

Stratford-on-Avon District Council – Site Allocations Plan

Heritage Impact Assessment

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| SHLAA Reference | HAMP.03 |
| Site Address | East of Snitterfield Road, Hampton Lucy |
| Site Capacity | Approx. 15 dwellings |

Site Description:

The site is irregular in shape, and is composed of part of a grassed field to the north of the settlement of Hampton Lucy. It steeply rises in topography from south to north. A public footpath runs to the east of the site. The site is bordered by detached dwellings to part of its western boundary, whilst to the south lies further grassed field of which the site forms a part. To its eastern boundary are mature hedgerow and trees, beyond which lies a Grade II listed cottage and the designated Conservation Area. This sits at a much lower elevation than the site. To the north and the remainder of the western and eastern boundaries lies further grassed fields.



Assessment criteria:**Heritage Asset 1:**

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | Cottage on the West Bank of the River Avon opposite Charlecote Mill in Avon Ford, Bridge Street |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Heritage Asset. • Grade II listed building. |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | <p>The listed building was designated in 1967. Its Listing Description states: “Cottage. C17. Timber-frame with painted brick infill; steeply pitched thatched roof with brick ridge stacks. 2-unit plan plus rear outshut with thatched catslide roof. EXTERIOR: 2 storeys; 2-window range. One wall mostly gone. Entrance to right end has plank door in moulded frame. Windows to ground and attic floors have casements. Roof partly covered in tarpaulin. INTERIOR: plastered smoke hood. Picturesque situation.”</p> <p>The building is removed from the main built-up area of Hampton Lucy and is bordered by a grass field (the site) to the west and the River Avon to the east. It is located to the north-east of a non-listed building, and north-east of the main village settlement of Hampton Lucy. Its relatively remote location is important to its significance as a riverside cottage in a historically isolated position from the settlements of Hampton Lucy and Charlecote. It is situated approximately 30m to the east of the site.</p> <p>Key Views – A public footpath to the east of the site provide public views of the listed building and its curtilage. This public footpath also borders the site. The listed building is set at a significantly lower elevation than the site, and is mostly shielded from view from the adjacent public footpath by mature hedges and trees that border the footpath. As such, views into and out of the listed building’s curtilage are limited.</p> <p>The contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset include the built-form of the building (including architectural design features and materials) but also its immediate curtilage and the wider local landscape within which it is located.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset</p> | <p>Development of this site would impact on the immediate setting of the listed building and the wider rural setting of the building, and change the character of the site by adding built-form to a rural landscape.</p> <p>The proposed site consists of the field immediately to the west of the listed building. The listed building is set at a significantly lower elevation than the site and the public footpath, and is shielded by existing vegetation. As such, development on this field may only be minimally visible from the listed building.</p> <p>However, development in this location would permanently remove the remaining rural separation between the asset and the existing built form of the settlement, thus removing an important historic element that contributes to the significance of the asset and its setting. Development of the site would remove the rural buffer between the Listed Building and these dwellings, and would thus impact upon its historical separation and remote location from the built form of the village.</p> |
| <p>Potential mitigation measures for identified harm</p> | <p>There is existing planting surrounding the listed building which assists in partly shielding the site from view. Additional landscaping and planting could assist in screening new development from the listed cottage. Reduction of the net-developable area to provide a buffer/separation and reduce the impact of development on the setting of the asset could also provide some mitigation of impact upon this heritage asset. However, this would not prevent the inevitable removal of separation between the listed building and the main built form of the village that would result from development in this location. The historic remoteness of the heritage asset is considered to form an important and intrinsic part of its heritage significance, and there would be no measures that could mitigate against the impact of development on this aspect of the asset's significance.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is considered that there would be no mitigation measures available that would reduce the level of identified harm to a satisfactory level.</p> |
| <p>Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset</p> | <p>The heritage asset itself would not be affected, however the setting of the asset would be significantly adversely impacted through the introduction of development in this location. Mitigation measures would be insufficient to address the harm to the setting of the heritage asset, as the development of the site would inevitably result in the removal of the asset's remote rural setting and separation from the main urban form of the village. This is considered to be provide an intrinsic part of the heritage asset's heritage significance. Accordingly, the level of harm to the heritage asset is</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>assessed to be 'substantial'.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Substantial harm.</p> |
|--|--|

Heritage Asset 2:

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | Bridge over River Avon |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Heritage Asset. • Grade II listed building. |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | <p>The listed building was designated in 1952. Its Listing Description states: "Bridge. 1829 with C20 reconstruction and 1991 strengthening. For Rev John Lucy. Cast-iron, limestone ashlar and brick. Cast-iron manufactured by Horseley Iron Works, Shropshire. Segmental arch formed of 4 identical cast-iron members with panelled arches and cusped lattices to spandrels; cyma-moulded cornice. Each end has ashlar section, each with 5 single-chamfered arches and 2 C20 concrete piers to each side. Cast-iron railings with pointed arches. Brick abutments to each end, with lattice railings to balustrade."</p> <p>The bridge is located approximately 115m south-east of the site. It is shielded from view from the site by intervening existing mature vegetation.</p> <p>Key Views – The bridge is a public thoroughfare open to both pedestrians and vehicles. It is visible from the public road of which the bridge forms a part.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | Development of this site would not impact on the setting of the listed building, as the site is not visible from the bridge and the similarly, the bridge is not visible from the site. This is due to the distance and intervening mature vegetation between the site and the bridge. Additionally, there is existing modern housing situated to the west of the bridge, to the south of the site, which is visible from the bridge, and so development within the vicinity of the bridge has already previously been deemed acceptable. It is therefore not considered that development of the site would further adversely affect the setting of the heritage asset in terms of cumulative impact. |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | It is not considered that mitigation measures would be necessary as no potential harm to the asset as a result of the development of the site has been identified. |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | Neither the heritage asset itself or the setting of the asset would be affected through the introduction of development in this location. Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: No harm. |

Heritage Asset 3:

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | Charlecote and Hampton Lucy Conservation Area. |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Heritage Asset. • Conservation Area. |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | <p>Designated 1994. The site lies adjacent to the Conservation Area with the eastern boundary of the site conterminous with that of the Conservation Area. It is also within close proximity of the Conservation Area boundary to the south of the site.</p> <p>The Conservation Area primarily encompasses the village centres of Hampton Lucy and Charlecote, including Charlecote Park. However the Conservation Area also stretches north of the village to include the Grade II Listed Cottage on the West Bank, as well as the south west portion of</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>the site which abuts the River Avon. The site is important to the setting of the Conservation Area as it provides a rural fringe to the River Avon and the Grade II Listed Cottage.</p> <p>Key Views: The Conservation Area is highly visible from the site, due to the site's elevated position above the village to the south, and views into the Conservation Area are also possible from the footpath that runs to the east of the site. Views into the site from the Conservation Area to the south would be less affected, due to existing modern dwellings situated to the south of the site partly shielding the site, although views of the site would still be possible from Bridge Street.</p> |
| <p>Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset</p> | <p>Development in this location would significantly alter the character and appearance of the site through the introduction of built form.</p> <p>Given the proximity of the site to the Conservation Area, particularly the conterminous boundary to the east of the site, as well as its elevated position above the part of the Conservation Area situated to the south, any development would significantly impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. Development of the site would impact upon the significance of the Conservation Area by removing the rural landscape setting to the Conservation Area that the site currently provides. Furthermore, key views to the Conservation Area from the public footpath that runs to the east of the site would be significantly adversely impacted by development of the site.</p> |
| <p>Potential mitigation measures for identified harm</p> | <p>Due to the site's close proximity and elevated position above the Conservation Area, it is considered that development of the site would have a substantial negative impact on the significance of the Conservation Area. This is as the site would affect views into and out of the Conservation Area, which would be enhanced by the site's significant elevation above the Conservation Area. Any development of the site would thus be prominent due to this elevated position, and result in the removal of the current rural setting to the Conservation Area that the site currently provides. Whilst landscaping could partially reduce the level of this impact, it would not be sufficient to address the level of harm that would be caused to the Conservation Area as a result of the development of the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, key views from the public footpath to the east of the site would be significantly impacted. Whilst attractive design and layout of the development could partly reduce this impact, the development would still result in a substantial negative impact due to the significant disruption of public views into the Conservation Area that would occur as a result of development of the site.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Accordingly, it is considered that there would be no mitigation measures available that would reduce the level of identified harm to a satisfactory level. |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | <p>Sensitive site layout and design could partially reduce the detrimental impact of development on the Conservation Area. However, there would remain a significant impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, due to a permanent change in the character of the site through the introduction of built form. This would affect views both into and out of the Conservation Area, as there is a public footpath that runs adjacent to the site. It is considered that the site provides an important rural landscape setting to the Conservation Area, which is enhanced due to its elevated position. As such, it is considered that mitigation measures would not be sufficient to address the harm to the setting of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Substantial harm.</p> |

Heritage Asset 4:

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | Church Of St Peter ad Vincula, Church Street |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Heritage Asset. • Grade I Listed Building |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | <p>The listed building was designated in April 1967. Its listing description states:</p> <p>“Church. 1822-6. By Thomas Rickman and Hutchinson. For Rev John Lucy. Chancel and porch added and other alterations, 1858 by Sir Gilbert Scott. Limestone ashlar; slate and lead roofs. STYLE: Decorated. PLAN single-bay chancel with polygonal apse; 6-bay nave with lean-to aisles, 3-stage west tower and 2-storey north porch.</p> <p>EXTERIOR: moulded plinth, top cornice and pierced crenellated parapets and pierced coped gables; buttresses have richly crocketed pinnacles; window hoods with head stops; much rich carving. Apse has 5 faces, 3-light windows with Decorated tracery in arches of 2 orders under traceried crocketed free-standing gables between gabled buttresses with pinnacles and figures. East end of chancel has pierced coping and flanking buttresses with pinnacles to tabernacles; 3-</p> |

light north and south windows as to apse, but gables against wall. Clerestory has gabled buttresses with pinnacles, top cornice and pierced crenellated parapet; east end has octagonal pinnacles with cornices and pierced friezes with brattishing; 2-light windows with Decorated tracery. Aisles have cornices and traceried parapets continued as coping; gabled buttresses with pinnacles between 3-light windows with cast-iron Decorated tracery; east end of north aisle has entrance with continuous moulding, but corresponding south aisle bay has window with spherical-lozenge tracery; north aisle west end has double-cusped light. South porch has top cornice and parapet with pierced quatrefoils; large octagonal pinnacles with gabled buttresses; canted stair turret to buttress to east; entrance of 2 orders now with glazed infill and Bishop and Queen headstops; canopied niche above has statue of St Peter in chains, flanking cusped lights above shields in panels; damaged gable cross. Tower has gabled buttresses and string courses; tall-bell stage has octagonal pinnacles with gabled buttresses, cornice and pierced parapet with finials; west entrance has deep gabled portal with rich ball-flower, stiff-leaf carving and Lucy arms, offset buttresses with pinnacles and flanking niches; paired plank doors with good wrought-iron work. North and south sides have 3-bay blind arcades, that to south with later 2-light window, north side with entrance to canted stair turret; second stage has 2-light window with cast-iron tracery; bell-stage has 2-light louvred bell-openings with Decorated tracery in deep moulded arches; clock face to front has gable and pinnacles.

INTERIOR: chancel has wall shafts to lierne vault; chancel and apse arches of 4 orders; blind trefoil-headed arcading to apse has marble shafts, foliate capitals and spandrels, and crocketed gables between pinnacles; inlaid floor. Nave has tall 6-bay Perpendicular arcades with wall shafts to plaster quadripartite rib vaulting, and similar vaulting to aisles. Clerestory has cusped blind arches between windows; 1856 tower arch has entrance of 3 orders with cinquefoil over trumeau and pierced balustrade above, the west windows in shafted arched recess. North aisle has east bay enclosed by screens, each with pointed arch with ogee gable flanked by traceried openings. South aisle has east bay enclosed for vestry with trefoil-pointed entrance to west.

FITTINGS: reredos of 5 trefoil-pointed arches, crocketed gables and pinnacles; richly carved choir stalls with traceried canopies and iron and brass panels to fronts. Richly carved wood pulpit on ashlar base with clustered marble shafts, handrail with metalwork by Skidmore. 2 original pew ends with cast-iron poppyheads, other pew ends brattished. Alabaster font has relief panels of Biblical scenes. C18 Royal Arms to south aisle in frame with Tudor- and ball-flower.

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>STAINED GLASS: east window, dated 1826, by Willement; similar glass to some aisle windows, and decorative glass to clerestory and west windows; some glass to chancel probably by Clayton and Bell. The magnum opus of Rickman and Hutchinson (Pevsner) and a very good example of early C19 church architecture, the richness of which is due to the generosity of funding”.</p> <p>Key Views: The church is highly visible throughout the majority of the village and forms a central focal point, due to its height and central location. The top half of the church is visible from the site, although it is situated approximately 200m from the site. The site is not visible from the listed building at ground level.</p> <p>The contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset include the built-form of the building (including architectural design features and materials) but also its immediate curtilage and the wider local landscape within which it is located.</p> |
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | <p>Development of this site would have a small impact on the significance of this asset, as it would introduce some additional development to this part of the village and result in some disruption of views from the public footpath to the east of the site to the listed Church. However, the church would still remain highly visible due to its height and location, and its immediate setting would not be impacted by the proposed development as it is situated approximately 250m away from the site. Furthermore, there is already existing modern residential development in the intervening distance between the site and the heritage asset. The overall impact of development of the site on this heritage asset is assessed to be “less than substantial”.</p> |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | <p>Development in this location would not have an impact on the immediate setting of the listed building due to the significant intervening distance between the site and the heritage asset. However, it would have an impact on views of the church from the public footpath running to the east of the site, particularly on the currently rural setting of this viewpoint to the church, although this impact overall would be small. It is not considered that mitigation measures would be effective in reducing the impact further, due to the height and prominence of the listed church.</p> |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | <p>Development in this location would have a small impact on views of the heritage asset from the public footpath to the east of the site; however, due to the intervening distance between the site and the asset, the effect on the setting of the listed building would be low.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Less than substantial harm.</p> |

Heritage Asset 5:

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | MWA20579 - Drem Mark II Aviation Ground Lighting for Wellesbourne Mountford Airfield |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Designated Heritage Asset. • No listed status. |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | A system of ground lighting was installed in 1942 to assist approaching aircraft to land at night or in bad weather. Fifty, or so, pole mounted lights were installed in a great circle about three and three quarter miles in diameter. On the runway approach the circle was modified so as to lead aircraft to the runway. The development of airfield ground lighting was covered in a Symposium held by The Institution of Civil Engineers on the subject of War Time engineering problems held in 1948, as confirmed in the HER. |
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | Development could lead to loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance. |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | <p>Desk based assessment and potential further archaeological evaluation should be undertaken prior to any development, in line with Chapter 16 of NPPF (February 2019).</p> <p>These additional assessments would need to be undertaken as part of any planning application for the development of the site.</p> |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | <p>Development of this site could lead to the loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance.</p> <p>However, further archaeological evaluation work associated with a planning application for development of the site could lead to a better understanding of the historic environment.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Less than substantial harm.</p> |

Heritage Asset 6:

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | MWA9132 - Hampton Lucy Medieval Settlement |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Designated Heritage Asset. • No listed status. |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | The possible extent of the Medieval settlement in Hampton Lucy. The area of settlement is suggested by observations made on the Ordnance Survey map of 1887. No above ground evidence of this site was evident during the site visit. This monument layer covers the majority of the site, with the exception of a small section to the north of the site. |
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | Development could lead to loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance. |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | Desk based assessment and potential further archaeological evaluation should be undertaken prior to any development, in line with Chapter 16 of NPPF (February 2019). These additional assessments would need to be undertaken as part of any planning application for the development of the site. |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | <p>Development of this site could lead to the loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance. However, further archaeological evaluation work associated with a planning application for development of the site could lead to a better understanding of the historic environment. No archaeological investigation of the site has yet been undertaken.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Less than substantial harm.</p> |

Overall Conclusion of Level of Harm

Based on the assessment of the designated and non-designated heritage assets affecting this particular site, it is concluded that mitigation measures, such as reduced dwelling capacity or implementing landscaping screening, would not be sufficient in order to reduce the impact of the substantial harm development in this location would cause in particular to the setting of nearby listed buildings and the Conservation Area. This is due to the fact that development of the site would cause irreversible harm to the rural setting of the adjacent Grade II listed cottage and Conservation Area by the introduction of built form to this location.

Stratford-on-Avon District Council – Site Allocations Plan

Heritage Impact Assessment

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| SHLAA Reference | HAMP.04 |
| Site Address | South of Church Street, Hampton Lucy |
| Site Capacity | Approx. 12 dwellings |

Site Description:

The site consists of a rectangular shaped area of land located to the west of Hampton Lucy, and to the south of Church Street. The site is currently formed of part of a ploughed agricultural field. It is situated adjacent to the Hampton Lucy Conservation Area, to the east, and is near to several Grade II listed buildings, also situated to the east of the site. The site is level in topography. A public footpath runs to the north of the site. The site is bordered by hedgerows to its northern and eastern boundaries.



Assessment criteria:**Heritage Asset 1:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | Numbers 37 And 38 And Tudor Cottage, 37 And 38, Church Street |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Heritage Assets. • Grade II listed buildings. |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | <p>The listed buildings were designated in 1989. The Listing Description states: “3 houses. Probably C18 with C19 and C20 alterations. Timber-frame with very late cruck trusses and whitewashed brick infill, and roughcast and whitewashed brick; thatch roof with brick ridge stack and end stacks, mostly with rounded flues. EXTERIOR: single storey plus attic; 6-window range. Entrances to left end, right of centre and right end have C20 doors under, respectively, hipped tile hood, open porch with hipped tile roof, and open porch with lean-to roof. Windows have C20 single-light and 2-light leaded casements; 3 gabled dormers with 2-light casements. Single-storey extensions to returns; lean-to outshuts, gable to 2 windows and 2 dormers to rear. INTERIOR: recorded as having: No.37, an open fireplace, spine beam and late C18/C19 framed partition; raised cruck truss of very light scantling and old purlins; front and dividing walls of brick. No.38, open fireplace, similar beam and cruck truss. Tudor Cottage noted as having beams, wide boards and hood to open fireplace.”</p> <p>The listed buildings are located to the western extent of the village and Conservation Area, and are bordered by ploughed arable fields to the west, allotments to the south, and existing housing development to the north and east. They are located approximately 25m to the east of the site.</p> <p>Key Views – The buildings are visible from Church Street to the north, although at an oblique angle and shielded by vegetation. A lane runs to the east of the buildings, where the buildings can be publically viewed, although they are also largely shielded by vegetation from this orientation. The buildings are minimally visible from a public footpath running to the north of the allocated site, where the roofs of the buildings can be seen above the existing mature trees/vegetation bordering the site.</p> <p>The contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset include the built-form of the buildings</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>(including architectural design features and materials) but also their immediate curtilage and the wider local landscape within which they are located.</p> |
| <p>Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset</p> | <p>Development of this site would impact on the immediate setting of the listed building and the wider rural setting of the building to the west, and change the character of the site by adding built-form to an open arable landscape due to its proximity to the asset.</p> <p>The proposed site includes the field immediately to the west of the listed buildings. The listed buildings are shielded by existing vegetation from the view from the site, although roofs are still visible.</p> <p>However, development in this location would permanently remove the remaining rural character of the landscape beyond this heritage asset to its western edge, thus removing an important historic element that contributes to the significance of the asset and its setting.</p> <p>An outline planning application for four new dwellings at this site (Ref. No. 16/04015/OUT) was refused in February 2017. One reason cited for this refusal in the Decision Notice was the harm caused by the proposal to the Conservation Area, by virtue of its siting, through the extension of the built form to the south of Hampton Lucy, the introduction of modern buildings and the erosion of the boundary with the open landscape. Furthermore, the Decision Notice also noted that there would be harm caused to the closest listed buildings by the loss of the open landscape and boundary between that and the historic core of the village. The Officer's Report concluded that development of the site would negatively impact upon these listed buildings, as it would disrupt the relationship between the village and the surrounding landscape. This is as these listed buildings form the confines of the historic core of the village, and development of the site would change this to the detriment of these heritage assets and their setting. Whilst individually the impact to each of the listed buildings was assessed to be low, cumulatively, in conjunction with the harm caused to the other heritage assets, including the Conservation Area, the impact was assessed to be 'less than substantial'.</p> <p>The application, in that case, concerned four dwellings. This is significantly less than the potential 12 dwellings that could be accommodated in the site area assessed for the Site Allocations Plan, where the impact of the development of the entirety of the site would be far greater than that</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>assessed under 16/04015/OUT due to the greater extent of landscape setting that would be lost as a result. Accordingly, the assessed impact of development on the significance of this site is judged to be 'substantial'. This is due to the cumulative impact that would result to this heritage asset, along with other heritage assets such as the Conservation Area, as a result of development of the site. This would include the permanent removal of the rural buffer from the immediate setting of these listed buildings, which is considered to form an important part of their heritage significance.</p> |
| <p>Potential mitigation measures for identified harm</p> | <p>Development of the site would introduce an unacceptable level of harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings due to the fundamental change in the landscape that would place the Listed Buildings firmly within an urban, built up environment instead of at the fringe of a rural landscape. Small scale development, with appropriate landscaping and planting to the north-east of the site could reduce the harm to the listed buildings. However, there would still be a cumulative impact to these heritage assets as a result of the development of the site, which forms part of the rural setting to these listed buildings as well as the Conservation Area.</p> <p>'Key views' into and out of the heritage assets from the public footpath to the north of the site, as well as from Church Street, would be adversely affected by development of the site, as the current rural landscape setting of these listed buildings would be disrupted.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is not considered that there would be any mitigation measures that could sufficiently address the harm to these public views that would be caused as a result of development of the site.</p> |
| <p>Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset</p> | <p>The heritage asset itself would not be affected, however the setting of the asset would be negatively impacted through the introduction of development in this location, removing the wider rural landscape setting of the asset and adding to cumulative impact upon the wider Conservation Area, of which the listed buildings form an important part. Mitigation measures would not be sufficient to address the harm to the setting of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Substantial harm.</p> |

Heritage Asset 2:

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | Old Post Office and Attached Reading Room/Institute, 40, Church Street |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade II Listed Building • Designated Heritage Asset. |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | <p>The listed building was designated in March 1997.</p> <p>Listing Description: “House and attached reading room, now institute. c1840. Brick with ashlar dressings; tile roofs with brick stacks. EXTERIOR: house of single storey with attic; 3-window range. Gabled forward break to left of centre; wide eaves and decorative bargeboards with finials. Segmental-headed openings are single-chamfered. Entrance to forward break has battened door with strap hinges and bracketed gabled canopy, canted bay window to right has hipped roof over 3 lattice-glazed lights. Carriage entrance to right end has label mould raised over blank ashlar panel and projecting C20 garage doors. Window to ground floor left end has label mould over 2-light casement with lattice glazing. First floor has similar casements to windows to gable and gabled half dormer to each side. Cross-axial stack with 2 diagonal shafts. Institute has single-storey, 3-window range, with later range attached to rear at right angles, with re-entrant porch. Front range has plain plinth and 3 segmental-headed, single-chamfered windows with stone sills, labelmoulds and 2-light frames; lateral stack to rear with 2 shafts. Right return has similar, taller, window. Porch has stone-coped parapet and straight-headed entrance with plank door and return light with label. Rear range has offset buttresses between windows with small-paned lights over inserted C20 casements. INTERIOR: not inspected. Built by the Lucy family for the use of the villagers.”</p> <p>The listed building is located to the west of the village, behind the Listed Buildings of No. 37, 38 and Tudor Cottage. Its provenance is as the historic Post Office and reading room for the village, providing a community focal point to the village. The building forms part of the built up settlement of the village.</p> <p>The contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset include the built-form of the building (including architectural design features and materials) but also its immediate curtilage and the wider local landscape within which it is located.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | The listed building is very minimally visible from the site due to the existing buildings and vegetation that lies between it and the site. Similarly, any development of the site would only have a very minimal impact on the significance of the listed building, if any due to its lack of visibility. However, the development of the site would affect the wider rural setting of the listing building as part of the Hampton Lucy Conservation Area. The development of the site therefore would adversely affect this heritage asset through cumulative impact. |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | Mitigation measures, such as landscaping to the eastern boundary of the site, would not reduce the level of harm to the asset, as there would still be an inevitable removal of the rural setting of the Conservation Area cause by development of the site. This would have a cumulative impact upon the listed building. |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | Due to the distance between the asset and the site, as well as the intervening buildings and vegetation, there would be little impact on the heritage asset itself. However, the development of the site would affect the wider setting of the listing building as part of the Hampton Lucy Conservation Area, which is currently in proximity to the wider rural landscape of which the site forms a part. The development of the site therefore would adversely affect this heritage asset through cumulative impact as part of the wider Conservation Area. Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Less than substantial harm. |

Heritage Asset 3:

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | Charlecote and Hampton Lucy Conservation Area. |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Heritage Asset. • Conservation Area. |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | The site lies adjacent to the western extent of the Conservation Area, which primarily encompasses the village centre of Hampton Lucy and Charlecote, including Charlecote Park. The Conservation Area includes the Listed Buildings of No. 37, 38 and Tudor Cottage, which are located directly adjacent to the site. This area of the Conservation Area comprises the historic core of Hampton Lucy, with a high concentration of listed buildings as well as unlisted buildings which are considered to contribute to the historic character of the Conservation Area. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>The site is important to the setting of the Conservation Area as it provides the rural setting to the village and Conservation Area. The Conservation Area is visible from the site due to its proximity, however is partly shielded by a large amount of vegetation at the border between the Site and the adjacent listed buildings.</p> |
| <p>Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset</p> | <p>Development in this location would significantly alter the character and appearance of the site through the introduction of built form to an arable landscape, that currently forms part of the immediate rural setting to the Conservation Area. Furthermore, several listed buildings are situated at the boundary of the Conservation Area which lies adjacent to the site. Given the proximity of the site to the Conservation Area, and the particular heritage significance of this portion of the Conservation Area due to the high concentration of listed buildings, any development would significantly impact on the setting of the Conservation Area in this part of the settlement.</p> <p>An outline planning application for four new dwellings at this site (Ref. No. 16/04015/OUT) was refused in February 2017. The Officer's Report concluded that the proposed development in this location would disrupt the existing relationship between the historic core of the Conservation Area and the wider open landscape, of which the site forms a part. It was considered that the introduction of more modern form of development to the southern side of the village would harm the setting of the Conservation Area, by introducing sprawl and eroding the open landscape.</p> <p>The conclusions of the Officer's Report are concurred with in this assessment. The development of the site would significantly impact on the Conservation Area through the disruption of the current wide open landscape that currently forms the setting of the Conservation Area to its western extent.</p> |
| <p>Potential mitigation measures for identified harm</p> | <p>Development of the site in this location would result in erosion of the character of the Conservation Area by introducing new built form adjacent to the Conservation Area boundary. This would be detrimental to the existing wider landscape which currently forms the setting to south of the Conservation Area boundary. As such, it is not considered that there would be any mitigation measures which could reduce to the level of harm to 'less than substantial', as the important rural setting of the Conservation Area would be irreversibly diminished as a result of the development of the site.</p> |
| <p>Conclusion of harm on the</p> | <p>The open landscape to the south of the Conservation Area, of which the site forms part of the most</p> |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| heritage asset | <p>immediate portion adjacent to the Conservation Area, would be substantially harmed by the introduction of development to this location. This wider landscape is considered to be important to the significance of the Conservation Area, and formed part of the basis of refusal of planning application Ref. No. 16/04015/OUT. Accordingly, the level of harm to the heritage asset as a result of the development of the site is judged to be 'substantial'</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Substantial harm.</p> |
|----------------|--|

Heritage Asset 4:

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | Church Of St Peter and Vincula, Church Street |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Heritage Asset. • Grade I Listed Building |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | <p>The listed building was designated in April 1967. Its listing description states:</p> <p>“Church. 1822-6. By Thomas Rickman and Hutchinson. For Rev John Lucy. Chancel and porch added and other alterations, 1858 by Sir Gilbert Scott. Limestone ashlar; slate and lead roofs. STYLE: Decorated. PLAN single-bay chancel with polygonal apse; 6-bay nave with lean-to aisles, 3-stage west tower and 2-storey north porch.</p> <p>EXTERIOR: moulded plinth, top cornice and pierced crenellated parapets and pierced coped gables; buttresses have richly crocketed pinnacles; window hoods with head stops; much rich carving. Apse has 5 faces, 3-light windows with Decorated tracery in arches of 2 orders under traceried crocketed free-standing gables between gabled buttresses with pinnacles and figures. East end of chancel has pierced coping and flanking buttresses with pinnacles to tabernacles; 3-light north and south windows as to apse, but gables against wall. Clerestory has gabled buttresses with pinnacles, top cornice and pierced crenellated parapet; east end has octagonal pinnacles with cornices and pierced friezes with brattishing; 2-light windows with Decorated tracery. Aisles have cornices and traceried parapets continued as coping; gabled buttresses with pinnacles between 3-light windows with cast-iron Decorated tracery; east end of north aisle has entrance with continuous</p> |

moulding, but corresponding south aisle bay has window with spherical-lozenge tracery; north aisle west end has double-cusped light. South porch has top cornice and parapet with pierced quatrefoils; large octagonal pinnacles with gabled buttresses; canted stair turret to buttress to east; entrance of 2 orders now with glazed infill and Bishop and Queen headstops; canopied niche above has statue of St Peter in chains, flanking cusped lights above shields in panels; damaged gable cross. Tower has gabled buttresses and string courses; tall-bell stage has octagonal pinnacles with gabled buttresses, cornice and pierced parapet with finials; west entrance has deep gabled portal with rich ball-flower, stiff-leaf carving and Lucy arms, offset buttresses with pinnacles and flanking niches; paired plank doors with good wrought-iron work. North and south sides have 3-bay blind arcades, that to south with later 2-light window, north side with entrance to canted stair turret; second stage has 2-light window with cast-iron tracery; bell-stage has 2-light louvred bell-openings with Decorated tracery in deep moulded arches; clock face to front has gable and pinnacles.

INTERIOR: chancel has wall shafts to lierne vault; chancel and apse arches of 4 orders; blind trefoil-headed arcading to apse has marble shafts, foliate capitals and spandrels, and crocketed gables between pinnacles; inlaid floor. Nave has tall 6-bay Perpendicular arcades with wall shafts to plaster quadripartite rib vaulting, and similar vaulting to aisles. Clerestory has cusped blind arches between windows; 1856 tower arch has entrance of 3 orders with cinquefoil over trumeau and pierced balustrade above, the west windows in shafted arched recess. North aisle has east bay enclosed by screens, each with pointed arch with ogee gable flanked by traceried openings. South aisle has east bay enclosed for vestry with trefoil-pointed entrance to west.

FITTINGS: reredos of 5 trefoil-pointed arches, crocketed gables and pinnacles; richly carved choir stalls with traceried canopies and iron and brass panels to fronts. Richly carved wood pulpit on ashlar base with clustered marble shafts, handrail with metalwork by Skidmore. 2 original pew ends with cast-iron poppyheads, other pew ends brattished. Alabaster font has relief panels of Biblical scenes. C18 Royal Arms to south aisle in frame with Tudor- and ball-flower.

STAINED GLASS: east window, dated 1826, by Willement; similar glass to some aisle windows, and decorative glass to clerestory and west windows; some glass to chancel probably by Clayton and Bell. The magnum opus of Rickman and Hutchinson (Pevsner) and a very good example of early C19 church architecture, the richness of which is due to the generosity of funding.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Key Views: The church is highly visible throughout the majority of the village and forms a central focal point, due to its height and central location. The top half of the church is visible from the site, although it is situated approximately 200m from the site.</p> <p>The contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset include the built-form of the building (including architectural design features and materials) but also its immediate curtilage and the wider local landscape within which it is located.</p> |
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | <p>Development of this site would have a small impact on the significance of this asset, as it would introduce some additional development to this part of the village and result in some disruption of views from the public footpath to the north of the site to the listed Church. However, the church would still remain highly visible due to its height and location, and its immediate setting would not be impacted by the proposed development as it is situated approximately 200m away from the site. The overall impact of development of the site on this heritage asset is assessed to be “less than substantial”.</p> |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | <p>Development in this location would not have an impact on the immediate setting of the listed building due to the significant intervening distance between the site and the heritage asset. However, it would have an impact on views of the church from the public footpath running to the north of the site, although this impact overall would be small. Reducing the net developable area of the site would further reduce impact to this heritage asset.</p> |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | <p>Development in this location would have a small impact on views of the heritage asset from the public footpath to the north of the site; however, due to the intervening distance between the site and the asset, the effect on the setting of the listed building would be low.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Less than substantial harm.</p> |

Heritage Asset 5:

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | MWA9132 - Hampton Lucy Medieval Settlement |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Designated Heritage Asset. • No listed status. |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | The possible extent of the Medieval settlement in Hampton Lucy. The area of settlement is suggested by observations made on the Ordnance Survey map of 1887. |
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | Development could lead to loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance. |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | Desk based assessment and potential further archaeological evaluation should be undertaken prior to any development, in line with Chapter 16 of NPPF (February 2019). These additional assessments would need to be undertaken as part of any planning application for the development of the site. |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | <p>Development of this site could lead to the loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance.</p> <p>However, further archaeological evaluation work associated with a planning application for development of the site could lead to a better understanding of the historic environment; particularly as it is not certain if a Medieval settlement is located at the site, but is suggested due to observations from historical maps.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: Less than substantial harm.</p> |

Heritage Asset 6:

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | MWA20579 - Drem Mark II Aviation Ground Lighting for Wellesbourne Mountford Airfield. |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-designated Heritage Asset • No listed status |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | A system of ground lighting was installed in 1942 to assist approaching aircraft to land at night or in bad weather. Fifty, or so, pole mounted lights were installed in a great circle about three and three quarter miles in diameter. On the runway approach the circle was modified so as to lead aircraft to the runway. The development of airfield ground lighting was covered in a Symposium held by The Institution of Civil Engineers on the subject of War Time engineering problems held in 1948, as confirmed in the HER. |
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | Development could lead to loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance. |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | Desk based assessment and potential further archaeological evaluation should be undertaken prior to any development, in line with Chapter 16 of NPPF (February 2019). These additional assessments would need to be undertaken as part of any planning application for the development of the site. |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | <p>Development of this site could lead to the loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance. However, further archaeological evaluation work associated with a planning application for development of the site could lead to a better understanding of the historic environment.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage assets: Less than substantial harm.</p> |

Heritage Asset 7:

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | EWA10095 - Archaeological Evaluation |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-designated heritage asset • No listed status |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | An evaluation comprising four trenches was carried out ahead of proposed development off Church Street, Hampton Lucy. Two of the trenches were blank; a medieval ditch and the remains of a 19th century cottage were recorded in the others. |
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | Development could lead to loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance. |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | Desk based assessment and potential further archaeological evaluation should be undertaken prior to any development, in line with Chapter 16 of NPPF (February 2019). These additional assessments would need to be undertaken as part of any planning application for the development of the site. |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | <p>Development of this site could lead to the loss of archaeological remains of unknown significance. However, further archaeological evaluation work associated with a planning application for development of the site could lead to a better understanding of the historic environment.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage assets: Less than substantial harm.</p> |

Heritage Asset 8:

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of Heritage Asset affected by allocated site | EWA10344 - Geophysical Survey Report |
| Type of heritage asset/Listed Grade/Significance Value | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-designated heritage asset • No listed status |
| Contributing elements to significance of the heritage asset | A detailed gradiometer survey on land at Church Street in Hampton Lucy did not identify any anomalies typically associated with archaeological activity. A series of parallel anomalies were identified as probably being associated with modern ploughing and some magnetic disturbance indicative of ferrous objects was recorded. |
| Assessment of impact of development on significance of the asset | The geophysical survey did not detect any potential archaeological activity. |
| Potential mitigation measures for identified harm | No archaeological activity was detected as a result of this geophysical survey, therefore no mitigation measures would be required. |
| Conclusion of harm on the heritage asset | <p>No archaeological activity was detected as a result of this geophysical survey.</p> <p>However, further archaeological evaluation work associated with a planning application for development of the site could lead to a better understanding of the historic environment.</p> <p>Conclusion on harm to heritage asset: No harm.</p> |

Overall Conclusion of Harm

Based on the assessment of the designated and non-designated heritage assets affecting this particular site, it is concluded that mitigation measures (such as reduced dwelling capacity) would not be possible in order to acceptably reduce the impact of the substantial harm development in this location would cause in particular to the setting of the adjacent listed buildings and Conservation Area. This is as the site forms part of the wider landscape setting of the Hampton Lucy Conservation Area, as well as the setting of adjacent Grade II listed buildings, and any development of the site would cause harm to the setting of these assets. The cumulative impact of the proposed development on these heritage assets is assessed to be 'substantial'.

It is concluded that development in this location would result in substantial harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets when considering the cumulative impacts on each asset.