

# Chapter J

## Historic Built Environment

---



# **Milton Keynes East Environmental Statement**

## **Chapter J: Historic Built Environment**

March 2021

**RPS  
20 Farringdon Street,  
London EC4A 4AB**

**[www.rpsgroup.com](http://www.rpsgroup.com)**

# Contents

<b>J1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
	About the Author	1
<b>J2.0</b>	<b>Policy Context</b>	<b>2</b>
	Legislation	2
	National Planning Policy Framework	2
	Planning Practice Guidance	3
	Local Planning Policy	4
	Other Relevant Policy, Standards & Guidance	6
<b>J3.0</b>	<b>Assessment Methodology &amp; Significance Criteria</b>	<b>8</b>
	Assessment Methodology	8
	Significance Criteria	9
	Consultation	11
	Assumptions and Limitations	12
<b>J4.0</b>	<b>Baseline Conditions</b>	<b>13</b>
	Existing Conditions	13
	Future Baseline	16
<b>J5.0</b>	<b>Potential Effects</b>	<b>17</b>
	During Construction	17
	During Operation	18
<b>J6.0</b>	<b>Mitigation and Monitoring</b>	<b>21</b>
	During Construction	21
	During Operation	21
<b>J7.0</b>	<b>Residual Effects</b>	<b>22</b>
	During Construction	22
	During Operation	22
<b>J8.0</b>	<b>Summary &amp; Conclusions</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>J9.0</b>	<b>Abbreviations &amp; Definitions</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>J10.0</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>29</b>

---

## **J1.0 Introduction**

- J1.1 This chapter forms part of the Milton Keynes East Environmental Statement ('ES') which sets out the findings of an Environmental Impact Assessment ('EIA') of the proposed development of a sustainable urban extension to Milton Keynes. It relates to land to the east of the M1 motorway and to the south of Newport Pagnell. A description of the background to the proposal; the relationship of this chapter to the wider ES; and a description of the site and the development is provided at Chapters A to C of this ES.
- J1.2 This chapter of the ES assesses the likely significant effects of the proposed development on the site and its environment in respect of Built Heritage. It sets out the policy context, assessment methodology and baseline conditions of the site, examines potential effects of the proposed development, and presents mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset (where possible) any significant adverse impacts. The likely residual impacts once these mitigation measures have been implemented are presented, and their significance assessed.
- J1.3 This chapter should be read in conjunction with the following technical appendices (Volume 2 to this ES):-
- Appendix J1 (Built Heritage Assessment).

### **About the Author**

- J1.4 This chapter has been prepared by Senior Associate Director Victoria Brocksopp BA (Hons), MA of RPS and is based upon 9 years' experience in the heritage sector, working particularly on sites across the South East. Project oversight has been provided by Operational Director Duncan Hawkins BA (Hons), MSc, FSA, MCIfA who has over 35 years' experience in the sector and is a full Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, which is the leading professional body representing archaeologists working in the United Kingdom. RPS Heritage are one of the largest heritage teams within the UK with a proven track record relating to the successful delivery of sustainable major urban developments involving effects on the historic environment, both within London and also in urban centres across the country.

## J2.0 **Policy Context**

### **Legislation**

J2.1 National legislation regarding the historic built environment is contained in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990<sup>Ref 1</sup>. Section 66(1) sets out the duty of the planning authority with regard to the determination of applications for development that may affect the setting of a heritage asset. It states that:

*“In considering whether to grant planning permission 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.”*

J2.2 This requirement is an acknowledgement that although the impact of a development proposal may not affect the physical fabric of a listed building or a heritage asset, it is possible to affect its special interest through development that may be located within its setting.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

J2.3 The revised National Planning Policy Framework<sup>Ref 2</sup> (NPPF) was published in July 2018, which was most recently revised in June 2019. The NPPF sets out national policy relating to the historic built environment, and is supported by the National Planning Practice Guidance<sup>Ref 3</sup> (PPG), a web-based resource that was launched in 6th March 2014 and has since been periodically updated.

J2.4 Section 16 of the NPPF is entitled ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ and provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Heritage assets are described as:

*“A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).”*

J2.5 The NPPF refers to heritage significance in relation to built heritage assets, and this term is used in the explanatory paragraphs below for consistency, but throughout this ES Chapter this term is substituted with “importance” to comply with EIA terminology.

J2.6 The guidance contained within Section 16, ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment’ paragraphs 184-202, relates to the historic environment and developments which may have an effect upon it. These policies provide the framework for the preparation of policies for the historic environment and guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 16 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking: the delivery of sustainable development; understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment; conservation of England’s heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; and recognition that heritage contributes to our knowledge and understanding of the past.

J2.7 Section 16 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 189 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that the level of detail supplied by an applicant should be no more than sufficient to review the potential impact

of the proposal upon the significance of that asset and to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

J2.8 The NPPF policy states clearly that the more important the heritage asset, the greater the level of protection is given to that asset. Paragraphs 193-4 state that:

*“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.*

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

*a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*

*b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”*

J2.9 Paragraphs 193-4 note that significance can be harmed or lost through development within the setting of a heritage asset. Paragraph 195 provides a test for assessing harm in relation to designated heritage assets: “Where the application will lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance, local planning authorities should refuse consent; Paragraph 196 notes that where development, will lead to less than substantial harm... the public benefits should be weighed against the loss”.

J2.10 Paragraph 197 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining an application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

J2.11 Paragraph 200 notes that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. It emphasises that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to, or better reveal the significance of, the asset should be treated favourably.

## **Planning Practice Guidance**

J2.12 The Government launched the PPG to accompany the NPPF policies on 6 March 2014, which has since been updated periodically. The guidance states that the protection and enhancement of the historic environment is an important part of national policy to achieve sustainable development. The PPG relating to Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment was last updated July 2019.

J2.13 It is crucial that the significance of a heritage asset is understood and consideration of this incorporated into decision making. The guidance explains that heritage assets may be affected by, direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals.

- J2.14 The guidance reiterates that the crucial issue in the assessment of proposals is whether development would cause substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset and explains that significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.
- J2.15 The guidance addresses the policy in the NPPF that relates to substantial or less than substantial harm as set out in paragraph 196 of the Framework, which notes that "where development, will lead to less than substantial harm... the public benefits should be weighed against the loss."
- J2.16 The policy guidance states that as part of the assessment of the impact of a proposal, thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

## **Local Planning Policy**

- J2.17 In considering any planning application for development, the planning authority will be mindful of the framework set by government policy, in this instance the NPPF, by current Development Plan Policy and by other material considerations.
- J2.18 The local planning context is currently prescribed by Milton Keynes Council.

### **Plan:MK 2016 – 2031<sup>Ref 4</sup> (Adopted March 2019)**

- J2.19 Plan:MK sets out the Council's strategic approach to managing growth and development up to 2031. It is now a part of the development plan for the Borough. The plan contains the following policies which are relevant to built heritage and the current application:

#### **Policy SD12: Milton Keynes East Strategic Urban Extension**

- J2.20 A. Land is allocated at Milton Keynes East – as shown on the Key Diagram and Policies Map – for a comprehensive new residential and employment development to meet the long-term needs of Milton Keynes. Development can commence once the necessary strategic infrastructure required to make the site deliverable is funded and is being delivered. In that circumstance, the development of the site will be allowed to proceed within the plan period as an additional source of housing and employment land supply.
- J2.21 B. Development will be brought forward in line with all relevant policies in Plan:MK, particularly Policies SD1, SD9, SD10 and INF1. A comprehensive development framework for the site will be prepared in accordance with Policies SD1, SD9, SD10 and INF1 and approved by the Council prior to planning permissions being granted.
- J2.22 C. The development framework and subsequent applications for planning permission will establish the quantum and form of development in more detail, but proposals for development will be expected to meet the following criteria (*inter alia*):
- Be informed by appropriate surveys of archaeology, built heritage and ecology with appropriate mitigation of impact as consistent with other policies of the Plan and the NPPF.

#### **Policy HE1 Heritage and Development**

- J2.23 A. Proposals will be supported where they sustain and, where possible, enhance the significance of heritage assets which are recognised as being of historic, archaeological, architectural, artistic, landscape or townscape significance. These heritage assets include:
- 1 Listed Buildings;
  - 2 Conservation Areas;

- 3 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and non-designated Archaeological sites;
- 4 Registered Parks and Gardens;
- 5 Assets on the MK New-Town Heritage Register; and
- 6 Other places, spaces, structures and features which may not be formally designated but considered to meet the definition of 'heritage assets' as defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF.

- J2.24 B. Where appropriate, development proposals must provide an impartial and objective heritage assessment. Where necessary, the Council will require suitably qualified specialists to undertake the heritage assessment. The heritage assessment shall:
- 1 Assess and describe the significance of the heritage assets affected, identifying those elements that contribute to that significance and, where appropriate, those that do not. The level of detail shall be proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of proposals on their significance. Limited and localised alterations to an unlisted building in a conservation area need not be supported by the level of detail required to convey the impact on significance caused by development in the setting of a listed building or by proposed alterations to the built fabric of a listed building.
  - 2 Be of an analytical and interpretive nature rather than simply provide a description of the assets and the proposed works.
  - 3 Provide a sound justification for the works, based on the economic, social and environmental benefits delivered by the scheme, for example, promoting the long term care for a heritage asset and/or its setting.
  - 4 Explain how the scheme has taken account of the significance of the assets in its scope, design and detail, in order to minimise or avoid harm to the heritage assets affected.
  - 5 Assess the nature and extent of any harm or public benefit arising from the scheme.
  - 6 Where harm is caused by the proposal, the assessment shall explain why such harm is unavoidable or required to deliver public benefits that outweigh the harm caused.
- J2.25 D. Granting of permission for proposals that result in substantial harm to or total loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset will only be exceptional or wholly exceptional in accordance with national policy and guidance.
- J2.26 E. Permission for proposals that cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset will only be granted where the harm is demonstrably outweighed by public benefits delivered by the scheme.
- J2.27 F. Proposals that result in harm to the significance of non-designated heritage assets will be resisted unless the need for, and benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm, taking into account the asset's significance and importance, and only once all feasible solutions to avoid and mitigate that harm have been fully implemented.
- J2.28 G. In assessing any potential harm or enhancement to the significance of a heritage asset(s) the following will be considered: 1. Avoiding successive small scale changes that lead to a cumulative loss or harm to the significance of the asset or historic environment; 2. Respecting the character, appearance, special interest and setting of the asset and historic environment; 3. Retaining architectural or historic features which are important to the character and appearance of the asset (including internal features) in an unaltered state; and 4. Retaining the historic form and structural integrity of the asset.



## **Milton Keynes East Strategic Urban Extension, Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document <sup>Ref 5</sup> (March 2020)**

J2.29 The Milton Keynes East Development Framework was adopted by the Cabinet of Milton Keynes Council on 10 March 2020 following a call-in of the decision to adopt the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on 13 January 2020. The SPD provides guidance on how the allocation of Milton Keynes East (Policy SD12 and other relevant policies) within Plan:MK should be planned and developed. The SPD is an important material consideration when determining relevant planning applications.

J2.30 The SPD makes the following conclusions with regard to built heritage and the allocated site:

*“Development should not adversely affect the setting of the heritage assets within or on the edge of the site, particularly Caldecote Mill, the hotel within the site and the Grade I listed Church of St Mary in Moulsoe.”*

*“Masterplanning of the site should protect the integrity and character of Moulsoe village, and be respectful of the character of other adjoining areas, such as parts of Newport Pagnell close to the site. Given the level of enclosure separating it from adjacent areas, and given the scale of MKE, the development has an opportunity to create a unique character of its own.”*

## **Other Relevant Policy, Standards & Guidance**

### **Historic England Good Practice Advice**

J2.31 The NPPF and PPG are additionally supported by a number of Good Practice Advice (GPA) documents published by Historic England, including GPA 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans <sup>Ref 6</sup>, GPA 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment <sup>Ref 7</sup> (both published March 2015) and GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets <sup>Ref 8</sup> (published in December 2017) and sets out the following stepped approach which should be taken to the assessment of impacts on the significance (in NPPF terms) of heritage assets:

- Step 1: Identify heritage assets that will be impacted, and the significance of these assets;
- Step 2: Assess whether, how and to what degree their settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s);
- Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance;
- Step 4: Explore the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm;
- Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

### **BS 7913:2003 Guide to the Conservation of Historic Buildings <sup>Ref</sup>**

J2.32 The British Standard 7913:2003 Guide to the Conservation of Historic Buildings provides guidance on the assessment of significance. It states that significance represents a public interest, and the planning system, and the policy and legislation which support it, reflect this.

J2.33 In identifying how significance may be assessed it is stated that heritage has cultural, social, economic and environmental values, and that the attributes that combine to define the significance of a historic building can relate to its physical properties or to its context.

J2.34 The guidance identifies that there are many different ways in which heritage values can be assessed. It recognises that some heritage bodies of the United Kingdom have suggested that these fall into the following groups:

- 1 aesthetic value, derived from ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place (this encompasses things purposely designed for that effect and those that are not (e.g. the picturesque, the sublime));
- 2 communal value, derived from the meanings of a place for people who relate to it in different ways, associations with social groups and individuals (this changes over time);
- 3 evidential value, derived from the potential of a place to yield evidence about the past (e.g. archaeology);
- 4 historical value, derived from the ability of a place to demonstrate or illustrate an aspect of the past or association with historic figure or event (for example a battlefield or memorial).

J2.35 The guidance goes further to suggest an alternative approach and to think of a historic building's significance as comprising individual heritage values from a list that might include:

*“architectural, technological or built fabric value; townscape characteristics; spatial characteristics; archaeological value; artistic value; economic value; educational value; recreational value; social or communal value; cultural value; religious value; spiritual value; ecological value; environmental value; commemorative value; inspirational value; identity or belonging; national pride; symbolic or iconic value; associational value; panoramic value; scenic value; aesthetic value; material value; and technological value.”*

J2.36 This chapter has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the 2017 EIA Regulations, guidance in the NPPF and the PPG, HE guidance and current best practice.

## J3.0 **Assessment Methodology & Significance Criteria**

### **Assessment Methodology**

J3.1 This section of this ES chapter presents the following:

- 1 Information sources that have been consulted throughout the preparation of this chapter;
- 2 Details of consultation undertaken with respect to built heritage;
- 3 The methodology behind the assessment of effects on built heritage assets, including the criteria for the determination of sensitivity of receptor and magnitude of change from the existing 'baseline' condition;
- 4 An explanation as to how the identification of heritage assets and assessment of potential effects has been reached; and
- 5 The significance criteria and terminology for the assessment of residual effects to built heritage assets.

J3.2 The following sources of information that define the Proposed Development have been reviewed and form the basis of the assessment of likely significant effects on built heritage (full details are provided in Chapter C of this ES):-

- 1 Land Budget
- 2 Parameter Plans

J3.3 Reference has also been given to a Design and Access Statement submitted alongside the planning application for MKE where relevant.

### **Methodology for Determining Baseline Conditions and Sensitive Receptors**

J3.4 No standard EIA methodologies exist for built heritage assessment. However, assessment methodology has been guided by various published documents including: BS 7913:2003 Guide to the Conservation of Historic Buildings, Historic England's GPA 3 and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges 2020 <sup>Ref</sup>. Although the latter was designed as best-practice for road schemes in particular, it is accepted as best-practice for the assessment of cultural heritage in relation to listed buildings.

J3.5 The assessment is a qualitative one, and the evaluation of significance is ultimately a matter of professional judgement.

J3.6 The three-stage approach presented below is adopted in order to reach an understanding of the level of any effect that a Proposed Development may have on a heritage asset. It is necessary to understand the importance of the asset and the proposed impacts on the asset to assess the overall effect on identified assets.

J3.7 Using a matrix that measures both asset importance (significance in the context of NPPF terminology) and impact magnitude produces an assessment of the level of the effect of the Development on identified assets. This approach, including the matrices themselves, is set out below in Table J3.1 to Table J3.3.

J3.8 To inform this assessment, a Built Heritage Baseline Assessment was prepared in July 2020 and updated January 2021. This report can be found in Appendix J1 (Volume 2 of this ES) and provide further information on the baseline conditions at the Site.

- J3.9 A study area was identified as the basis for the identification and assessment of heritage assets, extending 500m from the Site boundary, but extending further to the east to include all listed buildings within the village of Moulsoe. This scope is considered to be a proportionate approach to the assessment, based upon an understanding of the Site, local topography, existing townscape and the nature of the Development.
- J3.10 Built heritage assets are recorded in national and/or local historic environment databases, in this instance the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) and the Milton Keynes Historic Environment Record (HER). These data sources have been used in the preparation of this chapter and to inform the approach to mitigation for the Site. In accordance with national and local planning policy, this assessment considers both designated and undesignated heritage assets within the study area, including:
- 1 Registered Parks and Gardens;
  - 2 Listed Buildings
  - 3 Conservation Areas; and,
  - 4 Non-designated built heritage assets.
- J3.11 Listed below are the main sources consulted during the compilation of the baseline information:
- 1 Milton Keynes HER;
  - 2 Historic England National Heritage List; and
  - 3 Milton Keynes Council online sources.

### **Methodology for Determining Construction Effects**

- J3.12 This assessment considers the nature, scale and significance of the effects to identified built heritage assets that will arise during construction, with the effects defined on the basis of any changes compared to the baseline (i.e. the conditions which would exist if the proposals did not go ahead). The criteria for the assessment are outlined in Tables J3.1 to J3.3.
- J3.13 There are no known built heritage assets within the Site. Anticipated construction effects to the settings of built heritage assets within the defined study area would be indirect, short term and temporary. Potential effects include construction noise, dust or vibration, in addition to visual effects. Visual effects may relate to the presence of construction equipment (including any cranes) and hoardings in the short term and these views would change as construction progresses.
- J3.14 Accordingly, this assessment considers the following potential effects:
- 1 Direct effects on built heritage assets; and
  - 2 Indirect effects on the settings of nearby built heritage assets.

### **Methodology for Determining Operational Effects**

- J3.15 Potential operational effects are related primarily to visual effects on the settings of identified built heritage assets, since there would not be undue noise, vibration or odour associated with the Development.

## **Significance Criteria**

### **Receptor Importance**

- J3.16 Receptors are either known designated or non-designated heritage assets.

- J3.17 Listed buildings are designated by the Secretary of State (based on recommendations from Historic England) for their special architectural or historic interest. Conservation Areas are designated locally for special architectural or historic interest. Whilst Milton Keynes Council do not have a published list of locally listed buildings, a number of non-designated heritage assets were identified in the course of pre-application discussions. The NPPF and the PPG introduce criteria for the assessment of the importance of heritage assets and these have been factored into this assessment.
- J3.18 The importance of a heritage asset (referred to as “heritage significance” in national planning policy and guidance and within Appendix J: Built Heritage Baseline Assessment) can be defined in EIA terms as being of International, National, Regional/County, Local or No Importance. The criteria to establish the importance of heritage assets are described in Table J3.1.

Table J3.1 Significance Criteria for Evaluating Importance of Heritage Assets

Importance/Sensitivity	Description
International/Very High	World Heritage Sites Assets of acknowledged international importance Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives
National/High	Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives Listed Buildings – Grade I, II* or II Conservation Areas – containing very important listed buildings
Regional/Medium	Designated or undesignated assets that contribute to regional research objectives Conservation Areas - containing buildings that contribute significantly to their historic character
Local/Low	Undesignated assets of local importance Assets of limited importance, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives Locally Listed Buildings
None/Negligible	Assets with very little or no surviving interest

### Magnitude of Impact

- J3.19 The magnitude of impact is assessed without regard to the importance of the asset. In terms of the judgment of the magnitude of impact this is based on the principle (established in the NPPF) that preservation of the asset and its setting is preferred, and that total physical loss of the asset is the least preferred. Determining the magnitude of impact is based on an understanding of how, and to what extent, the Development would impact on the setting of built heritage assets. The magnitude of impact is rated as High, Medium, Low and Negligible.
- J3.20 Impacts can be direct and indirect:
- 1 Direct impacts: are defined as an impact caused by an action, which generally occurs at the same time and place as that action. They are generally associated with the construction, operation or maintenance of a facility or activity and are usually obvious or quantifiable; and
  - 2 Indirect impacts: are defined as changes resulting from primary impacts. These changes include impacts to the setting of assets; effects can be short or long term depending on their persistence or duration.
- J3.21 The criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact are set out in Table J3.2.

Table J3.2 Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Impacts

Magnitude	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts
High	Change to most or all key built heritage assets, such that the resource is totally altered	Radical transformation of the setting of a built heritage asset.
Medium	Changes to many key built heritage assets, such that the resource is clearly modified.	Considerable changes to setting that affect the character or importance of the asset.
Low	Changes to key built heritage assets, such that the asset is slightly altered.	Minor change to the setting of a built heritage asset.
Negligible	No impact from changes in use, amenity or access. No change in the ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.	No perceptible change in the setting of a built heritage asset.

### Effect Scale and Significance

J3.22

The assessment of effects is a combination of the importance and sensitivity of the heritage asset (Table J3.1) and the magnitude of impact on that asset (Table J3.2). Effects can be adverse or beneficial and temporary or permanent. Adverse effects are those that create or amplify existing or new impacts upon the importance/sensitivity of heritage assets or their setting and remove or limit the ability to understand and appreciate the importance of the heritage asset. Beneficial effects are those that mitigate existing impacts and help to restore or enhance the importance/sensitivity of heritage assets or their setting, therefore allowing for greater understanding and appreciation of it. Effects that are moderate or above are considered significant in EIA terms. Table J3.3 presents a matrix that demonstrates how the scale of effect has been assessed.

Table J3.3 Scale of Effect Matrix

		Magnitude of Impact				
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible	No Impact
Importance / Sensitivity	International / Very High	Major	Major	Moderate/ Major	Moderate	No Impact
	National / High	Major	Major/ Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor	
	Regional / Medium	Moderate	Minor/ Moderate	Minor	Negligible	
	Local / Local	Minor/ Moderate	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	
	None / Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	

J3.23

Effects that are identified as Moderate/Major or Moderate/Minor require professional judgement to determine the Scale of Effect.

J3.24

Effects that are identified as moderate or major adverse/beneficial are considered to be 'significant' effects, whilst those that are identified as negligible or minor adverse/beneficial are considered to be 'not significant' effects.

### Consultation

J3.25

Pre-application consultation was undertaken with Milton Keynes Council (meetings on 27 August 2020 and 2 February 2021). The Built Heritage Baseline Assessment was presented

during these discussions and the scope of the study area was agreed with the council's conservation officer. Draft parameter plans were additionally presented for discussion and comments were fed into the final parameter plans.

J3.26 Historic England provided a consultation response to an EIA scoping opinion (2 November 2020) and declined to comment, stating:

*“This application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your expert conservation advice.”*

J3.27 Milton Keynes Council responded to the EIA scoping opinion (dated 30th November 2020) as follows:

*“The approach for the Heritage Assessment, in particular taking into account the listed buildings in Moulsoe and the Grade II listed Holiday Inn building, is agreed. The potential impacts on those assets should be considered as part of the LVIA work, and further discussions should continue with the Council's Conservation Officer.”*

J3.28 These comments regarding the scope of assessment have been fully addressed in the Built Heritage Baseline Assessment and further discussions took place during the meeting on 2 February 2021.

J3.29 Pre-application consultation was additionally undertaken with Historic England (advice letter appended to Appendix J (Built Heritage Assessment)). Historic England agreed with the broad findings of the Built Heritage Baseline Assessment, that there would be a degree of harm caused to the setting of St Mary's Church, Moulsoe (in addition to other heritage assets in Moulsoe and Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse). Historic England additionally suggested a number of other heritage assets for detailed assessment, although acknowledged that they had been unable to undertake a site visit. Milton Keynes Council were approached to seek re-agreement of the scope of assessment.

### **Assumptions and Limitations**

J3.30 The assessment of the scale of effects is based on extensive professional experience gained on other major developments across Buckinghamshire and South East England.

J3.31 The assessment assumes the accuracy of the available datasets reviewed in its compilation. The Built Heritage Baseline Assessment undertaken to support this ES Chapter was undertaken in July 2020 and updated February 2021, including a range of both desk and site-based assessment.

## J4.0 **Baseline Conditions**

### **Existing Conditions**

- J4.1 The current baseline conditions are informed by the Built Heritage Baseline Assessment (undertaken July 2020 and updated February 2021), which is appended as Appendix J1 (Volume 2 of this ES). Figure 2 within Appendix J1 shows the relationship of the Site to heritage assets.
- J4.2 A study area was agreed with the conservation officer at Milton Keynes Council as the basis for the identification and assessment of heritage assets, extending approximately 500m from the Site boundary, but extending further to the east to include all listed buildings within the village of Moulsoe. This radius is considered to be a proportionate approach to the assessment, based upon an understanding of the Site, local topography, existing townscape and the nature of the Proposed Development
- J4.3 The site contains no built heritage assets. The site entirely surrounds (but does not include) one Grade II listed building, Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse (currently a Holiday Inn). Within the study area there are twenty-one listed buildings (three listed at Grade I and eighteen at Grade II) and two conservation areas. Three non-designated heritage assets, recorded on the local HER, were identified for assessment during pre-application discussions with Milton Keynes Council. Whilst lying outside of the study area, one Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Campbell Park, Milton Keynes, is also appraised within this report as part of a comprehensive assessment, to assess longer distance views north eastwards towards the Site.

### **Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse, Grade II**

- J4.4 This Grade II listed building is surrounded by the site on all sides, although remains outside of the Site boundary. It comprises a late eighteenth or early nineteenth century house, now converted to hotel use. The importance of the listed building relates primarily to the architectural interest of its fabric and design. It has historic interest illustrating the pattern of settlement across the local landscape.
- J4.5 The setting of Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse has been altered from its historic context, experienced in the present day alongside later buildings associated with its hotel use and a large car park. A band of tree planting screens the building from London Road but the traffic noise remains intrusive to the experience of the listed building. Beyond the hotel complex, to the east are large twentieth century agricultural sheds. The immediate setting of Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse makes very little contribution to its importance. More widely, the surrounding network of fields (comprising the site) provide a visual sense of rurality and contribute to the setting and importance of the listed building, but the noise and vibration of heavy traffic on London Road and the M1 notably undermine the way in which the importance of the building is experienced. The wider setting of the listed building, including the site, therefore makes no more than a moderate contribution to its importance.

### **Heritage Assets in Moulsoe**

- J4.6 The Church of St Mary is a Grade I listed church, dating in origin from the fourteenth century but heavily restored and rebuilt in the nineteenth century. Its importance relates to its special architectural and historic interest. Architectural interest is derived from the age and quality of the built fabric and associated evidential value, which traces the evolution of the building over the course of centuries. Historic interest is derived from the building's identity as a focal point within the historic core of Moulsoe, as well as the church's association with William Burges, a



leading Victorian architect. The immediate setting of the listed church relates to its churchyard and the monuments contained within it, one of which is Grade II listed in its own right. Beyond these environs, its setting includes The Rectory (Grade II) to the north and properties along Newport Road (both historic and modern in date). The church is positioned at a high point in the landscape, which drops down to the south, towards Milton Keynes. The descending topography, existing hedgerows and position of Church Farm to the south, restrict views into those areas of the Site lying in closest proximity to the church. Short and mid-distance view directions to the south include a rural setting of agricultural fields in the foreground, bounded by hedgerows with intermittent bands of tree planting. Longer distance views include views of the M1 and the environs of Milton Keynes, which include large warehouses at Magna Park. These views include some views of the Site, as part of the wider agricultural landscape. Longer distance views are also available from the church looking in a north west direction towards the eastern boundary of the Site, currently comprising the undulating agricultural landscape and network of hedgerows.

- J4.7 Thatch Cottage, Hillcrest Cottage, Wisteria Cottage and St Mary's Cottage are Grade II listed buildings located along the northern side of Newport Road, with rearward views towards the Site in varying degrees. There are two non-designated heritage assets in the village: Moulsoe Glebe Farm barn and Moulsoe School. To the north of the village are two further Grade II listed buildings at Tickford Park and Tickford Park Farmhouse, with outward views westwards towards the Site.

### **Heritage Assets in Willen**

- J4.8 The village of Willen, now subsumed within the suburbs of Milton Keynes, includes a group of six listed buildings and a conservation area. The position of the village, to the south of the M1 and surrounded by modern development is such that the site makes no contribution to the settings of the heritage assets and it was agreed during the pre-application meetings that these heritage assets would not experience effects of development within the Site.

### **Heritage Assets in Broughton**

- J4.9 The village of Broughton, now subsumed within the suburbs of Milton Keynes, includes two listed buildings and a conservation area. The position of the village, to the south of the M1 and surrounded by modern development is such that the site makes no contribution to the settings of the heritage assets and it was agreed during the pre-application meetings that these heritage assets would not experience effects of development within the site.

### **Campbell Park RPG, Grade II**

- J4.10 Campbell Park is located outside of the study area, to the north east of Milton Keynes town centre. It has historic interest as one of the largest parks to be laid out in England in the twentieth century, notable for the way in which it accommodated the Grade Union Canal and the existing natural landscape around the River Ouzel, with a large central area of pastoral landscape. The park's quality of design is reflective of the values and wider social history of Milton Keynes as a New Town, as well as the fundamental planning principles which guided its masterplanning.
- J4.11 There are long distance views from the high point of the park to the north-east towards the Site and the landscape beyond the M1. These views contribute to the setting and importance of the registered park for the way in which they illustrate the relationship of Milton Keynes with the wider countryside, providing some insight into the nature of the local context prior to the designation and construction of the New Town.

## **Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works, Pineham**

- J4.12 Construction of the Cotton Valley treatment plant at Pineham began in the late 1960s. It contains a group of historically important buildings in the Modernist style, set within verdant landscape surroundings. In this way it reflects the fundamental planning and design principles which have shaped Milton Keynes New Town. The vast majority of the Site lies to the north of the M1. Where a small section of the site drops down to the south of the M1 the boundary wraps around the northern and eastern edges of the sewage works. The enclosed nature of the sewage works is such that the Site makes no more than a minor contribution to its setting and importance.

### **Scoping Exercise**

- J4.13 After undertaking two site assessments a number of heritage assets within the study area could be excluded from further detailed appraisal, based upon the importance of the heritage assets, the distance they are located from the site and the nature of intervening landscape/townscape, which would prevent inter-visibility with the Proposed Development. In addition, there are no known direct historic or cultural associations between the heritage assets identified below and the Site. The following heritage assets were consequently scoped out from further detailed assessment as part of this ES Chapter (see Chapter 3 of the Built Heritage Baseline Assessment for details of this scoping exercise):

#### **Moulsoe**

- Yew Tree Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212854)
- Bretigny Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212856)
- End Thatch, Grade II (List entry number: 1289305)
- Carrington Arms Public House, Grade II (List entry number: 1212858)

#### **Willen**

- Church of St Mary Magdalene, Grade I (List entry number: 1160998)
- Wall Surrounding Church Yard with Gates at East and West Ends, Grade II (List entry number: 1125231)
- Willen War Memorial Obelisk, Grade II (List entry number: 1458606)
- School House, Grade II (List entry number: 1161013)
- Brook Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1125232)
- The Hospice of Our Lady and St John, Grade II (List Entry number: 1332332)
- Willen Conservation Area

#### **Broughton**

- Church of St Lawrence, Grade I (NHLE ref: 1332313)
- The Old Rectory, Grade II (NHLE ref: 1160062)
- Broughton Conservation Area

### **Receptors and Receptor Importance**

- J4.14 Table J4.1 below details the scoped-in built heritage assets identified within the Site and study area. Data has been sourced from the Historic England National Heritage for England (NHLE) List, the Milton Keynes Historic Environment Record and the Built Heritage Baseline Assessment.

Table J4.1 Heritage Resources and their Importance

Baseline Evidence	Description of Resource/Asset and Potential	Comment	Importance/Sensitivity
NHLE	Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1212914)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	Church of St Mary, Grade I (List entry number: 1212922)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	First Thatch Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1289355)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	Hillcrest Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212919)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	Wistaria Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212920)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	St Mary's Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212921)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	Screen Enclosing Carrington Graves to North East of Church of St Mary, Grade II (List entry number: 1212925)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	The Rectory, Grade II (List entry number: 1212926)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	Tickford Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1125465)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	Tickford Park Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1332206)	Listed Building	High
NHLE	Campbell Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1467405)	Registered Park and Garden	High
HER	Moulsoe Glebe Farm barn, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5415)	Non-Designated Heritage Asset	Low
HER	Moulsoe School, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5416)	Non-Designated Heritage Asset	Low
HER	Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works, Pineham	Non-Designated Heritage Asset	Low

## Future Baseline

J4.15

The baseline conditions for built heritage assets at the site and its environs are not likely to change unless the site is subject to redevelopment.

## J5.0 Potential Effects

### During Construction

- J5.1 This section identifies and assesses the likely effects on relevant built heritage assets during the demolition and construction of the Development. The potential effects, and the significance of the effects on the assets, are characterised in the absence of mitigation measures.
- J5.2 The principal expected construction effects would be views of the Site and indirect effects on the settings of some heritage assets. These visual effects would include the temporary presence of construction equipment (including any cranes) and hoardings in the short term and these views would change as construction progresses.
- J5.3 Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse is enclosed by the site on all sides and would experience effects of construction in close proximity, leading to a **major adverse** effect. These effects would be temporary. Some beneficial effects would be additionally delivered by the removal of modern farm buildings to the east. All other built heritage assets would experience longer distance temporary views during construction, but their immediate settings would remain unaffected. As such, no other built heritage assets would experience effects arising from construction which would be regarded as significant.
- J5.4 Potential effects arising from demolition and construction are summarised in Table J5.1.

Table J5.1 Assessment of Likely Construction Phase Impacts

Heritage Asset	Importance/ Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Scale of Effect
Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1212914)	High	High Indirect	Major Adverse, temporary
Church of St Mary, Grade I (List entry number: 1212922)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
First Thatch Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1289355)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
Hillcrest Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212919)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
Wistaria Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212920)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
St Mary's Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212921)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
Screen Enclosing Carrington Graves to North East of Church of St Mary, Grade II (List entry number: 1212925)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
The Rectory, Grade II (List entry number: 1212926)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
Tickford Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1125465)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
Tickford Park Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1332206)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
Campbell Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1467405)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse, temporary
Moulsoe Glebe Farm barn, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5415)	Low	Low Indirect	Negligible Adverse, temporary

Heritage Asset	Importance/ Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Scale of Effect
Moulsoe School, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5416)	Low	Low Indirect	Negligible Adverse, temporary
Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works, Pineham	Low	Low Indirect	Negligible, Adverse temporary

## During Operation

J5.5 This section identifies and assesses the likely effects on built heritage assets once the Proposed Development is complete and occupied.

### Direct Impacts

J5.6 There will be no direct effects to built heritage assets during the operational stage of the Proposed Development.

### Indirect Impacts

J5.7 Indirect and permanent operational effects would arise as a result of primarily visual effects on the settings of some of the identified built heritage assets. These effects would include the introduction of built form and infrastructure, supported with an appropriate landscaping strategy which would screen views which are sensitive in built heritage terms as far as reasonably practicable.

J5.8 The area of the site surrounding Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse would comprise residential use, with green pedestrian linkages to the immediate north, which connect the linear park with the eastern areas of the Site. The introduction of built form in place of agricultural land would impact adversely upon the way in which the importance of the listed building is experienced, but these effects could be minimised through good design and layout as part of a future reserved matters application. Notable beneficial effects would also be derived from the Proposed Development by the downgrading of London Road. Beneficial effects would also be achieved by the creation of new opportunities for pedestrians to appreciate the listed building.

J5.9 The proposed development would impact to varying degrees on the settings of heritage assets identified in Moulsoe, relating principally to the creation of mid and longer distance views of built form along the eastern edges of the Site in place of the existing agricultural land. The Building Heights Parameter Plan demonstrates that built form would be restricted in height along this eastern edge (up to 2.5 storeys/max. 12.5m ridge height (from existing ground levels +/- 2m)), to minimise potential visual effects of development. Effects could additionally be minimised through an appropriate landscaping strategy, which is discussed within the Design and Access Statement. Key features of the suggested strategy include proposed planting at Moulsoe New Wood, which would create over six hectares of community woodland, partly restoring the historic area of woodland known as Drake's Gorse. This planting would assist to screen views from listed buildings in Moulsoe towards the eastern edges of the site, minimising effects on the importance of the identified heritage assets.

J5.10 With specific regard to the Church of St Mary, a primary school is proposed for the section of the site to the south, which lies in closest proximity to the church. The Building Height Parameter Plan demonstrates that built form would be restricted in height up to one storey/ max. 8m ridge height (from existing ground levels +/- 2m) and set back from the Site boundaries to minimise effects of development on the setting of the Grade I listed church. The landscaping strategy

presented in the Design and Access Statement would minimise visual effects through the introduction of native hedge planting and hedgerow trees along the Site boundary, which would be used to supplement existing vegetation along the edge of the site. The hedge would be allowed to grow to the full height of the school fence and combined with taller tree canopies would provide screening for sensitive receptors in Moulsoe.

J5.11 There would be some long distance views of development within the site from the high point of Campbell Registered Park and Garden. These views would expand the outer edges of Milton Keynes in this view, reducing the degree of visible rural landscape. Whilst this would reduce the degree to which a viewer can appreciate the Registered Park within a wider context, it would not fundamentally alter the way in which the importance of the park and its design are currently appreciated.

J5.12 The Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan illustrates that areas of the Site located closest to the Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works, Pineham would fall within the linear park, without any proposed built form. As such, whilst there would be changes introduced to the setting of the non-designated heritage asset, the verdant surroundings of the sewage works (which contribute to its importance) would remain conserved.

J5.13 Table J5.2 outlines effects arising from the Proposed Development during operation:-

Table J5.2 Evaluation of Predicted Impacts During Operational Phase

Heritage Asset	Importance/ Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Scale of Effect
Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1212914)	High	High Indirect and Medium Indirect	Major Adverse and Moderate Beneficial
Church of St Mary, Grade I (List entry number: 1212922)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
First Thatch Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1289355)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
Hillcrest Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212919)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
Wistaria Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212920)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
St Mary's Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212921)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
Screen Enclosing Carrington Graves to North East of Church of St Mary, Grade II (List entry number: 1212925)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
The Rectory, Grade II (List entry number: 1212926)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
Tickford Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1125465)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
Tickford Park Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1332206)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
Campbell Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1467405)	High	Low Indirect	Minor Adverse
Moulsoe Glebe Farm barn, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5415)	Low	Low Indirect	Negligible

<b>Heritage Asset</b>	<b>Importance/ Sensitivity</b>	<b>Magnitude of Impact</b>	<b>Scale of Effect</b>
Moulsoe School, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5416)	Low	Low Indirect	Negligible
Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works, Pineham	Low	Low Indirect	Negligible

## J6.0 **Mitigation and Monitoring**

### **During Construction**

- J6.1 A Construction Environmental Management Programme (CEMP) would be implemented for the Site to reduce the effects of construction on built heritage assets by the control of lighting, dust and defined construction hours (see Chapter C of the ES for full details). This has been treated as embedded mitigation for the purposes of assessing magnitude of impact and thereby significance of effects of construction.

### **During Operation**

- J6.2 Embedded mitigation is provided in relation to design through the control of building heights in relation to areas of heritage sensitivity, as shown on the Building Heights Parameter Plan. The landscaping strategy proposed within the Design and Access Statement additionally offers appropriate mitigation measures to minimise visual effects of development upon the setting and importance of identified built heritage assets. This assessment has regarded these mitigation strategies as embedded mitigation for the purposes of assessing magnitude of impact and thereby significance of operational effects.



## J7.0 Residual Effects

J7.1 Residual effects are those that are predicted to remain after implementation of the mitigation measures described above. It is important to demonstrate that any measures included as part of the mitigation package to respond to adverse effects can be delivered in practice, the measures correspond with planning policy and therefore that there is confidence that they will be implemented.

### **During Construction**

J7.2 There would be no long term residual effects to the settings built heritage assets arising from construction. Whilst there would be a **major adverse** effect to Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse during construction, these effects would be short term and temporary.

### **During Operation**

J7.3 Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse would experience **major adverse** effects arising from the transformation of rural surroundings within the site to built form and infrastructure. Moderate beneficial effects on the setting of the listed building would at the same time be derived by the downgrading of London Road, which currently has a notably negative impact upon its setting by the transit of heavy traffic in close proximity. Beneficial effects would also be achieved by the creation of new opportunities for pedestrians to appreciate the listed building and its importance.

## J8.0 Summary & Conclusions

- J8.1 This chapter has summarised the built heritage baseline at the site and the defined study area, including evidence garnered from the National Heritage List for England, Milton Keynes Council online sources and pre-application discussions with the conservation officer at Milton Keynes Council.
- J8.2 A study area was agreed with the conservation officer at Milton Keynes Council as the basis for the identification and assessment of heritage assets, extending approximately 500m from the Site boundary, but extending further to the east to include all listed buildings within the village of Moulsoe. The Site contains no built heritage assets. The site entirely surrounds (but does not include) one Grade II listed building, Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse (currently a Holiday Inn). Within the study area there are twenty-one listed buildings (three listed at Grade I and eighteen at Grade II) and two conservation areas. Three non-designated heritage assets, recorded on the local HER, were identified for assessment during pre-application discussions with Milton Keynes Council. Whilst lying outside of the study area, one Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Campbell Park, Milton Keynes, is also appraised within this report due to long distance views towards the Site.
- J8.3 Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse (Grade II) is enclosed by the site on all sides and would experience effects of construction in close proximity, leading to a **major** but temporary **adverse effect**. No other built heritage assets would experience effects arising from construction which would be regarded as significant.
- J8.1 There will be no direct effects to built heritage assets during the operational stage of the Proposed Development. Indirect and permanent operational effects would arise as a result of primarily visual effects on the settings of some of the identified built heritage assets. These effects would include the introduction of built form and infrastructure, supported with an appropriate landscaping strategy which would screen views which are sensitive in built heritage terms as far as reasonably practicable.
- J8.2 Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse (Grade II) would experience **major adverse** and **moderate beneficial** effects arising from the Proposed Development. Whilst adverse effects would be derived from the transformation of agricultural land to built form, important beneficial effects would be accrued by the downgrading of London Road and by the creation of new opportunities for pedestrians to appreciate the listed building from proposed adjacent pathways. Adverse effects could be minimised through good design and layout as part of a future detailed application.
- J8.3 The Proposed Development would impact to varying degrees on the settings of heritage assets identified in Moulsoe, relating principally to the creation of mid and longer distance views of new built form in place of the existing agricultural land, with the outer edges of Milton Keynes on the horizon. Built form would be restricted in areas of heritage sensitivity to reduce views of new development. Effects could additionally be minimised through an appropriate landscaping strategy, particularly by proposed tree planting at Moulsoe New Wood, which would assist to screen views from listed buildings in Moulsoe towards the eastern edges of the Site. None of the heritage assets in Moulsoe would experience effects that would be regarded as significant.
- J8.4 There would be some long distance views of development within the Site from the high point of Campbell Registered Park and Garden (Grade II). The Proposed Development would expand the outer edges of Milton Keynes in this view, reducing the degree of visible rural landscape on the horizon but the changes would not be regarded as significant.

- J8.5 Areas of the Site located closest to the Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works, Pineham (non-designated heritage asset) would fall within the linear park. The arising effects on the importance of the non-designated heritage asset would not be significant.
- J8.1 Table J8.1 below contains a summary of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development with regard to built heritage.

Table J8.1 summary of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development with regard to built heritage

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/ Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor) (Beneficial/Adverse /Negligible)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/ Minor) (Beneficial/Adverse/ Negligible)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
<b>During Construction</b>											
Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1212914)	Temporary	Major	CEMP			X					Major Adverse
Church of St Mary, Grade I (List entry number: 1212922)	Temporary	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
First Thatch Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1289355)	Temporary	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Hillcrest Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212919)	Temporary	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Wistaria Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212920)	Temporary	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
St Mary's Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212921)	Temporary	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Screen Enclosing Carrington Graves to North East of Church of St Mary, Grade II (List entry number: 1212925)	Temporary	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
The Rectory, Grade II (List entry number: 1212926)	Temporary	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Tickford Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1125465)	Temporary	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Tickford Park Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1332206)	Temporary	Minor				X					Minor Adverse

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/ Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor) (Beneficial/Adverse /Negligible)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/ Minor) (Beneficial/Adverse/ Negligible)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
Campbell Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1467405)	Temporary	Minor	CEMP			X					Minor Adverse
Moulsoe Glebe Farm barn, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5415)	Temporary	Negligible								X	Negligible Adverse
Moulsoe School, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5416)	Temporary	Negligible								X	Negligible Adverse
Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works, Pineham	Temporary	Negligible								X	Negligible Adverse
<b>During Operation</b>											
Moulsoe Buildings Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1212914)	Permanent	Major and Moderate	Landscaping Strategy and Control of building heights in heritage sensitive locations			X					Major Adverse and Moderate Beneficial
Church of St Mary, Grade I (List entry number: 1212922)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
First Thatch Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1289355)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Hillcrest Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212919)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Wistaria Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212920)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
St Mary's Cottage, Grade II (List entry number: 1212921)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Screen Enclosing Carrington Graves to North East of Church of St Mary, Grade II (List entry number: 1212925)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/ Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor) (Beneficial/Adverse /Negligible)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/ Minor) (Beneficial/Adverse/ Negligible)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
The Rectory, Grade II (List entry number: 1212926)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Tickford Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1125465)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Tickford Park Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1332206)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Campbell Park, Grade II (List entry number: 1467405)	Permanent	Minor				X					Minor Adverse
Moulsoe Glebe Farm barn, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5415)	Permanent	Negligible	Landscaping Strategy and Control of building heights in heritage sensitive locations							X	Negligible, Adverse
Moulsoe School, non-designated heritage asset (HER number: MKK5416)	Permanent	Negligible								X	Negligible, Adverse
Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works, Pineham	Permanent	Negligible								X	Negligible, Adverse

Key \* Geographical Level of Importance

I = International; UK = United Kingdom; E = England; R = Regional; C = County; B = Borough; L = Local

J9.0

## **Abbreviations & Definitions**

- CEMP - Construction Environmental Management Programme
- FSA - Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London
- GPA - Good Practice Advice (Historic England)
- HE - Historic England
- HER - Historic Environment Record
- MCIfA - Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
- PPG - Planning Practice Guidance
- NHLE - National Heritage List for England
- NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework
- RPG - Registered Park and Garden
- SPD - Supplementary Planning Document

**J10.0**

## **References**

- 1 UK Government, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- 2 CLG (February 2019) National Planning Policy Framework
- 3 CLG (March 2014) Planning Practice Guide
- 4 Milton Keynes Council (March 2019) Plan:MK 2016 – 2031
- 5 Milton Keynes Council (March 2020) Milton Keynes East Strategic Urban Extension, Development Framework SPD
- 6 Historic England (March 2015) GPA 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans
- 7 Historic England (March 2015) GPA 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment
- 8 Historic England (December 2017) GPA 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets
- 9 The British Standards Institution (December 2013) BS 7913:2003 Guide to the Conservation of Historic Buildings
- 10 Highways England (January 2020) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges 2020