



10. Historic Environment

10.1 Introduction

- 10.1.1 MVV Environment Limited (the Applicant) has submitted a full planning application for a Carbon Capture Retrofit Ready (CCRR) Energy from Waste Combined Heat and Power (EfW CHP) Facility at Canford Resource Park (CRP), off Magna Road, in the northern part of Poole. Together with associated CHP Connection, Distribution Network Connection (DNC) and Temporary Construction Compounds (TCCs), these works are the Proposed Development.
- 10.1.2 The primary purpose of the Proposed Development is to treat Local Authority Collected Household (LACH) residual waste and similar residual Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste from Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and surrounding areas, that cannot be recycled, reused or composted and that would otherwise be landfilled or exported to alternative EfW facilities further afield, either in the UK or Europe.
- 10.1.3 The Proposed Development will recover useful energy in the form of electricity and hot water from up to 260,000 tonnes of non-recyclable (residual), non-hazardous municipal, commercial and industrial waste each year. The Proposed Development has a generating capacity of approximately 31 megawatts (MW), exporting around 28.5 MW of electricity to the grid. Subject to commercial contracts, the Proposed Development will have the capability to export heat (hot water) and electricity to occupiers of the Magna Business Park and lays the foundations for a future CHP network to connect to customers off Magna Road.
- 10.1.4 The location and the extent of the Proposed Development is identified by the red line shown on **Figure 1.1**. In total, the Proposed Development covers an area of 10.0 hectares (Ha).
- 10.1.5 A full description of the Proposed Development is provided in **ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development**. A list of terms and abbreviations can be found in **ES Appendix 1.1**.
- 10.1.6 This chapter of the ES has been produced by Savills Heritage and Townscape to assess the Proposed Development in relation to the effects it would have upon the historic environment. The historic environment includes the sub-topics of built heritage and archaeology.
- 10.1.7 The historic environment includes a wide range of features resulting from human intervention in the landscape, varying in scope from buried archaeological remains to late 20th century industrial and military structures.
- 10.1.8 This ES chapter describes the assessment methodology, the historic baseline conditions of the Proposed Development area and its surroundings, the likely significant environmental effects arising from the Proposed Development, the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or off-set any significant negative (adverse) effects, and the likely residual effects after mitigation measures have been employed.
- 10.1.9 The purpose of this chapter is to determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, an understanding of the historic environment resource to:
- provide a historic evidence assessment to understand the historical background to the Proposed Development;
 - identify any heritage assets located in the area and which have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Development;



- set out the significance of the identified heritage assets; and,
- formulate an assessment of the likely impact of the Proposed Development on the significance of the known heritage assets and propose any mitigation to the Proposed Development, if required.

10.1.10 This chapter is supported by a Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**) and is intended to be read as part of the wider ES, with particular reference to the introductory chapters (**ES Chapters 1–5**).

10.2 Assessment Criteria & Methodology

Previous Assessment

10.2.1 The land contained within the Red Line Boundary has not been subject to previous assessment. Assessment of the wider area has been undertaken by way of archaeological investigations and interpretation of findings, much of which is now recorded in the Dorset Historic Environment Record (HER). A summary of previous investigation, including their locations, is included at **Annex 2 and 4** of the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**). Where relevant, the results of previous investigations, locations of identified heritage assets, or details of points of interest in the historic environment, are referenced through the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**).

Legislative Context, Technical Guidance and Best Practice

Legislative Context

10.2.2 Section 66(1) of *the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* requires:

10.2.3 *“In considering whether to grant planning permission [or permission in principle] for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”*

10.2.4 Section 72(1) of *the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* pertains to the consideration of Conservation Areas.

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

10.2.6 Potential impacts on the settings of Conservation Areas and Scheduled Monuments, and on non-designated heritage assets are, however, considerations under Section 16 of the NPPF (July 2021) and local planning policy.

10.2.7 Regarding archaeological (buried) assets, the relevant legislation is contained in the *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979*. Section 2(2) of the Act requires applicants to seek scheduled monument consent for any works that demolish, repair or alter scheduled monuments. Scheduled monument consents are determined by the Secretary of State. There is no statutory protection of the setting of scheduled monuments, but setting is protected in national planning policy (Section 16 of the NPPF, July 2021).



- 10.2.8 Section 16 of the NPPF provides consideration of non-designated heritage assets in relation to the effect of an application on their significance. Paragraph 194 requires that ‘As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.’
- 10.2.9 The Poole Local Plan (2018) includes Policy PP30 – Heritage Assets, which sets out the approach in relation to the historic environment. In addition, the Heritage Assets Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted in 2013, and appropriate adopted Conservation Area Appraisals (for the former Borough of Poole and former Borough of Bournemouth Councils, where relevant), provide policy context.
- 10.2.10 The Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Waste Plan (2019) includes Policy 19 relating to the historic environment.

Guidance Best Practice

- 10.2.11 There is no specific heritage guidance or prescribed heritage methodology for undertaking an EIA. Relevant national and local guidance on the assessment of historic environment assets have been considered, including the following documents:
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2020, Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment;
 - Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014, Standards and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment;
 - Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysis Significance in Heritage Assets (Historic England Advice Note 12, 2019);
 - The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 2nd Ed, 2017);
 - Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2, 2015); and,
 - Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC), *Planning Practice Guidance: Historic Environment (PPG)* (revised edition, 23 July 2019).
- 10.2.12 Annex 2: Glossary of the NPPF (July 2021) includes definitions for terms related to the historic environment.

Baseline Data Collection

- 10.2.13 To determine the full historic environment potential of the Proposed Development, a broad range of standard sources were consulted, including documentary and cartographic sources and the results from any archaeological investigations within a wider Study Area (**Table 10-1**). This information was examined in order to assess which built heritage assets were located within specified Study Areas, to evaluate which were relevant to understanding the historic and archaeological background and context of the land contained within the Red Line Boundary and which were sensitive to the Proposed Development. The sources were also consulted to determine the likely nature, extent, preservation and significance of any known or possible buried heritage assets that may be present within or adjacent to the Proposed Development.



- 10.2.14 The Study Area assessed has reflected recommendations set out by BCP Council (Conservation Consultation Report, 2 September 2022) regarding proposed Study Areas for each heritage asset type. The Study Areas comprises a 15km radius for assessing the sensitivity of Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings, a 10km radius for assessing the sensitivity of Conservation Areas and a 3km radius for assessing the sensitivity of all other designated heritage assets and Locally Listed Buildings (non-designated heritage assets).
- 10.2.15 Bournemouth Borough Council's Local List (2000), and Poole Borough Council's Heritage Assets SPD (2013) were used to inform the list of non-designated heritage assets, alongside online mapping. The National Heritage List for England (NHLE), maintained by Historic England, was used to inform identification and assessment of designated heritage assets. Information on Conservation Areas was obtained through a review of both Dorset Council and BCP Council's online mapping and associated Conservation Area Appraisals.
- 10.2.16 In terms of proximity to the Proposed Development, there are:
- 140 Grade I or Grade II* listed buildings within 15km;
 - 64 Scheduled Monuments within 10km;
 - 48 Conservation Areas within 10km;
 - 36 Grade II listed buildings within 3km;
 - 11 Registered Parks and Gardens within 15km; and
 - 51 locally listed buildings within 3 km.
- 10.2.17 A full list of built heritage assets is included in **ES Appendix 10.1**.
- 10.2.18 A 1km Study Area was used in assessing the likely nature, extent, preservation and significance of any known or possible buried heritage assets. The Dorset HER dataset was used to inform the assessment of archaeology and its potential.
- 10.2.19 See **Annex 2, Figures A2-1 to A2-12 in ES Appendix 10.1** for mapping of heritage assets and Dorset HER dataset.
- 10.2.20 **ES Appendix 10.1** provides a desk-based study, or Heritage and Archaeology Statement, which includes a review of available information to determine the baseline conditions of the Proposed Development and surrounding Study Area.
- 10.2.21 The Heritage and Archaeology Statement sets out the findings from an analysis of existing written, graphic, photographic, electronic information and walkovers undertaken across the Proposed Development and the Study Area, in order to identify the likely heritage assets within the Red Line Boundary and wider Study Area and to determine their significance in accordance with the NPPF and Historic England guidance. Section 8 of the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**Appendix 10.1**) sets out sources consulted in the identification and assessment of built heritage and archaeological Receptors.
- 10.2.22 BCP Council's Scoping Opinion (14 October 2022, reference PREA/22/00049) (**ES Appendix 5.2**) included the following response in relation to the Historic Environment:
- Officers accept your conclusions in relation to both the built environment and archaeology – impacts on these issues should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.*
- Your report identifies 72 listed buildings, 19 scheduled monuments and five conservation areas (this should include the Talbot Village CA to make six total) to be assessed within a 3km ZTV to form part of the LVIA. BCP conservation officers recommend extending this to 10km in relation to grade I and II* listed buildings to ensure the taller elements of the building would have no impact. This range may need to be widened if impacts are found at 10km.*



The assessment should also consider the impact on ‘groups’ of heritage assets as well as individual buildings and the cumulative impact of this. A recommended methodology from the BCP conservation team will be sent under separate cover.

Mitigation should be a direct response to impacts. Once an assessment on impacts has been conducted, any mitigation measures that are subsequently required would have to be robust and should not rely solely on landscaping or tree coverage as a mitigation measure. Site layout, building/plant design, materials and the colour palette would all be important ways to mitigate.

It is important that all heritage assets likely to be impacted, are identified in the first instance, their significance addressed and described and the impact that the proposal would have on each of them individually and as part of a group or wider view or setting.

The archaeology methodology within the report is acceptable in principle; however, is generic and should be tailored to the site. Officers appreciate the development is still at pre-application stage. Preliminary works should take place at pre-application stage and the results included in the ES, including site-specific information on how the works are undertaken and a heritage Desk-Based Assessment.

- 10.2.23 BCP Council’s Conservation Consultation Report (2 September 2022. See **Annex 6** of the Heritage and Archaeology Statement, **ES Appendix 10.1**) provided further advice including that relating to the proposed extent of Study Areas when assessing each set of heritage assets, mitigation measures and consideration of a cumulative impact assessment.
- 10.2.24 Pre-application advice was sought from Historic England via their Enhanced Advisory Service. Their response is included at **Annex 5** of **ES Appendix 10.1** (Heritage and Archaeology Statement).
- 10.2.25 Consultation with Dorset Council’s Senior Archaeologist, was also undertaken. This involved discussion of previous ground works and quarrying within the Proposed Development Boundary and its immediate vicinity; the potential for impact on and/or loss of archaeological remains; details of proposed groundworks and extent/dimensions of proposed cable trenches; and, potential mitigation measures.
- 10.2.26 Following receipt of BCP Council’s Scoping Response (**ES Appendix 5.2**), contact with the BCP Conservation team was attempted to discuss the proposed methodology and identified built heritage assets sensitive to the Proposed Development. No response was received, however the advice contained in the Conservation Consultation Report (2 September 2022) was taken on board in the subsequent Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**).

Predicting Effects

- 10.2.27 Following the characterisation of the baseline environment, the methodology used to assess the likely environmental effects on potential above ground (built) heritage assets or potential archaeological (buried) assets (‘Receptors’ in EIA terms) within the Proposed Development Boundary and wider Study Area would include evaluating the significance/importance of heritage assets. This is based on existing designations as well as professional judgment where such resources have no formal designation, and considering historic, archaeological, architectural/artistic interest, as outlined in the NPPF and Historic England’s Guidance.
- 10.2.28 The NPPF defines significance as “*the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. Such interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic and it may derive not only from a heritage asset’s physical*



presence, but also from its setting". The determination of the significance of a heritage asset is based on statutory designation and/or professional judgement against these values.

- **Historic Interest:** the ways in which the asset can illustrate the story of past events, people and aspects of life (illustrative value, or interest). It can be said to hold communal value when associated with the identity of a community. Historical interest considers whether the asset is the first, only, or best surviving example of an innovation of consequence, whether related to design, artistry, technology or social organisation. It also considers an asset's integrity (completeness), current use/original purpose, significance in place making, associative value with a notable person, event, or movement.
- **Archaeological Interest:** the potential of the physical remains of an asset to yield evidence of past human activity that could be revealed through future archaeological investigation. This includes above-ground structures and landscapes, earthworks and buried or submerged remains, palaeoenvironmental deposits, and considers date, rarity, state of preservation, diversity/complexity, contribution to published priorities (research value), supporting documentation, collective value and comparative potential, and sensitivity to change.
- **Architectural and Artistic Interest:** derive from a contemporary appreciation of an asset's aesthetics. Architectural interest can include the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures. Artistic interest can include the use, representation or influence of historic places or buildings in artwork. It can also include the skill and emotional impact of works of art that are part of heritage assets or assets in their own right.

10.2.29 Criteria for assessing the degree of heritage significance/importance are set out in **Table 10-1** below. This importance, or significance, then translates into the 'sensitivity to change' of the receptor (heritage asset).

Table 10-1: Heritage Significance/Importance

Heritage Significance/Importance	Criteria
Very High Of International Importance	World Heritage Sites and the individual attributes that convey their Outstanding Universal Value. Areas associated with intangible historic activities as evidenced by the register and areas with associations with particular innovations, scientific developments, movements or individuals of global importance.
High Of National Importance	Scheduled Monuments Listed Buildings (Grade I, II*) Registered Historic Parks and Gardens (Grade I, II*). Grade II Listed Buildings which can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historic associations Registered Battlefields. Non-designated sites and monuments of schedulable quality and/or importance discovered through the course of assessment, evaluation or mitigation. Unlisted assets that can be shown to have exceptional qualities or historic association and may be worthy of listing at Grade II* or above. Designated and undesignated historic landscapes of outstanding interest, or high quality and importance and of demonstrable national value. Well-preserved historic landscapes, exhibiting considerable coherence, time-depth or other critical factors.



Heritage Significance/Importance	Criteria
Medium Of Regional Importance	Conservation Areas Grade II Listed Buildings Grade II Registered Historic Parks and Gardens Historic townscapes and landscapes with reasonable coherence, time-depth and other critical factor(s). Unlisted assets that can be shown to have exceptional qualities or historic association and may be worthy of Grade II listing. Designated special historic landscapes. Undesignated historic landscapes that would justify special historic landscape designation, landscapes of regional value. Averagely well-preserved historic landscapes with reasonable coherence, time-depth or other critical factors. Archaeological features and deposits of regional importance.
Low Of Local Importance	Locally Listed Buildings Sites of Importance within a district level. Heritage Assets with importance to local interest groups or that contributes to local research objectives Robust undesignated assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor contextual associations. Robust undesignated historic landscapes. Historic landscapes with importance to local interest groups. Historic landscapes whose value is limited by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations.
Negligible	Assets with little or no archaeological, architectural, artistic, or historic interest

10.2.30 An advice note published in 2017 by Historic England provides guidance on managing change within the settings of heritage assets. It gives advice on understanding setting in relation to significance in NPPF terms (or 'sensitivity to change' in EIA terms), and how views may contribute to setting. The advice note sets out a recommended approach (reformulated here in context of the EIA), including:

- setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced and may therefore be more than its curtilage; that it may be affected by a range of factors beyond visual, including historical relationships between assets; it may extend beyond public rights of way;
- provide a historic evidence assessment to understand the historical background to the site of proposed development;
- the extent of setting is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve; heritage assets within extensive landscapes may have nested or overlapping settings;
- where the setting of a heritage asset has been compromised, consideration needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance the importance of the asset;
- importance of setting in relation to designed landscapes can extend beyond the designated area and may not necessarily be confined to land visible from the site of proposed development, but may have historic or other associations with the asset; and
- the contribution of views to setting can be assessed in relation to static, dynamic, long, short or laterally spreading views, and include a variety of views of, from, across or including that asset.



- 10.2.31 Once the sensitivity to change of Receptors is assessed, an assessment of the impact ('magnitude of change' in EIA terms) of the proposed development is undertaken. Effects on built heritage may relate to impacts of setting and/or visual changes and the effect of the scale of the Proposed Development on views potentially to and from built heritage assets.
- 10.2.32 The assessment of the magnitude of change resulting from the Proposed Development upon the heritage Receptors is summarised in **Table 10-2**.

Table 10-2: Heritage Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of Change	Description of Change
Large	Complete removal of asset; Change to asset importance resulting in a fundamental change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context, character and setting; The transformation of an asset's setting in a way that fundamentally compromises its ability to be understood or appreciated; and The scale of change would be such that it could result in a designated asset being undesignated or having its level of designation lowered.
Medium	Change to asset importance resulting in an appreciable change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting; and Notable alterations to the setting of an asset that affect our appreciation of it and its importance; or the unrecorded loss of archaeological interest.
Small	Change to asset importance resulting in a small change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting.
Negligible	Negligible change or no material change to asset importance. No real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context, character and setting.
Uncertain	Level of survival/condition of resource in specific locations is not known: magnitude of change is therefore not known.
No Change	No Change

- 10.2.33 The significance of the resultant environmental effect of the Proposed Development is determined by combining the assigned sensitivity to change of the receptor (dictated by the importance of the heritage asset) with the predicted magnitude of change (impact) on that receptor:

Sensitivity to change (of the receptor) + magnitude of change (impact) = significance of effect

- 10.2.34 **Table 10-3** illustrates how information on the sensitivity to change of the asset and the magnitude of change arising from the Proposed Development has been combined to arrive at an assessment of the significance of the effect. The matrix is not intended to 'mechanise' judgment of the significance of the effect, but to act as a check to ensure that judgements



regarding heritage importance and the asset's sensitivity to change and magnitude of change arrive at a level of significance of the effect that is reasonable and balanced.

10.2.35 Where information is insufficient to be able to quantify either the receptor's sensitivity to change or the magnitude of change arising from the proposed development with any degree of certainty, the effect is given as 'uncertain'.

10.2.36 In terms of an EIA, only the Major and Moderate effects would be considered 'significant', and these are shaded in grey.



Table 10-3: Heritage Significance Criteria

		Sensitivity to change of the receptor (depending on its heritage significance)									
		Very High		High		Medium		Low		Negligible	
Magnitude of change(impact of the development)	Large	Major		Major		Major or Moderate		Moderate or Minor		Minor or Negligible	
	Medium	Major or Moderate		Major or Moderate		Major or Moderate		Minor		Minor or Negligible	
	Small	Moderate or Minor		Moderate or Minor		Minor		Minor		Negligible	
	Negligible	Minor or Negligible		Minor or Negligible		Negligible		Negligible		Negligible	

10.2.37 The following terms are used to define the significance of effects identified:

- **Major effect:** where the Proposed Development could be expected to have a considerable effect (either adverse or beneficial) on heritage receptors (assets). For the historic environment, if the effect is adverse in nature, this equates to ‘substantial harm’ to, or total loss of, importance (or significance in terms of the NPPF) of an asset of very high, high or medium heritage importance, as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
- **Moderate effect:** where the proposed development could be expected to have a noticeable effect (either adverse or beneficial) on heritage assets (receptors). For the historic environment, if the effect is adverse in nature, this equates to ‘less than substantial harm’ (in NPPF terms) to the importance (or significance) of an asset of very high, high or medium heritage importance, as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
- **Minor effect:** where the proposed development could be expected to result in a small, barely noticeable effect (either adverse or beneficial) on heritage assets (receptors). For the historic environment, if the effect is adverse in nature, this equates to a low degree of ‘less than substantial harm’ (in NPPF terms) to the importance of an asset of very high, high or medium heritage importance, as a result of changes to its physical form or setting, or ‘substantial harm’ to, or the loss of, importance of an asset of low heritage importance.
- **Negligible:** where very minor or no discernible effect is expected as a result of the proposed development on heritage receptors (assets), i.e., the effect is insignificant. In this case the nature of the effect is identified as neutral.

10.2.38 Once the significance of the effect has been established, the next step is to assess the nature (or direction) of the effect, which can be ‘beneficial’, ‘adverse’ or ‘neutral’. If the proposed development would enhance heritage values or the ability to appreciate them, as expressed in the first stage of the assessment, then the impact on heritage importance would be deemed to be positive, therefore the nature of the effect is attributed as ‘beneficial’. However, if the proposed development would fail to preserve heritage values, or impairs



their appreciation by affecting the receptor's heritage importance negatively, then the nature of the effect would be deemed to be 'adverse'. In cases where the importance of the effect is considered very minor, negligible or uncertain, then it is generally impossible to identify the nature of the effect. In these cases, the nature of the effect is attributed as 'neutral'.

Geographical Scope

- 10.2.39 The Study Area comprises a 15km radius from the Proposed Development for assessing the sensitivity of Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings, a 10km radius for assessing the sensitivity of Conservation Areas, a 3km radius for assessing the sensitivity of all other designated heritage assets and Locally Listed Buildings (non-designated heritage assets). The Study Area took into account advice received from BCP Council's Conservation team and Historic England (see **Annex 5 and 6** in the Heritage and Archaeology Statement, (**ES Appendix 10.1**)). Where relevant, heritage assets beyond the Study Area were considered and reviewed where they were considered to be potentially sensitive to the Proposed Development.
- 10.2.40 A 1km Study Area was used in assessing the likely nature, extent, preservation and significance of any known or possible buried heritage assets.

Temporal Scope

- 10.2.41 The 'Potential Environmental Impact and Effects' section of this chapter assesses the likely significant effects (and the magnitude of change arising from these effects) that the Proposed Development would have on heritage assets during the construction and operational stages, along with the resultant environmental effects on the significance of these assets. The decommissioning stage would follow the operational phase and would last one year and be in accordance with an approved Decommissioning Plan.

Assumption and Limitations

- 10.2.42 The Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**) has been compiled using primary and secondary information derived from a variety of sources. It has been assumed that this data, as well as that derived from other secondary sources, is reasonably accurate. The Dorset HER can be limited because records are not based on a systematic search of the county but rather the records are largely reliant upon chance finds, opportunities for research and public contribution. Furthermore, documentary sources might be biased, inaccurate or difficult to interpret unless they can be corroborated by other sources of information. Grid coordinates recorded in the HER may be rounded to such an extent that the actual location of the asset can no longer be identified.
- 10.2.43 It is assumed that the Dorset HER dataset and mapping is reasonably accurate and up to date, with monument and event records having been assigned accurate dating and conclusions.
- 10.2.44 Non-designated built heritage assets have been considered within a 3km radius (Study Area) of the Proposed Development Boundary. The list of these heritage assets is derived from the Dorset HER and published Local Lists of the three former local planning authorities (now part of BCP Council). Part of the land within the 3km Study Area is located outside the BCP Council area and remit of the adopted Local Lists mentioned above, being in Dorset Council. It is assumed that any non-designated heritage assets identified by either BCP Council or Dorset Council are already recorded on either the Dorset HER, adopted Local Lists, or both.



- 10.2.45 A Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was produced to inform the landscape impact assessment of the Proposed Development (see **Annex 2** of the Heritage and Archaeology Statement, **ES Appendix 10.1**). This ZTV has also been used to inform the Heritage and Archaeology Statement by illustrating a 15km radius around the Proposed Development Boundary and identifying areas from where the Proposed Development will not be visible. Whilst it is acknowledged that setting of heritage assets is not concerned solely with visibility, the results of the ZTV were used to scope out any heritage assets in these areas based on the assumption that due to distance, intervening built form, and topography, the settings of these heritage assets would also not be sensitive to the Proposed Development. The ZTV results are indicative only and do not take into account any built form or topography which would further limit intervisibility.
- 10.2.46 A high-level review of all built heritage assets within the Study Area for each heritage asset type has been undertaken. Following an assessment of each heritage asset, a sifting exercise was undertaken to assign sensitivity to each and scope out further assessment where relevant. This sifting exercise was informed by the results of the ZTV, map regression, understanding of topography and existing landscaping and evaluation based on professional judgement of the significance of each heritage asset (following guidance and best practice, as described earlier in this chapter). The sifting exercise also considered the heritage asset's significance and setting and was informed by intervisibility between the heritage asset and the Proposed Development. Not all heritage assets have been subject to a Study Area walkover. Study Area walkovers were undertaken for the most sensitive heritage assets where practicably possible, dependent on public access availability.

10.3 Baseline Conditions

Current Baseline

- 10.3.1 A list of designated and non-designated heritage assets within the Study Area is included in the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**Annex 3** of **ES Appendix 10.1**). It also includes mapping of the locations of each heritage asset in the context of the Proposed Development. The sensitivity of built heritage assets which may be affected is included at **Annex 3** of the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**). In terms of proximity to the Proposed Development, there are:
- 140 Grade I or Grade II* listed buildings within 15km;
 - 64 Scheduled Monuments within 10km;
 - 48 Conservation Areas within 10km;
 - 36 Grade II listed buildings within 3km;
 - 11 Registered Parks and Gardens within 15km; and
 - 51 locally listed buildings within 3 km.
- 10.3.2 The Dorset HER dataset has been used, alongside research and assessment of primary and secondary sources, to inform the current baseline and identification of known heritage assets or previously undertaken archaeological events.

Future Baseline

- 10.3.3 Should the Proposed Development not proceed, the current baseline would remain and the CRP would continue to function as a waste management site with the current uses remaining. A future baseline would be informed by;



- future archaeological investigation which would be incorporated into the Dorset HER and/or other relevant depositories;
- any future review of adopted Local Lists held by the relevant local authority; and,
- or any future review, by way of addition, removal or updating of national heritage list of designated heritage assets maintained by Historic England, or the local authority (regarding Conservation Areas).

10.3.4 It is not considered likely that changes to the current baseline would be sufficiently altered in the future in a way that would alter the conclusions of the significance of effect of the Proposed Development.

10.4 Inherent Design Mitigation

10.4.1 There is some degree of inherent design mitigation in the Proposed Development which would mitigate any effects upon the built heritage Receptors; the EfW CHP Facility will comprise a curved roofline which is more consistent with the curving topography which surrounds it; the use of materials and colour to finish the proposed built form, as well as green roofs, would help blend the structures into the surrounding landscaping; the chimney will be finished in fading paint to minimise its visual presence on the skyline.

10.4.2 In terms of archaeology, in locating the majority of the proposed built form within the area of the existing recycling centre and previous quarrying and infill, the potential impact upon the archaeological resource of the Proposed Development is mitigated.

10.5 Potential Environmental Impact and Effects

10.5.1 Historic environment Receptors that could be affected by the Proposed Development are identified in **Annex 3** of the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**). A review of built heritage assets within the Study Areas that may be considered susceptible to impact by the Proposed Development is identified, followed by an assessment of their significance (sensitivity, termed 'susceptibility' in this chapter, to distinguish this sub-categorisation from the term 'sensitivity to change' of heritage receptors), and then the impact of the Proposed Development upon them is assessed.

10.5.2 Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that "*local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.*"

10.5.3 Following national guidance, it has not been necessary to fully assess the heritage significance (importance), setting and impact (magnitude of change) of the Proposed Development on all built heritage Receptors within the Study Area. An initial screening was carried out to decide which built heritage Receptors would require full assessment. The list descriptions, ZTV mapping, and historic and current mapping and aerial imagery were used to consider each asset and assign it a level of predicted susceptibility to impact (magnitude of change).

10.5.4 A susceptibility of 'A' was attributed to Grade I and II* listed buildings within the ZTV that had settings that might contribute to their significance and might be impacted by views towards the Proposed Development. A sensitivity of 'B' was attributed to Grade I and II* listed buildings upon which the impact could be predicted to be insignificant due to the



distance from the Proposed Development, or where the setting consisted of views restricted by woodland or urbanisation.

- 10.5.5 A susceptibility of 'B' was also attributed to any Grade II listed building, or locally listed building within 3km, that may have a setting that contributes to significance and which could be impacted visually by views towards the Proposed Development.
- 10.5.6 A susceptibility of 'C' was attributed to Grade I, II*, and II listed buildings and locally listed buildings situated outside of the ZTV; have settings that do not contribute to their significance; have settings that are confined by nearby trees or buildings; or, are at such a distance and of a nature to make the appearance of the Proposed Development clearly insignificant.
- 10.5.7 Heritage assets with a susceptibility of 'A' were fully assessed for their heritage significance, setting and the potential impact (magnitude of change) of the Proposed Development. Heritage assets with a susceptibility of 'B' were assessed either individually or as part of a group with other buildings and/or a conservation area. Heritage assets (Receptors) with a susceptibility of 'C' were not assessed further after the initial screening but a note was made to justify their being scoped out, in terms of their nature, setting, and location, which is included in **Annex 3** of the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**).
- 10.5.8 Of the Grade I or Grade II* listed buildings in the Study Area, 25 were considered to have a susceptibility worthy of further assessment. 22 Grade II Listed buildings were considered susceptible, 9 Conservation Areas considered susceptible and taken forward for further assessment, 5 Scheduled Monuments were considered susceptible, seven Locally listed buildings were considered susceptible, and one Registered Park was assessed.
- 10.5.9 A review of the archaeological potential of land within the Red Line Boundary, taking the previous use of the land and known previous investigations into consideration, identified that there is potential for some degree of impact. This is also set out in the Heritage and Archaeology Statement at **Section 6** of **ES Appendix 10.1**.
- 10.5.10 The Proposed Development Boundary does not contain any archaeological features of national importance (that is designated archaeological remains) and it is not considered that there is potential for such remains to be encountered in the EfW CHP Facility Site. The Heritage and Archaeology Statement concludes that whilst there is a potential for archaeological features to remain in the general vicinity of the Proposed Development Boundary, the potential for such remains to be encountered within the Proposed Development Boundary has been considerably reduced due to the known extent of quarrying and mineral extraction, and varies across the land contained within the Red Line Boundary. This assessment is informed by reviewing the known baseline, evaluating the Dorset HER and planning history of the vicinity of the Proposed Development, and known archaeological investigations previously undertaken. The methodology for assessing the potential for archaeology, and its potential significance (sensitivity to change), is set out in the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**). The DNC CHP Connection and DNC Corridor has greatest potential for archaeology, and has the greatest sensitivity to change.
- 10.5.11 **Table 10-4** sets out the heritage Receptors (built heritage) assessed following the initial sifting exercise when considering the assessment of the potential impact of change on the heritage Receptors identified within the Study Areas proposed for inclusion. The magnitude of change, significance of effect and nature (direction) of the effect is included. Mapping and identification of heritage Receptors is included at **Annex 2** of the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**).
- 10.5.12 **Table 10-4** summarises the significance of effect which would result during the operational phase; further discussion of the construction and operational phases follows **Table 10-4**.



Table 10-4: Built Heritage Receptors and Significance of effect at the operational phase

Built Heritage Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect	Nature (or direction) of effect
LISTED BUILDINGS				
White Mill Bridge	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Canford School	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
John of Gaunt's Kitchen, Canford School	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Ninevah Court, Attached Carriage Arch and Screen Wall, Canford School	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Merley House	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Crawford Bridge	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Julian's Bridge	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
High Hall	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Little Moors Farmhouse	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Church of St Andrew	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Christchurch Parish and Priory Church	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Kingston Lacy House	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Dean's Court	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
The Minster Church of St Cuthberga	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Parish Church of St Nicholas	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Church of St Martin	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
The Castle	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Parish Church of Canford Magna	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Cedar Court	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Henbury Hall and Henbury House	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral



Built Heritage Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect	Nature (or direction) of effect
Wilksworth Farmhouse	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Charborough Tower	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Upton House	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Church of St Mary, St Cuthberga and All Saints	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Old Manor Farmhouse	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
280-286, Poole Lane	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Longham Bridge	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Rose Cottage	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Manor Farmhouse	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Church Cottages	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
310 and 312, Poole Lane	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
11-15, Canford Magna	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
21 AND 22, Canford Magna	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Court House, Canford School	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Lodge of Canford School	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Headstone Approx 9 Metres South East of South Porch of Parish Church of Canford Magna	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Two Chest Tombs Approx 15 Metres South of East End of Parish Church of Canford Magna	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
44 and 45, Knighton Lane	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Merley Mews at Merley House and Attached Front Wall and Archway	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral



Built Heritage Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect	Nature (or direction) of effect
2 and 4, Oakley Lane	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
10 and 12, Oakley Lane	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Merley Court and Attached Front Gateway and Walls	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
South Lodge of Canford School	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Garden Wall and Orangery Approx 100 Metres South East of Merley House	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Piers, Gates and Railings North West of Wimborne Lodge to Canford School	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
6 and 8, Oakley Lane	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
11 Oakley Lane	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
LOCALLY LISTED BUILDINGS				
43 Knighton Lane	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Merton Grange, Wheelers Lane	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Spinney Cottage, Arrowsmith Road	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Moortown Farm 1, Moortown Lane	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Moortown Farm 2, Moortown Lane	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Moortown Farm 3, Moortown Lane	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Moortown Farm 4, Moortown Lane	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Moortown Lodge, Moortown Lane	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
CONSERVATION AREAS				
Ridgeway and Broadstone Park	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral



Built Heritage Receptor	Sensitivity to change	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect	Nature (or direction) of effect
Tudor Road and Golf Links Road	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Ashington	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Oakley Lane	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Canford Magna	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Talbot Village	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Wimborne Minster	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Pamphill	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Wimborne St Johns	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
SCHEDULED MONUMENTS				
Badbury Rings	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Dudsbury Camp	High	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral
Bowl barrows cemetery and four other bowl barrows on Canford Heath	High	Small	Minor	Adverse
Bowl barrow on Canford Hath 650m south of southern corner of New Covert	High	Small	Minor	Adverse
Bowl barrow on Canford Heath 730m south east of Alhambra	High	Small	Minor	Adverse
REGISTERED PARKS AND GARDENS				
Kingston Lacy Registered Park and Garden	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral

Construction phase

- 10.5.13 During the initial construction phase, the effects of the Proposed Development upon the built heritage assets would be negligible as the works would be of a scale which would not be perceptible from any heritage Receptors. Once works get to a stage where built form could be seen from heritage Receptors, notably the Scheduled Monuments to the south on Canford Heath, the significance of effect would increase. The TCC areas and CHP Connection and DNC Corridor and POC would have a negligible effect, at most, on the sensitivity to change (significance) of the built heritage asset and this would not change any



significance of effect identified. The EfW CHP Facility would be the only element which may have a degree of effect upon built heritage Receptors during the construction phase, however, whilst this could result in adverse harm (being of less than substantial harm in NPPF terms), this is not considered to be significant in EIA terms.

10.5.14 Construction activities (temporary effects from dust, noise and vibration and artificial lighting) during the construction phase of the Proposed Development would have a negligible effect on the sensitivity to change (significance) of the built heritage assets and this would not change any significance of effect identified.

10.5.15 The potential for impact on archaeology would relate to the construction phase primarily. Groundworks could impact any archaeological features or remains, although this would not relate to the EfW CHP Facility Site itself due to previous quarrying and infill activities. TCC1 and TCC2, having experienced some degree of land alteration, may still retain archaeological features, which may be impacted during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. The CHP Connection and DNC Corridor have a greater potential for archaeological features to remain; it is considered that groundworks along this route would have a greater significance of effect than in other parts of the Proposed Development. As such, before mitigation measures are introduced, the Proposed Development has the potential to result in a minor adverse effect due to a medium magnitude of change to a receptor which has a low sensitivity to change.

Operational phase

10.5.16 Once operational, the Proposed Development would be perceptible from certain built heritage assets. The degree to which this would be visible and/or contribute to the setting of the heritage Receptors is assessed in the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**), alongside how this contributes to the significance, or importance, of Receptors. Only the chimney and main building of the EfW CHP Facility, and to a much lesser degree, the built form at the POC, are considered relevant in relation to sensitivity of Receptors, magnitude of change and significance of effect, when considering the operational phase and built heritage, as the other components would not be perceptible or appreciable from any built heritage assets.

10.5.17 In assessing the significance of effect of the Proposed Development, the Scheduled Monuments to the south of the Proposed Development are amongst the most sensitive to change and the magnitude of change upon them is considered the most significant (in EIA terms). **Table 10-4** summarises the built heritage Receptors and the significance of effect at the operational phase.

10.5.18 There would be no impact on archaeology during the operational phase of the Proposed Development as all impacts would have occurred during the construction phase.

Decommissioning Phase

10.5.19 For this assessment, a working assumption has been made that the Proposed Development has an operational lifespan of 40-years. However, it should be noted that it is common for such developments to be operational for longer periods. It is anticipated that the process of decommissioning would involve the termination of operational activity, following which there would be electrical and process isolation and demolition activities. The EfW CHP Facility Site (including the CHP Connection) and the DNC would be left in a clear and secure condition in accordance with a Decommissioning Plan. The decommissioning process is anticipated to last for one year.



- 10.5.20 For the purposes of this assessment, the environmental effects associated with the decommissioning phase would be of a similar level to those reported for the construction phase works, albeit with a lesser duration, of one year.

10.6 Additional Mitigation

- 10.6.1 Due to the nature of the potential impact that would be had to sensitive built heritage assets, it is not considered that further mitigation measures which could be implemented to further reduce any negative effects. The height of the chimney, and the associated building, has been reduced as far as possible as part of the inherent design mitigation, taking into account the required functions of the EfW CHP Facility as well as consideration of impacts on other Receptors outside of the historic environment.
- 10.6.2 A programme of archaeological fieldwork mitigation might be required where there is the potential to encounter archaeological remains. It is deemed that the route of the CHP Connection and DNC Corridor has the highest potential for encountering archaeological features and due to the nature of the proposed works, is the most sensitive to intrusive groundworks. Should archaeological features be encountered during the construction phase, the impact on these features could be mitigated by a programme of works to be agreed with the County Archaeologist. This may involve investigation during groundworks.
- 10.6.3 Consultation with the County Archaeologist, which followed the production of the Heritage and Archaeology Statement (including assessment of the potential for archaeology across the Proposed Development and review of previous archaeological investigation undertaken in the vicinity), concluded that the area of the Proposed Development Boundary was a complex site of previous investigation, quarrying and land alteration, with some details not known or difficult to determine.
- 10.6.4 In summary, there is potential for archaeology within the Proposed Development, albeit higher potential to the north. The County Archaeologist suggested the imposition of a programme of works condition, to be informed once details of the construction methods were known.

10.7 Residual Effects

Construction phase

- 10.7.1 As it is not considered that any additional mitigation measures could be provided in relation to built heritage, the residual effects would echo the effects identified in **Section 10.5**.
- 10.7.2 If required, a programme of archaeological fieldwork, to be agreed in consultation with the County Archaeologist as part of any planning consent condition, would mitigate against the identified construction effects. Therefore, it is considered the residual effect of the Proposed Development on the below ground heritage assets (archaeological remains) will be minor in magnitude and adverse, since, whilst the assets will have been impacted, they would be recorded, where relevant, and the archaeological interest of the land would be better understood.

Operational phase

- 10.7.3 No additional mitigation is proposed regarding the effects identified to built heritage assets. The residual environmental effects during the operation phase would be equal to the potential environmental impacts and effects as outlined above. The residual effects would echo the effects identified in **Table 10-4**.



- 10.7.4 There will be no operational effects on archaeology as all remains will have been recorded through the agreed programme of mitigation prior to the operational phase.
- 10.7.5 During any decommissioning phase, any effects upon the built heritage Receptors would be no worse than the operational phase and could be reduced during the decommissioning phase, dependent on its nature and degree of retention.

10.8 Implications of Climate Change

- 10.8.1 It is not considered that predicted climate change would alter the predicted effects. The climate makes no contribution to the importance of any heritage Receptors within the Study Area and would not alter the magnitude of change deemed to result from the Proposed Development.

10.9 Cumulative Effects

- 10.9.1 A review of the schedule of committed schemes provided in **ES Chapter 5: Approach to Assessment** has been undertaken. It is considered that two of the schemes included in the Schedule may be relevant in the assessment of the magnitude of change and resultant significance of effect upon one heritage receptor (the locally listed Merton Grange). The schemes (Magna Road, Bournemouth, application reference APP/21/01186 and Wheelers Lane, Bournemouth, application reference APP/21/00620/F) would result in a major change to the setting of the Receptor and adversely impact its importance. This would reduce the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of the Receptor. The significance of effect of the Proposed Development on Merton Grange would be negligible.
- 10.9.2 The solar farm scheme (APP/21/00400/F) to the west of the Proposed Development Boundary, is a minor element on the setting of the Scheduled barrows to the south of the Proposed Development Boundary (NHLE numbers 1018486, 1018487 and 1018488) and is understood as having had an adverse impact on the sensitivity of the heritage Receptor. The Proposed Development would result in a cumulative effect of increased adverse effect.
- 10.9.3 It is possible that the impact of other consented developments located closer to heritage assets identified in the assessment would have a more direct impact or effect upon the setting and significance (sensitivity) of any particular heritage asset; however it is not considered that they would result in any cumulative effect as a result of the Proposed Development, rather they may have an effect which is beyond the scope and relevance of the Proposed Development.
- 10.9.4 No cumulative effects would impact on the assessment of significance of effect of the archaeology of the Proposed Development.

10.10 Summary

- 10.10.1 The Heritage and Archaeology Statement (**ES Appendix 10.1**) sets out the conclusions of the assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development upon the historic environment. It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in a negligible effect upon the majority of built heritage assets (as set out in **Table 10-4**).
- 10.10.2 The change to the setting of the Scheduled barrows to the south of the Proposed Development (including the Bowl barrow south of the southern corner of New Covert, NHLE number 1018487, the Bowl barrow south east of Alhambra, NHLE number 1018488, and notably the Bowl barrow cemetery and four other bowl barrows on Canford Heath, NHLE number 1018486) would be altered as a result of the Proposed Development, which is

10.22

Environmental Statement Chapter 10: Historic Environment



considered to be a minor adverse effect. This is a result of a small magnitude of change to the heritage Receptors which have a high sensitivity to change; the effect being minor, as the Proposed Development would have a low degree of, in NPPF terms, 'less than substantial harm'. This level of effect is **not significant in EIA terms**.

10.10.3 The potential for encountering archaeological features or remains as a result of the Proposed Development varies across the Proposed Development Boundary. Should these be encountered during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, it is likely that they would be effected to a minor degree of magnitude which could be reduced through undertaking a programme of archaeological fieldwork and 'preservation by record'. This level of effect is **not significant in EIA terms**.

10.10.4 A summary of this assessment is set out at **Table 10-5** below.



Table 10-5: Summary of Effects

Receptor	Sensitivity of Receptor	Nature of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant/not significant
Construction phase					
Built heritage: Bowl barrows cemetery and four other bowl barrows on Canford Heath	High	Change to setting	No additional mitigation would alter the impact	Minor adverse	Not significant
Built heritage: Bowl barrow on Canford Hath 650m south of southern corner of New Covert	High	Change to setting	No additional mitigation would alter the impact	Minor adverse	Not significant
Built heritage: Bowl barrow on Canford Heath 730m south east of Alhambra	High	Change to setting	No additional mitigation would alter the impact	Minor adverse	Not significant
Archaeology	Low	Invasive groundworks	Programme of archaeological fieldwork	Minor adverse	Not significant
Operational phase					
Built heritage: Bowl barrows cemetery and four other bowl	High	Change to setting	No additional mitigation would alter the impact	Minor adverse	Not significant



10.24

Environmental Statement Chapter 10: Historic Environment

Receptor	Sensitivity of Receptor	Nature of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant/not significant
barrows on Canford Heath					
Built heritage: Bowl barrow on Canford Heath 650m south of southern corner of New Covert	High	Change to setting	No additional mitigation would alter the impact	Minor adverse	Not significant
Built heritage: Bowl barrow on Canford Heath 730m south east of Alhambra	High	Change to setting	No additional mitigation would alter the impact	Minor adverse	Not significant
Archaeology	Low	No change	N/A	N/A	N/A

10.11 Mitigation Commitments Summary

- 10.11.1 No further mitigation measures are proposed in relation to built heritage. In relation to archaeology, any impacts of the Proposed Development would be mitigated by way of a programme of archaeological fieldwork, to be agreed in consultation with the County Archaeologist.



10.25

Environmental Statement Chapter 10: Historic Environment

Table 10-6: Summary for Securing Mitigation

Identified receptor	Type and purpose of additional mitigation measure (prevent, reduce, offset, enhance)	Means by which mitigation may be secured (e.g. planning condition / legal agreement)	To be delivered by	Auditable by
Construction				
Archaeology	Programme of archaeological works, to be agreed. To enhance understanding and record features	Planning condition	Applicant/ EPC Contractor	LPA's archaeology advisor (Senior, Archaeologist, Dorset Council)