



Yeargate Limited

LAND NORTH OF BIRCH BUSINESS PARK

Environmental Statement Volume I Chapter 15 -
Archaeology

August 2026

UK0040790.1297





Yeargate Limited

LAND NORTH OF BIRCH BUSINESS PARK

Environmental Statement Volume I Chapter 15 - Archaeology

TYPE OF DOCUMENT (VERSION) PUBLIC

PROJECT NO. UK0040790.1297

OUR REF. NO. UK0040790.1297

DATE: AUGUST 2026

WSP

8 First Street

Manchester

M15 4RP

Phone: +44 161 200 5000

WSP.com



QUALITY CONTROL

Issue/revision	First issue	Revision 1	Revision 2	Revision 3
Date	May 2026			
Prepared by	Harry Twining BA MA PCIfA			
Signature				
Checked by	Dr Rob Smith MCIfA			
Signature				
Authorised by				
Signature				
Project number	UK0040790.1297			
Report number				
File reference	UK0040790.1297 - Birch Business Park New - Documents\03 WIP\5.EIA			

CONTENTS

15	ARCHAEOLOGY	2
15.1	INTRODUCTION	2
15.2	CONSULTATION, SCOPE, METHODOLOGY AND SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA	2
15.3	LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK, POLICY AND GUIDANCE	7
15.4	BASELINE CONDITIONS	10
15.5	SENSITIVE RECEPTORS	11
15.6	ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS, MITIGATION AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS	11
15.7	OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT	13
15.8	DIFFICULTIES AND UNCERTAINTIES	13
15.9	SUMMARY	14
15.10	NTS CHAPTER SUMMARY	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSARY

ABBREVIATIONS

e.g. EA	Environment Agency
AMR	Archaeological Monitoring and Recording
ADBA	Archaeological Desk Based Assessment
HER	Historic Environment Record

15 ARCHAEOLOGY

15.1 INTRODUCTION

- 15.1.1. This chapter reports the outcome of the assessment of likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development upon archaeological assets. This chapter has been produced by Orion Heritage.
- 15.1.2. The assessment of archaeological assets has established that the following additional mitigation measures are required:
 - A programme of Archaeological Monitoring and Recording (AMR)
- 15.1.3. The following residual effects have been identified:
 - There is likely to be a direct, permanent **Moderate adverse** residual effect on potential remains of post-Medieval cottage foundations, former field boundaries, and any as yet unidentified archaeological remains of other periods (termed '**significant**' in EIA regulations).
- 15.1.4. The remainder of this chapter describes the assessment methodology and the baseline conditions relevant to the assessment, which have been used to reach these conclusions, as well as a summary of the likely significant effects leading to the additional mitigation measures required to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset any likely significant adverse effects, and the likely residual effects and any required monitoring after these measures have been employed.
- 15.1.5. This chapter (and its associated figures and appendices) is intended to be read as part of the wider ES, with particular reference to the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (ADBA) (**Appendix 15.1**) which has been prepared for the site.

15.2 CONSULTATION, SCOPE, METHODOLOGY AND SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN TO DATE

- 15.2.1. **Table 15-1** provides a summary of the consultation activities undertaken in support of the preparation of this assessment.

Table 15-1 - Summary of consultation undertaken

Body / organisation	Individual / stat body / organisation	Meeting dates and other forms of consultation	Summary of outcome of discussions
Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS)	Lesley Dunkley, Historic Environment Records Officer	Historic Environment Record (HER) Data for the site and a 1km search radius has been procured from GMAAS	

SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT

- 15.2.2. The scope of this assessment has been established through an ongoing scoping process. Further information can be found in **Chapter 5: Approach to EIA**.

ELEMENTS SCOPED OUT OF THE ASSESSMENT

- 15.2.3. No archaeological elements have been scoped out of this assessment.

ELEMENTS SCOPED INTO THE ASSESSMENT

Construction Phase

- 15.2.4. The following elements are considered to have the potential to give rise to likely significant effects during construction of the Proposed Development and have therefore been considered within this assessment:

- The below ground remains of Post-Medieval cottages within the south west extent of the site;
- Post-Medieval field boundaries within the central area of the site; and
- Unknown archaeological remains within the site boundary.

Operation Phase

- 15.2.5. From an archaeological perspective, there are not expected to be any likely significant effects associated with the Operation Phase of the Proposed Development. All such impacts are expected to have occurred during the groundworks of the Construction Phase. As there are no such groundworks proposed for the Operation Phase of the site, further impacts upon any below ground archaeology are not expected, and so no significant effects are assessed during this phase.

Extent of the Study Area

- 15.2.6. There are no defined parameters for the study areas of cultural heritage setting assessments. A buffer of 1km from the boundary of the site was used in the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (ADBA, **Appendix 15.1**) as a suitable study area for the consideration of potential impacts to heritage receptors. This 1km buffer study area has also been applied to the EIA as this is considered suitable to place receptors within an appropriate context and to accurately assess potential significant effects to heritage likely to arise from the Proposed Development. The area beyond this was also reviewed and no sensitive heritage assets were present in the wider area that merited further consideration in this assessment.

METHOD OF BASELINE DATA COLLATION

DESK STUDY

- 15.2.7. An ADBA (**Appendix 15.1**), in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments (CIfA 2014) has been prepared. Sources reviewed include:
- The Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record (CMHER);
 - National Monuments Record;
 - Historic cartographic and documentary sources;
 - Aerial photographs;

- LiDAR data; and
- Unpublished material from recent nearby archaeological investigations.

SITE VISIT AND SURVEYS

- 15.2.8. A site visit was not appropriate, as the study site comprises a small parcel of rough land with no above ground archaeological remains surviving. Aerial photography from 2026 confirms this layout of the study site.
- 15.2.9. A geophysical survey has been recommended as further investigation of the archaeological potential of the study site, likely followed by intrusive archaeological investigations to further confirm the preservation and heritage significance of archaeological remains.

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The sensitivity of a heritage asset will be dependent on factors such as the condition of the asset and its perceived heritage value and significance. The sensitivity of a heritage asset receptor is defined by its significance in terms of national, regional or local statutory or non-statutory protection and grading of the asset. Table 15-2 below sets out the criteria for assessing sensitivity from Negligible to Very High:

Table 15-2 – Assessment methodology

Sensitivity	Receptor type
Very High	World Heritage Sites (including nominated Sites). Sites, buildings or landscapes of acknowledged international importance.
High	Sites of national importance, scheduled monuments, archaeological Sites of schedulable quality & significance, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, historic battlefields.
Medium	Local authority designated Sites, e.g. conservation areas and the settings. Undesignated Sites of demonstrable regional importance.
Low	Sites with significance to local interest groups e.g. historic buildings on a 'local list'. Sites of which the significance is limited by poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations.
Negligible	Structures that are not designated, within which there is no heritage value, or any heritage value has been rendered illegible by modern development.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

- 15.2.10. The significance level attributed to each effect has been assessed based on the sensitivity/value of the affected receptor(s) and the magnitude of change arising from the Proposed Development, as well as a number of other factors that are outlined in more detail in **Chapter 5: Approach to EIA**. As above, the sensitivity of the affected receptor is assessed on a scale of very high, high, medium, low and negligible, and the magnitude of change is assessed on a scale of large, medium, small, negligible and no change, as set out in **Chapter 5: Approach to EIA**.

15.2.11. The definitions of this magnitude of change are outlined in Table 15-3 below:

Table 15-3 – Magnitude of Change

Magnitude	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts
Very Large Adverse	Complete removal of an archaeological Site. Demolition of built heritage assets or demolition within a Conservation Area.	Radical transformation of the setting of an archaeological monument. Substantially harmful change to the significance of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area due to a change in setting.
Large Adverse	Demolition of built heritage assets or substantial demolition within a Conservation Area. Significant removal of an archaeological Site.	Radical transformation of the setting of an archaeological monument. Substantially harmful change to the significance of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area due to a change in setting.
Medium Adverse	Harmful alteration (but not demolition) of a built heritage asset or alterations to a building in a Conservation Area. Removal of a major part of an archaeological Site and loss of research potential / significance.	Less than substantial harm to the significance of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area due to a change in setting. Partial transformation of the significance of an archaeological Site e.g. the introduction of significant noise or vibration levels to an archaeological monument leading to changes to amenity use, accessibility or appreciation of an archaeological Site.
Small Adverse	Alterations to a built heritage asset, (including listed buildings and conservation areas) resulting in minor harm. Removal of an archaeological Site where a minor part of its total area is removed but the Site retains significant future research potential.	Minor harm to the significance of an archaeological monument or built heritage asset (including listed buildings and conservation areas) due to a change in setting.
Negligible/ No Change	Negligible impact from changes in use, amenity or access. Negligible direct impact to the built heritage asset or Conservation Area.	Negligible perceptible change to the significance of a building, archaeological Site or Conservation Area due to a change in setting.
Small Beneficial	Alterations to a built heritage asset or Conservation Area resulting in minor beneficial impacts. Land use change resulting in improved conditions for the	Minor enhancement to the setting of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area. Decrease in visual or noise intrusion on the setting of a building, archaeological Site or monument.

Magnitude	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts
	protection of archaeological remains.	
Medium Beneficial	Alterations to a built heritage asset or Conservation Area resulting in moderate beneficial impacts. Land use change resulting in improved conditions for the protection of archaeological remains plus interpretation measures (heritage trails, etc.)	Significant reduction or removal of visual or noise intrusion on the setting of a building, archaeological Site or monument. Improvement of the wider landscape setting of a built heritage asset, Conservation Area, archaeological Site or monument. Improvement of the cultural heritage amenity, access or use of a built heritage asset, archaeological Site or monument. Moderate enhancement to the setting of the built heritage asset and Conservation Area.
Large Beneficial	Arrest of physical damage or decay to a built heritage asset or structure. Alteration to a built heritage asset or Conservation Area resulting in significant beneficial impact.	Significant enhancement to the setting of a built heritage asset, Conservation Area or archaeological Site, its cultural heritage amenity and access or use.
Very Large Beneficial	Alteration to an archaeological monument or Site resulting in significant beneficial impact. Arrest of physical damage or decay to a built heritage asset or structure. Alteration to a built heritage asset or Conservation Area resulting in a major beneficial impact.	Significant enhancement to the setting of an archaeological Site, its cultural heritage amenity and access or use. Significant enhancement to the setting of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area, its cultural heritage amenity and access or use.

EFFECT SIGNIFICANCE

15.2.12. The following terms have been used to define the significance of the effects identified and apply to both beneficial and adverse effects:

- **Major effect:** where the Proposed Development could be expected to have a substantial improvement or deterioration on receptors;
- **Moderate effect:** where the Proposed Development could be expected to have a noticeable improvement or deterioration on receptors;
- **Minor effect:** where the Proposed Development could be expected to result in a perceptible improvement or deterioration on receptors; and
- **Negligible:** where no discernible improvement or deterioration is expected as a result of the Proposed Development on receptors, including instances where no change is confirmed.

15.2.13. As set out in **Chapter 5: Approach to EIA**, effects that are classified as **moderate or above** are considered to be **significant**. Effects classified as below **moderate** are considered to be **not significant**.

15.2.14. These definitions of effect significance are also outlined in Table 15-4 below:

Table 15-4 – Effect significance matrix

Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact					
		Negligible/No Change	Small	Medium	Large	Very Large
	Very High	Negligible	Minor	Moderate or Major	Major	Major
	High	Negligible	Minor	Minor or Moderate	Moderate or Major	Moderate or Major
	Medium	Negligible	Negligible or Minor	Minor	Moderate	Moderate or Major
	Low	Negligible	Negligible or Minor	Negligible or Minor	Minor or Moderate	Moderate
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible or Minor	Negligible or Minor	Minor

15.3 LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK, POLICY AND GUIDANCE

LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

- 15.3.1. The applicable legislative framework is summarised as follows;
- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979)
- 15.3.2. This legislation protects the fabric of Scheduled Monuments but does not afford statutory protection to their settings.

POLICY

National Planning Policy Framework

- 15.3.3. Government policy in relation to the historic environment is outlined in Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024), Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. This provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 16 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:
- Delivery of sustainable development;

- Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment;
- Conservation of England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; and
- Recognition of the contribution that heritage assets make to our knowledge and understanding of the past.

15.3.4. Section 16 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term.

15.3.5. Paragraph 200 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset and that level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.

15.3.6. Paragraph 201 states that local planning authorities should take account of the particular significance of any heritage asset which may be affected by a proposal and take this into account with considering any impact to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

15.3.7. The key test in NPPF paragraphs 205-207 is whether a Proposed Development will result in substantial harm or less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset. Paragraph 206 states that:

"Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

-Grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;

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

15.3.8. Paragraph 209 requires the decision-maker to take into account the effect on the significance of non-designated heritage assets and to take a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of harm or loss and significance of the asset(s) potentially affected.

Local Planning Policy

15.3.9. The Rochdale Publication Core Strategy (October 2016) has the following policy relating to the historic environment.

15.3.10. *P2 - Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage:*

1. We will protect and enhance the borough's character, the distinctiveness of its town centres, housing areas and countryside, and the qualities of its landscapes, utilising the considerable potential of these assets in development and regeneration schemes.

We will do this by:

a. Requiring new development to integrate successfully with the key natural features of the borough, e.g. river valleys and the Pennine landscape;

b. Requiring new development to take opportunities to protect and open up important views of hills and valleys which are part of the borough's unique character;

c. Restoring the River Roch and other water bodies to their place as key and attractive features of the borough, including opening up waterways where they have been covered, and enhancing their setting, heritage assets and biodiversity potential;

d. Protecting, enhancing and utilising outstanding cultural landscapes, such as the Cheesden Valley area and around Littleborough and Hollingworth Lake; and

e. Conserving and enhancing townscape character.

2. We will protect the borough's heritage by:

a. Conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings. Key heritage assets of the borough include:

- Four outstanding conservation areas: Central Rochdale, Middleton and Littleborough town centres and Rock Nook / Summit;
- Other designated assets such as listed buildings, conservation areas, registered parks and scheduled ancient monuments;
- The heritage of the Co-operative movement, the Rochdale Pioneers and the Labour movement;
- The Edgar Wood and J. H. Sellers cultural heritage;
- The heritage of the seventeenth and eighteenth century vernacular tradition; and
- The engineering heritage, including mills, canals and railways.

b. Conserving, enhancing and utilising other non-statutory heritage assets of local interest, be they buildings, parks, gardens or archaeological sites, including promoting their sensitive restoration;

c. Using heritage assets positively and intelligently to strengthen identity and image and support the visitor economy, particularly in development and regeneration schemes; and

d. Prioritising the conservation of heritage assets at risk from decay, giving special attention to designated heritage assets in this regard.

GUIDANCE

15.3.11. The following guidance documents have been used during the preparation of this chapter;

- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment

15.3.12. The purpose of this document (Historic England 2015) is to provide information to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment policy in the NPPF and PPG. It outlines a six-stage process to the assembly and analysis of relevant information relating to heritage assets potentially affected by a Proposed Development:

- Step 1: Understand the significance of the affected assets;
- Step 2: Understand the impact of the proposal on that significance;
- Step 3: Avoid, minimise and mitigate impact in a way that meets the objectives of the NPPF;
- Step 4: Look for opportunities to better reveal or enhance significance;

- Step 5: Justify any harmful impacts in terms of the sustainable development objective of conserving significance and the need for change; and
- Step 6: Offset negative impacts on aspects of significance by enhancing others through recording, disseminating and archiving archaeological and historical interest of the importance of elements of the heritage assets affected.

15.4 BASELINE CONDITIONS

- 15.4.1. This summary of the archaeological baseline of the site has been taken from the ADBA which has been produced for this site and appended to this chapter as **Appendix 15.1**.
- 15.4.2. There are no previous archaeological investigations recorded by the Historic Environment Record within the study site.
- 15.4.3. There are no archaeological remains dating to the prehistoric period recorded by the HER within the study site, although the wider study area appears to fall within a broad palaeolithic landscape. A sub-rectangular cropmark situated c.75m to the north west of the study site (MGM3652) may date from the later Bronze age, although this is more likely to be the remains of post-Medieval extraction works.
- 15.4.4. There are no archaeological remains dating to the Roman period recorded by the HER within the study site or within the wider study area, suggesting a negligible potential for such remains to survive within the study site.
- 15.4.5. There are no archaeological remains dating to the early Medieval period recorded by the HER within the study site or within the wider study area. Although the name of the nearby settlement (Pilsworth) is Old English in origin, there are no further historical or archaeological indications of significant activity during this period within or immediately surrounding the site.
- 15.4.6. Although there are no archaeological remains dating to the Medieval period recorded by the HER within the study site, a numerous earthworks (banks and ditches) interpreted as field systems and house platforms of a deserted Medieval settlement (MGM3641) have been identified c.680m south west of the main body of the study site. Surrounding this are remains of further field systems and evidence for ridge and furrow ploughing (MGM3642 and MGM3643) to the north and south of the abandoned settlement, as well as focus of later Medieval industrial work (MGM3644) with considerable *in situ* slag recorded. Several other Medieval farmsteads are noted within the wider study site, particularly to the south and the south east. The study site falls within a wider agricultural and possibly industrial landscape during the later Medieval period.
- 15.4.7. Although there are no archaeological remains dating to the Medieval period recorded by the HER within the study site, extractive pits (marl, colliery etc.) are noted (MGM10484) to the west of the site, showing a focus of local industrial behaviour. The landscape remains overall agricultural, with farmsteads to the south and south west (Broom Hill Farm and Higher Barn etc.) being developed in the 18th century.
- 15.4.8. The 1838 tithe maps shows that the site at this time was agricultural in use, with a variety of arable, pasture, and meadow. It is noted that 'cottages and gardens' (Plot 200) fell within the south west extent of the main body of the study site. The names of some of the fields (Marled Fields, Brick Kiln Field etc.) point to previous local industrial use, as recorded by the HER back into the 18th century, particularly to the west and south west of the main body of the study site. A field to the immediate north west of the study site is shown to contain a single rectangular building. The remains of

extraction pits are noted to the immediate west of the study site, by this point likely as ponds. During this time, the site is noted as 'post-Medieval piecemeal enclosures'. More mining shafts and 'flashes' are noted into the later 19th century, particularly to the west of the study site.

- 15.4.9. Into the second half of the 20th century, various industrial estates are noted as developing within the landscape of the site, whilst it appears to maintain its agricultural nature. By the present day, the site is shown to comprise a parcel of rough ground.

FUTURE BASELINE

- 15.4.10. Should the Proposed Development not be constructed, the site would remain as existing.

15.5 SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

- 15.5.1. The following sensitive receptors have been assessed:

- Potential Archaeological remains of Post-Medieval cottages within the south west extent of the site;
- Potential archaeological remains of Post-Medieval field boundaries within the central area of the site; and
- Any as yet unknown archaeological remains of all periods (although of varying potential as assessed in the appended ADBA (**Appendix 15.1**)).

- 15.5.2. All key sensitive receptor locations in relation to archaeology are shown on **Figures 2-4** within the ADBA as **Appendix 15.1**.

15.6 ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS, MITIGATION AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

CONSTRUCTION PHASE

- 15.6.1. The groundworks associated with the construction phase of the Proposed Development would largely be restricted to the footprints of the Unit A and Unit B warehouses, central to the site, as shown within the masterplan within **Chapter 3**. There may be some potential for truncation to occur during the development of the access roads and parking along the east boundary of the site, and to the south west extent. However, such groundworks are unlikely to reach the depths of archaeological deposits.
- 15.6.2. Any archaeological remains which survive within these development areas at the proposed depth of the groundworks would be truncated and/or destroyed by these associated groundworks (foundations etc.). This particularly refers to the potential remains of the Post-Medieval cottages noted within the south west extent of the site, which fall within the Proposed Development areas of the site access road and junction with the existing industrial park to the south of the site. Any remains of the Post-Medieval field boundaries depicted on 19th century mapping as running through the centre of the would also likely be truncated and/or destroyed by the groundworks associated within the Proposed Development of Units A and B.
- 15.6.3. Furthermore, any as yet unidentified archaeological remains (as discussed within the potential section of the ADBA, **Appendix 15.1**) which fall within the developmental footprints would be truncated and/or destroyed.

- 15.6.4. This truncation/destruction would constitute a large adverse change to archaeological remains of low heritage significance. With reference to Table 15-5 (Determining Significance), the Proposed Development would therefore have a **Minor to Moderate Adverse direct impact** upon these archaeological remains outlined above. Considering the baseline and site conditions, this would likely be considered a **moderate adverse** impact.
- 15.6.5. However, it is noted that the apparent significant Modern truncation which has occurred within the site (as particularly noted within Sections 4.42-4.47 within the ADBA, **Appendix 15.1**). This may have therefore already removed Medieval and later remains, including the aforementioned cottage foundations.
- 15.6.6. In order to mitigate this adverse impact, any archaeological remains which may be impacted by the development (i.e. within the Unit A and B footprints and associated access road) must be recorded prior to truncation/destruction. Although further archaeological investigation (such as a geophysical survey) would clarify the location and preservation of such remains, the potential for such remains has been assessed as *negligible* or *low* for most periods, with the exception of the Post-Medieval period. This has been assessed both on analysis of the existing heritage baseline and the considerable Modern truncation observed across the site. This assessment is outlined in more detail within the appended ADBA (**Appendix 15.1**). Further archaeological investigation to inform archaeological preservation, significance, and so mitigative strategy is therefore not thought to be necessary, particularly considering the relatively small area of the site and the development footprints therein where truncation would potentially occur.
- 15.6.7. In order to record any remains which do survive (and so mitigate harm), it is recommended that a programme of archaeological monitoring and recording is undertaken within the site either before or during any groundworks associated with the proposed development.
- 15.6.8. Whilst the resulting research from the potential archaeological recording of any archaeological remains (including the Post-Medieval cottage foundations and former field boundaries) would contribute to the increased knowledge and understanding of local Post-Medieval agricultural activity within the site, this offsets (rather than alters) the overall effects on archaeological deposits, as they will still be destroyed/removed. Therefore, the overall effect would remain **Moderate Adverse**, and **significant** by EIA terminology.

Table 15-5 - Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation, residual effects and monitoring during construction

Sensitive receptor	Potential archaeological remains of Post-Medieval cottages within the south west extent of the site, the potential remains of Post-Medieval former field boundaries and as yet unknown potential archaeological remains from all periods within the site.
Potential effects	The sensitivity of the potential archaeological remains of cottages, field boundaries and as yet unknown potential archaeological remains from all periods within the site is low, and the magnitude of change is major. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term minor adverse effect on these potential archaeological remains (significant).
Additional mitigation	A programme of archaeological monitoring and recording would allow the preservation by record of any surviving archaeological remains. This would not reduce the actual adverse impact upon said remains but would offset this harm. Such a programme of works is anticipated to be secured as a condition of consent of the application.

Residual effects and monitoring	The sensitivity of potential archaeological remains is low, and the magnitude of change, following mitigation, remains major, as such remains would still be removed/destroyed as part of the proposed groundworks. Therefore, there is likely to remain a direct, permanent, long-term Moderate adverse residual effect upon surviving archaeological remains (significant) following the implementation of mitigation measures. However, it is noted that such measures offset (rather than alter) this effect, through the research contribution that the recording of such remains make.
--	--

OPERATIONAL PHASE

- 15.6.9. Direct impacts upon archaeological remains are only anticipated to occur during the truncation of undisturbed ground during groundworks associated with the Proposed Development. As there is not anticipated to be any groundworks during the proposed development's Operational Phase, there are not anticipated to be any further impacts upon any archaeological remains which survive within the site. Therefore, there will be **no change**, and no additional mitigation required.

ASSESSMENT AGAINST FUTURE BASELINE

- 15.6.10. The archaeological baseline is not anticipated to change without the Proposed Development, although designated archaeological assets may be impacted and altered by other development within their settings.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

- 15.6.11. The ES Chapter assesses the proposed development of the site at Birch Business Park as part of a wider development of the area (under ref: 25/00418/OUT). As such, the works associated with the proposed development of the wider area are anticipated to contribute towards a broader effect against the local archaeological record.
- 15.6.12. Particularly, any groundworks associated with this broader development (excavation of foundations etc.) would continue to erode the finite archaeological record. The baseline within the appended ADBA (**Appendix 15.1**) as outlined above in section 1.4 has concluded that archaeological remains relating to later Medieval and Post-Medieval agricultural and small-scale industrial activity survive throughout the 1km study area of the site, within which the majority of the wider proposed development falls. Such remains include former mining pits, ridge and furrow ploughing, and former field boundaries. Potential archaeological remains may include evidence for metal-working (such as the slag deposits recorded on the HER to the west of the assessed site) and further evidence for agricultural activity and settlement.
- 15.6.13. The erosion of the local archaeological record would occur through the physical truncation and/or destruction of such remains during groundworks. As noted above, the presence of appropriate mitigation (programme of archaeological monitoring and recording, etc.) would offset rather than alter any adverse effect. A cumulative erosion of the preserved Post-Medieval agricultural landscape is also anticipated to occur due to the Proposed Development.

15.7 OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT

- 15.7.1. There are no real opportunities available for environmental enhancement.

15.8 DIFFICULTIES AND UNCERTAINTIES

There are no major difficulties which have been anticipated in compiling of above information. The only possible uncertainty has been addressed above in section 1.6.6; that being the decision to not

recommend further archaeological investigation prior to the submission of the application, such as a geophysical survey. This is due to the assessed low archaeological potential within the site from the heritage baseline information, as well as the relatively small area of the site. Without this investigation, the presence of archaeological remains of heritage significance cannot be completely confirmed or denied. However, the site has been assessed to be of negligible archaeological potential for the survival of such remains.

15.9 SUMMARY

15.9.1. Table 15-6 below provides a summary of the findings of the assessment.

Table 15-6 - Summary of Residual Effects

Receptor	Potential Effects	Significance of Effects Prior to Mitigation/Enhancement	Additional Mitigation	Residual Effects	Monitoring
Construction Phase					
Potential archaeological remains of Post-Medieval cottages within the south west extent of the site, the potential remains of Post-Medieval former field boundaries and as yet unknown potential archaeological remains from all periods within the site.	Truncation and/or destruction from groundworks, removal from finite archaeological record.	Moderate Adverse (significant)	Programme of archaeological monitoring and recording.	Moderate Adverse (significant)	N/A
Operational Phase					
N/A	N/A	No Change	N/A	No Change	N/A

Key to table:

P / T = Permanent or Temporary, D / I = Direct or Indirect, ST / MT / LT = Short Term, Medium Term or Long Term, N/A = Not Applicable

wsp

