

16. Built Heritage

Introduction

- 16.1 This Chapter reports the outcome of the assessment of likely significant environmental effects arising from the Project for Assessment in relation to built heritage. It also reports the likely significant environmental effects associated with the Proposed Scheme, which comprises the planning application.
- 16.2 The Chapter describes the technical consultation that has been undertaken during the EIA, the scope of the assessment and assessment methodology, and a summary of the baseline information that has informed the assessment.
- 16.3 In line with **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA**, the assessment reports on the likely significant environmental effects, the further mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects, or further enhance beneficial effects. The conclusions are provided both in terms of the residual effects and whether these are considered significant. The assessment of effects takes into consideration both primary and tertiary mitigation (see **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA** for further details) and is informed by the EIA Scoping process (**Appendix 2.1 – 2.2**) and iterative scoping process where applicable.
- 16.4 This Chapter, and its associated **Figure 16.1** and **Appendix 16.1** is intended to be read as part of the wider ES with particular reference to the introductory Chapters of this ES (**Chapters 1 – 6**), as well as **Chapter 17: Landscape and Visual**.
- 16.5 In addition, this Chapter should be read in conjunction with **Chapter 19: Assessment of Cumulative Effects**.

Summary of Consultation

- 16.6 **Table 16.1** provides an overview of the consultation that has been undertaken to inform the EIA, including the consideration of likely significant effects and the methodology for assessment.

Table 16.1: Summary of Consultation

Body / Organisation	Contact	Date/Form of Consultation	Summary of Consultation Outputs
BC & RBC	Conservation Officers	2022, pre-application meetings, submission of a pre-application submission document and receipt of an informal	Discussion of methodology with the Scoping Opinion requesting the heritage assessment work be carried out in accordance with Historic England's Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). Further information was requested in relation to key views within the setting of Lower Whittle Farm (grade II listed building)

Body / Organisation	Contact	Date/Form of Consultation	Summary of Consultation Outputs
		scoping opinion.	and recommended mitigation measures were noted.
BC	Conservation Officer	25 th March 2024, email	Confirmation that the BC draft local list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest has not been updated since 2022 and that it remains in draft with no timetable for the adoption.
RBC	Conservation Officer	23 rd April 2024, email	Confirmation that RBC local list data has not been mapped.
RBC	Conservation Officer	26 th April 2024, 14 th June 2024, emails	Request for information to support Heritage Assets Plan issued by Turley.
RBC	Conservation Officer	25 th June 2024, email	Response from RBC to confirm addresses for Silver Birch Stables; recommended meeting to discuss other Heritage Assets data.
RBC	Conservation Officer	19 th July 2024, meeting	Meeting to confirm location/existence of mapped heritage assets. RBC to review all buildings within the Site against local listing criteria.
BC & RBC Conservation Officers, Historic England	Conservation Officers and Inspector	6 th August 2024, Meeting	Discussion of methodology including rationale for not assessing against Principles of Conservation (Historic England 2008) when assessing each asset. Explanation of potential impacts on heritage receptors.
RBC	Conservation Officer	23 rd September 2024, email	Confirmation of additional Non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs), which have been assessed with the Built Heritage Assessment (Appendix 16.1)
RBC, BC and Historic England	Conservation Officers and Inspector	14 th November 2024, meeting	Meeting to discuss the findings of the Initial Heritage Appraisal (provided as part of the EIA Scoping Report (Turley, October 2024, Appendix 15.1)), ES methodology, identification of likely significant effects and mitigation measures.
RBC	Conservation Officer	18 th November 2024, EIA Report – Consultation Response	Overall agreement of methodology with some requests for clarification and additional detail which have been addressed in the ES and Built Heritage Assessment (Appendix 16.1). The impacts on Birch Village Conservation Area have been fully assessed with this ES Chapter and the Built Heritage Assessment (Appendix 16.1). It was

Body / Organisation	Contact	Date/Form of Consultation	Summary of Consultation Outputs
		(Appendix 2.2)	requested that all non-designated heritage assets within the Assessment Boundary should be assessed as part of the EIA. Those which are proposed for demolition where there was potential for significant effects have been included in the ES. The remainder are assessed within the Built Heritage Assessment (Appendix 16.1). The collective impact of the loss of farmsteads has been considered in the Built Heritage Assessment (Appendix 16.1). It was urged that the Applicant review the highways works to prevent demolition within the conservation area. These works are not being delivered by the applicant but will be delivered separately through a DCO.
BC	Conservation Officer	EIA Scoping Report – Consultation response (Appendix 2.2), 20 November 2024	Agreement of methodology. Request that particular attention be paid to the mitigation of any intervisibility to the east and west of Brick House which has been incorporated into the parameters.
Historic England	Inspector	EIA Scoping Report – Consultation Response (Appendix 2.2)	Agree with the outcome of the EIA Scoping Report (Turley, October 2024) that built heritage should be scoped into the EIA. Agreement to the potential significant effects and sensitive receptors identified in the report for inclusion in the EIA.

Scope of the Assessment

16.7 An EIA Scoping Report was submitted to BC and RBC on 17 October 2024, as presented as **Appendix 2.1**. A Scoping Opinion has not been received to date; however a number of consultation responses have been received and are provided in **Appendix 2.2**. A response to the comments in **Appendix 2.2** are provided in **Appendix 2.3**. This section provides an update on the scope of the assessment presented within this Chapter following submission of the EIA Scoping Report.

Effects Not Considered to be Significant

16.8 The following effects were not considered significant as part of the EIA Scoping Report and are not considered further in this Chapter:

- Impact on the significance of designated heritage assets as a result of change within their setting (Receptors: Birch in Hopwood War Memorial HAP 9), Fountain and Horse Trough (HAP 6), Edgecroft (HAP 5), Church of St George (HAP 7), Unsworth War Memorial (HAP 8) – all grade II listed buildings); and
- Impact on the significance of the following non-designated heritage (**Figure 16.1**) assets as a result of change within their setting:
 - Bridge at Whittle Brook (HAP 16);
 - Jackson Fold Barn (HAP 18);
 - Egypt Farm (HAP 20);
 - Sandfield Farm (HAP 21);
 - Grange Farm (HAP 58);
 - Birch Conservation Area Group (HAP 31-33);
 - Stock Nook (HAP 37);
 - Birch Hotel (HAP 40);
 - Saxon's Farm (HAP 42);
 - The Gardner's Arms Public House (HAP 43);
 - New Gap Farm (HAP 44);
 - Coal Pits Farm (HAP 46);
 - Whittle Farm Farmhouse (HAP 51);
 - Doctor Fold Farm (HAP 55); and
 - Siddal Farm (HAP 56).

16.9 Following the EIA Scoping process, the following additional effect(s) are now not considered significant and the evidence to support this determination is outlined below.

Impact of the collective loss of historic farmsteads within the Assessment Boundary on the local heritage resource

16.10 Additional technical and design work subsequent to the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1**) has reduced the number of historic farmsteads which are now proposed for demolition. For the historic farmsteads outside of the Application Boundary but within the Assessment Boundary it has been necessary to make assumptions in relation to demolition and these are set out in **Chapters 4 and 5**. A Retention/Demolition Plan of heritage assets has been provided at **Figure 16.2**. This accords with EIA Assessment Plans (**Figures 4.1 – 4.3**) and Parameter Plans (**Figure 5.1 – 5.3**). The following farmsteads will be retained:

- Egypt Farm (HAP 20);

- Stock Nook (HAP 37);
- Saxon's Farm (HAP 42);
- Coal Pits Farm (HAP 46);
- New Gap Farm (HAP 44);
- Whittle Farm Farmhouse (HAP 51); and
- Doctor Fold Farm (HAP 55).

16.11 The level of effect has therefore been reduced and is not considered to be significant. These receptors have not been considered further within the EIA or reported within this Chapter.

16.12 The impact of the collective loss of the physical record of the above assets and the associated change to the local historic agricultural landscape is considered in the Built Heritage Assessment (**Appendix 16.1**). The impact on the landscape is assessed in **Chapter 17: Landscape and Visual**.

Effects Considered Likely to be Significant

16.13 The following effects (**Table 16.2**) were considered likely to be significant and are reported within this Chapter.

16.14 In light of the responses received as part of the EIA Scoping Opinion (**Appendix 2.1**), the wording of the impacts relating to Birch Village Conservation Area and listed buildings/RPGs has been amended to provide clarification.

16.15 In addition, the receptors associated with the impact on the significance of non-designated heritage assets as a result of demolition has changed from the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1**) due to changes in the number of non-designated heritage assets which have been assumed for demolition¹ and the identification of additional non-designated heritage assets by RBC (including Lodge View (HAP 54) which has been assumed for demolition.

Table 16.2: Effects Considered Likely to be Significant

Likely Significant Effect	Receptor(s)	Applicable Development Stage	Spatial Zone
Impact on the significance (character and appearance) of Birch Village Conservation Area,	Birch Village Conservation Area	Construction / Operation	D, E, F BB, CC, DD BBB

¹ Specifically, Stock Nook (HAP 37), Saxon's Farm (HAP 42), Coal Pits Farm (HAP 46) and New Gap Farm (HAP 44) which are assumed to be retained.

Likely Significant Effect	Receptor(s)	Applicable Development Stage	Spatial Zone
as a result of direct impacts and change within its setting ²			
Impact on the significance (special architectural and historic interest) of listed buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens (RP&Gs), as a result of change within their setting ³	Heaton Park (grade II RP&G) Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall (grade II* listed building) (HAP 1) Alkrington Hall (grade II* listed building) (HAP 2) Brick Farmhouse (grade II listed building, HAP 3) Lower Whittle Farmhouse (grade II listed building (HAP 4)	Construction / Operation	C, D, E, F AA, BB, CC, DD, EE, FF
Impact on the significance of non-designated heritage assets as a result of their demolition	<i>BC Draft local list:</i> Moss Side Barn/Farm Griffe Lane (HAP 15) Meadowcroft Fold Farmhouse and Barns (HAP 19) Thurston Fold (HAP 22) <i>RBC Local List:</i> Birch Mill (HAP 34) Lodge View (HAP 54) Higher Fields Farm (HAP 45) Broomhill Farm (HAP 50)	Construction ⁴	D, AA, DD, BBB

² Noted to be 'Impact on the significance (character and appearance) of Birch Conservation Area' in the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1**).

³ Noted to be 'Impact on the significance (special architectural and historic interest) of designated heritage assets as a result of change within their setting' in the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1**).

⁴ The demolition will take place during the construction stage, the assets will not be extant during the operational stage and the effects are therefore limited to the construction stage only.

Assessment Methodology

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance

16.16 The following legislation and policy have informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter, and is detailed further in **Appendix 16.1**:

- The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990;
- The National Planning Policy Framework (2024)¹; and
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan 2022 to 2039 (adopted March 2024)².

16.17 The following guidance has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 16.1**:

- English Heritage (2008) Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance³;
- Highways England (2020) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)⁴;
- Historic England (2015) Good Practice Advice Note 2, Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment⁵;
- Historic England (2017) Good Practice Advice Note 3, The Setting of Heritage Assets⁶;
- Historic England (2019) Advice Note 12, Statements of Heritage Significance⁷;
- IHBC, Cifa & IEMA (2021) Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment⁸; and
- Highways England (2020) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)⁹.

Defining the Study Area

16.18 A 1km Study Area from the Assessment Boundary has been defined following site visits and inspections of relevant heritage assets and a review of a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) (**Figure 17.3**) undertaken by suitably qualified heritage professionals (Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) and Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute MRTPI)), taking into account:

- The nature and scope of the Project for Assessment / Proposed Scheme;
- The proximity of heritage assets to the Project for Assessment / Proposed Scheme;
- The degree of inter-visibility between the heritage assets and the Assessment / Application Plots taking into consideration, for instance, changes in topography as well as interposing townscape and landscape features and seasonal changes; and
- The significance of the relevant heritage assets and the contribution made by their setting including any historic or functional relationships.

16.19 The potential impact of the Project for Assessment / Proposed Scheme has been considered in relation to all designated heritage assets within the 1km Study Area from the Assessment

Boundary. Due to the topography of the surrounding landscape, including the Pennine hills to the north and east where there are panoramic views across the Greater Manchester conurbation, the Project for Assessment may be experienced as part of the setting of assets beyond the Study Area. Within these views, which comprise both rural and urban areas, the Project for Assessment would be distanced and experienced as part of a wider urban area. Therefore, it is concluded that heritage assets beyond 1km would not experience significant effects, with the exception of two (Alkrington Hall and the Temple at Heaton Park, both grade II* listed buildings) assets. These assets have been identified as being of particular sensitivity due to being highly graded listed buildings and because setting makes a key contribution to the significance of the asset. There is therefore potential for these assets to experience significant effects, despite being outside the 1km Study Area.

16.20 A Heritage Asset Plan (HAP) is provided at **Figure 16.1**.

Background Studies to Inform the ES / Establishing the Baseline

16.21 **Table 16.3** summarises all studies/surveys/analysis/evaluations undertaken to inform the assessment presented within this Chapter.

Table 16.3: Background Studies / Surveys / Evaluations /Analysis

Study / Survey / Analysis / Evaluation	Overview	Date of Completion
Initial Heritage Appraisal (Appendix 15.1 of the EIA Scoping Report)	A baseline assessment of the significance of heritage assets within the Study Area and additional sensitive receptors identified outside the Study Area, together with a consideration of likely effects including any significant effects, to inform the EIA Scoping Report and engagement with heritage consultees.	September 2024
Heritage Assessment (Appendix 16.1)	Prepared in light of the statutory duties of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and national Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) for the historic environment.	March 2025

Assessment Process

16.22 In the absence of specific prescribed criteria for the assessment of impacts on built heritage, the methodology for establishing the relative value or importance of heritage assets; the magnitude of impact; and the significance of effect is drawn from Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). This assessment has also been informed by Historic England guidance as referenced above. The assessment will consider both the construction and operational stages and will be based upon the Assessment and Parameter Plans (**Figures 4.1 – 4.3 and 5.1 – 5.3**) as set out in **Chapters 4 and 5**. The mitigation measures set out within the **Design Code**, referred to as ‘Musts’ for the Proposed Scheme have been taken into account as primary mitigation in assessing the effects of the Proposed Scheme.

- 16.23 The Built Heritage ES Chapter takes into account the findings of **Chapter 17: Landscape and Visual** to ensure integration of approach and assessment. Analysis has been supported by the findings from site visits which sought to gauge the potential effects of the Project for Assessment / Proposed Scheme on heritage assets, judge their relative heritage significance and importance, including within any grouping, and also how sensitive their heritage significance would be to change. This evaluation is set out in the Built Heritage Assessment (**Appendix 16.1**).

Reporting of the Environmental Effects and Significance Criteria

- 16.24 The assessment of likely significant environmental effects as a result of the Project for Assessment has taken into account the construction and operational stage. The following sections define the approach adopted within the assessment for the determination of sensitivity (or value/importance), magnitude of change (or impact), the level of effect and significance.
- 16.25 To achieve consistency in reporting across the ES, the ES terminology has been adopted ('**emboldened**') with the equivalent DMRB terminology provided for reference in **Tables 16.4 to 16.7** below.

Determining Sensitivity of Receptor

- 16.26 The sensitivity of affected receptors has been considered on a scale of **high, medium, low** or **negligible**.
- 16.27 The heritage significance (sensitivity) of the heritage assets (receptors) has been defined on the basis of **Table 16.4**, which has been informed by the DMRB, and a clear understanding and appreciation of heritage significance as set out in the Built Heritage Assessment. This has been undertaken in accordance with Historic England guidance and informed by a site visit, research and professional judgement.
- 16.28 The ES terminology used in **Table 16.4** is consistent with the terminology used within the DMRB but the latter has a five-point scale with the additional category of 'very high.' As there are no assets within the 'very high' category (e.g. World Heritage Sites), this category has been omitted from the methodology.

Table 16.4: Determining the Sensitivity of the Receptor

Sensitivity	DMRB Definition	Asset Type
High	High importance and rarity, national scale, and limited potential for substitution	Scheduled monuments with standing remains Registered Battlefields Grade I and II* listed buildings Other listed buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association not adequately reflected in the listing grade Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens

Sensitivity	DMRB Definition	Asset Type
		Conservation areas containing very important buildings
Medium	Medium or high importance and rarity, regional scale, limited potential for substitution	Grade II listed buildings Historic (unlisted) buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association Grade II registered parks and gardens Conservation areas containing important buildings Historic townscape or built-up areas with historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures)
Low	Low or medium importance and rarity, local scale.	<i>'Locally listed'</i> buildings and landscapes Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association Historic townscape or built-up areas of limited historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures)
Negligible	Very low importance and rarity, local scale.	Assets of no architectural or historic note; buildings of an intrusive character

Determining the Magnitude of Change

16.29 The magnitude of change has been considered as the change experienced from the current baseline conditions at the sensitive receptor and has been considered on a scale of **large**, **medium**, **small** or **negligible**.

16.30 The magnitude of change to heritage assets is assessed as outlined in the criteria in **Table 16.5** which draws upon Table 3.4N of the DMRB.

Table 16.5: The Magnitude of Change to Heritage Assets

Magnitude of Change (ES/DMRB Terminology)	DMRB Definition	Application of Definition to the Built Heritage
Large/Major	<i>Adverse</i> – Loss of resource and/or quality and integrity of resource; severe damage to key characteristics, features or elements.	Change to key elements of the heritage asset, such that the asset is totally altered and much of its heritage significance is lost or

Magnitude of Change (ES/DMRB Terminology)	DMRB Definition	Application of Definition to the Built Heritage
	<i>Beneficial</i> – Large scale or major improvement of resource quality; extensive restoration; major improvement of attribute quality	enhanced. Substantial change within the setting of a heritage asset leading to considerable loss or enhancement of heritage significance of the asset.
Medium/ Moderate	<i>Adverse</i> – Loss of resource, but not adversely affecting the integrity; partial loss of/damage to key characteristics, features or elements. <i>Beneficial</i> – Benefit to, or addition of, key characteristics, features or elements; improvement of attribute quality.	Change to many key elements of the heritage asset, such that the asset is clearly modified and there is some loss or enhancement of heritage significance. Change within the setting of a heritage asset leading to some loss or enhancement of heritage significance of the asset.
Small/Minor	<i>Adverse</i> – Some measurable change in attributes, quality or vulnerability; minor loss of, or alteration to, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements. <i>Beneficial</i> – Minor benefit to, or addition of, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements; some beneficial impact on attribute or a reduced risk of negative impact occurring.	Changes to key elements of the heritage asset, such that the asset is slightly altered and there is some loss or enhancement of heritage significance. Change within the setting of a heritage asset leading to a slight loss or enhancement of heritage significance of the asset.
Negligible/ Negligible	<i>Adverse</i> – Very minor loss or detrimental alteration to one or more characteristics, features or elements. <i>Beneficial</i> – Very minor benefit to or positive addition of one or more characteristics, features or elements.	Slight changes to elements of a heritage asset or within its setting that hardly affect the heritage significance of the asset.

Determining the Level of Effect

16.31 The level of effect has been informed by the magnitude of change due to the Project for Assessment and the evaluation of the sensitivity of the affected receptor. The level of effect has been determined using professional judgement with a detailed narrative set out in the Built Heritage Assessment (**Appendix 16.1**). **Table 16.6** has been a tool which has assisted with this process and is informed by the Significance Matrix at Table 3.8.1 in the DMRB. The DMRB terminology is provided in brackets after the ES terminology.

- 16.32 Whilst **Table 16.6** provides ranges, the level of effect is confirmed as a single level and not a range, informed by professional judgement. For each effect, it has been concluded whether the effect is '*beneficial*' or '*adverse*'.

Table 16.6: Matrix to Support Determining the Level of Effect

Magnitude of change (or impact)	Sensitivity (or value, importance, etc.)			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Large (Major)	Major (Large or very large)	Moderate to major (Moderate or large)	Minor to moderate (Slight to moderate)	Negligible (Slight)
Medium (Moderate)	Moderate to major (Moderate or large)	Moderate (Moderate)	Minor (Slight)	Negligible (Neutral or slight)
Small (Minor)	Minor to moderate (Slight or moderate)	Minor (Slight)	Negligible to minor (Neutral or slight)	Negligible (Neutral or slight)
Negligible	Negligible (Slight)	Negligible (Neutral or slight)	Negligible (Neutral or slight)	Negligible (Neutral)

- 16.33 The following terms, defined in **Table 16.7** have been used to define the level of the effects identified and these can be 'beneficial' or 'adverse.' The standardised significance criteria are not an exact equivalence with the DMRB five-point significance categories. However, professional judgement would be used in determining the category of significance for the effect on each asset.:

Table 16.7: Level of Effect Categories and Definitions

Level of Effect (ES Terminology/DMRB)	DMRB Definition	ES Definition
Major/Very Large	Effects at this level are material in the decision-making process	Where the Project for Assessment / Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions and the receptor has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity
Major/Large	Effects at this level are likely to be material in the decision-making	
Moderate/Moderate	Effects at this level can be considered to be material decision-making factors	Where the Project for Assessment / Proposed Scheme is likely to cause either a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which has a degree of adaptability,

Level of Effect (ES Terminology/DMRB)	DMRB Definition	ES Definition
		tolerance or recoverability or a less than considerable change at a receptor that has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability
Minor/Slight	Effects at this level are not material in the decision-making process.	Where the Project for Assessment / Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a small, but noticeable change from the baseline conditions on a receptor which has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity; or where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which can adapt, is tolerant of the change or/and can recover from the change
Negligible/Neutral	No effects or those that are beneath levels of perception, within normal bounds of variation or within the margin of forecasting error.	Where the Project for Assessment / Proposed Scheme is unlikely to cause a noticeable change at a receptor, despite its level of sensitivity or there is a considerable change at a receptor which is not considered sensitive to a change

- 16.34 The duration of the effect has been assessed as either 'short-term', 'medium-term' or 'long-term'. Short-term is considered to be up to 1 year, medium-term is considered to be between 1 and 10 years and long-term is considered to be greater than 10 years.

Determining Significance

- 16.35 For each effect, a statement has been made as to whether the level of effect is '**Significant**' or '**Not Significant**'. This determination has been based on professional judgement and/or relevant guidance/legislation where applicable. Significance in this context relates to EIA and the identification of significant effects. For the avoidance of doubt, when referring to the significance of heritage assets the term 'heritage significance' has been used.
- 16.36 Significance has only been concluded for residual effects (i.e. following the identification of secondary mitigation).

Baseline Conditions

- 16.37 The earliest detailed mapping of the area dates from the mid-19th century and shows the land within the Assessment Boundary as having been primarily in agricultural use at that time, with dispersed farmsteads and a network of lanes and routes through the area. By the late 19th century and into the 20th century, the surrounding settlements of Unsworth,

Middleton and Heywood had grown, but the land within the Assessment Boundary itself remained largely in agricultural use. In the 1930s the No.35 RAF Maintenance Unit was established at Pilsworth Road. It closed in 1967, and the site became the Pilsworth Industrial Estate. The character of the area became more urbanised from the late 20th century onwards with the opening of the M62 in the early 1970s, followed by the M66 in the mid- 1970s. Birch Industrial Estate was added in the 1980s and the Pike Fold Golf Course was laid out in 1999. More recently the opening of the Queen Elizabeth Way in 2022 and the commencement of the construction of housing as part of development at South Heywood has added to the urban character immediately to the north and east of the area within the Assessment Boundary.

- 16.38 There are a number of designated and non-designated assets within the Assessment Boundary and in the surrounding area as indicated on the Heritage Asset Plan (HAP) (**Figure 16.1**). The significance of these assets, including the contribution made by setting and the Assessment/Application Plots, has been assessed proportionately within the Built Heritage Assessment (**Appendix 16.1**).

- 16.39 There are two listed buildings within the Assessment Boundary but outside of the Application Boundary: Brick Farmhouse (HAP 3, Plot DD) and Lower Whittle Farm (HAP 4, Plot BB) (both grade II listed). They hold special interest as farmhouses dating from the 17th century though both have later additions and Lower Whittle Farm is highly altered. Brick Farmhouse is partially enclosed by trees and vegetation which filter views to and from the surrounding landscape, though expansive views are likely from the upper floors. Lower Whittle Farm is enclosed on three sides by agricultural buildings (both traditional and modern) which limit views to and from the asset. The wider agricultural surroundings (including within the Assessment Boundary) emphasise their agricultural origins and associations.

- 16.40 The Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall (HAP 1, grade II* listed) is situated over 1km to the south west of the Assessment Boundary on a high point within Heaton Park, a grade II Registered Park and Garden. There are wide ranging views from the Temple encompassing areas of rural, suburban and urban character though views to the north are partly restricted by tree belts. Alkrington Hall (HAP 2, grade II* listed building) is an 18th century Palladian house over 2km from the Assessment Boundary but with extensive views across the landscape to the north west, towards the area within the Assessment Boundary.

- 16.41 Infrastructure Plot BBB includes part of the Birch Village Conservation Area, which is situated to the south of the M62 and Birch Services. The significance of the conservation area lies in the strong association it has with the influential architect Edgar Wood, its linear townscape and characteristic combination of 19th century industrial architecture and Arts and Crafts residences with distinctive local detail. The industrial architecture includes Birch Mill adjoining which is Lodge View, a terrace of former workers cottages, truncated by the M62 motorway. Both are included on the RBC Local List.

- 16.42 There are 17 assets within the Assessment Boundary that are included on either the RBC Local List or the BC Draft Local List with over 30 additional locally listed buildings within 1km of the Assessment Boundary. The Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record (HER) was consulted in November 2024 and a small number of additional features/buildings with potential to be considered NDHAs were reviewed with both LPA Conservation Officers to identify any additional non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs). The majority of NDHAs within the Assessment Boundary (as described in **Appendix 16.1**) are associated with the

area's agricultural history and, to varying degrees, draw significance from aspects of rural character within their setting. The local heritage significance of those NDHAs scoped into the ES Chapter are detailed in **Appendix 16.1** and summarised below:

- Moss Side Farm/Barn (HAP 15) – Holds local significance as a former hay barn dating to the 18th century or earlier which has been altered and converted to domestic use, diminishing its architectural interest. It is characteristic of the area's rural historic character and may hold evidential value in its historic fabric which could provide a clearer understanding of the building's age and contribute to a wider understanding of the area's pre-19th century history;
- Meadowcroft Fold Barns and Farmhouse (HAP 19) – The derelict farmstead has local historic significance in providing an understanding of the area's history rural development and the buildings have local architectural interest in exhibiting typical 19th century vernacular features and character;
- Thurston Fold (HAP 22) – Altered 18th century farmhouse and barn which provide an understanding of the historic rural character and development of the area and the potential evidential value the historic fabric may hold in further understanding the local rural vernacular (e.g. thatched roofing);
- Birch Mill (HAP 34) – The Mill has a modest, functional design and is of limited architectural interest. It is of local historic interest connected to its association with the cotton industry and as a catalyst for the late 19th century development of Birch;
- Lodge View (HAP 54) – The truncated terrace is of little architectural value but has a degree of local historic interest in its association with Birch Mill and the growth of Birch in the late 19th century, as well as the construction of the M62 in the late 20th century.
- Higher Fields Farm (HAP 45) – Highly altered late 19th century farmstead with limited architectural interest but remains legible as a historic farmstead and provides some understanding of the area's historic rural character and development.
- Broomhill Farm (HAP 50) – 18th century farm complex, expanded in the 19th and 20th centuries. Though architecturally modest and altered, the farmstead has a degree of local architectural interest in its agricultural grouping, phasing and features. It has local historic interest in providing an understanding of the area's historic rural character and development.

Future Baseline

16.43 In the absence of the Project for Assessment (or other planned development), it is anticipated that the baseline would experience limited change.

Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

Construction Stage

16.44 The following primary and tertiary mitigation which has been evaluated as part of the construction stage assessment is outlined in the table below. It is worth noting that those which are relevant to the Proposed Scheme can be controlled through **Volume 3**:

Environmental Management Plan, although those that apply to the Project for Assessment fall outside the Application.

Table 16.8: Primary and Tertiary Mitigation to Inform Assessment of Construction Effects

Mitigation	Relevant to	
	Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
The retention of existing development including heritage assets as defined by Figure 4.3 (Project for Assessment) and Figure 5.3 (Proposed Scheme)	✓	✓
The retention of areas of trees and vegetation as defined by Figures 4.1 and 4.3 (Project for Assessment) and Figures 5.1 and 5.3 (Proposed Scheme)	✓	✓
The implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) incorporating the measures set out Volume 3: Environmental Management Plan of the ES.	✓	✓

Operational Stage

16.45 The following primary and tertiary mitigation which has been evaluated as part of the operational stage assessment is outlined in the table below.

Table 16.9: Primary and Tertiary Mitigation to Inform Assessment of Operational Effects

Mitigation	Relevant to	
	Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
The retention of existing development including heritage assets as defined by Figure 4.3 (Project for Assessment) and Figure 5.3 (Proposed Scheme)	✓	✓
The maximum heights of Assessment/Application Plots as defined by Figure 4.2 (Project for Assessment) and Figure 5.2 (Proposed Scheme)	✓	✓
The retention of areas of trees and vegetation, and creation of heritage off-sets, landscape buffers and wetland habitat corridors as defined by Figures 4.1 and 4.3 (Project for Assessment) and Figures 5.1 and 5.3 (Proposed Scheme)	✓	✓

Mitigation	Relevant to	
	Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
Measures included in the Design Code for the Proposed Scheme relating to roof form and landscape buffers/wetland habitat corridors. These are referenced as 'Musts' in the Design Code (CODE M4-1 (a) and (b))	✗	✓

Assessment of Effects, Secondary Mitigation and Residual Effects

Construction Stage

Impact on the significance (character and appearance) of Birch Village Conservation Area, as a result of direct impacts and change within its setting [Project for Assessment and Proposed Scheme]

16.46 There will be an adverse effect on the heritage significance of Birch Village Conservation Area as a result of the Project for Assessment arising from the combination of the following impacts:

- The demolition of Birch Mill, a 19th century spinning mill which makes a modest contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area through its local architectural interest but makes a more notable contribution to an understanding of the history and development of the conservation area through providing the historic context for other buildings which are also positive contributors to the conservation area (Infrastructure Plot BBB);
- The demolition of Lodge View, a truncated and highly altered terrace that makes a very limited contribution to the significance of the conservation area through its association with Birch Mill, as former workers housing (Infrastructure Plot BBB);
- The general construction effects associated with the development of land in the north of the conservation area for highways infrastructure/remodelling (Infrastructure Plot BBB); and
- The general construction effects associated with the development within the Assessment/Application Plots (Principally Plots D and E).

16.47 In determining the magnitude of change, consideration has been given to the following factors:

- The limited architectural value of Birch Mill and Lodge View and their relative separation from the remainder of the buildings within the conservation area which limits the townscape impact of their demolition and the associated impact on the overall character and appearance of the conservation area;
- The overall size of the conservation area as a whole. The majority of the conservation area will remain intact and have integrity as an area of special architectural and historic interest;

- The linear and enclosed character of the conservation area which will reduce the adverse effects of construction on the experience of the conservation area; and
- The existing baseline including the existing visual and audible impacts of the M62 and A6045.

16.48 There are no direct impacts arising from the Proposed Scheme which will be over 350m from the conservation area at its nearest point, separated by the M62. Construction of development of the height and scale proposed could however have some indirect effects due to visibility from within the conservation area and on approach along the A6405, in particular the development of Application Plots D and E as the closest plots to the conservation area. This would increase the urban character which is currently experienced in parts of the conservation area and its setting, diminishing the appreciation of Birch as a rural village. However, the majority of construction activity will be at low level (height) and not experienced from within the conservation area given the intervening distance, development and landscape. Key views through the conservation area along Heywood Old Road, which are orientated away from the Application Boundary, will be sustained. The linear townscape character, industrial architecture and Arts and Crafts residences which characterise the conservation area would continue to be appreciable.

Project for Assessment

16.49 The sensitivity of Birch Village Conservation Area is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be large. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct and indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be major.

Proposed Scheme

16.50 The sensitivity of Birch Village Conservation Area is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be negligible.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

16.51 As the design of the highways works for Infrastructure Plot BBB develops, it is assumed that consideration will be given, through the Development Consent Order (DCO) process whether the proposed highways works can be further distanced from Birch Mill to potentially retain some of the 19th century phase of Birch Mill.

Table 16.10: Summary of Secondary Mitigation for Construction Stage

Mitigation	Person Responsible	Secured by	Relevant to	
			Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
Detailed siting and location of highways works	Highways England	DCO	✓	✗
Historic building recording	Highways England	DCO	✓	✗

Residual Effect

Project for Assessment

- 16.52 At this stage, there is insufficient detail about the nature and deliverability of the identified secondary mitigation to determine whether there would be a change to the effects reported for the Project for Assessment.
- 16.53 The effects for the Birch Village Conservation Area are therefore the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario for the Project for Assessment.

Proposed Scheme

- 16.54 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the effects for Birch Village Conservation Area are the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 16.55 This effect is considered to be **Significant** for the Project for Assessment.
- 16.56 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant** for the Proposed Scheme.

Impact on the significance (special architectural and historic interest) of listed buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens (RP&Gs), as a result of change within their setting [Project for Assessment and Proposed Scheme]

- 16.57 The extensive setting of **Heaton Park** has changed fundamentally since it was originally laid out and comprises both urban and rural areas of Greater Manchester and views towards the Assessment and Application Plots which are c.1km and c.2km from the RP&G respectively, are limited and filtered by layers of trees and vegetation. There is likely to be some visibility of construction activity, particularly activity at elevated heights such as cranes. This will have an urbanising effect on a part of the setting of the RP&G and the **Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall** which is within the RP&G and, given the nature of construction activity will diminish, to a degree, the aesthetic value of that constituent part. Due to the intervening distance, landscape and topography, the impact will be limited. The effects relating to the Proposed Scheme will be similar given the location and geographic extent of the Application Plots and the degree of visibility from Heaton Park.
- 16.58 There will be a similar effect in relation to **Alkrington Hall** and views looking north west towards the Assessment Boundary (Viewpoint 22, **Chapter 17: Landscape and Visual**). However, in the case of Alkrington Hall the impact will relate only to the most elevated aspects of construction work due to the intervening distance (over 2km), topography and landscape. The effects relating to the Proposed Scheme will be similar but reduced in extent, being limited to Plot D.
- 16.59 The effect of construction activity (Project for Assessment) on **Brick Farmhouse** and **Lower Whittle Farmhouse** will be greater given their location within the Assessment Boundary. Both listed buildings will be retained as defined on **Figure 4.3**. This will have an urbanising effect on their setting and reduce the appreciation of their historic rural context. The effect will be less for Lower Whittle Farmhouse given its enclosure and the limited contribution made by setting. In relation to the Proposed Scheme, construction activity will be distanced from the assets and the magnitude of change much reduced. Brick Farmhouse's relationship with the wider landscape and historic farmsteads within it, is limited to a degree by its partial enclosure from outbuildings and trees. Notwithstanding, that relationship will be further

diminished by the demolition of Thurston Fold and Moss Side Farm/Barn within the surrounding area as part of the construction stage of the Project for Assessment. The impact of the loss of Thurston Fold or Moss Side Farm/Barn is limited due to Brick Farmhouse not having a strong visual or associative relationship with those farmsteads but they contribute to the overall historic agrarian character of the wider landscape in which the asset is experienced. The Proposed Scheme will result in the demolition of Meadowcroft Fold Barns and Farmhouse, Higher Fields Farm and Broomhill Farm, however due to the intervening distance between those farmsteads and Brick Farm and the separation afforded by the Whittle Brook, there is no strong visual or associative relationship with these farmsteads and their loss will not result in a notable impact on the significance of the listed building. Due to the existing enclosure of the Lower Whittle Farmhouse, there is no strong visual or associative relationship with these farmsteads and their loss arising from the Project for Assessment or the Proposed Scheme will not result in a notable impact on the significance of the listed building.

Project for Assessment

- 16.60 The sensitivity of Heaton Park is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.
- 16.61 The sensitivity of the Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall is considered to be high. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.
- 16.62 The sensitivity of the Alkrington Hall is considered to be high. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be negligible.
- 16.63 The sensitivity of Brick Farmhouse is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be medium. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be moderate.
- 16.64 The sensitivity of Lower Whittle Farmhouse is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Proposed Scheme

- 16.65 The effects for Heaton Park, the Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall, Alkrington Hall and Lower Whittle Farmhouse are the same as that reported for the Project for Assessment.
- 16.66 The sensitivity of Brick Farmhouse is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 16.67 No secondary mitigation has been identified.

Residual Effect

- 16.68 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effects for the identified listed buildings and Registered Parks and Garden are the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 16.69 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant** for the Project for Assessment and the Proposed Scheme. This includes the moderate effect on Brick Farmhouse (grade II listed building) which is considered to be not significant due to the effect being temporary and the retention of land surrounding the asset which will not be used for construction activity and from where the heritage significance of the asset is appreciated. The construction stage will not affect the historic fabric of the building.

Impact on the significance of non-designated heritage assets as a result of their demolition (Project for Assessment and Proposed Scheme)

- 16.70 The Project for Assessment will result in the loss of Birch Mill, Lodge View and five historic farmsteads (as detailed in **Table 16.2**) which have been identified as non-designated heritage assets but vary in their level of heritage significance, condition and degree of alteration. These assets include Moss Side Farm/Barn, Thurston Fold, Meadowcroft Fold Barns and Farmhouses, Higher Fields Farm and Broomhill Farm; the latter three being located within the Proposed Scheme. The Proposed Scheme will result in the loss of three of those historic farmsteads. Moss Side Barn/Farm, Thurston Fold, Birch Mill and Lodge View are outside the Application Boundary and their demolition is not therefore included as part of the Proposed Scheme. The heritage significance of the assets has been assessed in detail in the Built Heritage Assessment (**Appendix 16.1**) and is summarised under 'Baseline Conditions' of this Chapter.

Project for Assessment

- 16.71 The sensitivity of the identified non-designated heritage assets is considered to be low. The magnitude of change is considered to be large. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.
- 16.72 The non-designated heritage assets have been identified as being of low sensitivity in accordance with the methodology set out in **Table 16.4**. The methodology does allow for discretion and professional judgement. Having assessed the local heritage significance of the assets, as set out in the Built Heritage Assessment (**Appendix 16.1**) and summarised above, it was concluded that the categorisation of the assets as being of 'low' significance was appropriate in each instance.

Proposed Scheme

- 16.73 The effects for Meadowcroft Fold Barns and Farmhouse, Higher Fields Farm and Broomhill Farm are the same as those reported for the Project for Assessment.
- 16.74 Birch Mill, Lodge View, Moss Side Farm and Thurston Fold are outside the Application Boundary and their demolition is therefore not included as part of the Proposed Scheme.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 16.75 An appropriate historic building recording of the assets to be demolished, proportionate to their limited local interest, would record their architectural and historic interest including any evidential value of their altered historic fabric.
- 16.76 A summary of the proposed secondary mitigation is provided in the table below.

Table 16.11: Summary of Secondary Mitigation for Construction Stage

Mitigation	Person Responsible	Secured by	Relevant to Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
Historic building recording	BC/RBC	Condition		✓
Historic building recording	BC/RBC	Future applications	✓	

Residual Effect

16.77 The effects for all receptors are the same as that reported at the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

16.78 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant** for the Project for Assessment and the Proposed Scheme due to the low heritage significance (sensitivity) of the assets.

Operational Stage

Impact on the significance (character and appearance) of Birch Village Conservation Area, as a result of direct impacts and change within its setting [Project for Assessment and Proposed Scheme]

16.79 There will be an adverse effect on the heritage significance of Birch Village Conservation Area as a result of the Project for Assessment arising from the combination of the development of land in the north of the conservation area for highways infrastructure/remodelling (Infrastructure Plot BBB) and the visual impact of development within the Assessment/Application Plots (Principally Plots D and E).

16.80 The demolition of Birch Mill and Lodge View has been considered above as part of the construction stage.

16.81 In determining the magnitude of change, consideration has been given to the following factors:

- The overall size of the conservation area as a whole;
- The linear and enclosed character of the conservation area which will reduce the visual impact of the Project for Assessment; and
- The existing baseline including the existing visual and audible impacts of the M62 and A6045.

16.82 There are no direct impacts arising from the Proposed Scheme which will be over 350m from the conservation area at its nearest point, separated by the M62. Development of the height and scale proposed would however have some visibility from within the conservation area and on approach along the A6405, in particular the development of Plots D and E as the closest plots to the conservation area. This would increase the urban character which is currently experienced in parts of the conservation area and its setting, diminishing the appreciation of Birch as a rural village. Key views through the conservation area along

Heywood Old Road, which are orientated away from the Application Boundary, will be sustained. The linear townscape character, industrial architecture and Arts and Crafts residences which characterise the conservation area would continue to be appreciable.

Project for Assessment

16.83 The sensitivity of Birch Village Conservation Area is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be medium. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct and indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be moderate.

16.84 This above conclusion takes consideration of the in combination effect on the conservation area across the construction and operational stages.

Proposed Scheme

16.85 The sensitivity of Birch Village Conservation Area is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

16.86 As the design of the highways works (Project for Assessment only) for Infrastructure Plot BBB develops, it is assumed that consideration will be given, through the DCO process, to:

- Whether the proposed highways works can be further distanced from the village and Birch Mill to minimise adverse impacts; and
- Associated impacts of the works on the character and appearance of the conservation area, including any mitigation measures e.g. acoustic fencing, landscaping bunds and planting.

16.87 In addition, the location, orientation and design (including materiality, colour palette and roofline) of new buildings within the Project for Assessment and the Proposed Scheme will be subject to detailed design and provides further opportunity for mitigation to reduce the level of indirect adverse impact to the heritage significance of the conservation area.

Table 16.12: Summary of Secondary Mitigation for Operational Stage

Mitigation	Person Responsible	Secured by	Relevant to	
			Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
Detailed siting and location of highways works	Highways England	DCO	✓	✗
Measures to reduce the visual and audible effects of the highways works e.g. acoustic fences and landscape bunds	Highways England	DCO	✓	✗
Historic building recording	An appropriately	DCO	✓	✗

Mitigation	Person Responsible	Secured by	Relevant to	
			Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
	qualified heritage professional appointed by the applicant(s) of forthcoming applications			
Location, siting, orientation, roof design and cladding of buildings	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Materiality and colour palette of new development	BC/RBC	Condition	✗	✓
Materiality and colour palette of new development	BC/RBC	Future applications	✓	✗
Density, height and species included within landscape mitigation	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Detailed landscape mitigation including species and required maintenance	BC/RBC	Condition	✗	✓
Detailed landscape mitigation including species and required maintenance	BC/RBC	Future applications	✓	✗

Residual Effect

Project for Assessment

16.88 At this stage, there is insufficient detail about the nature and deliverability of the identified secondary mitigation to determine whether there would be a change to the effects reported.

16.89 The effects for Birch Village Conservation Area are therefore the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Proposed Scheme

16.90 The effects for Birch Village Conservation Area are the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

16.91 This effect is considered to be **Significant** for the Project for Assessment.

16.92 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant** for the Proposed Scheme.

Impact on the significance (special architectural and historic interest) of listed buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens (RP&Gs), as a result of change within their setting [Project for Assessment and Proposed Scheme]

Heaton Park (Grade II RP&G) including the Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall (grade II* listed building)

- 16.93 The extensive setting of Heaton Park has changed fundamentally since it was originally laid out and comprises both urban and rural areas of Greater Manchester. From within the designed landscape, views to the wider area are largely restricted by topography and trees. From the high point around Heaton Hall and the Temple, long distance views are available to the south towards Manchester City centre where the towers in the urban core are visible. Views to the north are however limited by the density of trees within the park, though there is a break in the tree belt proximate to the Temple, which does allow some glimpsed views towards the Assessment and Application Plots which are c.1km and c.2km from the RP&G respectively, at their nearest point.
- 16.94 Due to the overall maximum height parameters of the Project for Assessment and the geographic extent of the Assessment Plots, the Project for Assessment will constitute a noticeable change within the setting of the RP&G and the Temple. However, as NPPG makes clear, *"It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed."*¹⁰ The different maximum parameter heights across the Plots introduces variation, layering and a step down in height towards the RP&G.
- 16.95 The ZTV (**Figure 17.5**) shows limited potential visibility from Heaton Park and, where there is likely to be visibility, this is predominately in the less significant parts of the RP&G, for example the golf course. Viewpoint 21 of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (**Chapter 17: Landscape and Visual**) is from taken from Heaton Park, proximate to the Temple looking north. It indicates there will be visibility of the Project for Assessment in views looking north, filtered by deciduous trees within the foreground. Whilst this part of the wider panoramic view is principally rural in character, the setting of the RP&G and Temple as a whole is, including views from this point, comprises both rural and urban elements. Due to the height of the Project for Assessment there is potential for the silhouette of the hills beyond to be obscured.
- 16.96 The Temple is a good example of a late 18th century temple, which was situated within the landscape to add incidence and interest, in conformity with the prevailing picturesque principles of landscape design typical of the period. Its setting is primarily defined by the RP&G with views out, beyond, reflecting the intent of placing the Temple to create a viewing point at an elevated position in the Hall's grounds. That intent will remain legible, but the rural qualities of views northwards will be diminished by the urbanising effect of the Project for Assessment. It is only the significance the asset draws from those rural qualities in glimpsed and filtered views to the north which will be affected by the Project for Assessment. Its historic fabric and appreciation of its architectural interest will not be affected.
- 16.97 The impact of the Proposed Scheme on the significance of Heaton Park RP&G and the Temple (grade II* listed building) are similar to those described above for the Project for Assessment; albeit slightly reduced due to the reduced geographical extent of the

Application Plots but only marginally so due to the location and maximum overall height parameters of the Application Plots. The **Design Code** for the Proposed Scheme (CODE M4-1) requires that, for development which is visible from within the setting of a designated heritage asset (including Heaton Park and the Temple), that building elevations **must** be designed to include materials which either reduce their visual impact on their surroundings, or accord with the local vernacular to lessen their visual impact when views from within the surrounding context.

Project for Assessment

- 16.98 The sensitivity of Heaton Park is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.
- 16.99 The sensitivity of the Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall is considered to be high. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Proposed Scheme

- 16.100 The effects for Heaton Park and the Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall are the same as that reported for the Project for Assessment.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 16.101 There is potential for the impact to be reduced through the location, siting, orientation, roof design and cladding of buildings which will be determined through the detailed design stage.

Table 16.13: Summary of Secondary Mitigation for Operational Stage

Mitigation	Person Responsible	Secured by	Relevant to	
			Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
Location, siting, orientation, roof design and cladding of buildings	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Materiality and colour palette of new development	BC/RBC	Detailed design	✓	✓
Density, height and species included within landscape mitigation	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓

Residual Effect

Project for Assessment

- 16.102 At this stage, there is insufficient detail about the nature and deliverability of the identified secondary mitigation to determine whether there would be a change to the effects reported.

16.103 The effects for Heaton Park and the Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall are therefore the same as that reported at the pre-mitigation scenario.

Proposed Scheme

16.104 The effects for Heaton Park and the Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall are therefore the same as that reported at the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

16.105 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant** for the Project for Assessment and the Proposed Scheme.

Alkrington Hall (grade II* listed building)

16.106 Alkrington Hall and its setting to the north were designed on the principles of the picturesque movement with its principal elevation and key rooms overlooking the part open and part wooded landscape to the north west. Whilst there are some dispersed areas of later development visible within that landscape, overall, it remains intact and of aesthetic value. The AVR for **Viewpoint 22 (Chapter 17: Landscape and Visual)** shows that if built to the maximum overall height as defined by **Figure 5.2** for the Proposed Scheme, parts of the Project for Assessment would be visible beyond and above the treed skyline in views looking north west from Alkrington Hall. The buildings would be distanced but would add further urban elements to the landscape. The impact on the view would be partial given the expansive nature of the view and the intent of the designed view would remain legible, albeit the aesthetic qualities will be diminished. Whilst the maximum overall height parameters represent a worse-case scenario, the AVRs are modelled from outside at ground level and not from within the principal rooms of the Hall (due to the private ownership of the property). Given the elevation of these rooms, the visual impact on views looking north west from the principal rooms within the Hall is likely to be greater than is represented by the AVR. The historic fabric of the Hall including its interiors, the historic association with Giacomo Leoni and the views from the landscape looking back to the principal elevation will not be affected by the Project for Assessment. The ability to appreciate Alkrington Hall as a Palladian style house illustrating early 18th century architectural trends will be maintained.

16.107 The nature of the impact of the Proposed Scheme on the significance of Alkrington Hall is the same as those described above for the Project for Assessment but at a reduced scale due to the reduced geographical extent of the Application Plots and visibility of the Proposed Scheme within **Viewpoint 22**, which is limited to Plot D and CODE M\$-1 of the Design Code which requires that development visible from the setting of Alkrington Hall must include variable rooflines to ensure they limit their visual impact and better integrate with the existing horizon.

Project for Assessment

16.108 The sensitivity of the Alkrington Hall is considered to be high. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Proposed Scheme

16.109 The effect for Alkrington Hall is the same as that reported for the Project for Assessment.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

16.110 There is potential for that impact to be reduced through the location, siting, orientation, roof design and cladding of buildings which will be determined through the detailed design stage.

Table 16.14: Summary of Secondary Mitigation for Operational Stage

Mitigation	Person Responsible	Secured by	Relevant to	
			Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
Location, siting, orientation, roof design and cladding of buildings	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Materiality and colour palette of new development	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓

Residual Effect

Project for Assessment

16.111 At this stage, there is insufficient detail about the nature and deliverability of the identified secondary mitigation to determine whether there would be a change to the effects reported. The effects for Alkrington Hall are therefore the same as that reported at the pre-mitigation scenario.

Proposed Scheme

16.112 The effects for Alkrington Hall are therefore the same as that reported at the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

16.113 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant** for the Project for Assessment and the Proposed Scheme.

Brick Farmhouse (grade II listed building)

16.114 Brick Farmhouse sits within the wider Assessment Boundary, outside of the Application Boundary. The property and its garden will be retained with an offset from new development with a landscape buffer that will retain part of the fields to the east and west of the former farmhouse. There will be no direct works to the property and therefore the impacts of the Project for Assessment relate to the indirect impact, arising from change within the setting of the listed building. The maximum overall height parameters for the adjacent Assessment Plots (the Maximum Change to Ground Level and Maximum Building/Structure Height mAOD) are 44m (Plot DD North), 42m (Plot EE) and 21m (Plot FF) AOD. The Whittle Brook which separates Plots D and DD, a short distance to the east of the listed building will be retained with a landscape mitigation area/wetland habitat corridor along its course. The maximum overall height parameter for development in Plot D is 69m AOD.

16.115 The listed building is principally experienced from its immediate domesticated surroundings. The proposed offset will retain those areas of garden and undeveloped land from which the listed building is principally appreciated. The proposed landscape buffer around Brick Farmhouse will soften the visual impact of new development. However, due to the height of

the Project for Assessment, the landscape buffer will not fully screen the new development. The setting of the listed building will therefore be more urbanised in character and experience including views. The agrarian character of parts of the asset's setting which contributes to an understanding of the former farmhouse's agricultural origins and associations will therefore be diminished. The asset's relationship with the wider landscape and historic farmsteads within it is limited to a degree by its partial enclosure from outbuildings and trees. Notwithstanding, that relationship will be further diminished by the demolition of Thurston Fold and Moss Side Farm/Barn within the surrounding area, and the enclosing effect of new development which will reduce or obscure views from the farmhouse to the wider landscape (depending on the siting and orientation of those buildings). The impact of the loss of Thurston Fold or Moss Side Farm/Barn is limited due to Brick Farmhouse not having a strong visual or associative relationship with those farmsteads but they contribute to the overall historic agrarian character of the wider landscape in which the asset is experienced.

- 16.116 Brick Farmhouse is outside the Application Boundary and the Proposed Scheme will be distanced from and separated from the listed building by the Whittle Brook and intervening fields to its west. Therefore, the impacts of the Proposed Scheme relate to the indirect impact, arising from change within the setting of the listed building. A landscape mitigation area will retain the existing landscaping along the route of the Whittle Brook. As identified above, the maximum overall height parameter for Plot D, the nearest Application Plot, is 69m AOD. This will exceed the height of vegetation along the Whittle Brook corridor and the Proposed Scheme will therefore be visible beyond the Whittle Brook. However, the **Design Code** for the Proposed Scheme requires that development which is visible from within the setting of a designated heritage asset such as Brick Farmhouse, **must** be designed to include materials which either reduce their visual impact on their surroundings, or accord with the local vernacular to lessen their visual impact when viewed within the surrounding context. There is potential for new development (depending on its siting and orientation) to obscure views of the wider landscape looking east from the listed building and its immediate surrounding. The nature of the development, which will be primarily logistics and industrial units, will have an urbanising effect on the character of the landscape to the east of the listed building, beyond the Whittle Brook. Views of the principal elevation of the listed building are orientated away from the Application Boundary. The Proposed Scheme will result in the demolition of Meadowcroft Fold Barns and Farmhouse, Higher Fields Farm and Broomhill Farm, however due to the intervening distance between those farmsteads and the listed building and the separation afforded by the Whittle Brook, there is no strong visual or associative relationship with these farmsteads and their loss will not result in a notable impact on the significance of the listed building.

Project for Assessment

- 16.117 The sensitivity of the Brick Farmhouse is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be medium. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be moderate.

Proposed Scheme

- 16.118 The sensitivity of the Brick Farmhouse is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

16.119 There is potential for level of effect to be reduced through future detailed design of development within the Assessment and Application Plots and consideration of the following:

- The siting and orientation of new development and graduation of height within the plots with reduced height proximate to the listed building;
- The type of planting and landscaping which could reference the former rural character of the area and
- The form and design of buildings in the immediate surroundings of the listed building and on the approach to it, including the materiality and colour palette of proposed units.

Table 16.15: Summary of Secondary Mitigation for Operational Stage

Mitigation	Person Responsible	Secured by	Relevant to	
			Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
Location, siting, orientation, roof design and cladding of buildings	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Materiality and colour palette of new development	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Density, height and species included within landscape mitigation	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Detailed landscape mitigation including species and required maintenance	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓

Residual Effect

16.120 At this stage, there is insufficient detail about the nature and deliverability of the identified secondary mitigation to determine whether there would be a change to the effects reported. The effects for Brick Farmhouse are therefore the same as that reported at the pre-mitigation scenario.

Proposed Scheme

16.121 The effects for Brick Farmhouse are the same as that reported at the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

16.122 Whilst moderate, this effect is considered to be **Not Significant** for the Project for Assessment and the Proposed Scheme because the effect is limited to that part of the asset's heritage significance which is drawn from setting. The immediate surroundings of the asset

in which the architectural and historic interest of the building is principally experienced, and the historic fabric of the building will not be affected.

Lower Whittle Farmhouse (grade II listed building)

- 16.123 Lower Whittle Farmhouse sits within the wider Assessment Boundary, within Plot BB, outside of the Application Boundary. The property and its garden will be retained with an offset from new development and a landscape buffer to retain the outbuildings and an area of the fields surrounding the farmstead. There will be no direct works to the property and therefore the impacts of the Project for Assessment relate to the indirect impact, arising from change within the setting of the listed building. The maximum overall height parameter for Plot BB is 35m AOD (Maximum Change to Ground Level and Maximum Building/Structure Height).
- 16.124 The farmhouse itself is highly altered externally and its significance largely resides in any remains of the 17th century timber framed farmhouse which may, or may not, survive internally. Notwithstanding, the complex of associated 19th century barns and stables and hard landscaping are more complete. There will be no effect on the relationship between the farmhouse and these historic outbuildings.
- 16.125 The Project for Assessment will result in the urbanisation of agricultural land historically associated with the farmstead. Due to the enclosure of the historic farmstead by modern agricultural sheds, the visual and physical connection between the farmhouse and the wider landscape is limited and principally experienced on approach to the asset. The proposed landscape buffer around the farmstead will soften the visual impact of new development on approach to the listed building and in any glimpsed views from the historic elements of the farmstead. However, due to the height of the Project for Assessment, the landscape buffer will not fully screen the new development. The Project for Assessment will also result in the demolition of a number of farmsteads, however due to the intervening distance between those farmsteads and the existing enclosure of the listed building, there is no strong visual or associative relationship with these farmsteads and their loss will not result in a notable impact on the significance of the listed building.
- 16.126 Lower Whittle Farmhouse is outside the Application Boundary with the nearest Application Plots E and F both having a maximum overall height parameter of 51m AOD. There is a proposed wetland habitat corridor and landscape mitigation along the east of Plot E and the south east of Plot F. The existing built area of Stock Nook to the north will be retained along with an area of the existing associated fields and landscape mitigation around the retained area.
- 16.127 As outlined above, the listed building is enclosed by later 19th century outbuildings, beyond which are modern agricultural sheds which further enclose the historic parts of the farmstead and limit the visual and physical connection to the wider landscape. The proposed areas of landscape retention and mitigation will soften and filter the visual impact of new development where views are available from the surroundings of the listed building (principally on approach) and the retention of Stock Nook will further distance and separate the listed building from new development. The nature of the development, which will be logistics and industrial units, will have an urbanising effect on the character of the wider landscape north of the listed building. The Proposed Scheme will also result in the demolition of Meadowcroft Fold Barns and Farmhouse, Higher Fields Farm and Broomhill Farm, however due to the intervening distance between those farmsteads and the existing enclosure of the listed building, there is no strong visual or associative relationship with

these farmsteads and their loss will not result in a notable impact on the significance of the listed building.

Project for Assessment

16.128 The sensitivity of Lower Whittle Farmhouse is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Proposed Scheme

16.129 The effects for Lower Whittle Farmhouse are the same as that reported for the Project for Assessment.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

16.130 The level of harm could be further reduced through future detailed design subject to appropriate consideration of the siting, orientation, height and design (including materiality and colour) of buildings which are visible from Lower Whittle Farm or on approach from Dr Fold Lane, as well as details of native planting and landscaping to provide a sense of the former rural context of the farm.

Table 16.16: Summary of Secondary Mitigation for Operational Stage

Mitigation	Person Responsible	Secured by	Relevant to	
			Project for Assessment	Proposed Scheme
Location, siting, orientation, roof design and cladding of buildings	BC/RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Materiality and colour palette of new development	RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Density, height and species included within landscape mitigation	RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓
Detailed landscape mitigation including species and required maintenance	RBC	Detailed design stage	✓	✓

Residual Effect

16.131 At this stage, there is insufficient detail about the nature and deliverability of the identified secondary mitigation to determine whether there would be a change to the effects reported. The effects for Lower Whittle Farmhouse are therefore the same as that reported at the pre-mitigation scenario.

Proposed Scheme

16.132 The effects for Lower Whittle Farmhouse are the same as that reported at the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

16.133 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant** for the Project for Assessment and the Proposed Scheme.

Limitations and Assumptions

16.134 To ensure transparency within the EIA process, the following limitations and assumptions have been identified.

- The assessment relies on available data, and all reasonable endeavours have been made to ensure that the data is accurate and up to date. The HER was reconsulted in November 2024. It is assumed that information obtained from, Historic England, the HER database and other sources are accurate;
- The RBC Local List has not been mapped and is only available in list form. The location of locally listed buildings within the Study Area has therefore been manually added to the HAP and checked with the local authority; and
- There has been no access to the interiors of the relevant listed buildings to assess their significance or to prepare AVRs. It is considered that an external inspection is sufficient for the purposes of assessing the impacts of the Project for Assessment/Proposed Scheme on their heritage significance through change in part of the buildings' setting as informed by representative AVRs and professional judgement.

Summary

16.135 **Table 16.17** provides a summary of the effects, receptors, residual effects and conclusions of significance considered within the Chapter, with reference to both the Project for Assessment and Proposed Scheme.

16.136 The table only provides a summary of the residual effects identified within the assessment. Details of all primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation that has been taken into account is summarised within **Volume 3: Environmental Management Plan**.

Table 16.17: Summary of Residual and Significant Effects for the Project for Assessment and Proposed Scheme

Effect	Receptor	Project for Assessment		Proposed Scheme	
		Residual Effect	Is the Effect Significant?	Residual Effect	Is the Effect Significant?
Construction Stage					
Impact on the significance (character and appearance) of Birch Village Conservation Area, as a result of direct impacts and change within its setting	Birch Village Conservation Area	Major Adverse	YES	Negligible Adverse	NO
Impact on the significance (special architectural and historic interest) of listed buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens (RP&Gs), as a result of change within their setting	Heaton Park (grade II RP&G)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
	Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall (grade II* listed building) (HAP 1)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
	Alkington Hall (grade II* listed building) (HAP 2)	Negligible Adverse	NO	Negligible Adverse	NO
	Brick Farmhouse (grade II listed building, HAP 3)	Moderate Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
	Lower Whittle Farmhouse (grade II listed building (HAP 4)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
Impact on the significance of non-designated heritage assets as a result of their demolition	Moss Side Barn/Farm Griffe Lane (HAP 15)	Minor Adverse	NO	N/A	N/A
	Thurston Fold (HAP 22)	Minor	NO	N/A	N/A

Effect	Receptor	Project for Assessment		Proposed Scheme	
		Residual Effect	Is the Effect Significant?	Residual Effect	Is the Effect Significant?
		Adverse			
	Birch Mill (HAP 34)	Minor Adverse	NO	N/A	N/A
	Lodge View (HAP 54)	Minor Adverse	NO	N/A	N/A
	Meadowcroft Fold Farmhouse and Barns (HAP 19)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
	Higher Fields Farm (HAP 45)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
	Broomhill Farm (HAP 50)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
Operational Stage					
Impact on the significance (character and appearance) of Birch Village Conservation Area, as a result of direct impacts and change within its setting	Birch Village Conservation Area	Moderate Adverse	YES	Minor Adverse	NO
Impact on the significance (special architectural and historic	Heaton Park (grade II RP&G)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO

Effect	Receptor	Project for Assessment		Proposed Scheme	
		Residual Effect	Is the Effect Significant?	Residual Effect	Is the Effect Significant?
interest) of listed buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens (RP&Gs), as a result of change within their setting	Temple to the north east of Heaton Hall (grade II* listed building) (HAP 1)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
	Alkington Hall (grade II* listed building) (HAP 2)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
	Brick Farmhouse (grade II listed building) (HAP 3)	Moderate Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO
	Lower Whittle Farmhouse (grade II listed building) (HAP 4)	Minor Adverse	NO	Minor Adverse	NO

References

¹ MCHLG (2024) National Planning Policy Framework

² Greater Manchester Combined Authority (2024) Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan 2022 to 2039

³ English Heritage (2008) Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment

⁴ Highways England (2020) The 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' ((LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring) and (LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment)) ('DMRB')

⁵ Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment

⁶ Historic England (2017) Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets

⁷ Historic England (2019) Advice Note 12, Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets

⁸ IEMA, IHBC and ClfA (2021) Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK

⁹ Highways England (2020) The 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' ((LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring) and (LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment)) ('DMRB')

¹⁰ MHCLG National Planning Practice Guidance (as updated) Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723