




Allerdale Borough Council



Allerdale Local Plan (Part 2) Site Allocations

Heritage Topic Paper

September 2018 (updated January
2019)



1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This topic paper has been prepared in support of the Allerdale Local Plan (Part 2), providing background information and evidence in support of the site allocation selection process in relation to the historic environment.
- 1.2 The paper addresses comments received from Historic England (HE) which raised concerns over the Local Plan's approach to site selection, and explains how the methodology, evidence and feedback has informed choices made in the site selection process

2.0 Historic England Comments

The HE response to the Preferred Options consultation indicated that that it was concerned that the 'site allocations' do not have a clear and robust assessment of all sites where they affect a heritage asset and its setting, and that the Sustainability Appraisal makes an assumption on the impact of development of a site on the historic environment using distance without any mitigation being able to be dealt with at planning application stage. Before allocating any sites, HE outlines the need for an evaluation of the impact that the development of the site might have on the significance of heritage assets as part of a heritage impact assessment (HIA) undertaken for all sites prior to allocation and undertaken by the Council's Conservation Officer.

3.0 Site Assessment Methodology

- 3.1 The sites put forward for development purposes in the site allocations process were assessed using the methodology outlined in the Site Assessment Methodology 2014.
- 3.2 An initial *high level assessment* was conducted, eliminating from further consideration those sites falling into one or more of the following categories:
 1. Located in open countryside;
 2. Located within or adjacent to infill/rounding off villages;
 3. Located within areas of high flood risk;
 4. Located within sites of international and national biodiversity and geological value or
 5. Located within and deemed to have a potential adverse impact on important archaeological or historical sites.

In addition, sites submitted for residential development were discounted at stage 1 if they were:

6. Located within the Principle and Key Services Centres and less than 0.3 ha in area;
7. Located outside Principal and Key Services Centres and less than 0.15 ha in area or
8. Located within the HSE inner zone of a hazardous installation.

3.3 Criteria 5 relates specifically to heritage assets. Sites where development would be likely to have substantial adverse effects on a significant heritage asset that could not be mitigated would not be considered for allocation for development. Significant heritage assets included:

- World Heritage Sites
- Heritage Assets that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to Scheduled Ancient Monuments
- Scheduled Ancient Monuments
- Grade 1 & 2* listed buildings and their curtilages
- Registered parks and gardens

3.4 At this preliminary stage, It was envisaged that sites where such significant adverse effects would be likely, for example within a registered park and garden, or on a scheduled ancient monument, would be excluded from any further analysis and evaluation. The Council agrees that only the most highly graded sites were a consideration at this early stage. Although the stage one assessment did exclude a number of sites, none were discounted on the basis of heritage assets (criteria 5).

3.5 Stage 2 in the site assessment methodology involved a high level screening exercise on those sites carried forward from stage 1, assessing their performance in relation to identified sustainability objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The objective was to identify those sites that performed most poorly against the *majority* of the indicators. In terms of heritage assets, the distance of each site from known heritage assets was measured using GIS software. A red/amber/green indicator system was used depending on the proximity of the site to any asset, in order to identify which sites were most proximate to heritage assets, and may require more formal/qualitative assessments. Results of the screening exercise are contained within the SA matrices. This simple system does not replace the more detailed analysis of each site and its context undertaken at stage 3 in the assessment process.

3.6 Sites were not excluded at stage 2; the performance of each site against the sustainability appraisal was a factor in the consideration of sites at stage 3 in the assessment methodology, involving more detailed site appraisals in order to refine the list of sites to a number of reasonable alternative site options.

- 3.7 The detailed site appraisals undertaken at stage 3 were designed to achieve a thorough understanding of the site and its context. This stage involved manual constraints checking on and around each site, combined with site visits, an examination of planning histories and internal discussions for specialist input to compile a complete record of each site.
- 3.8 In terms of heritage assets, heritage constraints considered included listed building designations, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Conservation Areas, Frontiers of the Roman Empire (Hadrian's Wall) World Heritage Site, and the Historic Environment Record held by Cumbria County Council.
- 3.9 Planning Officer visits to each site were undertaken to establish site characteristics and to ensure that a proper understanding of each site and its context was achieved; each site was photographed. Criteria noted at the site visit stage relevant to the historic environment included:
- Relationship to existing settlement pattern
 - Site topography
 - Character of area
 - Landscape/townscape character and visual amenity (noteworthy character features in the surrounding landscape/townscape)
 - On-site features
- Non-heritage assets in particular would be captured at this stage in the process. There is more information on the criteria used in the stage 3 assessment within the SA Report.
- 3.10 Each site considered a 'reasonable alternative' or 'preferred option' has been formally assessed for their potential for impacts upon the above ground heritage assets by the Council's Conservation Officer. This involved the use of the GIS constraints maps and site visits, taking account of the nature and importance of the asset(s) and local topography, screening and any other relevant features, rather than just distance. The Conservation Officer has commented on design constraints and likely mitigation requirements where relevant. The comments of Cumbria County Council's Historic Environment Officer have also been taken into account, so that all (known or suspected) heritage assets are considered. The conservation officer's comments are summarised at appendix 1.
- 3.11 Responses of statutory consultees, stakeholders and local communities, and the results of the Habitats regulations assessment were all utilized in arriving at the final selection of sites for allocation. Where a site has been selected for allocation, Conservation Officer recommendations and reference to any

historic environment attributes have been incorporated, where applicable, into the site specific allocations policies in order to guide development of the site.

- 3.12 In addition, the Conservation Officer has been keen to stress the importance of design for all applications for new development, incorporating design statements, and where necessary heritage statements which specifically explain how any new development meets the criteria of Allerdale Local Plan Part 1 policies S2, S4, S27 (where relevant), S33, DM12, DM14 and DM17 as well as any other policies relevant to the site or situation. It is acknowledged that much of the district's built heritage is undesignated; the Part 1 policies which cover the design aspects of new development will need to be applied robustly to ensure its protection.
- 3.13 Site SA48 (4/WOR/101/S) selected for allocation occupies a particularly sensitive location adjacent a grade II* listed building, opposite a Conservation Area at a central junction in Workington. Heritage assets have been a key factor in the decision to allocate this particular site, in that redevelopment has the potential to radically improve the appearance of this prominent town centre site. Considerations for this site are outlined in appendix 1.

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 The sites identified for allocation have undergone a comprehensive assessment with full consideration being given to the historic environment. This assessment has been more detailed than the simple measurement in the Stage 2 Sustainability Appraisal. This has included a thorough review of site constraints, and context, followed up by site visits designed to capture site characteristics and context. The more detailed heritage impact assessments undertaken by the Council's Conservation Officer, which also included site visits, has meant that the sites being considered have been examined in a formal way, in line with HE comments.

Appendix 1

Conservation Officer Comments on the Local Plan consultation response from Historic England and an assessment of each of the sites within the ALP (Part 2) Site Allocation Preferred Options (Jan 2017) in respect of their potential for impact upon the historic environment. Other sites subsequently considered in the Site Allocations process are also included.

Residential:	
<p>1/WOR/002/R Land east of Whitestiles, Workington</p>	<p>It is my view that there are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings could be affected by development on this site. In addition, the county archaeologist finds that there are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>1/WOR/050A/R & 1/WOR/053A/R Land off Stainburn Road, Workington</p>	<p>The nearest part of this site is approx 55 metres from the listed building Stainburn Hall. As such there is some potential for the development of this site to affect its setting. However, there are already houses to the east and south of the Hall, and the site is lower and falls away from that of Stainburn Hall. In my opinion, as long as any housing on the roadside faces the road but doesn't have a frontage closer than that of the existing house 122 Stainburn Road, it will be possible to develop this site without any significant adverse impacts upon the setting of the listed building. There are no other listed buildings or above ground heritage assets that could be affected by development on this site in my opinion.</p> <p>There is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p>
<p>1/WOR/051/R & 1/WOR/054/R Land off Moor Road, Workington</p>	<p>This is a small extension to an existing housing development and rounding off of a logical site. Although Schoose Farm Listed building and Curwen Hall Historic Park and garden are only approximately 1 km from this site, there is no direct line of sight between them. In addition, the existing housing, a 3 lane large trunk road, many trees, the topography and many wind turbines lie between the sites and would screen and negate to a large extent any impact of development on this</p>

	<p>site. As such, in my opinion development of this site would not have any impact upon the setting of these heritage assets. There are no other above ground heritage assets who's setting could be affected by development on this site in my opinion.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>1/WOR/051/R Land off Main Road, High Harrington Workington</p>	<p>I consider that there are no above ground heritage assets that could be affected by housing development on this site. However, there is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised by the County Council that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p>
<p>3/WOR/084/R Former Southfield School, Workington</p>	<p>In my opinion, and that of the County Council Historic Environment Officer, there are no heritage assets that could be affected by the development of housing on this site.</p>
<p>1/WOR/061M062/R Land off Woodville Way, High Harrington, Workington</p>	<p>I consider that there are no above ground heritage assets that could be affected by housing development on this site. However, there is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised by the County Council that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p>
<p>1/WOR/064A/R Land off Seaton Road, Seaton</p>	<p>There are no designated heritage assets that would be affected by development of this site.</p>

<p>1/WOR/005/R</p> <p>Land Adjacent Coronation Avenue, Seaton, Workington</p>	<p>There is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p> <p>The nearest part of the site is approx 400m from Seaton Mill listed building. However the setting of the Mill is very much focussed on the river and immediate surroundings mature and plantation deciduous trees adjacent to the site provide significant screening and as such I consider that any two storey housing development would have no significant impact upon the setting of the Mill.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>1/WOR/073A/MAR</p> <p>Former Moorclose sports centre and swimming pool</p>	<p>There are no heritage assets that could be affected by development on this site.</p>
<p>1/MAR/008/R</p> <p>Land adj. to Ritson Wharf, Maryport</p>	<p>I consider that in the development of this site, there is the potential to adversely impact upon the conservation area and the setting of the complex of listed buildings on South Quay/Bridge Street. As these buildings were very large and important C18 offices and warehouses relating to the shipping industry, they are not only of national historic importance themselves but are very important to the character of Maryport's Quays and are landmark buildings in the Conservation Area. I consider that the character and setting of these buildings should be taken account of in the design of any new development. In particular the scale and design complexity of any new buildings should be subservient to those of the listed buildings, but the quality of design and materials needs to be high in order to not adversely impact upon the setting of these listed buildings. I would suggest that the footprint of any development should be kept away from the most north-easterly corner of the site in order to reduce the direct impact.</p> <p>There is the potential for archaeological industrial remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment.</p>

<p>MAR/010/R Land at Elizabeth Dock, Maryport</p>	<p>The development of this site would have an impact upon the character of the conservation area, harbour and its associated buildings. Any development should, in my opinion, take references from the traditional architecture of Maryport and marine influences, as previous development has (however, this does not mean taking references from the modern development itself as this would be likely to weaken local character). I consider that the most appropriate designs are likely to be contemporary using the traditional materials of render, slate and glass. I consider that any blocks should be broken up vertically by the use of colour and varying rooflines.</p> <p>There is the potential for archaeological industrial remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment.</p>
<p>1/MAR/013/R Land adjacent to Maryport Marina</p>	<p>The development of this site could have an impact upon the character of the conservation area, harbour and its associated buildings. Any development should, in my opinion, take references from the traditional architecture of Maryport and marine influences (however, this does not mean taking references from the modern development itself as this would be likely to weaken local character). I consider that the most appropriate designs are likely to be contemporary using the traditional materials of render, slate and glass. I consider that any blocks should be broken up vertically by the use of colour varying rooflines.</p> <p>There is the potential for archaeological industrial remains to survive buried on the site and it is advised that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment.</p>
<p>1/MAR/017A/R Land adjacent to Whitecroft Maryport</p>	<p>The nearest part of the site is 1.5 km from Ewanrigg hall and much of the site would be visible from Ewanrigg Hall. However, there is a lot of C20 housing much closer (some 100m away) and new houses proposed within its curtilage that may in part screen the Hall from this site. As such I consider that any impact upon the setting of the Hall will be insignificant in comparison to other closer development. There are no other designated heritage assets whose settings could be affected by development on this site, but there is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any future application should be accompanied by an</p>

	<p>archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p> <p>Historic England (HE) suggests that for site 1/MAR/017A/R an archaeological evaluation should be carried out before allocation because the site is surrounded by known Roman period sites and will have a strong potential to contain further as yet unknown archaeological remains. My response is that in an ideal world, an archaeological evaluation would be carried out before allocation, but I assume that this would involve either a geophysical survey or excavation, in which case I don't think that this would be practical – as in who would pay for it? HE are not offering to pay and presumably our LP budget does not extend to that. Jeremy Parsons doesn't think that further evaluation is necessary (or realistic) until an application is in.</p> <p>Given HE further comments in response to the pre-submission draft, the following wording could be included:</p> <p>The site is approx 150 m from the Scheduled Monument: Romano-British Settlement and trackway at Ewanrigg. Given this proximity and the potential importance of any unknown archaeological remains on this site and their potential constraints on the layout of any housing development, it will be necessary for a geophysical survey to be carried out in advance of the submission of a planning application.</p>
<p>3/MAR/036/R Land to the rear of Ellenfoot Drive, Maryport</p>	<p>Ewanrigg Hall lies within 150 metres of the nearest part of the site and as such development would have the potential to have an impact upon its setting, particularly as the closest part of the site is higher than that around Ewanrigg Hall and if this site was to be developed, the setting of the Hall should be considered as part of any design brief. No other designated heritage assets would be affected and there are no archaeological issues</p>
<p>1/ASP/004/R Land adjacent to Aspatia RUFC</p>	<p>I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by the development of housing on this site. However, there is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any planning application</p>

	<p>should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p>
<p>1/ASP/006A/R Land at Harriston Road, Aspatria</p>	<p>I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by the development of housing on this site. However, there is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p>
<p>1/WIG/012M013/M Former Wigton Auction Mart, Wigton</p>	<p>Development of this site will impact upon the setting of LBs, The Old Vicarage, 1 and 2 Victoria Place as well as the rear of Proctors Row, Thomlinson Junior School, and upon the character of the CA. However, subject to a suitable design which addresses the street frontages and takes account of the grain, scale and character of Wigton's built environment, as well as the settings of the listed buildings, the development of this site should have a positive impact upon, and enhance, the setting of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Part of the site has been the subject of an archaeological evaluation which revealed buried medieval remains surviving. It is advised that further archaeological evaluation be carried out in the remaining area of the site and there should be mitigation of remains impacted by the development following planning approval.</p>

<p>1/WIG/016/R</p> <p>Land south of Lowmoor Road, Wigton</p>	<p>This site is close to the southern boundary of the conservation area and the playing fields of Nelson Thomlinson School. There is a row of post-war bungalows between the site and the conservation area, however any new housing would be visible from and have some potential impact upon the setting of the conservation area. As such I would suggest that any new houses back onto the existing bungalows with gardens and are not above normal two storey (with shallow roof pitch) in height. I would also suggest a linear road pattern to reflect the development patterns either side of the site and to fit the existing traditional suburban character of this part of the Town.</p> <p>The site has been the subject of a geophysical survey which revealed a number of buried features of potential archaeological interest. It is advised that further archaeological investigation of these features and, where appropriate, mitigation should be undertaken if planning consent is granted.</p>
<p>1/WIG/009/M – Land off West Road, Wigton</p>	<p>There is a listed building (former Schoolmasters House) approximately 100m from the nearest part of the site. However, modern housing on Brookfields is between the listed building and the site. As such I don't consider that housing on this site would impact upon the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>There is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p>
<p>1/WIG/032/R</p> <p>Land South of Lowmoor Road</p>	<p>I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by the development of housing on this site.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues on this site.</p>

<p>1/ABB/002A/R</p> <p>Land adjacent to Abbey Road, Abbeytown</p>	<p>This site is approx 150 metres from and within the setting of the Grade I Holme Cultrum Abbey, which in part dates from the C12. Much of the site is visible from the Abbey and the low stone wall fronting the site appears identical to the boundary wall of the Abbey. As such it is considered that the site was likely to have been part of the Abbey land. The wall still provides a strong visual link with the Abbey and in my opinion is a valuable part of its setting. As such I consider that it is very important that this wall is retained in almost its entirety, rather than be rebuilt, otherwise its historic value would be largely lost and its contribution to character and appearance is likely to be significantly compromised. In addition, the layout, design and materials of any new development must take account of the need to not detract from or dominate any views of the Abbey.</p> <p>There is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p>
<p>1/ABB/003/R</p> <p>Land at Abbey Farm, Abbeytown</p>	<p>This site is approx 80 metres from the Grade I Holme Cultrum Abbey itself and is within 10 metres of the Abbey's graveyard and curtilage. The frontage of the site is visible from the Abbey building and the site is entirely visible and very close to (ie on the opposite side of the road from) Abbey Land. Apart from a new build section at the entrance to the site, the stone wall fronting the road appears identical to the boundary wall of the Abbey.</p> <p>Currently the part of the site that most impacts upon the setting of the Abbey is a modern agricultural shed. However, it has a low key agricultural character of simple design, which takes account of the colours and height of the boundary wall and which therefore has limited impact upon the Abbey and its curtilage.</p> <p>I am concerned that it would not be possible to develop this site with housing without causing notable harm to the setting of the Abbey.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues on this site.</p>

<p>1/ABB/004/R</p> <p>Land south of Friars Garth, Abbeytown</p>	<p>This site is only approx 45 m from Mill Grove, a grade II* LB, which was originally the Abbey Infirmary and is thought to date from the 1470s, later a vicarage before becoming a farmhouse.</p> <p>The site will be very visible from Mill Grove and as such development is likely to have some impact upon its setting. However, other modern developments, including the houses opposite, have already compromised the setting to a greater extent than new housing on this site is likely to and so I don't consider that significant extra harm would be caused. However, I consider that the creation of a road access to the site from opposite Mill Grove (in case this is or becomes an option) where there is an existing farm access, would cause harm to the setting of Mill Grove which would be difficult to justify by public benefit, because this would almost inevitably involve an urban style junction and the removal of bits of wall and possibly hedge, in order to create visibility splays.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues</p>
<p>1/BRN/004/R</p> <p>Land north of Broughton Park, Broughton (Great & Little)</p>	<p>It is my view that there are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings could be affected by development on this site. The site has been the subject of an archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey and the results do not raise any archaeological issues within the development of the site. However, there is a standing stone on the site and it is advised that a statement on its significance and how it will be affected by any development should be provided. This is a reasonable precautionary approach to take for a feature that may have some potential heritage value.</p>
<p>1/BRN/007/R – land at Rose Farm, Broughton (Great & Little)</p>	<p>There are no designated heritage assets that would be affected by the development of this site. However, the C18 Rose Farm farmhouse together with attached/adjacent traditional agricultural buildings, are a good example of the Cumbrian farm vernacular of that time and form a very attractive historic courtyard and north western entrance to the village. As such the farmhouse and attached traditional barns are (non-designated) historic assets, which should be retained as part of the proposed development in order to comply with Strategic Policy S27 (as well as S1, S4 and others). Should demolition of any part of the non-designated heritage asset be necessary for the development of the site, a full explanation and justification will need to be supplied. In the event that any demolition is</p>

	approved, a building recording programme will need to be undertaken.
3/FLI/008/R Land adjacent to Towassen, Flimby	It is my view that there are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings could be affected by development on this site. However, the site is located at the end of some former ribbon development which itself weakens the traditional development pattern of the village and therefore diminishes its distinctiveness. There are no archaeological issues.
3/FLI/012/R Land off Elm Lane, Flimby	It is my view that there are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site. There are no archaeological issues.
1/KBR/002A/R Land off West Lane, Kirkbride	It is my view that there are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site. There are no archaeological issues.
3/KBR/010/R Land adjacent to Lynholme, Kirkbride	<p>The site is approximately 400m from the Grade II* clay dabbin, Lilac House. However, it is not envisaged that there will be any inter-visibility between the site and the listed building as there are buildings, trees and hedgerows between. As lilac house is a modest sized domestic property (with remains of former outbuildings) its setting is not considered to be expansive and so is considered not to be affected by any normal rural residential development on this site.</p> <p>The site is approximately 300m from the nearest part of the SM 'Kirkbride Roman Fort, part of associated vicus and roman road around 370m south east of Whitrigg Bridge'. As such there is potential for unknown archaeological remains and any application would need to take account of advice from the Cumbria County Council Archaeological advisory service.</p>
1/PRO/001A/R Land to the rear of Bank House, Prospect	It is my view that there are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site. There are no archaeological issues.

<p>1/THU/007A/R Land to north of The Steadings, Thursby</p>	<p>There are two listed buildings adjacent to the boundary of this site (former farmhouse at Whitegates – Orchard Cottage and Holly Lodge). I would suggest that built development is kept a bit further away from the boundary here so that there is at least 50m between the listed building and any new house. The roadside boundary wall of the site is important to the character of the village and its retention (or as much of it as is possible) will be important to the visual integration of the site into the village.</p> <p>There is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any future application should be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment and the results of an evaluation, in this instance a geophysical survey.</p>
<p>1/THU/006/R Land to south of Matty Lonning, Thursby</p>	<p>This site abuts the rear of the listed building West house. It is an early C19 large Georgian house who's outbuildings extend almost to its rear boundary which this site abuts. As such, development could affect the setting of the listed building. As such, I consider that the layout and design of any housing should take account of this setting and should be designed to ensure that any building should be kept at least 50 metres from the boundary of the listed building curtilage and (ideally) that an Article 4 Direction should be placed on relevant new houses.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues</p>
<p>2/THU/015/R Land at Evening Hill, Thursby</p>	<p>Whilst Evening Hill Farmhouse listed building and the separately listed outhouses are approximately 100m from the nearest part of the site, it is my view that the topography and, to a lesser extent, trees mean that the development of housing on this site is unlikely to affect the setting of the listed buildings.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>Employment Sites:</p>	
<p>1/WOR/032/E Land at Oldside, Workington</p>	<p>There are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site and no archaeological issues.</p>

<p>1/WOR/034/A/E Land north of Port of Workington</p>	<p>There are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site. However, it is the site of the Oldside Iron and Steel Works and there is the potential for archaeological industrial remains to survive buried on the site and so it is advised that any future application would need to be accompanied by an archaeological desk-based assessment.</p>
<p>1/WOR/046/E Land off Jubilee Road, Workington</p>	<p>It is my view that there are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site. There are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>1/WOR/047/E Land off Joseph Noble Road, Workington</p>	<p>There are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site. There are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>1/WOR/048/E Land off Hallwood Road, Workington</p>	<p>There are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site. There are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>1/WOR/049/E Land north of Branthwaite Road, Workington</p>	<p>The site is less than 1km from the listed building Wythemoor Sough. However, the topography is such that unless the development involves a very large/tall building, there is unlikely to be any impact upon the setting of the listed building. There are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>1/MAR/009/E Hutton Place, Glasson Industrial Estate, Maryport</p>	<p>The listed building the Settlement is within one km of the site, and is on a hill so has considerable views. However the main listed building is screened by an outbuilding and any development on this site that complies with Local Plan design policies would not adversely affect the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues.</p>

<p>2/COC/019/M Land at Low Road, Cockermouth</p>	<p>The site is 300m from The Fitz listed building. There is scope for some impact upon its setting, but the site is screened partially in winter and fully in summer and the setting of the LB is already significantly harmed more directly by housing on Parklands Drive. As such I consider that if the development meets local plan design policies, then it will not harm the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>The site has been the subject of an archaeological desk-based assessment which identifies the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to survive. It is advised that archaeological evaluation and, where appropriate, mitigation would need to be carried out in the event that planning consent is granted.</p>
<p>3/COC/025/E Land off Low Road, Cockermouth</p>	<p>It is considered that no listed buildings are likely to be affected by the development of this site. However, the site is close to the western boundary of the conservation area and as such any design should take account of the setting of this edge of the conservation area.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>1/WIG/012M013/M Former Wigton Auction Mart, Wigton</p>	<p>The site is within the conservation area and is close to a number of listed buildings. As such development of the site will impact upon the setting of LBs, The Old Vicarage, 1 and 2 Victoria Place and possibly the rear of Proctors Row and Thomlinson Junior School. However, subject to a suitable design which addresses the street frontages and takes account of the grain, scale and character of Wigton's built environment and the settings of the listed buildings, in accordance with local plan design policies, development of this site should have a positive impact upon, and enhance, the setting of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Part of the site has been the subject of an archaeological evaluation which revealed buried medieval remains surviving. It is advised that further archaeological evaluation in the remaining area of the site and mitigation of remains impacted by the development should be undertaken in the event planning consent was granted.</p>

<p>3/ASP/014/E Land at Aspatria Business Park</p>	<p>There are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site and no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>Retail & Town Centres</p>	
<p>3/WOR/086/S Central Car Park, Workington</p>	<p>It is considered that there are no listed buildings or conservation areas that would be affected by the development of this site and there are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>1/WOR/030/S Solway House, Workington</p>	<p>Jane Pit Engine House and detached chimney, which are designated listed buildings and a scheduled ancient monument are approx 200 metres away from the nearest part of the site. As such there is some potential for a retail development to impact upon its setting. There are two storey houses and single storey industrial units closer to the site and it is considered that unless any retail development is higher than a residential two storey height or consists of a unit with a very large footprint near to the boundary of the site closest to the Jane pit buildings, then any new development would be unlikely to cause notable harm to the setting of Jane Pit.</p> <p>There are no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>Gypsies & Travellers:</p>	

<p>3/WOR/096/GT</p> <p>Former Caravan Park, Oldside, Workington</p>	<p>There are no listed buildings or conservation areas whose settings would be affected by development on this site and no archaeological issues.</p>
<p>Housing Sites post preferred options</p>	
<p>1/ABB/007/R:</p> <p>Land off main Road, Abbeytown.</p>	<p>There are 5 listed buildings within approximately 1 km of the site, the most important of which is the Grade I Holme Cultram Abbey, approx 500 metres from the site. The nearest listed building is the grade II Holme Cultram House (former vicarage) approx 250 metres from the nearest part of the site. None of the listed buildings have any direct intervisibility with the site and I do not think that there would be any likelihood of harm to any of these assets, if the normal design constraints of ALP S4 and DM 14 are complied with.</p>
<p>4/ABB/008/R:</p> <p>Land at Abbey Road, Abbeytown. (See 2/2014/0053)</p>	<p>The nearest part of the site is less than 100m from the Grade I listed Holme Cultram Abbey and approx 60 metres from its curtilage listed buildings. Given the cultural and social importance of the Abbey historically, I would say that its setting could be assumed to extend well beyond views of it and that its setting is an important part of its significance. However, given that its immediate setting has been significantly affected by C20 development, I will take its setting, for purposes of assessing any further impact upon it, to be any area that has views of it, or which could be seen from the Abbey's immediate curtilage. The site and any housing on it will be seen within views of the Abbey from a number of viewpoints East of the Abbey, in particular from along Abbey Road but also from some points along Main Street and Friars Garth. As such the site is within the immediate setting of the Abbey. However, nearer post war housing will also be seen within all of these views and so the impact upon the setting will be considerably less than would otherwise have been the case. However, there would be potential to further harm the setting if new housing was not designed to ensure that there is no greater impact than that caused by existing housing. I would suggest that, in addition to meeting (or in order to meet) the requirements of S4 and DM 14, it is important that any new housing follows the general layout pattern, scale and simplicity of form and detailing of the simple traditional housing in the village as well as the housing immediately surrounding the site. The Grade II* listed Farmhouse of Mill Grove is also approximately 100m of the nearest part of the site, however as a</p>

	private farmhouse its setting is not extensive and there are no clear views between it and the site and as such I do not consider that its setting could be harmed by the development of this site.
1/ASP/003/R: Land at Brayton Road, Aspatria	I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by development on this site.
4/BRM/010/R: Land adjacent to Meadowlands, Broughton Moor	I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by development on this site.
4/FLI/013/R: Flimby Brow	I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by development on this site.
4/FLI/014/R: Land to rear of Marona, West Lane Flimby	I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by development on this site.
4/KBR/013/R: Ivy Dene, Kirkbride	The site is approx 60m from the Grade II* listed Lilac House, Kirkbride and is clearly visible from the site of the listed buildings and there would be potential to affect the setting of the listed building. Lilac House is a C17 clay dabbin house which has been altered and added to and has important remains of a historic cruck barn to the rear. The front of the house is of a simple, understated Georgian design and I consider that its classical proportions and simple, undecorated frontage should be respected and taken account of in the design of any new housing in order to preserve and enhance its setting. There are no other above ground heritage assets that I consider will be affected.
3/KBR/009 Birch Hill Lane, Kirkbride	This site is approximately 100 m from The Grade II* listed building (clay dabbin) Lilac House. This is clearly an important historic asset due to its age and materials, but it is thought to have always been a small holding of house with byers, within the settlement, and so is unlikely to have had an extensive geographical setting. A dense development involving more than two stories on this site could have

	<p>some impact upon the setting of Lilac House, but this is unlikely to be the form of development considered appropriate for the village for other policy reasons and it is thought to be possible to develop this site without any notable impact upon its setting. However, given the proximity, the setting of Lilac House should be considered a constraint.</p> <p>The site is also approximately 120 m from the SM 'Kirkbride Roman Fort, part of associated vicus and roman road around 370m south east of Whitrigg Bridge'. As such there is a high potential for buried archaeological assets to survive and a geophysical survey will need to be carried out in advance of any application and provisions will need to be made for the investigation and recording of any remains disturbed by the construction of the development.</p>
<p>1/SIL/002/R: Land at Fell View. Silloth (2/2005/1033 expired)</p>	<p>I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by development on this site.</p> <p>Archaeological assets are known to survive buried on the site and provisions will need to be made for the investigation and recording of the remains disturbed by the construction of the development.</p>
<p>4/SIL/005/R: Harvest Park, Silloth</p>	<p>I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by development on this site.</p>
<p>4/THU/017/R: Land North of Matty Lonning, Thursby (remainder of field adjacent to Storey's)</p>	<p>The south east corner of this site is approx 200m from Howend Farm listed building. However, a C20 bungalow and modern agricultural buildings, as well as the A595, are located between the site and the listed buildings. (There is also a large wind turbine, but that will not be there longer than a few decades at most and so is not considered relevant.) As such I consider that there is limited scope for causing harm to the setting of the listed building, particularly if the housing is no more than two storey. The listed buildings of Evening Hill and Evening Hill farmhouse are both within 500m of the site and the housing may be visible from their land and upper floors, but I do not consider that their settings will be notably affected due to the undulating landscape and trees but also because the housing already approved/built on the adjacent site are closer and so will have had a greater impact.</p>
<p>4/WIG/034: Land off Syke Road,</p>	<p>I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by</p>

Wigton	<p>development on this site.</p> <p>There is a high potential for buried archaeological assets to survive on the site and provisions will need to be made for the investigation and recording of any remains disturbed by the construction of the development.</p>
1/WOR/023/M: The Cloffocks, Derwent Valley	<p>This site adjoins the Brow Top conservation area and there is scope for causing harm to its setting, in particular by the removal of trees on this site, but also the size and design of any building(s) could impact upon the character and appearance of the historic street and buildings. However if any buildings meet ALP design policies and are sited at the bottom of the slope facing the leisure centre road, and trees are retained near the top of the slope, then the impact should be limited.</p>
1/WOR/024/M: Borough Park, Derwent Valley	<p>I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by development on this site.</p>
1/WOR/027/M: Derwent Park Rugby Stadium, Derwent Valley	<p>The listed buildings of the Joseph Pirt and Co Engineering works adjoins this site, as does the St Michael's Conservation Area. In addition, the grade II* listed St Michael's church, is visible from the site. Some of the existing site appears to be banking around the stadium and this may need to be removed to ensure that the levels means that development does not overly dominate and affect the settings of the listed buildings, of which the church is most sensitive and important, and conservation area. The height of any development will obviously influence its impact. The site has some mature/semi mature trees at its southern boundary and these, in summer at least, help to screen the site from these heritage assets. Additional screening may also help.</p>
1/WOR/028/M: Land adjacent Tesco, Derwent Valley	<p>I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by development on this site.</p>
1/WOR/029/M: The Green, Derwent Valley	<p>The grade II* listed St Michael's church, the grade II* former Rectory and the St Michael's conservation area are all within 50 m of this site. The grade II listed Joseph Pirt and Co Engineering works are also approx 60 m from the site. Of these, the setting of the church is by far the most</p>

	<p>extensive and important because of its historic importance and community influence. The church is prominently visible from the north because of its size and high position on top of an escarpment above land to the north and east. This site is part of land which, until mid-late C20, used to be a mixture of residential and small scale commercial and industrial properties, so the open setting of the church to the north is relatively recent. However, due to the topography and size of the church, views from the north have probably always been part of its setting. As such I consider that the significant blocking of views of the church from the north would affect its setting and therefore its significance. As such, I consider that the scale and design of any development should take account of the need to preserve and enhance the setting of the church.</p>
<p>1/WOR/097/M: Lonsdale Park, Derwent Valley</p>	<p>The Brow Top conservation area and grade II listed Trades Hall are within 150m of the site. However, their settings are protected to some extent by the trees and planting on the bank to their north. As a result of this, the distance from the site and the urban nature of the area, I think that it is unlikely that development of this site would notably adversely impact upon the setting of any heritage assets and any impacts could be mitigated with tree planting along the site's southern boundary.</p>
<p>1/WOR/053A/R: Stainburn site (already commented, extra bit of land to the South)</p>	<p>The nearest part of this site is approx 55 metres from the listed building Stainburn Hall. As such there is some potential for the development of this site to affect its setting. However, there are already houses to the east and south of the Hall, and the site is lower and falls away from that of Stainburn Hall. In my opinion, as long as any housing on the roadside faces the road but doesn't have a frontage closer than that of the existing house 122 Stainburn Road, it will be possible to develop this site without any notable adverse impacts upon the setting of the listed building, if necessary with the use of landscape planting.</p>
<p>1/WOR/064/R: Seaton site, (already commented, now whole field)</p>	<p>I don't consider that there are any above ground heritage assets that would be affected by development on this site.</p>
<p>4/WOR/101/M: The Royal British Legion club, St John's Workington</p>	<p>The heritage assets that would be affected by this proposal are the Grade II* listed St John's Church and the Portland Square Conservation Area. The settings of both of these would be affected by development of this site and there is the opportunity to positively or negatively affect those settings. The existing British Legion building does not in my opinion have a positive impact upon the settings of</p>

the heritage assets or the townscape, but it is low and relatively discreet and so, in my opinion, does not cause significant harm either. The site is very prominent due to its town centre corner location on one of Workington's busiest traffic junctions and on the edge of the shopping centre. In townscape terms it would suggest the need for a landmark or distinctive building that welcomes visitors and elegantly turns the corner providing a stronger visual link between Washington Street and Jane Street. However, the site needs to be designed very carefully to take account of the settings of the heritage assets: St John's Church, as suggested by the Grade II* listing, is a nationally important piece of architecture and one of Workington's most important heritage assets which provides a very distinctive contribution to its townscape and skyline. Its classical architecture contributes an elegance and serenity to its surroundings which, in my opinion, could be easily be harmed by an inappropriate building on this site. In my opinion, existing views of the church should be retained as far as possible and the building line on Washington Street will therefore be very important. It maybe that a stepped façade is possible so that the building line at ground floor comes forward of that of the upper floors. In respect of the design, I would say that it is very important that the design is a high quality, robust design without features which would detract from the elegance and simplicity of the church. I would have thought that this is most likely to be achieved by a contemporary design, but one which takes account of local characteristics, particularly in respect of materials and colours.