views from Station Road, west across the valley towards the church. Low potential for buried heritage assets, although some standing building recording may be required. Ecologically low impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Conclusions:</td>
<td>This site is considered to be a low sensitivity location for change/development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Assessment (Heritage)</th>
<th>Site ref. No. IR4</th>
<th>Site Address: South of Gipsy Lane, Irchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Potential assets which may be affected:</td>
<td>St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Significance:</td>
<td>Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Impact:</td>
<td>Site IR4 is considered to be of low impact with regards to the historic vistas concerning Irchester village. St Katharine’s church is not visible from this site. Due to the former land use being an ironstone quarry, buried heritage asset potential is low. Ecological impact would be low to moderate with some tree and hedgerow sensitivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Conclusions:</td>
<td>Considered to be one of the lowest areas of sensitivity/location for change, with low impact on historic landscape/character setting of Irchester village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Assessment (Heritage)

**Site ref. No.** IR5 + IR15  
**Site Address:** Land south of Woodlands Road (IR 5) & Land West of Farndish Road (IR15), Irchester

A **Potential assets which may be affected:** St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)  
B **Significance:** Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area  
C **Impact:** Sites IR5 + IR15 would have a low impact on the historical landscape and setting of Irchester village, and St Katharine’s church, owing to the fact that the topography of the land is fairly low lying and as such would not interrupt the views of the village to any greater extent than the already existing housing estates.  
D **Conclusions:** These two sites are considered to be in areas of low sensitivity for possible new housing.

### Site Assessment (Heritage)

**Site ref. No.** IR6  
**Site Address:** Land north of Station Road, Irchester

A **Potential assets which may be affected:** St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)  
B **Significance:** Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area  
C **Impact:** Site IR6 would impose a high impact upon the historic landscape and character setting of Irchester village if developed. Sensitive views of St Katharine’s church along Station Road and west across the valley just before entering the village of Knuston would be interrupted.  
D **Conclusions:** IR 6 is considered to be a highly sensitive location

### Site Assessment (Heritage)

**Site ref. No.** IR7  
**Site Address:** Land off Farndish Road, Irchester

A **Potential assets which may be affected:** St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)  
B **Significance:** Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area  
C **Impact:** The development of site IR7 would have little impact on the historic character setting of the village, owing to an earlier wind farm development on the opposite side of the hill, which has already seriously eroded the historic setting of the church. Further to this, large industrial sheds to the east of the village, also visible from this plot have affected the historic views across the village and beyond. Views out of the village would not be affected by development here as the land is low lying, behind already existing 20th century housing estates.  
D **Conclusions:** This site is considered to be of low sensitivity to change

### Site Assessment (Heritage)

**Site ref. No.** IR9  
**Site Address:** Land north of Station Road, Irchester

A **Potential assets which may be affected:** St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)  
B **Significance:** Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area  
C **Impact:** The impact of change here would be high, interrupting sensitive views of St Katharine’s church, blocking one of the only view points from which St Katharine’s church can be seen in entirety from the wider public realm.  
D **Conclusions:** This site is considered highly sensitive to the historical landscape and character setting of Irchester village and St Katharine’s church.
### Site Assessment (Heritage)
**Site ref. No.** IR3  
**Site Address:** Land between Bakers Crescent & Chester Road, Irchester

**A** Potential assets which may be affected: St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)  

**B** Significance: Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area  

**C** Impact: The location of site IR3 to the north of Irchester has limited views of the village, with only the spire of St Katharine’s church visible from a distance. Due to the topography of the land, Irchester village is not particularly visible from the Higham Road to the north. However, the close proximity of public rights of way to and across the site renders the area sensitive to change; less so on the western extent, but critically at the eastern extremity. E.g. Development of the north-eastern area of the site that lies to the north of IR16 would interrupt a longstanding historical view of St Katharine’s church looking west from Chester Road.  

**D** Conclusions: Site IR3 is highly sensitive to change

### Site Assessment (Heritage)
**Site ref. No.** IR12  
**Site Address:** Land between Bakers Crescent & Chester Road, Irchester

**A** Potential assets which may be affected: St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)  

**B** Significance: Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area  

**C** Impact: The location of site IR12 to the north of Irchester has limited views of the village, with only the spire of St Katharine’s church visible from distance. Due to the topography of the land, Irchester village is not particularly visible from the Higham Road to the north. However, the close proximity of public rights of way to and across these sites renders the area sensitive to change; less so on the western extent, but critically at the eastern extremity. E.g. Development of the north-eastern area of the site that lies to the north of IR16 would interrupt a longstanding historical view of St Katharine’s church looking west from Chester Road.  

**D** Conclusions: Site IR12 is highly sensitive to change

### Site Assessment (Heritage)
**Site ref. No.** IR11 + IR13  
**Site Address:** Land south of Station Road, Irchester

**A** Potential assets which may be affected: St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)  

**B** Significance: Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area  

**C** Impact: Sites IR11 + IR13 would be of low impact, with the natural topography of the land dipping down towards the cut of the railway line. As such any development within this site area is unlikely to interrupt the historic views of the village of Irchester. Cropmarks have been recorded within the site area and as such there may be a moderate potential for buried heritage assets.  

**D** Conclusions: An area of low sensitivity to change

### Site Assessment (Heritage)
**Site ref. No.** IR14  
**Site Address:** Land south of Station Road, Irchester

**A** Potential assets which may be affected: St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)  

**B** Significance: Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area  

**C** Impact: Site IR14 would have a low impact upon the historical landscape of Irchester village, owing to the fact that it would be positioned next to the already existing 20th century housing estates to the east of Irchester. Local footpaths that follow across this land are within the topographical dip that leads down to the railway cuttings, meaning that views of Irchester and St Katharine’s are limited.  

**D** Conclusions: With already existing infrastructure for the existing housing estate immediately to the west of the site, this area is considered to have low sensitivity to change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site Assessment (Heritage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site ref. No. IR16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Address: Land of High Street, Irchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><strong>Potential assets which may be affected:</strong> St Katharine’s Church (Grade I listed), and setting of; ecology of area, buried heritage (archaeology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><strong>Significance:</strong> Setting, historic landscape, buried heritage assets, local ecology of area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong> Site IR16 is located within a highly sensitive area, and development within this site would impact on the historic landscape and character views of Irchester Village and St Katharine’s church, with views from Chester Road south across the fields providing an impressive vista of St Katharine’s church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong> Site IR16 is considered to be a highly sensitive area, vulnerable to development owing to the historic views of St Katharine’s church.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Conclusions

In considerations of historic landscape characterisation, archaeological constraints and aspects of the built heritage of Irchester village, IR6, IR9, IR3+IR12 and IR16 are, in the main considered to be highly sensitive to change, and least compatible with new development proposals. These sites have been assessed as having both sensitive views (i.e. uninterrupted vistas synonymous with the development of the main settlement of Irchester), and archaeological and/or built heritage considerations that make the particular plot an asset to the historical character of the village.

The sites of IR5 and IR15 have been assessed as having a low overall sensitivity for change, as their position topographically would be low lying and as such would not affect the views into or out of the centre of Irchester village. However, these sites do have some archaeological considerations, with the known presence of possible prehistoric or Roman subsurface remains. Within sites IR15, IR5 and IR7 there is a water main running west-east along the northern section of the sites. This trench has been assessed by the Cambridge Archaeological Unit (Hogan, 2012)⁴, and was found to return no archaeological features along offtakes excavated along the trench route. However, due to required maintenance access to the pipeline there are development restrictions to the northern extents of these sites.

Site A, B, IR1, IR4, IR7, IR11, IR13 and IR14 are considered to have the lowest overall sensitivities to change and would have a low impact on the historic character and setting associated with Irchester village. In terms of archaeology, built heritage and historic character setting these sites have little or no archaeological constraints and are either outside of the village centre or in a position of low lying land, whereby historic views and settings would not be disturbed.

⁴ Local knowledge suggests finds associated with this archaeological investigation, however report records no archaeological deposits or features; http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archiveDS/archiveDownload?r=arch-822-1dissemination/pdf/cambridg3-127582_1.pdf
### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alluvium</td>
<td>Sediment laid down by a river. Can range from sands and gravels deposited by fast flowing water and clays that settle out of suspension during overbank flooding. Other deposits found on a valley floor are usually included in the term alluvium (e.g. peat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Priority Area/Zone</td>
<td>Areas of archaeological priority, significance, potential or other title, often designated by the local authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickearth</td>
<td>A fine-grained silt believed to have accumulated by a mixture of processes (e.g. wind, slope and freeze-thaw) mostly since the Last Glacial Maximum around 17,000 BP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.P.</td>
<td>Before Present, conventionally taken to be 1950.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>2,000–600 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building recording</td>
<td>Recording of historic buildings (by a competent archaeological organisation) is undertaken to document buildings, or parts of buildings, which may be lost as a result of demolition, alteration or neglect, amongst other reasons. Four levels of recording are defined by Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME) and Historic England. Level 1 (basic visual record); Level 2 (descriptive record); Level 3 (analytical record); and Level 4 (comprehensive analytical record)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built heritage</td>
<td>Upstanding structure of historic interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colluvium</td>
<td>A natural deposit accumulated through the action of rainwash or gravity at the base of a slope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation area</td>
<td>An area of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. Designation by the local authority often includes controls over the demolition of buildings; strengthened controls over minor development; and special provision for the protection of trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop marks</td>
<td>Marks visible from the air in growing crops, caused by moisture variation due to subsurface features of possible archaeological origin (i.e. ditches or buried walls).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-and-cover trench</td>
<td>Method of construction in which a trench is excavated down from existing ground level and which is subsequently covered over and/or backfilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut feature</td>
<td>Archaeological feature such as a pit, ditch or well, which has been cut into the then-existing ground surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devensian</td>
<td>The most recent cold stage (glacial) of the Pleistocene. Spanning the period from c. 70,000 years ago until the start of the Holocene (10,000 years ago). Climate fluctuated within the Devensian, as it did in other glacials and interglacials. It is associated with the demise of the Neanderthals and the expansion of modern humans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early medieval</td>
<td>AD 410–1066. Also referred to as the Saxon period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation (archaeological)</td>
<td>A limited programme of non-intrusive and/or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation (archaeological)</td>
<td>A programme of controlled, intrusive fieldwork with defined research objectives which examines, records and interprets archaeological remains, retrieves artefacts, ecofacts and other remains within a specified area. The records made and objects gathered are studied and the results published in detail appropriate to the project design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Chance find/antiquarian discovery of artefact. The artefact has no known context, is either residual or indicates an area of archaeological activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>Ground investigation, typically in the form of boreholes and/or trial/test pits, carried out for engineering purposes to determine the nature of the subsurface deposits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Weathered/soliflucted periglacial deposit (i.e. moved downslope through natural processes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage asset</td>
<td>A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Heritage assets are the valued components of the historic environment. They include designated heritage assets and assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic environment assessment
A written document whose purpose is to determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature of the historic environment resource/heritage assets within a specified area.

Historic Environment Record (HER)
Archaeological and built heritage database held and maintained by the County authority. Previously known as the Sites and Monuments Record.

Holocene
The most recent epoch (part) of the Quaternary, covering the past 10,000 years during which time a warm interglacial climate has existed. Also referred to as the ‘Postglacial’ and (in Britain) as the ‘Flandrian’.

Iron Age
800 BC–AD 43

Later medieval
AD 1066 – 1500

Last Glacial Maximum
Characterised by the expansion of the last ice sheet to affect the British Isles (around 18,000 years ago), which at its maximum extent covered over two-thirds of the present land area of the country.

Locally listed building
A structure of local architectural and/or historical interest. These are structures that are not included in the Secretary of State’s Listing but are considered by the local authority to have architectural and/or historical merit.

Listed building
A structure of architectural and/or historical interest. These are included on the Secretary of State’s list, which affords statutory protection. These are subdivided into Grades I, II*, and II (in descending importance).

Made Ground
Artificial deposit. An archaeologist would differentiate between modern made ground, containing identifiably modern inclusion such as concrete (but not brick or tile), and undated made ground, which may potentially contain deposits of archaeological interest.

Mesolithic
12,000 – 4,000 BC

National Record for the Historic Environment (NHRE)
National database of archaeological sites, finds and events as maintained by Historic England in Swindon. Generally not as comprehensive as the country HER.

Neolithic
4,000 – 2,000 BC

Ordnance Datum
A vertical datum used by Ordnance Survey as the basis for deriving altitudes on maps.

Palaeo-environmental
Related to past environments, i.e. during the prehistoric and later periods. Such remains can be of archaeological interest, and often consist of organic remains such as pollen and plant macro fossils which can be used to reconstruct the past environment.

Palaeochannel
A former/ancient watercourse

Pleistocene
Geological period pre-dating the Holocene.

Post-medieval
AD 1500–present

Preservation by
Archaeological mitigation strategy where archaeological remains are fully excavated and recorded archaeologically and the results published. For remains of lesser significance, preservation by record might comprise an archaeological watching brief.

Preservation in situ
Archaeological mitigation strategy where nationally important (whether Scheduled or not) archaeological remains are preserved in situ for future generations, typically through modifications to design proposals to avoid damage or destruction of such remains.

Registered Historic Parks and Gardens
England is compiled and maintained by Historic England.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual</strong></td>
<td>When used to describe archaeological artefacts, this means not in situ, i.e. Found outside the context in which it was originally deposited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roman</strong></td>
<td>AD 43–410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheduled Monument</strong></td>
<td>An ancient monument or archaeological deposits designated by the Secretary of State as a ‘Scheduled Ancient Monument’ and protected under the Ancient Monuments Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site</strong></td>
<td>The area of proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site codes</strong></td>
<td>Unique identifying codes allocated to archaeological fieldwork sites, e.g. evaluation, excavation, or watching brief sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study area</strong></td>
<td>Defined area surrounding the proposed development in which archaeological data is collected and analysed in order to set the site into its archaeological and historical context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solifluction, Soliflucted</strong></td>
<td>Creeping of soil down a slope during periods of freeze and thaw in periglacial environments. Such material can seal and protect earlier landsurfaces and archaeological deposits which might otherwise not survive later erosion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stratigraphy</strong></td>
<td>A term used to define a sequence of visually distinct horizontal layers (strata), one above another, which form the material remains of past cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truncate</strong></td>
<td>Partially or wholly remove. In archaeological terms remains may have been truncated by previous construction activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watching brief (archaeological)</strong></td>
<td>An archaeological watching brief is 'a formal programme of observation and investigation conducted during any operation carried out for non-archaeological reasons.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Hogan, S, 2012, Grafham Resilience Flow Trial, Northamptonshire; Archaeological Scheme of observation, investigation, recording, analysis and publication, Cambridge Archaeological Unit, University of Cambridge.


Other Sources

Historic Environment Record
Historic England
Internet – web-published sources
Northamptonshire Record Office

Cartographic sources

Irchester & Knuston Enclosure Award Map 1769+1773 (Northamptonshire Records Office)
Tithe Map of Irchester parish 1845 (Northamptonshire Records Office)

Ordinance Survey maps
Ordinance Survey 1st edition 25” map (1887–89).

Engineering/Architects drawings
ACD Ecology, Arboriculture, Landscape Architecture, Irchester Neighbourhood Plan (dwg. No. PRI19116, March 2014)
Appendix A - Stages in the ASIDOHL2 process

Stages in the ASIDOHL2 process

**STAGE 1: Contextual information**
The first stage of the ASIDOHL2 process is to gather essential, contextual information that should provide and form the introduction to the report. This information should include:

(a) A brief summary description of the development, with a map at the appropriate scale showing its location in relation to the historic landscape area on the Register.
(b) A statement about the context in which the ASIDOHL2 is being done, for example, as part of EIA, a feasibility study for development, as part of evidence to be presented at a Public Inquiry etc.
(c) If relevant, a brief summary of the planning history of the site (details of any previous permissions, appeals etc.).
(d) References to any related assessments, for example, an archaeological assessment or a previous landscape assessment etc.
(e) A summary of the national, regional and local planning policies in relation to historic landscapes in the development area (NPPF/NPPG advice, emerging Local Development Plans, etc.)
(f) In the relevant cases, an indication of the provisional status of any Historic Character Areas.
(g) An indication of the confidence levels of the data upon which the ASIDOHL2 is based and any resulting limits assigned to impact predictions, either because of techniques used or because of the limits of information available, timing or personnel used, inability to gain access to the land or data involved, and whether there are any contingent, or other, liabilities, issues of confidentiality, copyright relating to the data etc.
(h) A statement on the qualifications and experience of the person(s) responsible for undertaking the ASIDOHL2 and a full declaration of the nature of any contractor-client relationships.
(i) A description of the process used, work undertaken, the area over which impacts have been assessed, sources consulted, site visits etc., and an indication of the ASIDOHL2 stages undertaken.

Description(s) of the Historic Character Area(s) affected and any other relevant supporting information, maps, photographs etc. should normally be included as appendices to the ASIDOHL2 report

**STAGE 2 Assessment of direct, physical impact of development**
The second stage of the ASIDOHL2 process and report should describe and, as far as possible, quantify the direct, physical impacts of the development on the Historic Character Area(s) affected using the following framework.

A map should be provided at the appropriate scale showing the precise location and extent of the development, including any preliminary site works or supporting infrastructure necessary, in relation to the Historic Character Area(s) directly affected.
Where there are large amounts of information or clarity is
an issue, supplementary map(s) can be provided to show the
location of Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings,
Conservation Areas, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic
Interest, and any other coincident statutory, nature
conservation or landscape designations; the location of any
known, non-scheduled archaeological sites and monuments,
non-listed historic buildings or structures; traditional
boundaries, or any other key historic elements or
characteristics identified in the characterization report.

Wherever possible, the Primary Record Numbers (PRNs)
assigned in the regional Historic Environment Records should be
quoted.

Direct, physical impacts should be described and quantified in three ways, namely:

(a) In absolute terms
This should be expressed as a statement indicating the
actual percentage or proportion of the surface area of the
Historic Character Area that is directly affected, for example,
'55% (or just over half) of the area of Historic Character
Area X will be permanently lost or removed by development.'
(In some cases, the percentage surface area affected could
be greater than the physical extent of the development if,
for example, a construction land-take greater in area than,
or separate from, the development site is required for
extensive preliminary site works, ancillary developments
or supporting infrastructures.)

(b) In relative terms
This should be expressed with statements indicating the
percentages or proportions of the known resource (i.e. the key
elements or characteristics identified by characterization) that
will be permanently lost or removed by development, for
example, 'In Historic Character Area X, 25% (or a quarter)
of, for example, the number of known archaeological sites;
the extent of historic land use or pattern in area A; the length
of linear feature B, and so on, will be permanently lost or
removed by development'.

e.g. ASIDOHL2 STAGE 2: GRADES OF DIRECT PHYSICAL IMPACTS
75–100% permanently lost or removed Very Severe;
50–74% permanently lost or removed Severe;
30–49% permanently lost or removed Considerable;
15–29% permanently lost or removed Moderate;
5–14% permanently lost or removed Slight;
0–4% permanently lost or removed Very Slight.

As well as the intrinsic importance or value recorded in
step (b), account should also be taken of the extrinsic
importance of elements or characteristics within the
landscape of the Historic Character Area. Extrinsic
importance reflects the contribution the individual element
or characteristic makes to the value of the Historic Character
Area as a whole. The Historic Character Area will have a value in excess of the combined values of the individual elements or characteristics that make it up, on the basis that "the sum of the whole is greater than the sum of the individual parts". Elements or characteristics need not necessarily be similar, and may even be quite diverse, but as part of a landscape, they will have a measure of extrinsic, as well as of intrinsic, importance.

**STAGE 3 Assessment of indirect impacts of development**

Clearly, a finite area of land will be directly and physically affected by a development, but a much greater area will be indirectly affected through the fragmentation of Historic Character Areas, visual intrusion and encroachment that could devalue the historic landscape area as a whole.

The importance of 'setting' is a well-established criterion in the assessment of the significance of impact of development on Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Listed Buildings, and the same criterion should be applied to Historic Character Areas and to historic landscape areas on the Register.

There is no statutory definition of setting, but it could be considered as having two principal dimensions. **Firstly**, there is the immediate or essential setting which, in the case of a building, would be the ancillary land used with it or the curtilage. **Secondly**, there is the wider setting that, in the case of a building, may or may not be legally attached to it, may or may not be used with it, and is often part of the built environment or part of the countryside.

Settings may not be as easily defined for field monuments, but it may be possible to make reasonable inferences based on archaeological, or historical, information. Setting should not be interpreted too narrowly, and for the purposes of this process, impacts on settings will be categorized as 'indirect' impacts.

The third part of the ASIDOH2 report should, therefore, describe and quantify as objectively as possible the indirect impacts of the development on all Historic Character Areas affected.

Indirect impacts can be categorized as being mainly physical or visual in nature.

**Indirect (non-physical) visual impacts**

These can occur to elements as a result of one, or a combination, of the following factors:

(i) Visual impacts on elements from which a development can be seen (considered up to its maximum height). The impact might be on 'views to' or 'views from' these elements, and it should be assessed with reference to key historic viewpoints and essential settings. These should be considered in relation to a site's original character and function, as well as to the vantage points and visual experience of a visitor today.

Determining these aspects in relation to field monuments can be difficult, especially where the key historic viewpoints and essential settings recognized today may be different to those that were important to the original builders or inhabitants of a site. However, it might be possible to make reasonable assumptions on the basis of what is known archaeologically, or historically, about how certain types of monuments originally functioned, or were regarded.
Key viewpoints should also include those that subsequently became adopted as such, for example, the historic, artistic, viewpoints of a site, or those that were deliberately created as features in historic parks and gardens.

(ii) Impact on the visual connections between related elements, by occlusion, obstruction, etc., for example, an essential line of sight between historically linked defensive sites will become blocked or impaired by an intervening development.

(iii) Conversely, the creation of inappropriate visual connections between elements not intended to be inter-visible originally, by the removal of intervening structures, barriers, shelters, screening or ground.

(iv) Visual impact of the development itself in relation to the existing historic character of the area considering:
* its form — the scale, number, density, massing, distribution etc., and if appropriate, the movement of its constituent features;
* its appearance — the size, shape, colour, fabric etc. of its constituent features.

This section is aimed at assessing to what extent the development constitutes a visual intrusion or encroachment, and to what extent that affects the area’s historic character.

ASIDOH2 STAGE 4 & 5: SUMMARY OF THE OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON LANDSCAPE OF HISTORIC INTEREST ‘A’ VALUE OF HISTORIC CHARACTER AREA
### Appendix B Gazetteer of known historic environment assets

The table below represents a gazetteer of selected listed buildings within Irchester village. The gazetteer should be read in consideration of the historic setting and character views of Irchester village.

HER data was obtained to assess the locations and extent of the known historic environment sites and finds within a 2km radius study area, the information from which has been used within this report, though not reproduced in the gazetteer. HER data was accessed on 26/06/2015 and is the copyright of Historic England 2015. Historic England statutory designations data © Historic England 2015. Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2015. The Historic England GIS Data contained in this material was reproduced in the gazetteer. HER data was accessed on 26/06/2015 and is the copyright of Historic England 2015.

**Abbreviations**

HER – Historic Environment Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Site code/ HER No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Church of St Katharine, Irchester</td>
<td>DNN5090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade I listed church, dating to the late 12th century, with later 13th and 14th century additions. Constructed of regular coursed limestone with ironstone and ashlar dressings, the tower is banded limestone and ironstone ashlar, with lead roof. Aisled nave, chancel, south porch and west tower. South elevation chancel of three window range one with two light perpendicular windows to far right and two three-light perpendicular windows with four centred heads and carved label stops. South door between windows has trefoil head and carved label stops.</td>
<td>233473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manor House, 77 High Street, Irchester</td>
<td>1371728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II listed manor house, with 14th century origins, but mainly mid-18th century. Squared coursed limestone and ironstone to rear with rendered front façade and slate roof. Originally probably a hall house then double-depth plan. Two storeys with attic. Entrance front of three window range of sashes with glazing bars at first floor; tripartite sash to ground floor right and early 20th century square wooden bay and attached porch to left and centre. Central six panel door has moulded wood surround and arch fanlight with glazing bars. Three hipped roof dormers, ashlar gable parapets and ashlar stacks at ends. Right gable has tall 14th century blocked window opening and small blocked fire window to left. Rear has two large casements under wood lintels and two similar blocked openings. Interior not inspected but noted as having early 19th century staircase with stick balusters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manor Farm Cottage, High Street, Irchester</td>
<td>1040711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II listed late 17th, 18th century house. Regular coursed limestone with ironstone dressings and slate roof. Originally two unit plan. Two storeys, with two window range of cross casements with glazing bars under wood lintels. Cental six panel door with glazed top lights under wood lintel. Ashlar and brick stacks at ridge and end. Left gable has projecting plinth to first floor level with ashlar coping. Rear is similar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barn (approximately 14m south west of Manor Farm Cottage), Irchester</td>
<td>1040712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II listed tithe barn, now a barn and stables. Dated to early 16th Century, but altered in the 18th or 19th century. Regular coursed and squared coursed and banded limestone and ironstone with corrugated metal and pantile roof. Barn with central cart entrance to left and two stables with hay lofts over to the right. Cart entrance has wood lintel and is flanked by two stage ashlar buttresses, similar buttress to right. Remains of gable parapet to left and pantile roof to far right. Interior not inspected but noted as having some 18th century roof trusses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower Farm House, High Street, Irchester</td>
<td>1040709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II listed farmhouse with date stone 1616, and mid-18th century alterations. Regular coursed and banded limestone and ironstone with slate roof. Originally T-shape plan. Two storeys, main front window of six window range of 20th century casements in original openings under wood lintels and gauged stone lintels with keyblocks. One bay to left has lower eaves and may have originally been a barn. Main house has ashlar gable parapets and kneelers and brick and stone stacks at ridge and end. Left gable has date stone. Rear similar with two 20th century entrances and projecting wing to right of centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blacksmiths Cottage, Irchester</td>
<td>1371727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II listed house of late 18th century date. Regular coursed limestone with brick gable and 20th century plain tile roof. Originally a two unit plan with through passage. Two storeys, three window range of leaded casements, partly renewed, under wood lintels. Cental six panel door 20th century under wood lintel, has cellar door to right. Brick stacks at ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34 High Street, Irchester</td>
<td>1040708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II listed house, with date stone 1794. Squared coursed limestone with thatched roof. L-shape plan. Two storeys, entrance front of two window range of casements with glazing bars under wood lintels. Central six panel door has panelled reveals and reeded wood surround. Brick stacks at ends. Rear is similar with panelled extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>33, 35 &amp; 37 High Street, Irchester</td>
<td>1040710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II listed house, now two dwellings and two shops. Mid-16th and 18th century. Limestone and now rendered with thatched roof. Probably originally open hall with through passage, now single storey with attic. Five window range of casements with glazing bars and 20th century leaded lights under eyebrow dormers. No. 33/35 has a 20th century door to left and No. 37 has two 19th century and 20th century shop windows. Central through passage is now an open entry. Ashlar gable parapets and kneelers and brick stacks at ridge and end. Raised cruck roof structured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KG Lawrence, 22 High Street, Irchester</td>
<td>1371725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade II listed house. Mid-18th century. Regular coursed limestone, now painted with slate roof. Originally two unit plan, two storeys, three window range of casements, now boarded under wood lintels. Canted wood bay to left and central four panelled door. Brick stacks at ridge and end. Rear similar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19–25 High Street, Irchester</td>
<td>1371726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four Grade II listed houses, from the early 18th century. Nos. 19 and 21 are squared coursed ironstone and No 23 and 25 are regular coursed limestone all with thatch roofs. One and two unit plans with two storeys. Together comprising a six window range of 19th century and 20th century houses with glazed windows under wood lintels, some with eyebrow dormers. Three 19th century and 20th century doors between windows, also under wood lintel. Brick stacks at ridge and end. Left gable of No 19 renewed in brick. The thatch to rear of No. 19 is 18th century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Site code/ HER No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11     | 1a London End, Irchester  
Grade II listed early 17th century house. Limestone, not rendered, with corrugated metal roof. Originally two unit plan, with single storey and attic. Two window range of plain casements with eyebrow dormers above. Brick stack at end. Interior has ceiling beams, an open fireplace with bressumer and original roof structure. Extension to right is 20th century. Said to have connections with the Pilgrim Fathers. | 1190882 |
| 12     | Home Farmhouse, Irchester Road, Knuston  
Grade II listed farmhouse from the late 17th century, of coursed limestone and ironstone with 20th century concrete tile roof. L-shape in plan, two storeys. Main front of four window range of casements with leaded lights that to first floor left of centre is original, all under wood lintels. 20th century doors to left and right of centre under wood lintels that to the left has a 20th century porch. Ashlar gable parapets and kneelers and brick stack at ridge. Rear is similar with some blocked openings. Interior not inspected but noted as having bread oven. | 1190845 |
Appendix C

Methodology for determining significance:

'Significance' lies in the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Archaeological interest includes an interest in carrying out an expert investigation at some point in the future into the evidence a heritage asset may hold of past human activity, and may apply to standing buildings or structures as well as buried remains. Known and potential heritage assets within the site and its vicinity have been identified from national and local designations, HER data and expert opinion. The determination of the significance of these assets is based on statutory designation and/or professional judgement against four values (EH 2008):

Evidence value: the potential of the physical remains to yield evidence of past human activity. This might take into account date; rarity; state of preservation; diversity/complexity; contribution to published priorities; supporting documentation; collective value and comparative potential.

Aesthetic value: this derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from the heritage asset, taking into account what other people have said or written;

Historical value: the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through heritage asset to the present, such a connection often being illustrative or associative;

Communal value: this derives from the meanings of a heritage asset for the people who know about it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory; communal values are closely bound up with historical, particularly associative, and aesthetic values, along with and educational, social or economic values.

Table T2 gives examples of the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Table T2: Significance of heritage assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage asset description</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World heritage sites</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled monuments</td>
<td>(International/national)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade I and II* listed buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Wrecks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage assets of national importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage asset description</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage Grade II registered parks and gardens</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation areas</td>
<td>(National/ regional/ county)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated historic battlefields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II listed buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected heritage landscapes (e.g. ancient woodland or historic hedgerows)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage assets of regional or county importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage assets with a district value or interest for education or cultural appreciation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally listed buildings</td>
<td>(District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage assets with a local (i.e. parish) value or interest for education or cultural appreciation</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Local)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic environment resource with no significant value or interest</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage assets that have a clear potential, but for which current knowledge is insufficient to allow significance to be determined</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Legislation and Policy

Relevant legislation to matters concerning the historic environment is primarily the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended (The Act)

Relevant Planning policy is encompassed in:

- Emerging Local Planning Policies, Core Strategy etc.
- The emerging Neighbourhood Plan

Advice is contained in:

- The History in the View 2011 (Historic England)
- GPA Note No.3 The Setting of Heritage Assets 2015 (Historic England)

(Also Local Authority Supplementary advice – SPD/SPG etc.)

The principal policy basis is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) & (NPPG)

The Government issued the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 (DCLG 2012) and supporting Planning Practice Guidance in 2014 (DCLG 2014). One of the 12 core principles that underpin both plan-making and decision-taking within the framework is to ‘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’ (DCLG 2012 para 17). It recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource (para 126), and requires the significance of heritage assets to be considered in the planning process, whether designated or not. The contribution of setting to asset significance needs to be taken into account (para 128). The NPPF encourages early engagement (i.e. pre-application) as this has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of a planning application and can lead to better outcomes for the local community (para 188).

NPPF Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, is produced in full below:

Para 126. Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

Para 127. When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest.

Para 128. 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. 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.

Para 129. 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.
Para 130. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

Para 131. 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.

Para 132: 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Para 133. 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; and
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- 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.

Para 134. 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.

Para 135. 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.

Para 136. Local planning authorities should not permit loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

Para 137. 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.

Para 138. Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 133 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 134, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

Para 139. Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

Para 140. Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

Para 141. Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (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. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

National Advice

‘Seeing the History in View’ was published by English Heritage in 2011 and is still current for development control purposes (notwithstanding the publication of NPPF 2012 and NPPG 2014). This provides advice on the consideration of the visual aspects of the assessment of significance and impact on heritage assets. This document suggests, amongst other things, that it is not just principal views in an area which contribute to the establishment or understanding of character; a holistic approach is recommended.

EH publication ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’ (2011) has been superseded by Historic England (HE) publication GPA3 ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’ (March 2015). The documentation provides advice on the definition and appreciation of setting and how changes can affect the setting and therefore the significance of heritage assets. It should be noted that a ‘setting’ does not have significance in its own right.
Appendix E

Photographs taken from a selection of chosen viewpoints:

View 1: Chester Road
View 2: Station Road
View 3: From the Water Tower
View 4: Rear of St Katharine’s
View 5: At the entrance to Irchester Grange
Farndish Road
View 6: From the B569
View 7: The immediate setting of the Church

Inter-visibility with the Water Tower

From the Cemetery/Church rear entrance path over the top of IR1
Other Elements

Meadow View

Existing entrance to IR1

View East from within the Country Park (Stock photo, undated)
Fig 1  Location of sites
Fig 2 Irchester Enclosure Map 1769–1773
Fig 4. Ordnance Survey Revised Edition Map of 1927
Fig 5  Ordnance Survey Revised Edition Map of 1958-59

Historical landscape assessment © MOLA 2015
Fig 6  Ordnance Survey Revised Edition Map of 1989–93
Fig 8  Map showing proposed sites, historic character viewpoints and settings
Fig 9 Map of proposed sites and areas of high to low sensitivity