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1. Introduction

1.1 SCOPE OF WORK UNDERTAKEN and SETTING
Cultural heritage is represented by a wide range of features that result from past human use of the landscape. These include historic structures, many still in use, above ground and buried archaeological monuments and remains of all periods, artefacts of anthropological origin and evidence that can help reconstruct past human environments. In its broadest form cultural heritage is represented by the landscape and townscape itself.

This report, commissioned by David Jarvis Associates on behalf of Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited, presents the findings of a cultural heritage desk-based assessment and site walkover as part of an EIA and planning application for a quarry extension at Mancetter Quarry, near Atherstone, Warwickshire. Research has been carried out by Andrew Josephs and Bill Boismier of Andrew Josephs Associate.

The report considers both direct and indirect effects upon cultural heritage. Indirect effects can occur as a result of significant changes to the setting of a landscape or asset, whether permanent or temporary. This is particularly relevant to designated features of national importance, such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Registered Parks and Gardens.

The current context of the quarry and Proposed Extension Area (PEA) is shown on Figure 1. The PEA boundary extends to approximately 23ha and is centred on NGR SP 30720 94840. The whole application site comprises approximately 96ha and includes the operational quarry (also known as Oldbury Quarry) and adjacent land to the south-west. The adjacent land includes an area of farmland, farmland scrub and a small area which forms part of the redundant Purley Chase Golf Course.

It should be noted that not all of the PEA would be subject to mineral extraction operations, with a significant area being utilised to create permanent screening landforms. Overburden materials generated from the PEA would partly be used to restore ground levels in the south-eastern part of the current quarry. The proposed phasing, including restoration of the currently permitted quarry is shown on Figure 2.

The concept restoration is shown on Figure 3.

The PEA comprises arable fields and semi-improved pasture. It is situated on part of a moderate northeast-facing slope, which forms a low ridge that drops from 171m to 150m OD. Existing field boundaries for the area are hedgerow. It is bordered to the south and west by Purley Chase Golf Course, to north by pasture and Oldbury Farm and to the east by the active quarry.

The scope of work for this project was discussed and agreed with Anna Stocks of the County Archaeological Service and discussions continued throughout the project. A site walkover was carried out with Ms Stocks on 19th May 2014. Consultations were also held with English Heritage. It was agreed that there was no archaeological potential within the working and worked quarry areas and that this assessment should concentrate on the PEA and the setting of designated features in the vicinity.
Research has included collation of available information from the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record (HER) and online databases, including the National Monuments Record, HEIRNET, PASTSCAPE and MAGIC. Satellite imagery has also been examined and the National Mapping Programme records for aerial photography consulted.

An initial site walkover was carried out of the PEA and its environs on the 22nd of March 2012. Subsequent walkovers and visits to designated heritage assets were carried out in December 2013 and June 2014.

All work has been undertaken in accordance with the Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (Institute for Archaeologists 2008)

1.2 GEOLOGY
The drift geology of the area is mapped as Thrussington glacial till sediments (diamicton) on the British Geological Survey 1:50,000 scale mapping. These sediments form part of the Wolston Formation of glacigenic sediments dating from the Anglian Cold Stage (MIS12) of the Quaternary (Maddy 1999).

1.3 RELEVANT LEGISLATION, POLICY AND GUIDANCE
The importance of archaeology and cultural heritage is clearly recognised at both national and local levels. Certain features that are deemed to be of particular importance are given legal protection through the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (Scheduled Monuments), the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) and the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 (Hedgerows of Historic Importance).

1.3.1 Policy and Guidance
In accordance with the EIA Regulations the significance of an effect should be identified as part of this cultural heritage assessment. This is achieved using a combination of the following published guidance and professional judgement.

1.3.2 National Policy Planning Framework

National planning policy on how cultural heritage should be assessed is given in National Policy Planning Framework, published in March 2012. This covers all aspects of heritage and the historic environment, including listed buildings, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens, battlefields and archaeology. The relevant policy is reproduced below.

Chapter 12 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

126. Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

127. When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest.

128. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

129. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

130. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

131. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
• the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

• the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

• the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

132. 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

133. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

• the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and

• no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and

• conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and

• the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

134. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

135. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly 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.

136. Local planning authorities should not permit loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.
139. Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

140. Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

141. Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

1.3.3 Local Planning Policy

The Minerals Local Plan for Warwickshire was adopted in 1995. Although Local Plans have been replaced with Local Development Frameworks this Mineral Local Plan was saved until September 2007. It will be replaced by a Minerals & Waste Development Framework in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004).

The County Council made a case to the Secretary of State to extend the period for which a number of policies from the Minerals Local Plan would be saved. Policies that were saved include Policy M6 Considerations and Constraints affecting Minerals Extraction that includes reference to cultural heritage “Applications for the extraction of minerals….will be considered on the provisions of the development plan and their likely overall impact on...sites and landscape of historical and archaeological importance.”
2. Desk-Based Assessment

2.1 OVERVIEW

The Warwickshire Historic Environment Record (WHER) and online databases maintained by the National Monuments Record were searched for documented sites and monuments within the PEA and a 3km radius surrounding it. This was considered an appropriate distance to place the PEA within its archaeological context and allow an assessment of potential effects upon designated assets to be undertaken.

The Warwickshire County Record Office (WCRO) was visited on the 23rd of March 2012 in order to check historic maps of the area, as well as any other pertinent documents and local history books. We are grateful to the staff at the Warwickshire Record Office for their help in locating various maps and other documents and for permission to use photographs of maps in this report.

2.2 DESIGNATED FEATURES

No designated features of cultural heritage importance lie within the PEA.

2.2.1 Scheduled Monuments

There are three scheduled monuments within 3km of the PEA. These comprise:

- **Oldbury Camp** (SM37, MWA255). An Iron Age hillfort with a single rampart and ditch surviving on three sides. The interior of the monument is now a covered reservoir with broadleaf woodland on the surviving earthworks. Later archaeological sites and landscape features recorded in the HER for the interior prior to the reservoir comprise the site of Oldbury Hall (MWA258), a gazebo (MWA259) and associated garden (MWA12565). The monument is located approximately 410m southeast of the PEA at an elevation of c.178m OD.

- **Round Barrow** (SM21544, MWA246). A Bronze Age bowl barrow excavated during the first half of the 19th century containing cremations and associated finds with a secondary early Anglo-Saxon inhumation (MWA6001). It is situated near the entrance to Hartshill Hayes Country Park approximately 1.50km to the southeast of the PEA.

- **Hartshill Castle** (SM21544). A motte and bailey castle earthwork (MWA241), and later 13th century castle (MWA240) with surviving sections of stone curtain walls, the remains of a chapel constructed against the north curtain wall (MWA241) and a 16th century house built within the northeast corner (MWA239). Associated features include a possible medieval pond (MWA249) and the remains of a post-medieval garden (MWA12549) related to the 16th century house. The monument is located approximately 1.92km southeast of the PEA.

Scheduled monuments are shown on Figure 4.
2.2.2 Listed Structures

There are six listed structures within 3km of the PEA. These comprise:

- **Ansley Hall** (MWA157; DWA740; LBSUID309091). A Grade II* country house with associated later buildings (MWA158, MWA159), kitchen garden (MWA12499) and park (MWA12498);

- **Ansley Hall Barn** (DWA363; LBSUID30902). A Grade II 18th century brick-built barn associated with Ansley Hall.

- **Hartshill Castle Ruins** (SM21544; DWA340; LSBUID309189). Grade II fragmentary remains of a 13th century castle (MWA240) with surviving sections of stone curtain walls, and the remains of a chapel constructed against the north curtain wall (MWA241) and a 16th century house built within the northeast corner (MWA239). It is associated with an earlier motte and bailey castle (MWA241), a possible pond (MWA249) and the remains of a post-medieval garden (MWA12549) related to the 16th century house.

- **Bridge 33, Coventry Canal** (DWA634; LSBUID434694). A Grade II brick-built 18th century Accommodation Bridge spanning the canal and towpath.

- **Milestone between Bridges 34 and 35, Coventry Canal** (DWA602; LSBUID434696). A Grade II late 18th century stone milestone set at the back of the towpath.

- **Crossing Keeper’s Cottage** (DWA357; LBSUID309233). A Grade II brick-built mid 19th century railway crossing keeper’s cottage.

The location of listed buildings is shown on **Figure 4**.

2.2.3 Conservation Areas

There are no Conservation Areas within the 3km area surrounding the PEA.

2.2.4 Other Cultural Heritage Sites

There are no World Heritage Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens or Registered Battlefields within 3km of the PEA.

2.2.5 Historic Landscape Characterisation

The PEA lies within HWA2854 HLC as shown on **Figure 5**. HWA2854 is categorised as very large irregular post-war fields. Additional information also notes that the presence of s-shaped boundaries suggests that the fields were enclosed on a piecemeal basis. The present field configuration is also noted as modern in date (post 1955).
2.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PEA and its VICINITY

2.3.1 Overview

In total, some 108 archaeological sites, findspots, buildings and other landscape features are recorded for the 3km area surrounding the PEA. These include evidence for Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic activity, Neolithic and Bronze Age findspots and flint scatters, Romano-British and medieval settlement around Mancetter and Hartshill, and numerous quarries, mines and other industrial features reflecting the area’s rich industrial heritage. Evidence for Iron Age and Anglo-Saxon settlement within the area is limited to a small number of archaeological sites and findspots. Only two locations occur within the immediate vicinity of the PEA and no sites, finds or features are recorded for the PEA.

A number of archaeological investigations have been carried out in the 3km area surrounding the PEA. Recent investigations include numerous excavations, evaluations and geophysical surveys of Romano-British sites around the Mancetter area (EWA2124, EWA2697, EWA2697, EWA2798, EWA2726, EWA2966, EWA2992, MWA8267), and watching briefs and evaluations around Hartshill (EWA6713, EWA6899, EWA7717).

Archaeological investigations in the vicinity of the PEA comprise the antiquarian excavation of the Hartshill Hayes round barrow in 1835, the 1949 excavation of a trench across one of the ramparts at Oldbury Castle in advance of the construction of a reservoir and a watching brief within the scheduled area of the monument in 1993. Other investigations include a 1992 watching brief at Oldbury Grange, fieldwalking to the southeast of the monument in 1988 and a RCHME survey of Hartshill Hayes.

No archaeological investigations have been carried out within the area of the PEA.

2.3.2 Archaeology within the PEA

There are no archaeological sites, features or finds recorded for the area of the PEA.

2.3.3 Archaeology outside the PEA

The archaeological sites and features discussed below are shown separated by period on Figures 6, 7 and 8.

Table 1 lists the entries in the Warwickshire HER for the vicinity of the PEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER</th>
<th>NGR</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Distance from site boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWA 150</td>
<td>SP 2870 9520</td>
<td>Bentley Park: Medieval deer park</td>
<td>1.88km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA 157</td>
<td>SP 3042 9338</td>
<td>Ansley Hall: Post-Medieval house</td>
<td>1.53km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA 158</td>
<td>SP 3070 9331</td>
<td>Chinese Temple at Ansley Hall: Folly built during the Imperial period.</td>
<td>1.57km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA 159</td>
<td>SP 3059 9327</td>
<td>Hermitage at Ansley Hall: The remains of a folly built during the Imperial period</td>
<td>1.63km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA 160</td>
<td>SP 3073 9331</td>
<td>Site of a private chapel or oratory with medieval origins situated at Bretts Hall, Ansley:</td>
<td>1.56km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>3069</td>
<td>Site of moat thought to have surrounded Bretts Hall constructed during the Medieval period</td>
<td>1.59km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>3040</td>
<td>Findspot: Fragments of carved stone fragments thought to be Medieval in date</td>
<td>1.63km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>Possible Round Barrow (Bronze Age)</td>
<td>1.27km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Post Medieval House within Hartshill Castle</td>
<td>1.92km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Hartshill Castle, Phase II: remains of a 13th century castle with surviving sections of stone curtain walls, the remains of a chapel constructed against the north curtain wall, and a 16th century house built within the northeast corner. SM 21544</td>
<td>1.92km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Hartshill Castle, Phase I: The remains of a motte and bailey castle, which was the predecessor of the later Medieval Hartshill Castle. SM 21544</td>
<td>1.92km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Hartshill Castle Chapel: The remains of a Medieval chapel which was associated with Hartshill Castle</td>
<td>1.92km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>3256</td>
<td>Site of a house dating from the Post Medieval period, which was known as 'The Chapel'.</td>
<td>1.89km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>Drayton War Memorial (Modern)</td>
<td>1.91km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>3272</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Church, Hartshill (Imperial)</td>
<td>2.4km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>3175</td>
<td>Hartshill Round Barrow (Bronze Age). SM 21623</td>
<td>1.50km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>3230</td>
<td>Findspot: Several unspecified finds of Roman date</td>
<td>1.59km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>3280</td>
<td>Findspot: Medieval pottery and evidence for iron smelting</td>
<td>2.1km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>3262</td>
<td>Earthworks to E of Hartshill Castle: Ponds of Medieval or Post Medieval date</td>
<td>2.0km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>3134</td>
<td>Oldbury Camp: The remains of an Iron Age hillfort with surviving earthworks. SM 37</td>
<td>410m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>3134</td>
<td>Site of Medieval Benedictine nunnery located on the south side of Oldbury Camp</td>
<td>740m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>Findspot: Medieval latten ring</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>3134</td>
<td>Site of Oldbury Hall. (Imperial)</td>
<td>640m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>Gazebo at Oldbury Hall. (Imperial)</td>
<td>830m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint (Neolithic/Bronze Age)</td>
<td>1.39km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>Medieval town of Mancetter</td>
<td>1.19km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>3214</td>
<td>Site of medieval settlement</td>
<td>2.04km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>3090</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint (undated)</td>
<td>1.36km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10037</td>
<td>3254</td>
<td>Findspot: Anglo-Saxon stirrup mount.</td>
<td>1.99km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10059</td>
<td>3136</td>
<td>Findspot: Roman javelin head</td>
<td>1.56km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>3092</td>
<td>Findspot: amber bead and bronze metalwork fragments. (undated)</td>
<td>110m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155</td>
<td>3130</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint (Mesolithic)</td>
<td>1.59km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>3090</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint (Neolithic/Bronze Age)</td>
<td>1.26km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint (undated)</td>
<td>1.26km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>3190</td>
<td>Findspot: - Prehistoric worked flint (Mesolithic)</td>
<td>1.59km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint (undated)</td>
<td>1.22km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12232</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint (undated)</td>
<td>1.84km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12498</td>
<td>3078</td>
<td>Ansley Hall Park: Designed park associated with Ansley Hall developed in early 18th century.</td>
<td>1.56km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12499</td>
<td>3051 9354</td>
<td>Ansley Hall kitchen garden: Kitchen garden situated on opposite side of B4114 from Ansley House.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12548</td>
<td>3251 9414</td>
<td>Hartshill Cemetery: Imperial to Modern in date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12549</td>
<td>3258 9427</td>
<td>Hartshill Castle garden: earthwork remains of castle; late C16th house with garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12565</td>
<td>3127 9506</td>
<td>Oldbury Hall park/garden: Parkland, plantations, drive, kitchen garden, ponds, terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12569</td>
<td>3066 9605</td>
<td>Purley Chase garden and park: Pleasure grounds and formal gardens of late C19th villa and common land/woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448</td>
<td>3260 9460</td>
<td>Society of Friends’ Meeting House originally built in the Post Medieval period and later converted into a house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2449</td>
<td>3272 9470</td>
<td>Wesleyan Chapel built during the Imperial period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3181</td>
<td>3211 9339</td>
<td>Site of mineral railway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3495</td>
<td>3183 9654</td>
<td>Site of Roman defensive ditch excavated in 1978.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3497</td>
<td>3183 9649</td>
<td>Site of three Roman ditches and possible thorn barrier excavated in 1980.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3863</td>
<td>3220 9615</td>
<td>Findspot: Sherd of Roman pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3865</td>
<td>3260 9520</td>
<td>Findspot: Roman pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3866</td>
<td>3275 9518</td>
<td>1983 excavation of five Roman pottery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4233</td>
<td>3275 9519</td>
<td>Site of five Roman pottery kilns excavated in 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4373</td>
<td>3057 9440</td>
<td>Coventry Canal (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4432</td>
<td>3100 9400</td>
<td>Prehistoric flint scatter (undated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4440</td>
<td>2900 9400</td>
<td>Findspot: Bronze Age palstave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4592</td>
<td>3000 9600</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint (Mesolithic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4598</td>
<td>3100 9400</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint (Mesolithic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4609</td>
<td>3155 9470</td>
<td>Icehouse (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844</td>
<td>3178 9531</td>
<td>Undated linear cropmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5009</td>
<td>3200 9610</td>
<td>Findspot: Prehistoric worked flint artefacts (Mesolithic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5075</td>
<td>2986 9640</td>
<td>Site of Post Medieval ponds and dam surviving as earthworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5076</td>
<td>2967 9610</td>
<td>Site of Post Medieval ponds and dam surviving as earthworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5077</td>
<td>2910 9579</td>
<td>Site of Post Medieval ponds and dam surviving as earthworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5809</td>
<td>3089 9551</td>
<td>Site of Oldbury Quarry (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5810</td>
<td>3094 9533</td>
<td>Site of tramway (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811</td>
<td>3068 9529</td>
<td>Site of Oldbury reservoir (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>3025 9667</td>
<td>Site of a quarry (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822</td>
<td>3142 9624</td>
<td>Site of canal wharf (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823</td>
<td>3181 9641</td>
<td>Site of railway signal box (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5829</td>
<td>3233 9525</td>
<td>Site of canal wharf (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5830</td>
<td>3250 9513</td>
<td>Site of a tramway (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5831</td>
<td>3269 9504</td>
<td>Site of quarry (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5872</td>
<td>3065 9369</td>
<td>Site of Ansley Hall Colliery (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5873</td>
<td>3045 9399</td>
<td>Site of mineral railway at Ansley Hall Colliery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5874</td>
<td>3027 9404</td>
<td>Site of brick kilns (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883</td>
<td>3156 9386</td>
<td>Pumphouse (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884</td>
<td>3188 9377</td>
<td>Site of quarry (Imperial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence for Palaeolithic and Mesolithic activity has been recorded within the larger area surrounding the PEA. These include two penknife point findspots (MWA6034, MWA6308) dating from the Later Upper Palaeolithic and a number of findspots of Mesolithic worked flint (MWA1158, MWA4598, MWA5009, MWA6039).

Neolithic activity within the study area is represented by two dated artefact findspots (MWA6050, MWA6073) and two flint scatters (MWA378, MWA5920). In addition, a number of undated findspots of worked flint (MWA1155, MWA1159, MWA12232,
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MWA4432) and flint scatters (MWA1156, MWA1157, MWA890) found within the area are also probably Neolithic and/or Early Bronze in date.

Recorded evidence for Bronze Age activity in the area is restricted to a findspot of a palstave (MWA4440), one round barrow (MWA246; SM21544) and the possible site of another round barrow (MWA164).

Iron Age and Roman 650BC to 510AD (Figure 6)

Evidence for Iron Age activity in the area surrounding the PEA is limited to the univalliate hillfort, Oldbury Camp (MWA255), lying adjacent to the southern boundary of existing quarry workings and within 500m of the PEA, and a adult male burial situated some 500m to the south of the hillfort (MWA6100).

Roman activity is concentrated in the east /northeast around Mancetter within an area of Romano-British settlement of long acknowledged importance. HER entries include evidence for town defences (MWA3495, MWA3497, MWA7468, MWA7961), Roman forts (MWA8267) and isolated findspots of pottery and other materials (MWA10059, MWA3863, MWA7806, MWA8113). Elsewhere, evidence for Roman activity comprises pottery kilns around Hartshill (MWA3866, MWA4233) and three findspots of Romano-British pottery and miscellaneous finds (MWA248, MWA3865, MWA6980).

Anglo-Saxon and Medieval 510AD to 1539AD (Figure 6 and 7)

Anglo-Saxon evidence comprises an Early Saxon burial (MWA6001) with an iron spearhead and shield boss placed in the one definitive Bronze Age round barrow for the study area (MWA246; SM21544), and an isolated stirrup mount findspot (MWA10037).

The principal medieval settlement for the study area is Hartshill Castle with its motte and bailey castle (MWA241), and later 13th century castle (MWA240) including a chapel (MWA242) and possibly a pond (MWA249). Settlements dating from around the time of the Norman Conquest comprise the site of a Benedictine Nunnery to the south of Oldbury Camp (MWA 256), and an early medieval iron production site (MWA8090). Additional evidence for medieval settlement and land use activity recorded in the Warwickshire HER includes the moated site (MWA161) and associated chapel (MWA160) at Bretts Hall, Ansley, medieval Mancetter (MWA389) and Hartshill (MWA9517), Bentley deer park (MWA150) and woodbanks at Hartshill Hayes (MWA8245). Elsewhere, evidence for medieval activity comprises a scatter of pottery, building and other materials on the outskirts of Mancetter (MWA390) and three findspots of medieval pottery and miscellaneous finds (MWA163, MWA247, MWA257).

Post-Medieval, Imperial and Modern 1540AD to 2012AD (Figure 7 and 8)

Buildings, gardens and parks as well as archaeological sites represent HER entries for the Post-Medieval period (1540AD to 1750AD). These include the Grade II* listed Ansley Hall (MWA157) with associated later buildings (MWA158, MWA159), including a Grade II listed barn (DWA363), kitchen garden (MWA12499) and park (MWA12498); the remains of a house (MWA239) and associated garden (MWA12549) in Hartshill Castle and the Friends Meeting House at Hartshill Green (MWA2448) dating from the Post-Medieval period onwards. Archaeological remains within the study area comprise the site of a house at Village
Green (MWA243) and a series of ponds and other earthworks that may or may not be associated with iron working (MWA5075, MWA5076, MWA5809).

HER entries recorded for the Imperial period (1751AD to 1913AD) within the study area consist of buildings, archaeological sites and other landscape features, and are predominately industrial in character. Industrial remains include quarries (MWA5809, MWA5812, MWA5831, MWA5884, MWA5885, MWA5886, MWA5902, MWA8212), mines (MWA5872, MWA6526), and related features (MWA5810, MWA5873), brick and tile workings (MWA5874, MWA5899) and the Coventry Canal (MWA4375) with associated facilities including wharfs (MWA5822, MWA5829) and a Grade II listed bridge (DWA634) and canal milestone (DWA602). Other industrial related entries are composed of two reservoirs (MWA5811, MWA6560), and the sites for a smithy (MWA5901), pumphouse (MWA5883), tramway (MWA5830), and railway signal box (MWA5823). Extant and demolished buildings include a church (MWA245) and chapel (MWA2449), Oldbury Hall (MWA258) and associated gazebo (MWA259), an ice house (MWA4609), stable (MWA6526) and a Grade II listed railway crossing keepers cottage (DWA357). Additional remains dating from this period comprise two parks (MWA12569, MWA6951), Hartshill cemetery (MWA12548) and scatter of post-medieval and modern pottery (MWA7053).

Modern remains post-dating 1913 found within the HER for the area consist of a war memorial (MWA244), the site of a mineral railway (MWA3181) and a quarry (MWA8246).

Undated (Figure 8)

Four HER entries for the study area are undated. These comprise, Oldbury Hall park/garden (MWA12565), a linear cropmark (MWA4844), a double terrace earthwork feature (MWA8247) and a findspot of an amber bead and bronze metal work (MWA1333) within 150m of the PEA.

2.4 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Historically the site lies in the township of Atherstone within the parish of Mancetter in the Borough of North Warwickshire.

The Domesday Book of 1086 mentions Atherstone as a small settlement on the line of the Roman road that was held by the Countess Godiva, which afterwards passed with most of her other lands to the Earls of Chester. The manor of Atherstone was granted to the Abbey of Bec Herlouin in Normandy by Hugh, Earl of Chester, soon after the Conquest (Morris 1976). It was established as a market town during the late 11th century when in 1246 Henry III granted to the abbey of Bec Herlouin in Normandy a weekly market and a yearly fair in their manor of Atherstone (Salzman 1945: 126-131). By the end of the Tudor period Atherstone was a thriving commercial centre for leatherworking, weaving, clothmaking, metalworking and brewing (ibid.). In the 16th century the town became famous for its trade in cloth, wool, and felt-making, principally for the manufacture of hats which became one of the mainstays of the local economy during the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries. After the Second World War the hat-making industry declined and finally disappeared in 1998 with the closure of the last factory. The town was also on the edge of the East Warwickshire coalfield and saw an influx of workers and their families with the opening of Ansley Hall Colliery in the 1870s (Redmill 1931).
The ancient ecclesiastic parish of Mancetter is described in the VCH for Warwickshire (Salzman 1947: 116-126) as very roughly diamond shaped and encompassing the four civil parishes of Mancetter, Atherstone, Hartshill and Oldbury. Mancetter is not mentioned in the Domesday Survey, but by 1235, was among the fees of the Earl of Warwick, and continued to be so until at least the 14th century. In 1196 Walter de Mancetter granted land for the endowment of the parish church. In 1221 and in 1232, Hugh de Mancetter held the manor. The manor passed to John de Mancetter, apparently grandson of Hugh, who died in 1296 and then to Guy, John's eldest son. Guy died in August 1365 and his possessions were divided among the representatives of his three daughters and the unity of the manor was never re-established. The different parts were subsequently passed on or sold until the 19th century when large portions of the former manor were bought by Grame Miller, Thomas Cowper Hinks and the Dugdale family. Since the middle of last century the Dugdale family have been lords of the manor.

Oldbury appears to have been granted to the Abbey of Polesworth before the Conquest when the nuns were evicted from Polesworth by the first Robert Marmion. Around 1130 the second Robert Marmion agreed to the removal of the convent from Oldbury to Polesworth. At the same time, Walter de Hastings granted to the nuns the estate of Oldbury where it remained in the hands of the convent until the Dissolution, when it went to the Crown. In 1542 Oldbury, now referred to as a manor, with the free warren and other rights formerly belonging to the convent of Polesworth, was granted to Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. The Duke passed his interest in the manor to Robert Greene, after whom, it was passed on or sold until 1745 when the Okeover family became lords of the manor. Shortly after 1850 the manor appears to have been broken up and dissolved.

At the time of the Conquest an estate of 2 hides in Hartshill and Ansley was held by the Countess Godiva, which afterwards passed to the Earls of Chester (Salzman 1947: 131-133). In 1229 Earl Ranulph recovered his seisin of the lands of Robert de Hardreshull, which had been taken into the king's hands. Ranulph's sister and co-heir was the mother of Hugh d'Aubigny, Earl of Arundel, who held 3/3 knight's fee in Hartshill in 1235. On the death of Earl Hugh in 1243, the fees of Chester assigned in dower to his widow included one in Hartshill, held by William de Hartshill, whose services were next year conveyed to John FitzAlan, a co-heir of Earl Hugh. William de Hartshill died in 1262 and passed the manor to his son Robert, but, after Robert’s death at Evesham, supporting Simon de Montfort, it was forfeited and granted to Warin de Bassingbourne. It was subsequently redeemed and John de Hartshill, Robert's brother, died in 1276 in possession of the manor. His son William was in ward to John de Monhaut until 1292 when he was granted free warren in all his demesne lands at Hartshill. At his death in 1303 his son John was only 10 years old, and John de Wysham acted as his guardian until he came of age. John de Hartshill conveyed the manor in 1326 to Philip de Hartshill, presumably in trust, as in 1356 Hartshill was settled on the same Sir John. He died about 1368, and the manor passed through marriage to one of his daughters to John Colepeper, and then to Thomas Colepeper, in 1378. The Colepeper family retained the manor till 1547, after which it was passed on or sold to various individuals till around 1900 when it was bought by Captain H. L. Townshend of Caldecote Hall who held it until his death in 1924. Since this date the VCH (ibid.) records that the title of lord of the manor of Hartshill appears to have lapsed from use.

The latter part of the 18th and 19th centuries saw substantial parts of the old parish of Mancetter turned over to minerals and other industries (Redmill 1931; Salzman 1947:116-131). The Coventry Canal, which crosses the parish in a northwesterly direction was begun in 1768, and the section to Atherstone was completed in 1770. The Trent Valley section of the LMS railway was built in 1847. These led to a concentration and expansion of heavy industry
in the north-east of the county, particularly those involving the movement of heavy goods such as coal mining and quarrying, lime and cement making, and tile, brick and stoneware production. Improvements in infrastructure and technology by the 1860s led to an expansion of the coal mining and hard rock quarrying that had been going on since the 13th century (ibid.). This expansion led to an increase in population in the 19th century, particularly in Hartshill, and an industrial landscape composed of working and abandoned mines and quarries. Nowadays, the collieries and brickworks have gone and quarrying has declined as the quarries have become worked out, although a few, such as Mancetter Quarry, remain in operation.

2.5 CARTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

The PEA is depicted on a series of historic maps, as follows:

Maps of Warwickshire by J. Speed, 1610; W. Yates, 1793; and C. Greenwood, 1822
There is little detail on any of these maps and the area of the PEA is not readily identifiable. All three, however, do show Oldbury on them situated to the south of the PEA. John Speed’s 1610 map of the County is presented in Figure 9 as an example of the large-scale maps examined for the County.

Harvey Walker’s 1728 map of the Okeover Estate (Figure 10)
This estate map provides more detail of the area than the preceding maps. The PEA lies within land owned by the Okeover Estate in 1728. It shows that the land on which it is situated was divided up into a series of small irregularly shaped fields. No quarries or similar excavations appear on the map.

No later tithe maps are available for the area.

First Edition 6’ Ordnance Survey map, 1888 (Figure 11)
The first edition OS map indicates that by 1888 the number of fields in the area of the PEA had been reduced to four rectangular fields. Mancetter Quarry and Oldbury Reservoir also appear on the map to the northeast of the PEA.

Second Edition 6’ Ordnance Survey map, 1904 (Figure 12)
There is very little change apparent from the First Edition Ordnance Survey map, other than a small increase in the area of Mancetter Quarry to the northeast of the PEA. The area of the PEA, however, remains open fields.

2½’ Ordnance Survey map, 1924 (Figure 12)
By 1924 the number of fields in the area of the PEA had been reduced to three by the joining of the northwest corner field with an adjacent field to the north. Other changes include an increase in the area of Mancetter Quarry.

1:10,000 Ordnance Survey map, 1991
By the 1990s the number of fields in the area of the PEA had been reduced to one large L-shaped field. South and west of this area the adjacent fields have been converted into a golf course. To the east Oldbury Quarry (formerly Mancetter Quarry) has more than doubled in size since 1924.
3. Site Walkover

3.1 METHODOLOGY

A walkover survey was carried out in March 2012 by Dr Bill Boismier on behalf of Andrew Josephs Associates. The walkover covered the whole of the PEA and was designed to assist in defining the presence/absence of archaeological remains within the area and the potential impacts of existing and proposed land use on their survival and condition.

The survey was undertaken on foot where access permitted and a series of notes were compiled concerning ground conditions, topographical features and any features of archaeological interest. These methods were in accordance with the guidelines for field visits set out in Section 3.3, Sources and Data Collection of the document Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (IfA 2008). A Satmap Active10 handheld GPS was used to record all locational information and to locate the sites and findspots recorded on the Warwickshire HER.

Weather and lighting conditions during the walkover were excellent at the time of the visit. The weather was dry, seasonally warm and sunny with no restrictions on visibility other than a light ground haze towards the end of the day. Light was predominately bright sunlight with shadow with good contrast, and made the identification of topographic features and other surface features reasonably easy.

Surface conditions within the arable fields of the PEA were also good for the identification artefacts. The area was covered by emergent crop plants around 10-35 cms high set out in drill rows, scrub growth and bare soil with exposed surfaces displaying varying degrees of weathering. No soil profiles were available for inspection within the PEA during the walkover.

Photographs 1-3 illustrate the topography of the PEA.

3.2 FINDINGS

No surface artefacts of any kind were identified other than bits of modern plastic sheeting and fragments of wooden palettes. No surface features were found within the area of the PEA or along its margins.

Within the pasture fields, there was no evidence of earthworks and the indications are that the fields have been occasionally ploughed and improved.

3.3 VISIT TO OLDBURY CAMP

Oldbury Camp Scheduled Monument lies at its nearest point approximately 410m southeast of the PEA. Both Warwickshire County Council and English Heritage in their scoping responses requested that the setting of the Camp be assessed against the potential impacts of the proposed extension.
The visit took place in March before the trees were in leaf and this may be considered an optimal time to assess effects. A further visit was carried out in December 2013 by Andrew Josephs.

Weather and lighting conditions during the site visits were excellent.

The monument is located on the north-western edge of Hartshill Hayes County Park in an area of largely deciduous woodland that is away from designated footpaths and bridleways. Surviving ramparts and ditches are covered in broadleaf trees and undergrowth. An anti-climb fence has also been installed along the top of the rampart to restrict access to the covered reservoir located in its interior. Barbed wire fencing separates the monument from the quarry to the north-west and from areas of pasture to the east.

Even in winter, when the trees are not in leaf, there is no intervisibility between the earthwork elements of the monument and PEA. The vegetation buffer of low branches, brambles and shrubs that separate the monument from the current quarry boundary make it very difficult even to get near the outer edges of the wooded area.

From the edge of the scheduled area it is possible to see a glimpse of the current quarry and part of the ramparts in the same view (Photograph 4) and at one point on the boundary of the current quarry and the scheduled monument, but beyond the earthworks, there is a view of the current quarry and the PEA (Photograph 5).

The view from the PEA to Oldbury Camp is shown on Photograph 6.

An assessment of the potential for indirect impacts upon Oldbury Camp is presented in Table 2.

### Table 2  Assessment of potential indirect impacts upon Oldbury Camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type and significance of monument</td>
<td>Scheduled univallate Iron Age Hillfort. The integrity of the monument has been compromised by the construction of a reservoir in it and it is unlikely that any significant archaeological deposits survive within the interior. The rampart and ditch surviving on three sides appear relatively intact. It is overgrown with trees and undergrowth. The current quarry has affected its setting, although this is not evident from publicly accessible places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working methodology</td>
<td>Phased extraction (as shown on Figure 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration in vicinity of SM</td>
<td>Restoration of quarried land nearest to the SM restored in Phase 1 to pre-quarry ground levels. Heathland buffer to west of SM enhances current setting. Bridleway to follow SM boundary. (Figure 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporality</td>
<td>Restoration closest to the monument completed in Phase 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>The monument is situated on the top of a hill at an elevation of c. 178m OD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility, screening and physical separation</td>
<td>The broadleaf trees and undergrowth covering the rampart and ditch screen the view of the PEA from the monument. The monument is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity</strong></td>
<td>The monument boundary lies immediately adjacent to the working quarry. At its nearest point the monument lies approximately 450m east of the PEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical views of, and from the monument.</strong></td>
<td>The earthworks of the monument cannot directly be seen from the PEA and appears only as a wooded hilltop (Photo 6). The PEA cannot be seen from the earthworks of the monument due to tree cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views from sensitive locations</strong></td>
<td>No sensitive locations were identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curtilage and Context</strong></td>
<td>The interior of the monument is now a covered reservoir with broadleaf woodland and scrub on the surviving earthworks. The monument is located along the northern edge of Hartshill Hayes Country Park in an area away from designated footpaths and bridleways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility, interpretation and public appreciation</strong></td>
<td>None other than a brief mention in a display at Hartshill Hayes Country Park Visitor Centre. Opportunity to place interpretation panel on bridleway next to scheduled boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Archaeological Potential of the PEA

The HER records 108 archaeological sites, findspots, buildings and other landscape features for the 3km area surrounding the PEA. These include isolated finds of Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic worked flint, Neolithic and Bronze Age flint scatters and artefacts, areas of Romano-British and medieval settlement, and numerous quarries, mines and other industrial features. Iron Age and Anglo-Saxon settlement evidence for the 3km area is limited to a small number of archaeological sites and isolated artefacts.

There is a clear skew in the HER records to the area around Mancetter which would be expected as it would have long been recognised as a source of cultural artefacts and a focus for archaeological investigations. This area has been subject to examination for surface artefacts by G Wykes and others, as well as being attractive to metal detectors. It is not clear if the PEA itself has been systematically examined.

No sites, finds or features are recorded within the PEA, and the map regression has indicated that ploughing and the removal of field boundaries from the late 18th century onwards would have disturbed much of the area and severely damaged or destroyed the upper levels of any archaeological features or deposits occurring within it. The walkover survey also found no artefacts, features or other archaeological evidence predating the late 20th century within the PEA and the pasture fields shown evidence of improvement.

The evidence would suggest that the PEA has only a low potential for archaeology. However, this may reflect a lack of systematic field-based examination and it may be more accurate to conclude that the overall potential is moderate.
5. Impacts and Mitigation

5.1 DIRECT IMPACTS
The nature of mineral extraction results in the total loss of the cultural heritage resource wherever extraction takes place, and the potential loss or damage in other areas associated with infrastructure and landscaping.

The preceding sections have assessed the potential for archaeology within the PEA. It is concluded that there is a moderate potential for archaeology within the PEA, but as a result of a long history of arable agriculture the significance of any archaeology that survives is likely to be low-moderate.

Nevertheless, the topography of parts of the PEA would have been potentially desirable to settlement in pre-modern times with far-reaching views to the north-east.

Following a site walkover with Anna Stocks, Planning Archaeologist, Warwickshire County Council, it was agreed that some pre-determination archaeological evaluation should take place in part of the PEA. Her letter is appended at Appendix A and the scope described in section 5.2, below.

5.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION
The archaeological evaluation shall comprise detailed geophysical survey and trial-trenching carried out within the arable field shown on Figure 1 of Appendix A. Work would be carried out by a competent contractor adhering to IfA Codes of Conduct and in adherence a Written Scheme of Investigation submitted to Warwickshire County Council for approval before commencement.

The results of the geophysical survey would inform the location of trenches. In absence of geophysical anomalies being identified, a random but stratified trench layout would be employed. The results would be provided to Warwickshire County Council before the determination of the planning application in order to allow an informed decision to be made in relation to the significance of any archaeology identified.

5.3 MITIGATION OF DIRECT IMPACTS
On current information there is no evidence of archaeology within the PEA. The field-based evaluation discussed above will assist in identifying whether sub-surface archaeology survives, its condition and significance. It is considered unlikely that archaeology of such importance as to require preservation in situ will be identified.

The scope of any mitigation will be directly related to the results of the evaluation but it is likely that, as NPPF recognises, should archaeology of less than national importance be identified, an acceptable alternative is preservation by record through targeted archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and publication appropriate to significance of the archaeological resource.
It is proposed that, should permission be granted, a tiered approach to mitigation is adopted, as set out below.

| Tier 1 | Low-level monitoring would involve one archaeologist observing soil stripping within the PEA. This would be an appropriate approach where isolated archaeological sites are being occasionally exposed. If archaeology is apparent s/he can intervene, and request a change of machining methodology to avoid archaeology until it can be dealt with or adopt a tier 2 approach, below. If no archaeology is showing up, and with the agreement of Warwickshire County Council, the watching brief could become more intermittent. |
| Tier 2 | Continuous monitoring would involve two archaeologists per machine - one watching, one cleaning and marking. This would be an appropriate approach where isolated archaeological features are being regularly exposed. When/if there is more archaeology than two archaeologists can deal with, a team would be brought in to excavate (Tier 3, below). |
| Tier 3 | Set piece archaeological excavation of areas containing a density of features using a team of archaeologists. |

In the event that no archaeology is identified by the evaluation, it may not be necessary for a watching brief to be carried out.

The mitigation strategy would be formalised within a Written Scheme of Investigation submitted to Warwickshire County Council for approval before development commenced. It could be revised as the project progresses to reflect discoveries. Work would be carried out by a competent contractor adhering to IfA Codes of Conduct.

5.4 INDIRECT IMPACTS and MITIGATION
Indirect impacts are those that do not physically affect a cultural heritage asset or landscape, but that alter the context or setting.

As discussed in Section 1.3.2, national planning guidance on development affecting the setting of a heritage asset is set out in the National Policy Planning Framework and English Heritage publications.

Of particular relevance is the following paragraph of the NPPF:

132. 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and
II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

One designated heritage asset lies in vicinity of the PEA. Oldbury Camp Scheduled Monument is an example of a univallate Iron Age Hillfort. The integrity of the monument has been compromised by the construction of a reservoir within it and it is unlikely that any significant archaeological deposits survive within the interior. The rampart and ditch surviving on three sides appear relatively intact. It is overgrown with trees and undergrowth. The current quarry, which at its closest point lies immediately adjacent to the scheduled boundary, has affected its setting.

There is no intervisibility with the PEA from the earthworks of the monument due to the woodland within the monument and a buffer of trees, shrubs and brambles between the monument and the current quarry. At one point on the scheduled boundary, but beyond the extent of earthworks, a view is possible across the current quarry. However, should the woodland ever be removed, views towards the PEA would be clear within the middle distance.

The monument is not discernible from the PEA, although its location can be seen as a wooded hill.

It is considered that the effects of working the PEA upon the setting of Oldbury Camp is slightly adverse.

The PEA would produce overburden that would partly be placed within the south-eastern extent of the current workings adjacent to the scheduled monument to restore the ground-levels to pre-quarry contours. A buffer of at least 50m of heathland will be maintained near the monument under the proposed restoration scheme and an opportunity exists to place an interpretation panel on the restored bridleway close to the monument’s boundary. This would be a positive impact of slight magnitude upon the setting of the monument.
6. Assessment of Effects

6.1 CRITERIA USED IN THE EVALUATION OF PREDICTED EFFECTS

In accordance with the EIA Regulations the significance of an effect should be identified. This is achieved using a combination of published guidance\(^1\) and professional judgement.

Four criteria have been considered in evaluating the significance of effects of the proposed development upon cultural heritage, based upon the impacts identified and taking account of any mitigation measures discussed in Section 8, above. These are sometimes referred to as residual effects.

6.1.1 Type of effect
Effects may be positive, negative, neutral (i.e. no discernible effect) or none. They may be permanent or temporary, direct or indirect. They may also be cumulative with other effects occurring in the vicinity.

6.1.2 Probability of the effect occurring
An assessment is made as to the likelihood of the identified effect occurring. Probability is considered as certain, likely or unlikely.

6.1.3 Sensitivity
Three categories of sensitivity are identified: high, medium and low. These are expanded upon in Table 3, below.

Table 3 Definitions of sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields, Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings. Sites may also be discovered as a result of new research that are also of national importance and are candidates for scheduling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Archaeological sites and features that are not considered sufficiently important or well-preserved to be protected as Scheduled Monuments, but that may be considered to be of at least regional importance. Grade II Listed Buildings. Conservation Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Archaeological sites and structures, and other components of the historic environment that contribute to the local landscape. Local designations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.4 Magnitude
The magnitude of change to a cultural heritage asset or landscape is considered in terms of its vulnerability, its current condition and the nature of the impact upon it. With respect to subsurface archaeology, there may be a degree of uncertainty of the magnitude of change, and where this is the case it is noted. Magnitude is assessed as considerable, slight or none and the criteria used in this report are set out in Table 4, below.

\(^1\) See section 1.3.1
Table 4  Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Change</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Considerable        | Complete destruction of a well-preserved archaeological site, historic structure or asset of the cultural heritage landscape  
Change to the setting of a cultural heritage asset or landscape such that our ability to understand the resource and its historical context is permanently changed |
| Slight              | Destruction of an archaeological site or other cultural heritage asset already in degraded condition  
Change to the setting of a cultural heritage asset or landscape such that our ability to understand the resource and its historical context is partially changed or temporarily changed but reversible. |
| None                | No physical effect upon an archaeological site or other asset of the cultural heritage landscape  
No discernible effect upon the setting of a cultural heritage asset or landscape, or our ability to understand the resource and its historical context |

6.2 ASSESSING SIGNIFICANCE
The four criteria are considered together to reach a conclusion upon the significance of an effect taking into account any measures that are proposed to mitigate the effect. In accordance with the approach required under the EIA Regulations these are quantified as significant, not significant or neutral (i.e. no change to the existing situation). In some cases it may not be possible to quantify the significance of an effect, for example due to a gap in information, and this is noted.

Table 5 presents a matrix of the inter-relationship of sensitivity with magnitude.

Table 5  Inter-relationship of sensitivity with magnitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not significant*</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*except effects of considerable magnitude upon statutorily designated heritage assets which are always ‘significant’

6.3 EVALUATION OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PREDICTED EFFECTS
The results of the evaluation of significance are drawn together in Table 6, below, together with the rationale behind the evaluation.
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## Table 6 Effects and Evaluation of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Type of Effect</th>
<th>Probability of Effect Occurring</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude of Effect</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct effects upon statutorily designated features of the historic environment</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>There will be no direct effects upon statutorily designated features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effects upon Oldbury Camp scheduled monument</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>The restoration of Phase 1 at the start of the proposed development using materials generated by the proposed new scheme will help restore the setting of the monument which is currently affected by the quarry. A buffer of at least 50m of restored heathland will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After restoration of Phase 1</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>There is no intervisibility with the PEA from the earthworks of the monument due to the woodland within the monument and a buffer of trees, shrubs and brambles between the monument and the current quarry. At one point on the scheduled boundary, but beyond the extent of earthworks, a view is possible across the current quarry. However, should the woodland ever be removed, views towards the PEA would be clear within the middle distance. The monument is not discernible from the PEA, although its location can be seen as a wooded hill. The restoration scheme of the PEA will be in keeping with the current situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction and restoration of the PEA</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effects upon archaeology within the PEA</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>The conclusions are based upon current information, an assessment of the archaeology of the area and the damage that has been</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Permanent | | | | | caused to any archaeology within the PEA through a long regime of arable agriculture and the reorganisation of fields. There is no evidence that any archaeology would be of sufficient importance to merit preservation *in situ*. An archaeological evaluation will be carried out prior to determination of the planning application. Mitigation measures would be designed based upon the results of the evaluation. This could involve archaeological monitoring and excavation during soil stripping. The scope of any work would be agreed in a Written Scheme of Investigation with Warwickshire County Council and its implementation could be secured via a planning condition.

Any negative effects would be partly offset by the benefits to knowledge gained through the archaeological fieldwork and analysis.
7. Summary

7.1 SCOPE OF WORK
This report presents the findings of a cultural heritage assessment for proposed mineral extraction and restoration at Mancetter Quarry, Warwickshire. It considers both direct and indirect effects upon cultural heritage. Direct effects are those that physically affect archaeology or a cultural heritage asset. Indirect effects can occur as a result of significant changes to the setting of a cultural heritage landscape or asset, whether permanent or temporary. This is particularly relevant to designated features of national importance, such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Registered Parks and Gardens.

Based upon our knowledge of archaeology within the vicinity of the Proposed Extension Area (PEA) it is considered that there is a moderate potential for archaeology within the PEA, but as a result of a long history of arable agriculture the significance of any archaeology that survives is likely to be low-moderate.

Nevertheless, the topography of parts of the PEA would have been potentially desirable to settlement in pre-modern times with far-reaching views to the north-east and it has been agreed with Warwickshire County Council that some pre-determination archaeological evaluation should take place in part of the PEA. The archaeological evaluation shall comprise detailed geophysical survey and trial-trenching carried out on approximately 8ha of the PEA, within an arable field. Work would be carried out by a competent contractor adhering to IfA Codes of Conduct and in adherence a Written Scheme of Investigation submitted to Warwickshire County Council for approval before commencement.

The results of the geophysical survey would inform the location of trenches. In absence of geophysical anomalies being identified, a random but stratified trench layout would be employed. The results would be provided to Warwickshire County Council before the determination of the planning application in order to allow an informed decision to be made in relation to the significance of any archaeology identified.

7.2 DIRECT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION
On current information there is no evidence of archaeology within the PEA. The field-based evaluation discussed above will assist in identifying whether sub-surface archaeology survives, its condition and significance. It is considered unlikely that archaeology of such importance as to require preservation in situ will be identified.

The scope of any mitigation will be directly related to the results of the evaluation but it is likely that, as national planning policy recognises, should archaeology of less than national importance be identified, an acceptable alternative is preservation by record through targeted archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and publication appropriate to significance of the archaeological resource.

The scope of work will be submitted to Warwickshire County Council before development commences in the form of a Written Scheme of Investigation and will be subject to a planning condition requiring its implementation.
In the event that no archaeology is identified by the evaluation, it may not be necessary for a watching brief to be carried out.

On current information, there is predicted to be a non-significant adverse effect upon archaeology within the PEA, which will be partly offset by gains in knowledge obtained from any excavations carried out.

7.3 INDIRECT EFFECTS and MITIGATION
Indirect impacts are those that do not physically affect a cultural heritage asset or landscape, but that alter the context or setting.

One designated heritage asset lies in vicinity of the PEA. Oldbury Camp Scheduled Monument is an example of an Iron Age Hillfort. The integrity of the monument has been compromised by the construction of a reservoir within it and it is unlikely that any significant archaeological deposits survive within the interior. The rampart and ditch surviving on three sides appear relatively intact. It is overgrown with trees and undergrowth. The current quarry, which at its closest point lies immediately adjacent to the scheduled boundary, has affected its setting.

There is no intervisibility with the PEA from the earthworks of the monument due to the woodland within the monument and a buffer of trees, shrubs and brambles between the monument and the current quarry. At one point on the scheduled boundary, but beyond the extent of earthworks, a view is possible across the current quarry. However, should the woodland ever be removed, views towards the PEA would be clear within the middle distance.

The monument is not discernible from the PEA, although its location can be seen as a wooded hill.

It is considered that the effects of working the PEA upon the setting of Oldbury Camp is slightly adverse.

The PEA would produce overburden that would partly be placed within the south-eastern extent of the current workings adjacent to the scheduled monument to restore the ground-levels to pre-quarry contours. A buffer of at least 50m of restored heathland will be maintained near the monument under the proposed restoration scheme and an opportunity exists to place an interpretation panel on the restored bridleway close to the monument’s boundary. This would be a positive impact of slight magnitude upon the setting of the monument.

7.4 CONCLUSION
The slightly adverse effects upon the setting of Oldbury Fort scheduled monument created by extraction within the PEA will be offset by the early restoration of the quarried area nearest the monument. The overall effect could therefore considered to be neutral.

There is no evidence of any significant archaeological sites within the PEA.

The proposed development will have no significant effects upon known archaeology or cultural heritage assets and therefore fully accords with both local and national cultural heritage policy.
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APPENDIX A

Letter from Planning Archaeologist, Warwickshire County Council re pre-determination archaeological evaluation
Dear Andrew,

RE: Proposed Extension to Mancetter Quarry.

Thank you for taking the time to show me around the proposed extension site last week.

As we have discussed, I am of the opinion that the archaeological implications of this proposal cannot be adequately assessed on the basis of the available information. I would therefore recommend that an archaeological evaluation be undertaken across the area outlined in pink on the attached fig. 1. This will help to define the character, extent, state of preservation and importance of any archaeological remains present, and will also provide information useful for identifying potential options for minimising or avoiding damage to them.

The results of this work should be supplied as part of any application to develop the site so that an informed and reasonable planning decision can be reached.

I would expect the first phase of archaeological evaluation strategy to comprise a programme of magnetometry (geophysical) survey across the area outlined in pink on the attached fig. 1, with readings taken a maximum of 25cm apart along traverses a maximum of 1m apart.

This should be followed by a programme of trial trenching across this area. This should target any features identified during the works outlined above and sample the remainder of the site.

We would normally recommend that the trial trenching examine a 4% sample of the site, however, it may be appropriate to reduce this should the geophysical survey identify extensive geophysical anomalies which can be targeted by the trenching. I would be happy to advise further on this once the results of the geophysical survey are available.
I have attached our generic briefs for geophysical survey and other fieldwork below. I would be happy to advise further on the arrangements for such work.

As we have discussed, I would not object to the evaluative fieldwork being undertaken following the submission of the application, providing that the results are available prior to its determination. Your client should, however, discuss this with the Planning Authority as it may have implications for the timetable for considering the application.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Anna Stocks
Planning Archaeologist
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