

CHAPTER 6: CULTURAL HERITAGE

Introduction

- 6.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement sets out the archaeological and historical background of the Barnsley Markets area and provides an evaluation of the archaeological sensitivity of the proposed development. Possible impacts of development on the archaeological resource are identified and appropriate mitigation measures for reducing these potential impacts are proposed where relevant. The following sections provide a brief introduction to the scheme.
- 6.2 The site is located in Barnsley town centre and currently comprises the Land between Cheapside/May Day Green/Kendray Street/Lambra Road east of railway line ('the Barnsley Market site') and land west of railway line ('the former CEAG site') between Kendray Street and the Harborough Hill Road. The site is divided by a railway line which crosses the site orientated north to south.
- 6.3 The current development proposals include the demolition of a significant part of Barnsley town centre for the construction of a mixed-use redevelopment, comprising retail and leisure, including new market, multi-storey car park, new pedestrian routes, means of access and open space.
- 6.4 Planning permission for a similar scheme was sought and achieved in 2006 but these plans have since been deemed no longer economically viable. Consequently, the planned scheme has now been scaled down and a revised planning application submitted.
- 6.5 It should be noted that the overall footprint of the development has not changed since the original (2006) redevelopment proposals.
- 6.6 The assessment includes the following principal elements:-
- Archaeological and cultural heritage baseline information for the proposed development area

- Consultation with statutory and non statutory agencies; mainly Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council (BMBC), Barnsley Central Library, South Yorkshire County Council
- Appraisal of the archaeological and cultural heritage value of the site
- Assessment of the development impacts
- Mitigation measures and opportunities for enhancement

Methodology

Sources of Information

6.7 Sources of information include:

- South Yorkshire County Council Sites and Monuments Record (SMR)
- West Yorkshire Archaeology Service (WYAS) 2003 Desk Based Assessment
- Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council (BMBC)
- Barnsley Central Library
- Report on Barnsley Shopping Centre - Investigation of Design Information of Existing Foundations and Basements; prepared by Mott MacDonald for Yorkshire Forward (ref. 213289/01/A/08, dated April 2004)
- Baseline Environmental Information to Support an EIA: Barnsley Markets Project – Vol.1 Report and Vol.2 Appendices; prepared by Enviro Consulting Limited for Yorkshire Forward (ref. YO0010043A, dated December 2004)
- Environmental Statement Scoping Report – Proposed Retail, New Market, Leisure and Residential Development and Car Parking – Land at Barnsley Markets Site and Adjacent CEAG Site, Barnsley; prepared and submitted by RPS (dated 27 January 2005)
- Scoping Opinion; prepared by BMBC Planning and Transportation Service (ref. DC/JH/EIA/01/05, dated 2 March 2005)
- Additional formal response Letter to the Scoping Report; prepared by BMBC Planning and Transportation Service to incorporate comments from the Council's Landscaping Section (ref. DC/JH/EIA/01/05, dated 7 March 2005)
- Environmental Statement chapter for Cultural Heritage prepared by Wardell Armstrong (2006)

- Environmental Statement Scoping Report – proposed mixed use redevelopment, comprising retail and leisure including new market, multi-storey car park, new pedestrian routes, means of access and open space – land at Barnsley Markets site and adjacent CEAG site, Barnsley. Prepared and submitted by Signet Planning (dated 28 March 2011)
- Scoping Opinion prepared by BMBC Planning and Transport Service (dated 27 April 2011)
- MAGIC (Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside) web site

Desktop Study

- 6.8 In order to inform the environmental assessment, the initial baseline conditions were examined through a review of the Baseline Environmental Information report completed by Enviros Consulting Ltd in 2004 (a copy of the relevant section of the report can be found in Appendix 6.1).
- 6.9 Reference was also made to the Desk Based Assessment of the site carried out by the West Yorkshire Archaeology Service in 2003. As reported by Enviros in 2004, The South Yorkshire Archaeology Unit has advised that this report provided sufficient information to evaluate the cultural heritage of the Barnsley Markets area. Reference was also made to the Cultural Heritage chapter of the Environmental Statement prepared by Wardell Armstrong for the 2006 submission. Due to the age of the report, the SMR was re consulted for additional sites that may have been added in the last two years and for a review of previous archaeological work. Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council was also re-consulted on listed buildings.
- 6.10 The 2005 Scoping Report stated that the archaeological and cultural heritage assessment would be undertaken in line with Planning Policy Guidance notes PPG15 and PPG16 by way of desktop study and that field investigations would only be carried out if necessary. Nothing to the contrary was stated in the two BMBC scoping opinion letters. Since then, however, PPG15 and 16 have been superseded by the publication in 2010 which sets out the Government’s planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment. The 2011 Scoping Opinion confirmed that the cultural heritage assessment should be undertaken in line with the guidance

included in PPS5 and also Policy CSP30 (Historic Environment) of the draft Core Strategy.

Baseline Site Walkover

- 6.11 EnviroS Consulting Ltd conducted a site walkover for their 2004 report with a member of the Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council present. Wardell Armstrong also carried out a walkover survey of the site in January 2006, to supplement the desk exercise.

Definitions of Terms

- 6.12 For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'site' is used to refer to the application area. The term 'search area' relates to the wider area defined for the purposes of baseline information collection.
- 6.13 Archaeological remains may take the form of portable artefacts (either buried or retrieved from the ground surface); buried evidence such as graves, the remains of structures, or palaeosols; upstanding remains (i.e. earthworks, complete or ruined walls and buildings); and microfossils (e.g. pollen grains, spores, molluscs) that can provide information on past environments.
- 6.14 Cultural heritage has a wider definition that can include geological and ecological attributes as well as features of archaeological or historical interest. Examples of the latter may be a landscape of historic value (for instance because of an intact ancient field system), the site of an historic battle, a fair or market of ancient origin, or a place or landscape associated with a historical figure, a notable work of literature or art, or well-known folklore.

Planning Policy Context

- 6.15 This section outlines the planning policies relating to archaeology and cultural heritage at the local, regional and national levels. These policies guide the planning process and as such the context of this development. Comments are provided to describe the ways in which the scheme and its proposed mitigation provisions comply with these policies.

National Policy

- 6.16 The Government's stance on archaeology and the historic environment is set out in Planning Policy Statement 5.

Planning Policy Statement 5

- 6.17 PPS5 sets out the Government's planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment and replaces the former PPG15 and PPS16. The Government's overarching aim is that the historic environment and its heritage assets should be conserved and enjoyed for the quality of life they bring to this and future generations. To achieve this, the Government's objective for planning for the historic environment include, inter alia:

- To deliver sustainable development by ensuring that policies and decisions concerning the historic environment take account of the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits of heritage conservation and recognise that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term;
- To conserve England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance by ensuring that, inter alia, decisions are based on the nature, extent and level of that significance, investigated to be proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset;
- That, wherever possible, heritage assets are put to an appropriate and viable use that is consistent with their conservation;
- That the positive contribution of such heritage assets to local character and a sense of place is recognised and valued.

- 6.18 Policy HE10 of PPS5 provides additional policy principles for guiding the consideration of applications for development affecting the setting of a designated heritage asset and states that, when considering applications that affect the setting of a heritage asset, local authorities should treat favourably applications that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the significance of the

asset and, when considering application that do not do this, local planning authorities should weigh such harm against the wider benefits of the application.

- 6.19 This assessment has been carried out in compliance with the general aims and requirements of PPG 15 and PPG 16.

Regional Policy

The Yorkshire and Humber Plan RSS (2008)

- 6.20 Regional guidance is provided through the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008) (RSS). Policy ENV9: Historic Environment places emphasis on heritage as a contributor to sustainable tourism and "historic-led regeneration". Paragraph 10.50 recognises that:

"This historic environment makes a very important contribution to its distinctive character, identity and sense of place; it also greatly adds to the quality of life of residents, and in particular the local and regional economy..."

- 6.21 Paragraph 10.52 states that:

"There is a need to safeguard the heritage resource where possible, recognise its benefits to the local and regional economy, and identify opportunities to safeguard it and ensure new development adds to it, rather than detracts from it..."

- 6.22 This chapter of the application supports the above principles of identification and management of important historic features, without detracting from the local historic environment.

Local Policy

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council – Barnsley Unitary Development Plan (2000)

- 6.23 The Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Local Plan expands upon national guidance, setting out the Council's policies with specific reference to cultural heritage and archaeology:

Policy BE1 (Conservation Areas) states:-

“In conservation areas development will only be approved if it enhances or preserves the character or appearance of the conservation area.”

Policy BE1A (Conservation Areas) further states:-

“In considering proposals for development in or affecting conservation areas the following principles will be applied:

- a) development should be of the highest quality of design and materials, to enhance or preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area**
- b) the council will not be prepared to determine applications in conservation areas in outline only**
- c) applications for development in conservation areas must include drawings which clearly illustrate the proposals in their context, so that their impact on the area may be properly assessed**
- d) the demolition of buildings and walls which contribute to the character of the conservation area will not be permitted**
- e) the removal of trees which make, or will make, a significant contribution to the character of the conservation area will not be permitted**
- f) where a conservation area consent or a listed building consent is granted for the demolition of a building in a conservation area, a condition will be imposed to ensure that the demolition only goes ahead when full planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the site and a contract for the execution of such works of redevelopment has been entered into**
- g) proposals for development adjacent to conservation areas should be designed to be in harmony, in terms of size, form and materials, with the conservation area**
- h) when considering development proposals, the council will take care to ensure that there is no detrimental effect on views into and out of the areas.”**

Policy BE2 (Listed Buildings) states:-

“The council will have special regard to the desirability of securing the retention, repair, maintenance and continued use of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. Development which would adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest character of listed buildings will not be permitted. Other buildings considered by the council to be of special architectural or historic interest will be put forward to the department of National heritage for listing.”

Policy BE2 (Listed Buildings) further states:-

“In considering proposals affecting listed buildings the council will apply the following principles :

- a) the council will only be prepared to countenance the demolition of a listed building when the applicant has conclusively demonstrated that an exhaustive search has failed to find a suitable alternative use and/or new owner or tenant**
- b) although the retention of the original use of a listed building will normally be preferred, the council will work with the owner to find an acceptable new use which will allow the building to be retained**
- c) the council will seek to preserve and enhance the settings of listed buildings by appropriate control over the design of new development in their vicinity, control over the use of adjacent land, and where appropriate, by the preservation of trees and landscape features.”**

Policy BE3 (Archaeological Sites) states:-

“Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings are affected by proposed development there will be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. Other unscheduled archaeological remains of more local importance may also be

worthy of preservation. Where these features are affected by development proposals, their relative importance will be weighed against other factors including the need for the proposed development. On sites of identified or potential archaeological significance, the council may require an archaeological field evaluation to be submitted as part of a planning application.”

Policy BE4 (Archaeological Sites) states:-

“Where the authority decides that the physical preservation of archaeological remains in situ is not justified, and that development which would destroy the remains should proceed, the authority will ensure, before granting planning permission, that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of the remains.”

Emerging Local Development Framework

Barnsley Core Strategy

- 6.24 The draft Core Strategy was the subject of an Examination in Public in March 2011. Policy CSP30 relates to the historic environment and states, inter alia, that development which affects the historic environment and Barnsley’s heritage assets will be expected to protect or improve heritage assets, whether built or archaeological.

Existing Situation

Archaeological Background

- 6.25 The West Yorkshire Archaeology Service assessment identified five SMR sites within the search area for this report (500m from the edge of the site boundary) and 17 Listed Buildings (see Figures 6.1 and 6.2). Besides identifying sites that may be directly or indirectly affected by the development, this search area was expected to provide sufficient data to represent the archaeological character of the area. These SMR sites and buildings are detailed in Appendix 6.2. Re-consultation with the South

Yorkshire SMR did not provide any additional SMR sites. Re-consultation with BMBC did not identify any additional listed buildings.

Statutory Designations

Scheduled Monuments

- 6.26 There are no Scheduled Monuments within the boundary of the site or within the search area. Therefore, further consultation with English Heritage was not necessary.

Listed Buildings

- 6.27 There are no listed buildings within the boundary of the site. The WYAS 2003 desk based assessment identified 16 listed buildings within the search area (see table 2 in Appendix 6.2) and the SMR recorded a further listed building (see table 1 in Appendix 6.2). However, upon consultation with Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council and as previously identified in the Enviro baseline report (2004), three of the listed buildings in particular were identified as being located in the vicinity of the site (see Figure 6.2). These comprise:

- The Civic Hall (including 44a, 46, 48, 52, 54 and 56 Eldon Street) listed at Grade II approximately 30m north of the site boundary (SE 3457 0645) in the Conservation Area
- The Queens Hotel and front railings listed at Grade II approximately 120m north of the site boundary (SE 3461 0654) in the Conservation Area
- The Former Yorkshire Bank building listed at Grade II approximately 50m west of the site boundary (SE 3447 0639). This consists of two separate buildings on either side of the southern end of Market Hill, the eastern one being in the Conservation Area

Conservation Areas

- 6.28 Although the site is not within a Conservation Area, the north-western boundary of the site is adjacent to the Regent Street/Church Street/Market Hill Conservation Area (see Figure 6.1). The region of the Conservation Area that borders the site is along the north side of Eldon Street (see Figure 6.2).
- 6.29 A draft study (work in progress) submitted by Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council to English Heritage in 1999 described the buildings on the north side of Eldon Street

as having been built in 1840, with the buildings on the southern side as rebuilt and not of special interest. It is stated in this document that there is little relationship between the two sides of the street.

Non-Statutory Designations

- 6.30 No non-statutory SMR entries are present within the site boundary. In the search area, however, there are four non-statutory SMR entries. No activity prior to the medieval period is recorded.

Previous Archaeological Work

- 6.31 In addition to the viewing of the Enviro baseline report (2004) and desk based assessment that was carried out by WYAS in 2003, a review of previous archaeological work carried out in the vicinity of the site was undertaken in 2006 at the SMR held by the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service.
- 6.32 Previous work included an archaeological desk based assessment which was carried out in March 2005 by WYAS, prior to development at Mandela Square (situated north of the site at NGR SE 3465 0657). It was concluded that very little of the site has been unaffected by previous modern development and during a subsequent watching brief in June 2005, during the excavation of geotechnical test holes, no archaeological remains were observed.
- 6.33 In October 2003 WYAS carried out a desk based assessment of land on Westgate (NGR SE 342065). The report suggested that there may be surviving foundations of fifteenth to nineteenth properties in the area.
- 6.34 Dendochronological analysis of timbers at the property at 41-43 Church Street (north-west of the site at NGR SE 3440 0667) was carried out in May 2002 by the Archaeological Research and Consultancy Service from the University of Sheffield (ARCUS). The report concluded that the trees had been felled in the later fifteenth century and that their use in the building indicated a degree of urbanisation in Barnsley at this time that possibly indicated a booming local economy.
- 6.35 To the west of the site and Barnsley town centre the construction of the Barnsley town centre link road entailed the production of an archaeological desk based

assessment in May 2000. The report concluded that the route largely avoided the known extent of the medieval settlement of Barnsley and that although the route did not impact upon any known archaeological sites, too little was known about the early history of Barnsley, to conclude that the report would have no archaeological implications.

- 6.36 A watching brief was carried out by ARCUS in 1999 at Clarkes Yard (north-west of the site at NGR SE 3446 0642) during demolition works and the excavation of new footings. The report stated that the remodelling of cellars and the construction of footings for nineteenth and twentieth century features had removed archaeological remains in part of the site. However, in the centre of the site the remains of a sixteenth century well were discovered (dated by dendochronology) and recorded to RCHME (Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England) standards.

Historical Background

- 6.37 A review of the 2003 assessment carried out by WYAS and a re-appraisal of the South Yorkshire SMR did not provide any evidence of Prehistoric, Roman or early medieval activity within the site boundary or the wider search area. It should be noted, however, that a prehistoric polished axe is recorded as having been discovered north-east of the search area in Monk Bretton.
- 6.38 The present day settlement of Barnsley is recorded as having been established by the monks of St John of Pontefract by 1280, after they had been granted the manor of Barnsley in 1156. Previous to this, a settlement to the north west named Berneslai, meaning Beorn's glade or forest clearing, is recorded in the Domesday Book (1086).
- 6.39 It is recorded that in 1249 the monks were granted a charter for a weekly market and an annual fair. A market cross would have marked the location of the market on the site of the present day Market Hill, north-west of the site. It is suggested in the 2003 desk based assessment that the market stalls may have extended down the hill into the part of the site known as May Day green. Further, it is stated that the annual fair would certainly have taken place on May Day Green where a further fair called St Helen's Fair was granted by Elizabeth I in 1583.

- 6.40 The medieval period is attested to by the recording of two timber framed buildings (SMR entries 1480 and 1481) approximately 400m to the west of the site (see Figure 6.1). It is thought that the medieval settlement would have formed around present day Church Street, Shambles Street, Westgate, Eastgate, Southgate and Market Place where the street pattern is medieval.
- 6.41 Two eighteenth century maps dating to 1740 and 1777 were studied by the WYAS assessment. The maps portrayed similar information, however the 1777 map reproduced here (see Figure 6.3), shows the site with the greatest clarity. Observation of these maps showed that the site was situated to the south of the main centre of Barnsley and had experienced partial development, with a number of small buildings shown. May Day Green can be seen situated extending into the east of the site and was described by the WYAS report as sufficiently open to allow for market activities.
- 6.42 No information accompanied the map to indicate what the use of the various numbered buildings were, however a later map attributed to Kendray and dated to 1817 was described by the WYAS assessment as informing on the use of a few of the buildings within the boundary of the site. The building to the west of the site boundary, labelled 163, was described as a croft and was taken as evidence for the availability of open land within the site boundary. Building number 182 was described as a house, shop and kiln, thus demonstrating industrial activity within the site boundary at this time.
- 6.43 Evidence of industrial activity within the search area is provided by lime kilns 500m to the north of the site (SMR entry 3465) and part of a linen mill built in 1845 (SMR entry 3550) approximately 350m to the west of the site (see Figure 6.1).
- 6.44 A street plan of Barnsley, dated to 1823 and showing the town's principal buildings, provides the first cartographic evidence for the establishment of a gas works in the south of the site (west of the railway). In addition an area labelled as Becketts Square can be seen in the north of the site, with a series of buildings of undenoted use, marked. No buildings were illustrated to the east of the railway line.
- 6.45 The 1850 first edition Ordnance Survey is described by the WYAS report as showing the area as much more built up. The gasworks is shown as having been extended,

with gasometers and a tank illustrated. Further, the railway dissecting the site is shown to have been constructed by this time.

- 6.46 The Union Foundry, documented by the WYAS report as being owned by Dunstan and Mitchett Company from 1848-50, was seen to have been built in the north of the site to the west of the railway line. This foundry is later documented as becoming the Tyas and Barraclough Foundry between 1851-52 and then the Joseph Barraclough Union foundry from 1853. A number of buildings to the east of the foundry are shown around the area previously labelled as Becketts Square and an area to the south of the previous Becketts Square is labelled as The Orchard. To the east of the railway, a rectangular building, labelled as a malt store, is depicted. To the north of this building a row of terraced housing is shown within the site boundary.
- 6.47 The Ordnance Survey map of 1888 provided in the WYAS report, confirmed the presence of the large industrial buildings of the gas works and the Union Foundry in the south and the north of the western site area respectively. A further foundry is also shown to have been built south of the gas works on the western side of the railway.
- 6.48 In the far north-west corner of the site on the western side of the railway, a cattle market is shown and to the east of this, and north of the Union Foundry a timber yard is denoted. The map also illustrates an alteration to the roads within the site boundary, as a road is shown to have been built between this cattle market and the Union Foundry.
- 6.49 The 1893 OS map, produced by the WYAS report, shows the southerly extension of the Union Foundry and the construction of an Electricity Works in the areas formerly known as The Orchard and Beckett Square. Trade directories (Robinsons Directory) dated to this period (1902 and 1905) and studied by the WYAS report, indicate the co-existence of a number of shops, markets and inns with these industrial buildings. The site east of the railway line is shown as unchanged, apart from the addition of a further malt store to the east of the existing one.
- 6.50 Two Ordnance Survey maps, dated to 1892-1893 and 1906 are shown in Appendix 6.3, illustrating some of the features of the site as described above.

- 6.51 An Ordnance Survey map of 1932 is described by the WYAS report as showing major structural changes within the site. The main building of the Union Foundry, which had ceased to function in 1922, had been demolished by this time and water coolers had been constructed in its place. The Enviros baseline report (2004) indicates that most of the gas works was also demolished in 1932. The two malt houses to the east of the railway line have been replaced by a rectangular shaped building, the current CEAG building. The terraces to the north of this remain.
- 6.52 In addition, to the west of the railway line, the relocation of the cattle market to the other side of Kendray Street, to the area in the north of the site previously marked as a timber yard on the 1888 OS map is illustrated. The previous site of the cattle market on the west of Kendray Street is described by the WYAS report as now being a fish and vegetable market. It is stated that to the east of Kendray Street a number of World War II air raid shelters were constructed.
- 6.53 By 1962, the cattle market had moved again, being relocated outside of the site. This area was now replaced by a market area called the Queens market, the southern half of which extends into the north of the site. The area of the former Union Foundry and then the water coolers is now marked as a new market. Labels such as works and depot demonstrate the industrial usage of much of the remainder of the site, including the current CEAG building on the east of the railway, described as replacing the malt houses by the production of the 1932 Ordnance Survey.
- 6.54 The 1970s saw major redevelopment of all but the south-east corner of the part of the site west of the railway line (which remained in industrial use). For the first time, the area known as May Day Green, first depicted extending into the western part of the site on the 1777 map, is shown built over by new retail units. The previous areas of the Queens Market (formerly the cattle market), the gas works, the electricity works (formerly the site of the Union Foundry, Becketts Sq and the Orchard), and all associated buildings are replaced by a new market hall, retail units, car parks and the council offices. See Appendix 6.3 for an OS map dated to 1970-1977.

- 6.55 This development led to Hey describing the area of May Day Green in *The Making of South Yorkshire* as “desecrated with concrete” making it “no different from countless other shopping centres up and down the country” (Hey 1979).
- 6.56 A plan in the Mott MacDonald 2004 report, showing the foundations for these buildings, illustrates that the area west of the railway line has been heavily affected by piled and pad foundations. An additional drawing showing a cross section of Barnsley Shopping Centre was observed (see Appendix 7.6 of that report). This drawing shows that the shopping centre has a basement approximately 6m in depth. At the western end of the site this is shown to have penetrated 6m into the ground. However, the ground slopes by a height of 4m towards the railway line, therefore the depth of ground disturbance caused by the basement would have been to a lesser extent.
- 6.57 The part of the site, east of the railway line is shown by OS maps to have lost the terraced housing by 1977.
- 6.58 Other notes on the historical development of the town centre and market area are included in the Enviro baseline report (2004) extract (Appendix 6.1).

Baseline Walkover Survey (Site Visit)

- 6.59 The site was previously visited on the 9th January 2006. The purpose of the site visit was to assess the cultural heritage importance of the buildings on the site and to assess if any of the proposed development area had not been disturbed by previous modern development. The setting of the listed buildings and the Conservation Area to the north-east of the site was also considered.
- 6.60 A multi-storey car-park was situated in the centre of the site, the top storey of which provided views over much of the area. From here it was observed that the site was predominantly built over by modern retail development with associated car parking. The council buildings were also observed in the north of the site on the western side of the railway.
- 6.61 A walkover of the entire site confirmed the existence of modern buildings consistent with modern Ordnance Survey mapping, showing the development of the site since

its emergence as a modern retail area since c.1970. No areas of the site west of the railway line were observed as unaffected by modern development and none of the buildings observed were considered to be of cultural heritage value.

- 6.62 The site east of the railway line was more open, with one large building (CEAG building) surrounded by car parking and hard standing. This building was observed as the oldest building within the border of the site, dating to around 1930; in line with the type of building that was expected from consideration of the historical Ordnance Survey mapping. The interior of the building was not observed.
- 6.63 In addition an old wall was also noted aligned along the western border of this part of the site, along the boundary of the railway. This was observed as part sandstone and part brick.
- 6.64 The Civic Hall (including 44a, 46, 48, 52, 54 and 56 Eldon Street) listed at Grade II and approximately 30m north of the site boundary was clearly visible from the pedestrianised area outside of the north-west corner council offices. The building held views into the site boundary in a southerly direction down the pedestrianised area outside of the council offices and towards the market buildings. Likewise these views are the same for the Conservation Area that is aligned along Eldon Street, including the area of the Civic Hall.
- 6.65 The former Yorkshire Bank consisted of two buildings, on the opposite sides of the southern end of Market Hill. These are listed at Grade II and are approximately 50m west of the site boundary (SE 3447 0639). The south-east view from the westerly building is aligned down a pedestrianised street towards the retail shops and the market area of the site. This building is also clearly visible from the area of the site now occupied by the Littlewoods shop. The easterly former bank building has views of the site along Eldon street towards the area of the site occupied by the council buildings. These views are the same for the Conservation Area.
- 6.66 The Queens Hotel and front railings listed at Grade II approximately 120m north of the site boundary (SE 3461 0654) have views into the site.
- 6.67 However, views from the other 14 listed buildings (recorded in the WYAS 2003 desk based assessment and the SMR) towards the site were blocked by buildings.

Summary And Potential Of Heritage Features

6.68 There are no Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings or any other statutory designations within the site boundary. However, the Regent Street/Church Street/Market Hill Conservation Area and numerous listed buildings are present in the search area and the settings of these designations will therefore be a consideration of this report. Of the Listed Buildings, three in particular have been identified by the Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council as being in the near vicinity of the site:

- The Civic Hall (including 44a, 46, 48, 52, 54 and 56 Eldon Street) listed at Grade II approximately 30m north of the site boundary (SE 3457 0645)
- The Queens Hotel and front railings listed at Grade II approximately 120m north of the site boundary (SE 3461 0654)
- The Former Yorkshire Bank building listed at Grade II approximately 50m west of the site boundary (SE 3447 0639). This consists of two separate buildings on either side of the southern end of Market Hill

6.69 The SMR does not record any entries or previous archaeological work within the site boundary.

6.70 Map regression indicates that the site was the location for a number of large industrial buildings from the early nineteenth to latter half of the twentieth century. These included a gas works, an electricity works, two foundries and two malt houses; the construction of which may have resulted in the loss of any potential archaeological remains predating them. Further, any industrial archaeology interest provided by the former gas works, foundries and electricity works was lost when the whole of the site west of the railway experienced major redevelopment in the 1970s, which would have also had a detrimental effect on any earlier archaeological remains. The extent of the ground disturbance was observed on plans illustrating extensive pad and pile foundations in the west of the site and a deep basement under the shopping centre. East of the railway tracks, the two malt houses were demolished by the time of the production of the 1932 Ordnance Survey map. These were replaced by a large rectangular shaped building (current CEAG building).

6.71 It is considered that although there has been extensive development across the site there is still the potential for small pockets of land not affected by previous

development to be present within the site, which will therefore have potential for buried archaeological remains. Indeed, this opinion is mirrored by the Enviro baseline report (2004) that was received for the 2006 ES.

- 6.72 The criteria employed to assess the archaeological potential of the identified resource are as follows:

Rarity

- 6.73 This relates to the heritage feature in terms of its representational value (some features are very rare either nationally or within their locality, others are relatively common and typical and so are important characteristics of a period or region, etc.). The fragility and vulnerability of the heritage features are also a consideration, since while there may be numerous surviving examples of a site or attribute they might all be so fragile or under such threat that widespread losses could entirely change the level of survival of the whole class. It has to be borne in mind in this section that the heritage is not a replaceable or substitutable resource.

Significance

- 6.74 This specifically relates to designations, indicating the levels of significance of each heritage feature. However, significance is not wholly based on designations, statutory or otherwise, and additional information should be incorporated to appraise significance within its context. Heritage features will be gauged at scales local, regional or national significance.

Significance of Resource

- 6.75 Table 6.1: Importance Of Impact Receptors

Impact Receptor	Rarity	Significance
Impact upon the setting of the Regent Street/Church Street/Market Hill Conservation Area	Local/Regional	Local/Regional
Impact upon the setting of Grade II Listed Buildings	Regional	Regional
Buried Archaeological Remains	Local	Local

Impact of Development

Methodology for assessment of impacts

- 6.76 The archaeological resource may potentially be affected by development through a variety of sources. The principal impacts include direct total or partial disturbance of archaeological features, both above and below ground; secondary disturbance through vibration, noise, dust or hydrological change to archaeological features or structures; severance of a cultural heritage feature from a group of closely associated features; and long-term deterioration of the physical setting of an archaeological feature or listed building. Major development is most likely to impact upon cultural heritage through direct disturbance of deposits during construction or through secondary impacts resulting from the construction works.
- 6.77 The significance of impacts of development is assessed taking into account the importance of the known or potential remains likely to be affected. The DfT publication Transport Analysis Guidance The Heritage of Historic Resources Sub-Objective (TAG Unit 3.3.9) (June 2003) is a document which seeks out criteria with which to assess impacts upon heritage features in quantifiable terms. These are described in Table 6.2 below, along with scale of impact significance.

Table 6.2: Scale of Impacts

Scale of Impacts Table	
Scale	Description
Large beneficial (positive) effect	<p>The proposals would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide potential, through removal, relocation or substantial mitigation of very damaging or discordant existing impacts (direct or indirect) on the heritage, for very significant or extensive restoration or enhancement of characteristic features or their setting • make a major contribution to government policies for the protection or enhancement of the heritage • remove or successfully mitigate existing visual intrusion, such that the integrity, understanding and sense of place of a highly valued area, a group of sites or features of national or regional significance is re-established
Moderate beneficial (positive) effect	<p>The proposals would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide potential, through removal, relocation or mitigation of damaging or discordant existing impacts on the heritage, for significant

	<p>restoration of characteristic features or their setting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contribute to Regional or Local policies for the protection or enhancement of the heritage • enhance existing historic landscape/townscape character through beneficial landscaping/mitigation and good design
Slight beneficial (positive) effect	<p>The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are not in conflict with national, regional or local policies for the protection of the heritage. • restore or enhance the form, scale, pattern or sense of place of the heritage resource through good design and mitigation • remove or mitigate visual intrusion (or other indirect impacts) into the context of locally or regionally significant heritage features, such that appreciation and understanding of them is improved
Neutral effect	<p>The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are not in conflict with, and do not contribute to policies for the protection or enhancement of the heritage • maintain existing historic character in a landscape/townscape • have no appreciable impacts, either positive or negative, on any known or potential heritage assets • are a combination of slight positive and negative impacts, on locally significant aspects of the heritage • do not result in severance or loss of integrity, context or understanding within a Historic landscape
Slight adverse (negative) effect	<p>The proposals would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be in conflict with local policies for the protection of the local character of the heritage • have a detrimental impact on the context of regionally or locally significant assets, such that their integrity is compromised and appreciation and understanding of them is diminished • damage locally significant heritage features for which adequate mitigation can be specified • not fit well with the form, scale, pattern and character of a historic landscape/townscape/area
Moderate adverse (negative) effect	<p>The proposals would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be out of scale with, or at odds with the scale, pattern or form of the heritage resource • be intrusive in the setting (context), and will adversely affect the appreciation and understanding of the characteristic heritage resource • be in conflict with local or regional policies for the protection of the heritage • be damaging to nationally significant heritage assets, resulting in loss of features such that their integrity is compromised, but not destroyed, and adequate mitigation has been specified

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be a major direct impact on regionally or locally significant heritage, resulting in loss of features such that their integrity is substantially compromised, but adequate mitigation can be specified
Large adverse (negative) effect	<p>The proposals would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have a major direct impact on nationally significant heritage assets such that they are lost or their integrity is severely damaged • have a moderate direct impact on or compromise the wider setting of multiple nationally or regionally significant heritage assets, such that the cumulative impact would seriously compromise the integrity of a related group or historic landscape/townscape • have a major direct impact on regional heritage assets, such that their integrity is lost and no adequate mitigation can be specified • be highly intrusive and would seriously damage the setting of the heritage resource, such that its context is seriously compromised and can no longer be appreciated or understood • be in serious conflict with government policy for the protection of the heritage, as set out in PPG 15 and PPG 16 • be strongly at variance with the form, scale and pattern of a historic landscape/townscape

Potential Impacts

6.78 The potential impacts associated with the proposed development are as follows:

- Impact on the setting of the Regent Street/Church Street/Market Hill Conservation Area (Off site – Operational Stage)
- Impact on the settings of Listed Buildings (Off site – Operational Stage)
- Physical impact on potential buried remains (On site – Construction Stage)

Setting of the Regent Street/Church Street/Market Hill Conservation Area

(Off site – Operational Stage)

6.79 A draft study submitted by the Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council to English Heritage in 1999 described the buildings on the southern side of Eldon Street (the north-eastern extremity of the site that borders the Conservation Area) as rebuilt and not of special interest. It is also stated in this document that there is little relationship between the two sides of the street.

6.80 Therefore it is suggested that the site does not contribute to a favourable setting of the Conservation Area and that replacement of the existing 1970s structures within

the site boundary with high quality design, while altering the site's character, will serve to enhance the appearance of the area. As a result, the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the Conservation Area is expected to be **neutral**.

Setting of the Listed Buildings

(Off site – Operational Stage)

- 6.81 Three of the listed buildings were cited by Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, as being in the vicinity of the site. These are:
- The Civic Hall (including 44a, 46, 48, 52, 54 and 56 Eldon Street) listed at Grade II
 - The former Yorkshire Bank consisting of two buildings, on the opposite sides of the southern end of Market Hill, both listed at Grade II
 - The Queens Hotel including front railings listed at Grade II
- 6.82 A further 14 listed buildings were identified as present in the search area, by the 2003 desk based assessment and the SMR. These are listed in Tables 1 and 2 Appendix 6.2.
- 6.83 There are no historical links between any of these listed buildings to any of the buildings present, and visible from the buildings, within the site as it stands today. Further the buildings within the site are of poor quality design and do not contribute to a satisfactory setting for the listed buildings. Neither will the height of the proposed development detract from the setting of the listed buildings as the present council building, market hall and carpark in the centre of the site are multi-storey buildings.
- 6.84 Therefore, it is suggested that while altering the site's character, the development will serve to enhance the appearance of the area. As a result, the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the listed buildings is expected to be **neutral**.

Buried Archaeological Remains

(On site – Construction Stage)

- 6.85 The extent to which archaeological evidence has survived will depend upon the degree of disturbance by subsequent industry through foundations, cellars/basements, services and ground engineering works. Available plans and sections (see 6.56) demonstrate that extensive pad and pile foundations have affected the west of the site and a 6m basement is present below the shopping centre (although the degree of ground disturbance is less towards the railway line).
- 6.86 Therefore, it is highly likely that some truncation or disturbance has occurred across most of the site west of the railway line, although there is still potential for small pockets of undisturbed ground. The area of the site, east of the railway has a greater potential for buried remains, due to the lesser degree of development that has taken place.
- 6.87 Should any evidence be present, the proposed development would be likely to cause disturbance through foundation construction and service installation as well as through pre-construction site investigation works.
- 6.88 It is considered that there is the potential for small pockets of land not affected by previous development to be present within the site. This potential was also pointed out by Enviros baseline report (2004). The potential significance of any unknown remains in these areas is likely to be of up to local significance; however, the possibility of regionally or nationally important remains cannot be discounted. The proposed works is expected to have a **slight adverse** (negative) to **neutral** effect on any potential archaeological remains on both sides of railway.

Residual Impacts

- 6.89 With appropriate mitigation (see below) it is not envisaged that there will be any significant residual impacts upon archaeological and cultural heritage features by the proposed development. It might even create a positive contribution to the understanding of these aspects in the locality.

Mitigation Measures

6.90 The proposed development avoids physical impact upon any statutorily protected cultural heritage assets. However, currently unknown archaeological evidence in potential pockets of undisturbed land may be exposed by the proposed development. Mitigation measures may be required upon the discovery of any archaeological remains. These may include:

- **avoidance** of cultural heritage features to preserve them *in situ*, unaffected by development;
- **reduction** of impact on archaeology through limiting the area of disturbance, using alternative methods or carrying out research to identify archaeologically sensitive areas before undertaking works;
- **preservation** by record of archaeological features where avoidance is not practicable within the context of the proposed scheme;
- **recording** of archaeological remains resulting in significant benefits to archaeological understanding.

6.91 The lack of any scheduled remains or SMR entries within the boundary of the site or within the near vicinity of the site and the intense development of the site, particularly west of the railway, leads to a conclusion that advance archaeological works are not required prior to development. However, there is the potential for pockets of land to remain within the site on both sides of railway, which have not been destroyed by the pile and pad foundations, or removed by cellars and basements. Therefore an archaeological watching brief is recommended during redevelopment of the site.

6.92 Mitigation measures should be put into place to record any presently unknown archaeological features exposed and identified during a watching brief, at the earliest possible stage.

Monitoring Programme

6.93 The scope of the watching brief required will need to be agreed with South Yorkshire Archaeological Unit in advance of its implementation.

Alternative Scenarios

6.94 As explained in the Introduction to the ES, the development location is prescribed by policy. The scoping opinion agreed with the Council, which has identified the site for redevelopment, does not require alternatives be examined.

Robustness of Analysis

6.95 No difficulties were encountered in compiling information and there are no known significant inadequacies in the information compiled.

Summary and Conclusions

6.96 Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement comprises an evaluation of the cultural heritage sensitivity of the Barnsley Markets site. Possible impacts of development on the archaeological resource have been identified and appropriate mitigation measures for reducing these potential impacts have been proposed where relevant.

6.97 The cultural heritage baseline has determined that there are no Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings or any other statutory designations within the site boundary. However, the Regent Street/Church Street/Market Hill Conservation Area and numerous listed buildings are present in the vicinity of the site boundary.

6.98 It is considered that the site as it exists at present does not contribute to a favourable setting for the Conservation Area or the listed buildings. The replacement of the existing 1970s structures within the site boundary with high quality design, while altering the site's character, will serve to enhance the appearance of the area. As a result, the proposed development is not expected to have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the Conservation Area or any of the listed buildings.

6.99 Development of the site with industrial buildings from the early nineteenth to latter half of the twentieth century and the major redevelopment of the whole of the site west of the railway line in the 1970s would have had a detrimental effect on any earlier archaeological remains. Further the redevelopment of the 1970s demolished any buildings of industrial archaeology interest. The oldest building on site is the 1930s (CEAG) building on the east of the railway line which is not regarded as historically important.

6.100 However, the potential for pockets of undisturbed land, particularly on the east of the railway line, cannot be discounted. An archaeological watching brief is recommended during redevelopment of the site. This is in line with recommendations made in the Enviro baseline report (2004) for this assessment. In the event of archaeological features being disturbed during the proposed development, mitigation measures should be put into place to record any presently unknown archaeological features at the earliest possible stage.

6.101 Furthermore, when evaluated with the mitigation measures that have been proposed, the proposed development of the Barnsley Markets area is not considered to be in conflict with regional or local plan policy, nor material planning guidance or emerging local policy.