



**Barnsley Local Plan,  
Archaeology Scoping Study of Potential Site  
Allocations 2015-  
2017**

**Prepared for:**  
**Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council,**  
Design & Conservation,  
Development Services,  
Westgate Plaza One,  
PO Box 603,  
Barnsley,  
S70 9FE.

**Prepared by:** Wessex  
Archaeology, Unit R6  
Riverside Block,  
Sheaf Bank Business Park,  
Prospect Road,  
Sheffield,  
S2 3EN.

[www.wessexarch.co.uk](http://www.wessexarch.co.uk)

**December 2017**

**T24081.01**

# Barnsley Local Plan, Archaeology Scoping Study of Potential Site Allocations

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Project summary

1.1.1 Wessex Archaeology undertook a scoping study of an initial 155 sites for inclusion in the Barnsley Local Plan in 2015 (Wessex Archaeology 2015a; hereafter 'Phase 1') and a subsequent study of 42 additional sites for inclusion in 2016 (Wessex Archaeology 2016; hereafter 'Phase 2').

1.1.2 In 2017, Wessex Archaeology was commissioned to undertake a scoping study of an additional 24 proposed sites for inclusion in the Local Plan (hereafter 'Phase 3'). The study comprises a review of existing archaeological and historic environment character data for the potential preferred sites, in order to assess the presence of designated and/or identified heritage assets within each site and a pre-determined study area around it.

1.1.3 Heritage assets and historic landscapes, within and surrounding each site have been considered to provide an evidence base for the assessment of the archaeological potential of each potential preferred site. Recommendations are made regarding the suitability of each potential preferred development site in terms of heritage constraints.

### 1.2 Project background

1.2.1 Wessex Archaeology was commissioned by the Development Services team at Barnsley MBC to carry out an archaeological scoping study of preferred sites for new development to meet Core Strategy targets for new housing and employment land in Barnsley District over the plan period to 2026. These include the identification (within the Core Strategy 2010 as submitted) of 'broad locations' for significant medium to large scale new development - mainly comprising urban extensions into the Green Belt and new mineral extraction sites. They include preferred sites for new housing, employment and traveller sites that will be detailed in the emerging Sites and Policies Document. They also include sites safeguarded for retention as Green Belt. An assessment of the suitability of these sites considered for potential allocation in the Local Plan and possible development, in relation to their archaeological potential, is required.

### 1.3 Planning policy

1.3.1 National planning policy, set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012) requires that planning authorities deliver sustainable development and requires consideration of the historic environment in policies and decisions concerning the historic environment, this includes recognising the wider importance of the historic environment and measures where:

*126. Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment...*

*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...*

1.3.2 Following on from the Publication Core Strategy, Barnsley MBC has identified proposed sites for new housing, employment, traveller sites and sites safeguarded for retention as Green Belt in the Development Sites and Places Supporting Documents. This Study will assess the additional proposed 42 sites to determine the suitability of these sites for future development, in relation to their archaeological potential.

## 2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

### 2.1 Aims

2.1.1 The overall aim of the project was to collect and collate information on the additional 42 potential preferred sites, in order to allow an assessment to be made of the archaeological potential of each potential preferred site and make recommendations as to their suitability for potential allocation and future development in terms of heritage constraints. The specific aims were:

Aim 1	To collate existing digital data in order to provide an evidence base for assessment.
Aim 2	To compile a geodatabase to identify heritage assets within each potential preferred site and its study area.
Aim 3	To identify the significance of heritage assets and historic landscapes within each potential preferred site and its study area.
Aim 4	To assess the archaeological potential of each potential preferred site and its study area.
Aim 5	To make recommendations as to the suitability of each potential preferred area for potential allocation and future development in terms of heritage constraints.
Aim 6	To prepare a report identifying, for each potential preferred area, heritage assets and their significance; archaeological potential; and suitability for allocation.

### 2.2 Objectives

2.2.1 The objects of the project were:

Objective 1	To contribute to the evidence base of Barnsley MBC's Local Plan to meet national and regional planning policy requirements to ensure that its preparation is based upon an understanding of the local archaeological resource.
Objective 2	To establish the known or expected archaeological potential of the sites identified as a potential preferred site for future development by Barnsley MBC.
Objective 3	To provide information that can inform subsequent decisions on whether to include all or only some of these potential 'preferred' development sites within the Local Plan Sites and Policies Document.

### **3 METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

3.1.1 A Project Design (Wessex Archaeology 2015b) was prepared by Wessex Archaeology in accordance with the guidance set out in Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment ('MoRPHE', English Heritage 2006). The Project Design was approved by Barnsley MBC and the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service prior to the commencement of the study.

#### **3.2 Data sources**

3.2.1 The following data sources were consulted:

- *Digital Ordnance Survey base map data provided by Barnsley MBC;*
- *digital Historic Environment Characterisation data, Sites and Monuments Record data and aerial photographic cropmark data provided by SYAS;*
- *where relevant, additional non-digital data sources (documents, plans etc) held by the SYAS will also be consulted and incorporated into the geodatabase;*
- *GIS based data relating to all designated heritage assets in England (National Heritage List for England);*
- *historic and modern Ordnance Survey maps;*
- *online sources including the National Heritage List;*
- *information about former mining activity from the Coal Authority (<http://mapapps2.bgs.ac.uk/coalauthority/home.html>); and*
- *modern aerial photograph/satellite imagery (e.g. <http://maps.google.co.uk/maps> and <http://www.bing.com/maps>).*

#### **3.3 Data handling and analysis**

3.3.1 An ArcGIS geodatabase was constructed to support the spatial analysis of the potential preferred development sites in relation to known heritage assets, modern and historic mapping and aerial photographs. Spatial queries were used to select the heritage assets potentially affected (both directly and indirectly) by the proposed development sites and the resulting lists were used to populate the heritage asset records.

3.3.2 Barnsley MBC's existing site reference codes were preserved for this study and the following information was recorded for each proposed development site:

- *A summary of the information consulted.*
- *Heritage assets that may be directly affected by the development of the site.*
- *Heritage assets and historic landscapes within 250m of the site boundary or that otherwise may be affected by development through effects on their setting.*
- *An assessment of the archaeological potential of the proposed site.*
- *A recommendation for each potential preferred site on the suitability of all or part of the site for allocation.*

3.3.3 A Microsoft Access interface to the system provided a summary view of the data on a site by site basis. The presence and significance of known or potential archaeological heritage assets was considered and assessed and a summary of this information was entered as plain text into the database form.

3.3.4 Where areas of significantly differing archaeological potential were identified within a site, the site was split into sub-areas for separate assessment (these sub-areas are indicated by capital letters, e.g., CE1aB indicates a second sub-area within allocation site CE1a). These areas are uniquely identifiable but remain referenced to the original potential preferred site.

3.3.5 These data were extracted from the geodatabase as the individual site reports.

### **3.4 The assessment process**

3.4.1 The significance of identified and potential heritage assets was assigned using professional judgement taking into account the nature of the heritage interest; the extent of the fabric (or site) that holds that interest; and the level of importance of that interest with reference to the heritage values set out in English Heritage's Conservation Principles (2008).

### **3.5 Consultation with South Yorkshire Archaeology Service**

3.5.1 Completed site assessments were submitted to the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service for approval prior to the compilation of this report. Where concerns or comments were raised the assessments have been amended to take account of the additional information provided by the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service.

### **3.6 Assumptions and limitations**

3.6.1 The data used to compile this report consists of secondary information derived from a variety of sources, only some of which have been directly examined for the purposes of this Study. The assumption is made that this data, as well as that derived from other secondary sources, is reasonably accurate.

3.6.2 The records held by South Yorkshire Sites and Monuments Record are not a record of all surviving elements of the cultural heritage resource, but a record of the discovery of a wide range of heritage assets. The information held within it is not complete and does not preclude the subsequent discovery of further elements of the historic environment that are, at present, unknown

## **4 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS**

### **4.1 Summary**

4.1.1 The results of the assessments are presented as individual site reports in.

4.1.2 Each site report includes location information, map, site assessment and a summary list of identified heritage assets. The first page of each site report includes a map of the proposed site that is colour-coded to provide a visual indicator of the likely archaeological implications of development, with red indicating significant archaeological constraints, through yellow and yellow/green stripes, to green indicating little or no archaeological constraints.

4.1.3 Each report also includes a site assessment with statements of archaeological significance and recommendations (see 4.2 and 4.3 below). This is followed by a summary of known heritage assets and historic landscapes within the site and the 250m study area and includes English Heritage designations where relevant. Each report concludes with:

a) an assessment of the possibility of encountering heritage assets within the site and the likely significance of each type of asset, and

b) a summary of the predicted survival of heritage assets at the site.

#### 4.2 Definitions: Archaeological significance

4.2.1 Each site has been allocated a significance level of International, National, Regional, high Local, medium Local, low Local, Negligible or Unknown depending upon the factors described in the table below.

4.2.2 Significance has been assessed taking into account current understanding of the heritage assets. In most cases this does not include any detailed desk-based research or field investigation and therefore the allotted significance should be considered as provisional pending further information. Sites may contain heritage assets of varying levels of significance, in which case the highest level of significance has been applied to the whole site or recorded as 'unknown', depending upon the nature of the heritage assets that are present or anticipated.

Significance	Factors Determining Significance
International	World Heritage Sites Assets of recognised international importance Assets that contribute to international research objectives
National	Scheduled Ancient Monuments Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings Grade I and Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens Undesignated assets of the quality and importance to be designated Assets that contribute to national research agendas
Regional	Grade II Listed Buildings Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens Assets that contribute to regional research objectives
Local (Low/Medium/High)	Locally listed buildings Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor contextual associations Assets with importance to local interest groups Assets that contribute to local research objectives
Negligible	Assets with little or no archaeological/historical interest
Unknown	The importance of the asset has not been ascertained from available evidence

#### 4.3 Definitions: Recommendations

4.3.1 The suitability of each site for potential allocation and possible development has been assessed based on heritage constraints, leading to one of the following four recommendations:

Major archaeological objections to allocation		The site contains, or is close to, <i>known</i> archaeological remains of national or regional significance <i>and</i> there has been little or no previous development or disturbance on the site and archaeological survival is predicted to be moderate or good.
Potential archaeological objections to allocation		The site contains, or is close to, <i>known</i> archaeological remains of regional or local significance <i>and</i> there has been little or no previous development or disturbance on the site and archaeological survival is predicted to be moderate or good.
Uncertain archaeological objections to allocation		The site contains, or is close to, <i>known or predicted</i> archaeological remains of local or unknown significance <i>or</i> there has been little or no previous development or disturbance on the site and archaeological survival is predicted to be moderate or good.
Little or no archaeological objections to allocation		The site contains no known or predicted archaeological remains <i>or</i> there has been significant previous development or disturbance on the site and archaeological survival is predicted to be poor.

#### 4.4 Chronology

Where mentioned in the text, the main archaeological periods are broadly defined by the following date ranges:

Modern	AD 1900 – Present	Romano-British	AD 43 – 410
19 <sup>th</sup> Century	AD 1800 – 1900	Iron Age	700 BC – AD 43
Post-medieval	AD 1500 – 1799	Bronze Age	2400 – 700 BC
Medieval	AD 1066 – 1499	Neolithic	4000 – 2400 BC

Saxon	AD 410 – 1066	Mesolithic	8500 – 4000 BC
Post-Roman	AD 410 – 650	Palaeolithic	650000 – 9500 BC

## 4.5 Abbreviations

4.5.1 The following abbreviations are used:

AP	Aerial Photograph (includes satellite imagery)
NMP	National Mapping Programme
HEC	Historic Environment Characterisation
OS	Ordnance Survey
SMR	Sites and Monuments Record
SYAS	South Yorkshire Archaeology Service
HE	Historic England

