



# Heritage Impact Assessment

**4 West View, Silkstone Common, Barnsley S75 4QF**

**Joe Schofield and Chloe Lucas**

Prepared by:

**SLR Consulting Limited**

Unit 2, Newton Business Centre, Thorncliffe Park  
Estate, Newton Chambers Road, Chapeltown,  
Sheffield, S35 2PH

SLR Project No.: 424.065037.00001

July 2024

Revision: 02

## Revision Record

Revision	Date	Prepared By	Checked By	Authorised By
01	1 July 2024	SP	CD	SP
02	8 July 2024	SP	CD	SP
	Click to enter a date.			
	Click to enter a date.			
	Click to enter a date.			

## Basis of Report

This document has been prepared by SLR Consulting Limited (SLR) with reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the timescales and resources devoted to it by agreement with Joe Schofield and Chloe Lucas (the Client) as part or all of the services it has been appointed by the Client to carry out. It is subject to the terms and conditions of that appointment.

SLR shall not be liable for the use of or reliance on any information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document for any purpose by any person other than the Client. Reliance may be granted to a third party only in the event that SLR and the third party have executed a reliance agreement or collateral warranty.

Information reported herein may be based on the interpretation of public domain data collected by SLR, and/or information supplied by the Client and/or its other advisors and associates. These data have been accepted in good faith as being accurate and valid.

The copyright and intellectual property in all drawings, reports, specifications, bills of quantities, calculations and other information set out in this report remain vested in SLR unless the terms of appointment state otherwise.

This document may contain information of a specialised and/or highly technical nature and the Client is advised to seek clarification on any elements which may be unclear to it.

Information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document should only be relied upon in the context of the whole document and any documents referenced explicitly herein and should then only be used within the context of the appointment.



## Executive Summary

SLR Consulting Ltd was commissioned by Joe Schofield and Chloe Lucas to produce an Heritage Impact Assessment to inform a planning application for a proposed extension to a dwelling at 4 West View, Silkstone Common, Barnsley S75 4QF (NGR: SE 29275 04684). The dwelling is situated close to, and within the setting of, the Grade II Listed Hill Top Cottages (NHLE 1151739).

This report has been prepared in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023), Barnsley Local Plan (2019), and Historic England guidance, and with full regard to the ethical standards of the Institute for Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) and Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). It assesses the significance of the 4 West View and Hill Top Cottages, including any contribution made by their setting. Subsequently, the likely impacts (positive, neutral, or negative) of the proposed development are assessed and described.

4 West View is a moderately well-preserved example of a late 19<sup>th</sup>-century semi-detached dwelling. It is not locally listed, nor is it recorded in the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (HER). It is of limited significance only and would not qualify as a non-designated heritage asset. The scheme would nonetheless constitute an enhancement, reversing harmful historical changes while enabling the future viability and evolution of the dwelling.

**The proposed extension will result in a neutral change within the setting of the Hill Top Cottages, thereby preserving its significance.** The scheme will not impact upon any of the contributing elements of the listed building's setting, including the fields to its north and the trackway to its south.

The scheme therefore complies with the requirements of Section 16 of the NPPF, Policies HE1, HE2, and HE3 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019), and the provisions of the Silkstone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2023 – 2033 (2023). By preserving the significance and setting of Hill Top Cottages, the scheme complies with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. **There is a policy presumption in favour of the proposed extension therefore, as iterated by Paragraph 212 of the NPPF: *'Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably'*.**



## Table of Contents

<b>Basis of Report</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project Background .....	1
<b>2.0 Site description and overview</b> .....	<b>1</b>
2.1 Site description and topography .....	1
2.1.1 4 West View.....	1
2.1.2 1-3 West View.....	2
<b>3.0 Historical Background</b> .....	<b>2</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	2
3.2 Cartographic Regression .....	2
<b>4.0 Statement of Significance</b> .....	<b>6</b>
4.1 Scoping.....	6
4.2 4 West View.....	6
4.3 Hill Top Cottages .....	6
<b>5.0 Impact Assessment</b> .....	<b>7</b>
5.1 Proposed Development.....	7
5.2 4 West View.....	7
5.3 Hill Top Cottages .....	8
<b>6.0 Conclusion</b> .....	<b>8</b>

## Figures in Text

Figure 1: Designated Heritage Assets.....	v
Figure 2: HER Data.....	vi

## Plates in Text

Plate 1: Tithe Map, 1845 .....	4
Plate 2: Ordnance Survey, 1855.....	4
Plate 3: Ordnance Survey, 1893 .....	4
Plate 4: Ordnance Survey, 1906 .....	4
Plate 5: Ordnance Survey, 1931.....	4
Plate 6: Ordnance Survey, 1972 .....	4
Plate 7: Google Earth, 2002.....	5
Plate 8: Google Earth, 2008 .....	5



Plate 9: Google Earth, 2021 .....	5
-----------------------------------	---

## **Appendices**

<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>Relevant local planning policy</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>Methodology and Glossary of Key Terms</b>







Figure 1







## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Project Background

SLR Consulting Ltd was commissioned by Joe Schofield and Chloe Lucas (hereafter ‘the Client’) to produce an Heritage Impact Assessment to inform a planning application for a proposed extension to a dwelling at 4 West View, Silkstone Common, Barnsley S75 4QF (NGR: SE 29275 04684) (hereafter ‘the Site’) (Figures 1 - 3). The dwelling is situated close to, and within the setting of, the Grade II Listed Hill Top Cottages (NHLE 1151739).

This report assesses the significance of the 4 West View and Hill Top Cottages, including any contribution made by their setting. Subsequently, the likely impacts (positive, neutral, or negative) of the proposed development are assessed and described.

This report has been prepared in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023), Barnsley Local Plan (2019), Silkstone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2023 – 2033 (2023), and Historic England guidance, and with full regard to the ethical standards of the Institute for Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) and Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council’s *Supplementary Planning Guidance for Heritage Impact Assessment* was also consulted (2019). Relevant (heritage) local plan policies are included at the back of this report (**Appendix A**).

The methodology employed during this assessment was based upon relevant professional guidance, including the CIfA’s *Standard and guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment* (2020), relevant technical guidance issued by Historic England, including *Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets* (2019). A methodology and glossary of key terms is included at the back of this report (**Appendix B**).

## 2.0 Site description and overview

### 2.1 Site description and topography

West View, and the Site, is located to the north of Beacon Hill, at the northern edge of Silkstone Common, Barnsley. Full photographic coverage of the building and its setting are available [here](#). West View comprises two pairs of semi-detached Victorian dwellings (nos. 1 – 4), each with a garden to the west, and access via a shared drive to their rear (east) ([Photos 1 and 2](#)).

4 West View is situated within gardens, to its north and west, with a former outbuilding to its rear (east). North and west of the Site is a track and PROW which leads from Beacon Hill to High Croft, a 1960/70s dwelling 40m northwest of the Site, the Grade II Listed Hill Top Cottages 25m north of the Site (17<sup>th</sup>- to 19<sup>th</sup>- century attached cottages with later alterations), and ultimately to a large field to the northeast of the Site. To the east, beyond the outbuilding, is a very much altered late Victorian dwelling known as Line View (having been subject to extension and modernisation in 2020, planning ref. 2019/0962).

#### 2.1.1 4 West View

4 West View comprises a semi-detached Victorian dwelling dating to 1876, alongside 3 West View to its south ([Photos 3 and 4](#)). It is of two storeys, stone built, of regularly coursed gritstone blocks, with gritstone detailing (quoins, lintels and sills, string course, frieze panel, cornice, parapet, and gable coping and trefoil finial). The building’s planform comprises a standard two-up two-down arrangement, orientated east-west, its principal elevation to the west, with a single-storey service range to its rear (east). The dwelling is slate-roofed and retains (damaged) decorative ridge tiles. It is lit by a modern glazed front door and uPVC French door (within the opening for a former bay window) to its principal elevation, with two new sash windows to first floor level. Its north elevation is blank. Its rear elevation features a single window opening at ground floor and two windows at first floor, all set with uPVC casements. The rear range features a uPVC door and two casement windows. The building’s guttering comprises modern uPVC.





## 2.1.2 1-3 West View

4 West View forms a pair with 3 West View to its south. 3 West View has seen extensive alterations, including stone cleaning, removal of its ridge tiles, the addition of roof lights and a dormer window to its rear, uPVC casement windows throughout, and loss of, and alterations to the opening of, its former bay window. In turn, 1 and 2 West View (dated to 1877) have also been extensively altered, with replaced windows and doors, and late 20<sup>th</sup>/21<sup>st</sup>-century two-storey side extensions. Both retain their original ground floor bay windows, however.

# 3.0 Historical Background

## 3.1 Introduction

The following section provides an overview of the Site's historical development, based on an assessment of the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (HER), relevant historical mapping and aerial imagery, and online data sources. Designated heritage assets are presented in **Figure 1** HER monument and event data, locally listed buildings, and historic landscape character data is presented in **Figure 2**.<sup>12</sup> Data is presented on the figures within a 500-metre study area, incorporating data from beyond the study area within the assessment below, where relevant.

No non-designated heritage assets are recorded within, or close to, 4 West View.

## 3.2 Cartographic Regression

Prior to the construction of West View, the 1845 Silkstone tithe map shows the Site area forming part of a field, recorded as plot '313' (**Plate 1**). The tithe award describes the plot as 'Marsden Croft', a pasture associated with a small dwelling to the southwest of the Site on Beacon Hill (plot 293 on the map, latterly known as 'East View'), owned by John Spencer Stanhope, and let to a Joshua Smith. North of the Site, a farm is depicted, recorded as plots 311 and 312, comprising a croft and homestead owned by the 'Robert Coldwell Clarke and Executors of Sarah Ann Clarke and Others' and occupied by a William Stead. The farm included a dwelling - latterly known as Hill Top Cottages (now listed at Grade II) - and, to its east, a probable stable or barn, and a small outbuilding. The depiction of the Hill Top Cottages is of interest, as it differs markedly from later 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century depictions in size and form. While this may be a drafting error, the mapping is otherwise accurate, which suggests that it may have been substantially rebuilt or partially demolished subsequent to its depiction in 1845.

By 1855, the Site remained little changed, though the depiction of Hill Top Cottages had changed (now largely consistent with its present form) (**Plate 2**). A railway had been constructed immediately southeast of the Site, cutting across the former croft to Hill Top Cottages and bisecting Beacon Hill (then known as Green Lane), with a level crossing for the road.

4 West View dates to 1876 and was constructed as one of four semi-detached dwellings along West View. At the time, the economy of Silkstone Common was predicated on small-scale coal mining, with a late 19<sup>th</sup>-century colliery, Hall Royd Colliery, situated within proximity to the Site. It is probable, therefore, that the dwellings were constructed to house workers, or likely foremen, for the colliery (owing to ease of access between West View and the colliery site).

West View is first shown on the 1893 Ordnance Survey map (**Plate 3**). The dwellings (nos. 1 – 4) are shown with bay windows to their front (west). A range of outbuildings (likely outhouses) are shown to the rear of the dwellings. To the east of the railway, Hall Royd Colliery is shown, including sidings connecting to the main line. To the north of the Site, the farm at Hill Top is shown very much changed, its former outbuildings and barn/stable had been demolished, the croft amalgamated with the field to its north, and the house partitioned into three cottages with separate rear gardens. In addition, immediately east of the Site, a new square dwelling had been constructed (latterly known as Line

<sup>1</sup> Lines, A. Marchant, J and Ratcliffe, D 2008 Unpublished. "South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation" South Yorkshire Archaeology Service, Sheffield, English Heritage, London. Database version date 08/07/2024.

<sup>2</sup> SYAS search ref. E24\_CSY4985 4 West View



View). Within Silkstone Common, new development had proliferated, including 'Hunters Cottage' to the east of the railway, terraced housing to Ben Bank Road, and dwellings west of the Site off Beacon Hill. Little change is shown by 1906 (**Plate 4**).

By 1931, no change is shown to 4 West View. Hall Royd Colliery had gone out of use, the former sidings removed, becoming a tip and 'Council Depot' (**Plate 5**). New development is visible within the area east of the railway, including a series of terraced housing which replaced Hunters Cottage.

The 1972 mapping shows further infill and new development within the area, focused to the east of the railway (**Plate 6**). To the northwest of the Site, adjacent to Hill Top Cottages, a new dwelling had been built, known as High Croft.

Development continued apace through the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. By 2002, Google Earth imagery shows that the bay windows to 3 and 4 West View had been removed (**Plate 6**). 1 and 2 West View had been extended with new side ranges (two storey for no.2, single storey for no.1). West of the West View a large shed building had been constructed, alongside a manège. New development had proliferated along the south side of Beacon Hill. Line View had also been extended by this time, with a full two-storey western extension. East of the Site, the level crossing over the railway had been removed. Little change is shown by 2008 (**Plate 8**). By 2021, however, the extension to 1 West View had been increased to two storeys (planning ref. 2012/1076). Line View had also been remodelled, with a new rear two-storey extension (planning ref. 2019/0962).





Plate 1: Tithe Map, 1845



Plate 2: Ordnance Survey, 1855



Plate 3: Ordnance Survey, 1893



Plate 4: Ordnance Survey, 1906



Plate 5: Ordnance Survey, 1931



Plate 6: Ordnance Survey, 1972







Plate 7: Google Earth, 2002



Plate 8: Google Earth, 2008



Plate 9: Google Earth, 2021



## 4.0 Statement of Significance

### 4.1 Scoping

4 West View is not recorded on the South Yorkshire HER (SYHER), nor is it locally listed. As the proposal will affect the building, however, its significance will be assessed below as a precaution.

Only a single designated heritage asset is situated within 500m of 4 West View: the Grade II Listed Hill Top Cottages 25m north of the Site. Its significance is therefore assessed below in order to understand if it would be sensitive to any setting change caused by the proposals. No designated heritage assets beyond the 500m study area will be affected by the proposed extension. No further designated assets are scoped in on this basis.

A review of the South Yorkshire HER indicates that no non-designated or locally listed heritage assets are situated close to the Site. None will therefore be affected by the proposed extension. The nearest locally listed structure, recorded in the South Yorkshire Local Heritage List, comprises the former Silkstone Wagonway: a tramway for the transportation of coal. The wagonway is over 300m west of the Site, with no meaningful associations between the two, and will not be affected by the proposed extension of 4 West View.

### 4.2 4 West View

4 West View is a moderately well-preserved example of a late 19<sup>th</sup>-century semi-detached dwelling. 4 West View is not unique or rare, being constructed in a standardised, non-vernacular form, or a type ubiquitous within the region. It does not retain any original windows and has lost its original bay window. The building's replacement windows, with the exception of the recently installed first-floor sash windows to the principal elevation, are unsympathetic. The most significant aspects of the building comprise its principal, most architectural, elevation (with its gritstone detailing), its vernacular materiality (e.g., use of gritstone), and its remnant ridge tiles. Its side and rear elevations are largely plain, and of little note.

The building is paired with, and experienced alongside, 3 West View which has been subject to an even greater degree of unsympathetic alteration, which unbalances the building pair. In turn, 1 and 2 West View have also been subject to varying degrees of alteration.

The building's setting makes limited contributions to its significance, and derives largely from its associations with 1 – 4 West View. Any contributions formerly deriving from Royd Hall Colliery ceased with the closure of the pit and removal of any associated infrastructure.

Therefore, from a heritage perspective, while the building has *some* significance, it is not considered sufficient to qualify as a non-designated heritage asset. The dwelling certainly falls short of the stringent criteria for the local listing as defined by the [South Yorkshire Local Heritage List](#).

As iterated within the Government's Planning Policy Guidance:

***A substantial majority of buildings have little or no heritage significance and thus do not constitute heritage assets. Only a minority have enough heritage significance to merit identification as non-designated heritage assets.*** (own emphasis: Paragraph: 039 Reference ID: 18a-039-20190723)

### 4.3 Hill Top Cottages

Hill Top Cottages is significant primarily for its architectural interest, as vested in its built form, as a highly altered, evolved, vernacular dwelling and former farmhouse ([Photos 5 and 6](#)). The changes evident in the building's fabric and from a review of historical mapping are of interest for what they reveal about the changing values and use of the building over time, though often those changes resulted in the loss of earlier fabric and legibility (e.g., harm). One of the most significant changes in the building's use resulted from the loss of its original farm outbuildings during the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and the subdivision of the property to form a series of cottages. The building has limited historic interest, in that the building has no strong or meaningful historical associations with famous individuals or events of national importance, and as its existing form is not illustrative of its original form and function as a farmhouse.



The building's setting makes a limited contribution to its significance. For the most part, any contributions from its setting stem from the fields to its north and the trackway to its south, with which it shares an historic functional relationship, and which allow it to be experienced in a modicum of its early setting (e.g., [Photos 7 - 9](#)). Substantive change has been introduced into that setting however, including 1-4 West View, East View, the railway, High Croft, and the dwellings east of the railway which are visible in views south to the Hill Top Cottages from the field to its east (e.g., [Photos 10 - 12](#)). For the most part, such later intrusions have, however, naturalised, and are now read as a neutral aspect of its setting. This includes High Croft, which though immediately adjacent and intervisible with Hill Top Cottage, does not diminish the ability to appreciate the listed building's residual significance.

Line View, to the east of the Site, and a small modern garage (associated with Hill Top Cottages), immediately north of the Site, possibly constitute an exception to this, owing to their prominence in views from the fields north and east of Hill Top Cottages and prominent use of modern, white render ([Photos 13 and 14](#)). Nevertheless, any impact to the significance of Hill Top Cottages from those buildings is very limited, and the building's remaining significance is still readily legible and intact. It is likely that, with time and weathering, Line View too will naturalise into the building's setting.

The way in which the significance of Hill Top Cottages is experienced is not dependent on the later buildings within its setting, including 4 West View ([Photos 15 – 18](#)). **Though 4 West View is situated close to, and is intervisible with, Hill Top Cottages, the listed building is not significant because of, and indeed derives no significance from, that spatial and visual relationship. 4 West View makes no contributions to the listed building's significance.**

## 5.0 Impact Assessment

### 5.1 Proposed Development

Details of the proposed development are included in the drawings which accompany the planning application. Those documents should be read in conjunction with this report.

The scheme's design has been developed in consultation with SLR Consulting Ltd, and in line with the Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council's *House Extensions and other Domestic Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document (2024), to incorporate traditional features, to reintroduce lost features, and to ensure that the scheme effectively responds to the existing dwelling in its design and proportions.

To summarise, the proposed scheme proposes:

- A new two-storey side extension to accommodate a dining room, bedroom, bathroom, and ensuite
- A single-storey rear extension to accommodate an open-plan kitchen
- Reinstatement of traditional features, including sash windows and a bay window
- Repair to the ridge tiles / roof

Justifications for the proposed scheme come from the desire to maximise liveable space and functionality within the existing building, and to justify the expense of restoring and reinstating lost features. The changes will ensure the future viability and maintenance of the property.

### 5.2 4 West View

4 West View is of little heritage significance. Nevertheless, the proposed scheme will preserve, and enhance, that significance. The proposed development will reintroduce traditional-style glazing within 4 West View, and reintroduce its lost bay window, better revealing important aspects of its original appearance. The proposed extension responds to the form of the original dwelling, being set back from its principal elevation. Its roofline is lower than, and emulates the form of, the existing roof to 4 West View. Thereby, the extension is both sympathetic and subservient, its relationship to the original building legible, though not to its detriment. Overall, therefore, though not assessed to be a heritage asset, the scheme would constitute an enhancement, reversing harmful historical changes while enabling the future viability and evolution of the dwelling.





## 5.3 Hill Top Cottages

**The proposed extension will result in a neutral change within the setting of the listed building. Its significance will thereby be preserved.**

The scheme will not impact upon any of the contributing elements of the listed building's setting, including the fields to its north and the trackway to its south. Views to the listed building from the fields to its north will be essentially unchanged, the proposed extension being largely screened by an intervening mature oak tree, the modern garage to Hill Top Cottages, and the outbuildings east of 4 West View, and as the proposed scheme will recreate the form and materiality of 4 West View's existing side elevation. In views from the trackway, although the extension will be readily visible, its appropriate materiality is such that it should appear as a natural addition to the streetscape. Minor benefits might be said to derive in specific views east from the trackway, wherein 4 West View and Hill Top Cottages are seen in conjunction, as the extension will mask the form of Line View, with its prominent use of redbrick and render (e.g., [Photo 19](#)).

## 6.0 Conclusion

4 West View is a moderately well-preserved example of a late 19<sup>th</sup>-century semi-detached dwelling. It is not locally listed, nor is it recorded in the SYHER. It is of limited significance only and would not qualify as a non-designated heritage asset. The scheme would nonetheless constitute an enhancement, reversing harmful historical changes while enabling the future viability and evolution of the dwelling.

**The proposed extension will result in a neutral change within the setting of the Grade II Listed Hill Top Cottages, thereby preserving its significance.** The scheme will not impact upon any of the contributing elements of the listed building's setting, including the fields to its north and the trackway to its south.

The scheme therefore complies with the requirements of Section 16 of the NPPF, Policies HE1, HE2, and HE3 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019), and the provisions of the Silkstone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2023 – 2033 (2023). By preserving the significance and setting of Hill Top Cottages, the scheme complies with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. **There is a policy presumption in favour of the proposed extension therefore, as iterated by Paragraph 212 of the NPPF: 'Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably'.**



## Bibliography

- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists., 2020. *Standards and guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment*. Available at: <http://www.archaeologists.net/codes/ifa> [accessed 01 July 2024]
- English Heritage., 2008. *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*. Available at: <https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-principles-sustainable-management-historic-environment/> [accessed 01 July 2024]
- Historic England., 2015. *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2*. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa2-managing-significance-in-decision-taking/> [accessed 01 July 2024]
- Historic England., 2017. *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3*. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/> [accessed 01 July 2024]
- Historic England., 2019. *Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets, Historic England Advice Note 12*. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/statements-heritage-significance-advice-note-12/heag279-statements-heritage-significance/> [accessed 01 July 2024]
- Historic England., 2021. *Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage*. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7/heag301-local-heritage-listing/> [accessed 01 July 2024]
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (DCLG)., 2023. *National Planning Policy Framework*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2> [accessed 01 July 2024]
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents> [accessed 01 July 2024]



# **Appendix A    Relevant local planning policy**



## ***Barnsley Local Plan (January 2019)***

### **Policy HE1 The Historic Environment**

We will positively encourage developments which will help in the management, conservation, understanding and enjoyment of Barnsley's historic environment, especially for those assets which are at risk.

This will be achieved by:-

- a. Supporting proposals which conserve and enhance the significance and setting of the borough's heritage assets, paying particular attention to those elements which contribute most to the borough's distinctive character and sense of place.

These elements and assets include:-

The nationally significant industrial landscapes of the Don Valley which includes Wortley Top Forge and its associated water management system.

Elsecar Conservation Village, its former ironworks and its workshops which were once part of the Fitzwilliam Estate.

A number of important 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century designed landscapes and parks including Wentworth Castle parkland (the only grade I Registered Park and Garden in South Yorkshire), and Cannon Hall Park.

The well preserved upstanding remains of the Cluniac and Benedictine monastery at Monk Bretton.

18 designated conservation areas of special and architectural interest including three town centre conservation areas, as well as large areas incorporating Stainborough Park, Cawthorne, Penistone and Thurlstone.

The 17<sup>th</sup> century Rockley Blast Furnace and its later engine house.

Gunthwaite Hall Barn, a large 16<sup>th</sup> century timber framed barn.

Barnsley Main Colliery Engine House and Pithead structures.

The 17<sup>th</sup> century Worsbrough Mill (the only historic working water mill in South Yorkshire).

Relatively widespread evidence of pre-historic settlements, and occupation which are often archaeological and below ground but sometimes expressed as physical or topographic features.

The boroughs more rural western and Pennine fringe characterised by upland and (often) isolated settlements or farmsteads surrounded by agricultural land and dominated by historic and vernacular buildings built from local gritstone.

- b. By ensuring that proposals affecting a designated heritage asset (or an archaeological site of national importance such as a Scheduled Ancient Monument) conserve those elements which contribute to its significance. Harm to such elements will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a designated heritage asset (or an archaeological site of national importance) will be permitted only in exceptional circumstances where there is a clearly defined public benefit.

- c. By supporting proposals that would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area. There are 18 conservation areas in the borough and each is designated for its particular built and historic significance. This significance is derived from the group value of its constituent buildings, locally prevalent styles of architecture, historic street layouts and its individual setting which frequently includes views and vistas both into and out of the area. Particular attention will be given to those elements which have been identified in a Conservation Area Appraisal as making a positive contribution to its significance.



d. By ensuring that proposals affecting an archaeological site of less than national importance or sites with no statutory protection conserve those elements which contribute to its significance in line with the importance of the remains. In those cases where development affecting such sites is acceptable in principle, mitigation of damage will be ensured through preservation of the remains in situ as a preferred solution. When in situ preservation is not justified, an understanding of the evidence to be lost must be gained in line with the provisions of Policy HE6.

e. By supporting proposals which conserve Barnsley's non-designated heritage assets. We will ensure that developments which would harm or undermine the significance of such assets, or their contribution to the character of a place will only be permitted where the benefits of the development would outweigh the harm.

f. By supporting proposals which will help to secure a sustainable future for Barnsley's heritage assets, especially those identified as being at greatest risk of loss or decay.

### **Policy HE2 Heritage Statements and general application procedures**

Proposals that are likely to affect known heritage assets or sites where it comes to light there is potential for the discovery of unrecorded heritage assets will be expected to include a description of the heritage significance of the site and its setting.

This description will need to include an appropriate but proportionate level of detail that allows an understanding of the significance of the asset but no more than is necessary to understand the impact of the proposal. For sites with significant archaeological potential, a desk based assessment may be required in line with the provisions of Policy HE6.

Applications made in outline form will not be accepted for proposals which will which affect a conservation area, a listed building or any other designated heritage asset. In such cases, sufficiently detailed plans and drawings to enable an assessment to be made of the likely impact of the development upon the significance of any heritage assets affected will be required.

### **Policy HE3 Developments affecting Historic Buildings**

Proposals involving additions or alterations to listed buildings or buildings of evident historic significance such as locally listed buildings (or their setting) should seek to conserve and where appropriate enhance that building's significance. In such circumstances proposals will be expected to:

Respect historic precedents of scale, form, massing, architectural detail and the use of appropriate materials that contribute to the special interest of a building.

Capitalise on opportunities to better reveal the significance of a building where elements exist that detract from its special interest.

### **Policy HE4 Developments affecting Historic Areas or Landscapes**

Proposals that are within or likely to affect the setting and the heritage significance of a Registered Park and Garden will be expected to: Respect historic precedents of layout, density, scale, forms, massing, architectural detail and materials that contribute to the special interest of an area. Respect important views either within the area or views that contribute to the setting of the area. Take account of and respect important landscape elements including topographic features or trees that contribute to the significance of the area where harm might prejudice future restoration.

### **Policy HE5 the Demolition of Historic Buildings**

The demolition of listed buildings, buildings that make a positive contribution to a conservation area, buildings in registered parks and gardens, or other buildings (including locally listed buildings) with evident historic significance will not be approved unless:

The building is structurally unsound and dangerous and cannot be viably repaired, where it is shown that every effort has been made to secure, repair, or re-use the building, and where no opportunities for grant funding, charitable ownership, sale or lease are available.



It can be demonstrated that the retention of the building is not justifiable in terms of the overarching public benefit that would outweigh the historic value of the asset.

Demolition involves partial demolition where that element can be shown not to contribute positively to the area or the heritage significance of the asset.

Where permission is granted for the demolition of a building within a conservation area or a registered park and garden, a condition will be attached to ensure that the demolition only goes ahead when full planning permission has been granted for redeveloping the site and the developer can demonstrate that the redevelopment will go-ahead within a specific timescale.

### **Policy HE6 Archaeology**

Applications for development on sites where archaeological remains may be present must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:

- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;

- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and

- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.

Where preservations of the remains are not justified, permission will be conditional upon:-

- Archaeological recording of the evidence (including evidence that might be destroyed), whether buried remains or part of a standing structure or building;

- Analysis of the information gathered;

- Interpretation of the results gained;

- Public dissemination of the results; and

- Deposition of the resulting archive with an appropriate museum or archive service.

## ***Silkstone Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2023 – 2033 (December 2023)***

### **Policy BH1 Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets on the Local List**

A candidate list of buildings and structures identified as non-designated heritage assets in the Local List is set out at Appendix 3. All development proposals affecting these locally important heritage assets (once formally approved by Barnsley Council), or their settings, will be assessed in terms of Barnsley Local Plan Policy HE1 The Historic Environment.

When designing development proposals for non-designated heritage assets, owners and developers should have regard to conserving the significance of the asset and the components which positively contribute to its character or appreciation as a heritage asset.

### **Policy D2 Promoting High Quality Design and Responding to Local Character**

All development should be sympathetic to the distinctive character of the relevant Character Area as defined in Appendix 4. New housing development in Silkstone Parish should have regard to the Silkstone Design Codes.

1. New development proposals should address the following principles:

- A. Development should have a maximum height of two storeys and scale should be informed by adjacent dwellings. Additional storeys may be provided within the roof space with sky lights and/or gable end windows.

- B. Materials and detailing should reflect the local vernacular of slate roofs (except where green roofs are proposed to improve sustainability), sandstone, brick or render walls, sills and lintels, and sash or





casement windows. However imaginative modern designs which use other high-quality materials in an innovative way will also be supported

C. Parking should be provided in line with Design Code 4 - Parking, Gardens and Boundary Treatments. Parking should be provided on-plot wherever possible. On-street parking as the only means of parking should be avoided in future developments. Electric vehicle and cycle charging points should be provided.

D. Private amenity space should be provided relevant to the size of the dwelling in accordance with the SPD Design of Housing Development.

E. Distances between buildings and elevations should refer to Design Code 5 - Privacy, Space and Natural Surveillance. Designs should avoid overlooking of habitable rooms and gardens. Windowed front elevations of dwellings should face the street where this is in keeping with local character.

2. Where proposals involve conversions of historic buildings schemes should address the following principles:

A. Conversions of historic buildings into residential use should preserve and enhance existing heritage features, to maintain the integrity of the original building.

B. Any new openings (windows and doors) should be positioned carefully to maintain the character and balance of the building and detailing should reflect the existing design through use of complementary materials and finishes.

C. The area around the building should be designed to the same standard as the changes to the building. Landscaping should respond to the existing character and defining features of the local landscape and consider any views into the site in line with NDP Policy NE1.



## **Appendix B      Methodology and Glossary of Key Terms**

## Methodology

### Standards

The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with all relevant statute, policy, and guidance. The assessment has been project managed and undertaken by Seth Price, Associate Heritage Consultant (MCIfA, AssocIHBC).

The assessment was signed off by Dr Emma Wells, Technical Director - Historic Buildings (MCIfA, FSA).

### Site visit

A site inspection was undertaken on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2024 to assess the Site within its wider landscape context. A settings assessment was undertaken during the site visit, including visits to all nearby heritage assets.

### Study area

A 500-metre study area was used to create a baseline for assessment, factoring any heritage assets beyond where any meaningful visual, spatial, thematic, or historic functional association was identified. South Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (SYHER) data was acquired out to 1 kilometre to inform the assessment.

### Sources

The SYHER, and relevant map and document resources were consulted during the preparation of this report. The National Heritage List for England (NHLE) was consulted to provide information on scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, and listed buildings. Available published and unpublished documents were consulted, and historic land-use has been reconstructed. Sources consulted are listed in the Bibliography section at the end of the report.

## Key Terms

### Heritage assets

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023 defines heritage assets as: *...a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).*

### Significance

The NPPF defines significance as: *the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic, or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage sites, the cultural value described within each site's Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.*

Current national guidance for the assessment of the significance of heritage assets expresses significance in terms of 'interests', as used within this report, and as per the NPPF definition (see *Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets*, Historic England 2019). Interests are analogous with 'special interest' as used within the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and with the 'values' as set out in Historic England's *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance* (English Heritage 2008). The interests set out under the NPPF include:

- *Archaeological Interest: there will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.*
- *Architectural and Artistic Interest: these are interests in the design and general aesthetics of a place. They can arise from conscious design or fortuitously from the way the heritage asset has evolved. More specifically, architectural interest is an*





*interest in the art or science of the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures of all types. Artistic interest is an interest in other human creative skill, like sculpture.*

- *Historic Interest: An interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material record of our nation's history but can also provide meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity.*

These interests should not be seen as prescriptive, but rather as a guide for understanding the significance of a heritage asset; for example, a heritage asset may have interests beyond the scope of archaeological, architectural, or historic interest – they may have communal value or may be significant for their group value, etc.

This assessment was also informed by the advice published by Historic England in the document entitled *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2* (2015) and *Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage* (2021).

### **Setting**

The NPPF defines setting as: *the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.*

The setting assessment within this report was guided by the recommendations outlined in *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning. Note 3* (Historic England 2017), which align with the general EIA process. The guidance advocates a staged approach to the assessment of the effects of development on the significance of heritage assets due to a change within their setting, using a five-step process:

Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected by the proposed development

Step 2: Assess the degree to which these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow their significance to be appreciated

Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on the significance of the identified heritage assets, or on the ability to appreciate it

Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm to that significance

Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes

### **Harm**

Potential development effects (impacts) to heritage assets are discussed in terms of 'harm', with reference to the NPPF (2023). Harm, in heritage terms, relates to a negative effect stemming from a change which results in a diminishment of the significance of a heritage asset, or the ability to appreciate that significance. The NPPF allows that harm may be either substantial or less than substantial and may vary within each category. How harm is assigned will trigger differing tests under the NPPF. Where harm to a designated heritage asset, or a non-designated heritage asset of equivalent significance, is identified, it must be given great weight in the planning decision. While it is up to the decision maker to determine the nature and degree of harm, they must take into account necessary expertise, and the particular significance of any heritage asset which may be affected (NPPF paragraph 201).

- *Substantial harm (or total loss of significance)*



An impact which results in a ‘...total loss of significance...’ (NPPF paragraph 207). The National Planning Policy Guidance sets out that substantial harm... ‘...is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting’. Substantial harm can be defined as having ‘...such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced’<sup>3</sup>; and

- *Less than substantial harm*  
Being any lesser level of harm than that defined above; recent case law has confirmed that this includes any level of harm (not considered substantial) regardless of its quantification, e.g., the finding of a ‘negligible’ level of harm to a designated heritage asset must still be treated as less than substantial harm and be weighed in the balance under paragraph 208.

The PPG provides that the category of harm identified for any given asset be ‘explicitly identified’, and that the extent of that harm be ‘clearly articulated’. For purposes of this assessment, this is done with reference to a ‘spectrum’, e.g., at the lower/upper end of the spectrum of less than substantial.

Where an impact, or harm to, the significance of a non-designated heritage asset is identified, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Where there is no harm to a heritage asset, an impact may be neutral or may enhance its significance. Statute and the NPPF indicate that great weight should be afforded any development or aspect of a development that would preserve or enhance the significance of a designated heritage asset. As of the adoption in October 2023 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill 2023, and its revisions to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, this includes enhancements to listed buildings, and preservation or enhancements to Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, and World Heritage Sites, in addition to conservation areas.

As clarified in the High Court, preservation does not mean that change is not possible; it specifically means no harm. This is echoed in *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 2* (GPA 2), which states that ‘Change to heritage assets is inevitable but it is only harmful when significance is damaged’. The Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill 2023 stipulates that preserving or enhancing means ‘preserving or enhancing a relevant asset or its setting includes preserving or enhancing any feature, quality or characteristic of the asset or setting that contributes to the significance of the asset’.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Bedford Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government & Anor* [2008] EWHC 2304 (Admin).



