HERITAGE STATEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH PROPOSED ENGINEERING OPERATIONS TO RE-PROFILE LAND AT LAND OFF WOMBWELL LANE, STAIRFOOT, BARNSLEY

February 2016

Our Ref: JAC21579

RPS
34 Lisbon Street
Leeds
LS1 4LX

Tel: 0113 2206190
Email: rpsld@rpsgroup.com

QUALITY MANAGEMENT

Prepared by:	**Dan Slatcher**
Authorised by:	**Andrew Stevenson**
Date:	**February 2016**
Project Number/Document Reference:	**JAC21579**

COPYRIGHT © RPS

The material presented in this report is confidential. This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of Sentiville Limited and shall not be distributed or made available to any other company or person without the knowledge and written consent of RPS.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 2
2 METHODOLOGY 3
3 PLANNING CONTEXT 7
4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC BACKGROUND 9
5 ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON BELOW GROUND ARCHAEOLOGY AND SETTINGS OF HERITAGE ASSETS 13
6 CONCLUSIONS 14
7 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES 15

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: HER Entries (Supplied by South Yorkshire Archaeology Service)

Appendix 2: Historic Maps (Supplied by Landmark Mapping)

FIGURES:

Figure 1: Site Location and HER Data Overview

Figure 2: Designated Assets within 1km of Proposed Development

Figure 3: Historic Landscape Character

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RPS has been commissioned to produce a heritage statement in connection with a proposal by Sentiville Limited to re-profile land to the southwest of Wombwell Lane, Barnsley.

The proposed development area is located to the south of Barnsley, southwest of Wombwell Lane and immediately southwest of the retail stores at Barnsley Retail Park on the west side of Wombwell Lane at Stairfoot, centred on NGR SE 375 049.

The retail stores at Barnsley Retail Park to the northeast of the proposed development area are located on level ground adjacent to a small stream, the Dob Syke, to their south. The proposed development area itself comprises in part a section of the Dearne and Dove Canal, which led from the Don Navigation in Swinton to the south to the Barnsley Canal, northwest of Barnsley to the north. The proposed development area is located on the northeast side of a slope on which is located a field and follows the 55 metre contour. Water level within the canal was probably at about 1.5 metres above the ground level within the adjacent Barnsley Retail Park to its northeast. The south-eastern part of the canal earthwork, extending for a distance of some 150 metres northwest of the Cork Bridge, has recently been removed and this part of the proposed development area levelled.

The geology of the proposed development area comprises Mudstone, Siltstone and Sandstone bedrock of the Pennine Middle Coal Measures Formation. Superficial deposits are not mapped.

The development proposal seeks retrospective planning permission for the engineering works relating to the re-profiling of the land on the edge of the existing Trade Park and includes a proposal for a landscaping scheme for this area. This planning application is primarily in response to the issuing of a temporary stop notice by Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council on 20th January 2016 relating to unauthorised works at this site by the applicant

There are a number of designated assets in the wider area. An assessment has been carried out to assess the effects if any on these assets and their settings as a consequence of the proposed development. There are none and no effects.

The Dearne and Dove Canal was constructed during the late 18th century and opened in 1804. The canal was abandoned during the late 1950s. Since then it has been heavily degraded and much of the original structure has been removed or infilled. It no longer survives as a coherent structure along its length and in places the line of the canal is now difficult to trace. The canal is of local significance. The section proposed for development makes a minor contribution to the asset as a whole and its recent partial removal has not significantly reduced the value or significance of the Dearne and Dove Canal. Although there are tentative and unfunded plans to restore the Dearne and Dove Canal these, if enacted would be undertaken on an alignment to the north of Wombwell Lane. In any event the development proposal would not preclude the future restoration of the canal along its original alignment.

The proposed footpath to be formed adjacent to the original line of the canal as part of the development proposals may be seen as a public benefit. The proposed development area and the wider area has been used as a canal since the early 19th century. In conclusion there is no evidence for the proposed development area to contain below ground remains of the highest significance, or of sufficient significance to warrant preservation *in situ*.

1 INTRODUCTION

Background

1.1 RPS has been commissioned to produce a heritage statement in connection with a proposal by Sentiville Limited to re-profile land to the southwest of Wombwell Lane, Barnsley.

Site Description

1.2 The proposed development area is located to the south of Barnsley, southwest of Wombwell Lane and immediately southwest of the retail stores at Barnsley Retail Park on the west side of Wombwell Lane at Stairfoot, centred on NGR SE 375 049.

1.3 The retail stores at Barnsley Retail Park to the northeast of the proposed development area are located on level ground adjacent to a small stream, the Dob Syke, to their south. The proposed development area itself comprises in part a section of the Dearne and Dove Canal, which led from the Don Navigation in Swinton to the south to the Barnsley Canal, northwest of Barnsley to the north. The proposed development area is located on the northeast side of a slope on which is located a field and follows the 55 metre contour. Water level within the canal was probably at about 1.5 metres above the ground level within the adjacent Barnsley Retail Park to its northeast. The south-eastern part of the canal earthwork, extending for a distance of some 150 metres northwest of the Cork Bridge, has recently been removed and this part of the proposed development area levelled.

1.4 The development proposal seeks retrospective planning permission for the engineering works relating to the re-profiling of the land on the edge of the existing Trade Park and includes a proposal for a landscaping scheme for this area. This planning application is primarily in response to the issuing of a temporary stop notice by Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council on 20th January 2016 relating to unauthorised works at this site by the applicant.

1.5 The geology of the proposed development area comprises Mudstone, Siltstone and Sandstone bedrock of the Pennine Middle Coal Measures Formation. Superficial deposits are not mapped (http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html).

Aims

1.6 The aims of this study are

- to assess the likelihood of the application site to contain archaeological remains and to provide an indication of what, if any, further work may be required with regard to archaeology; and
- to assess the significance of other heritage assets, including designated heritage assets and to determine, what, if any effect the proposed development may have on that significance.

1.7 Given that impacts on heritage would largely be confined to the canal itself, it is this asset which is considered in detail within this report.

Project Archive

1.8 The project archive is held by RPS at the time of writing.

1.9 This report has been written for and on behalf of RPS by Dan Slatcher BA, MA, MCIfA.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 During this assessment, Health and Safety considerations were paramount, relevant legislation and guidance were complied with and appropriate health and safety measures adopted at all times.

2.2 The desk assessment comprised, in the first instance, consultation with the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) and their Historic Environment Record (HER). Data from the National Record of the Historic Environment (NHRE) was also reviewed, including the copy held at the SYAS offices. Data on scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens and registered battlefields was obtained from English Heritage. A review of relevant documentary and archival material held in libraries and archives was undertaken and the Barnsley Archives was visited. An iterative approach was adopted during this process to determine the scope of the above consultations/searches.

2.3 A site visit was undertaken in February 2016 to establish the presence of above ground archaeology, whether or not previously recorded and the settings of the heritage assets in the vicinity of the proposed development area.

2.4 The assessment has conformed to the relevant legislation and guidance, including:

- *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (March 2012);
- *Code of Conduct* Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014);
- *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment* Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014);
- *Conservation Principles* English Heritage (2008);
- *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment* Historic England (2015a); and
- *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets* Historic England (2015b)

2.5 The proposed development comprises a scheme to re-profile the ground. On the basis of recent experience with similar developments, this assessment focuses on a study area of up to 1 km around the proposed development area with respect to the settings of heritage assets, while taking into consideration evidence from a wider area if appropriate.

2.6 Guidance on the settings of heritage assets is provided in *Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets* Historic England (July 2015). This document notes that *the purpose of this Historic England Good Practice Advice note is to provide information on good practice to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the related guidance given in the National Planning Practice Guide (PPG). It should be read in conjunction with Good Practice Advice (GPA) notes 1 (The Historic Environment in Local Plans) and 2 (Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment). This good practice advice acknowledges the primacy of the NPPF and PPG, supporting the implementation of*

national policy, but does not constitute a statement of Government policy itself, nor does it seek to prescribe a single methodology or particular data sources. Alternative approaches may be equally acceptable, provided they are demonstrably compliant with legislation, national policies and objectives (Historic England 2015: 1)

2.7 The document goes on to note that *the advice in this document, in accordance with the NPPF, emphasises that the information required in support of applications for planning permission and listed building consents should be no more than is necessary to reach an informed decision, and that activities to conserve or invest need to be proportionate to the significance of the heritage assets affected and the impact on the significance of those heritage assets. At the same time those taking decisions need enough information to understand the issues* (Historic England 2015: 1)

2.8 The advice is provided in several sections as follows:

I. Introduction

II. Relationship of setting to curtilage, character and context

III. The extent of setting. This section states that *The NPPF makes it clear that the setting of a heritage asset is 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 (NPPF glossary)* (HE 2015:2). Presumably, although Historic England does not state it, the NPPF glossary description (see NPPF page 57) comprises the government's view of the definition of setting of a heritage asset.

IV. Views and setting. This section notes that *the contribution of setting to the significance of a heritage asset is often expressed by reference to views, a purely visual impression of an asset or place which can be static or dynamic, including a variety of views of, across, or including that asset, and views of the surroundings from or through the asset, and may intersect with, and incorporate the settings of numerous heritage assets* (Historic England 2015: 3, paragraph 5). In addition Historic England goes on to note that *particular views may be identified and protected by local planning policies and guidance. This does not mean that additional views or other elements or attributes of setting do not merit consideration* (Historic England 2015: 3, paragraph 8).

V. Setting and the significance of heritage assets

VI. A Staged Approach to Proportionate Decision-Taking. This section notes that *Historic England recommends the following broad approach to assessment, undertaken as a series of steps that apply proportionately to complex or more straightforward cases:*

- *Step 1: identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected*
- *Step 2: assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s).* This step provides a bullet pointed list of potential attributes of a setting *that may help to elucidate its contribution to significance. Only a limited selection of the attributes listed is likely to be particularly important in terms of any single asset.* The list of attributes is identical to that provided in the table on page 19 of the English Heritage 2011 document.

- *Step 3: assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance*
- *Step 4: explore the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm*
- *Step 5: make and document the decision and monitor outcomes*

2.9 NPPF, *inter alia* paragraphs 128, 129, and 132 indicate that heritage assets may be of varying levels of significance. In addition, the Design Manual for Road and Bridges (Vol 11, Section 3 Part 2 HA208/07) (Highways Agency August 2007) details categories of relative importance. The categories of significance below are based on these documents, with NPPF taking precedence:

- Sites of the Highest Significance would include scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, Grade I and II* listed buildings and Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens and World Heritage Sites;
- Sites of High Significance would include Grade II listed buildings, and Grade II registered parks and gardens;
- Sites of Medium Significance, these being of Regional or County importance;
- Sites of Low Significance, these being of District or Local importance;
- Sites of Negligible Significance - with very little of no surviving heritage interest; and
- Sites of Unknown Significance.

2.10 Impact scales are defined thus:

Major	Change to those elements which contribute to the significance of most or all key asset elements, such that the resource is totally altered. Comprehensive changes to setting.
Moderate	Changes to many key asset elements, such that the resource is clearly modified. Considerable changes to setting.
Minor	Changes to key asset elements, such that the asset is slightly altered. Slight changes to setting.
Negligible	Very minor changes to elements or setting.
No change	No change.

2.11 The significance of effects is a combination of the value of the resource or asset and the magnitude of impact on that resource or asset. Effects can be adverse or beneficial. Beneficial effects are those that mitigate existing impacts and help to restore or enhance heritage assets, therefore allowing for greater understanding and appreciation. A matrix of the significance of effects is provided in the table below:

Table 1 – Significance of Effects Matrix

VALUE / SENSITIVITY					
Very High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate/ Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate/ Slight	Moderate/ Large	Large/Very Large
Medium	Neutral	Neutral/ Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate/ Large
Low	Neutral	Neutral/ Slight	Neutral/ Slight	Slight	Slight/ Moderate
Negligible	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral/ Slight	Neutral/ Slight	Slight
	No change	**Negligible**	**Minor**	**Moderate**	**Major**
	MAGNITUDE OF IMPACT				

2.12 Within this report, archaeological periods are defined as follows:

- Prehistoric [comprising Lower Palaeolithic (pre 30,000 BC), Upper Palaeolithic (30,000 - 10,000BC), Mesolithic (10,000 - 3,500BC), Neolithic (3,500 - 2,000BC), Bronze Age (2,000 - 700BC) and Iron Age (700BC - AD43)];
- Roman (AD43 - AD410);
- Medieval (AD450 - AD1540);
- Post Medieval (AD1540 to 1901); and
- Modern (1901 onwards).

3 PLANNING CONTEXT

3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DCLG 2012) provides advice to planning authorities regarding the protection of heritage assets within the planning process. The guidance deals with all types of heritage in a single document. The NPPF takes an integrated approach to the historic environment and 'heritage assets', moving beyond a distinction between buildings, landscapes and archaeological remains.

3.2 Paragraph 128 notes that in determining applications local planning authorities should require an applicant to provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected and the contribution of their setting to that significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the heritage asset.

3.3 A heritage asset is defined in the NPPF at page 52 as '*a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).*'

3.4 Setting is defined in the NPPF at page 56 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.*'

3.5 Paragraph 131 of the NPPF notes that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

3.6 Paragraph 132 notes that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.

3.7 Paragraph 135 notes that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

3.8 Listed buildings are protected under the provisions 54(i) of the Town and Country Planning Act (1971), as amended by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990) which empowers the Secretary of State for the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to maintain a list of built structures of historic or architectural significance.

3.9 Scheduled monuments are protected through the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979), which had been updated in the National Heritage Act (1983). Scheduled monuments are

maintained on a list held by the Secretary of State for DCMS. Any alterations or works to a scheduled monument (including archaeological investigation) requires scheduled monument consent (SMC).

3.10 The development plan for the application area comprises the Core Strategy, adopted in September 2011, the Barnsley Education Sites Development Plan Document (DPD), adopted in January 2009 the Joint Waste Plan adopted in March 2012 and the remaining saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan. The relevant policies are as follows:

Core Strategy Policy CSP30: The Historic Environment

We will positively encourage the management, conservation and enjoyment of Barnsley's historic environment and make the most of the heritage assets which define Barnsley's local distinctiveness.

Development which affects the historic environment and Barnsley's heritage assets and their settings will be expected to protect or improve:

- *the character and/or appearance of Conservation Areas*
- *the character and/or appearance of Scheduled Ancient Monuments*
- *the character and/or appearance of Listed Buildings (including any locally listed buildings or buildings of archaeological significance)*
- *archaeological remains of local or national importance*
- *the character and/or appearance of historic parks and gardens and other historic landscapes including key views from and within these landscapes*

UDP Policy BE4

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.

4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC BACKGROUND

Introduction

4.1 Figure 1 shows HER data within 1km of the proposed development area, with the former alignments of the Dearne and Dove Canal and the Worsborough Branch, while Figure 2 shows the designated assets within 1km of the proposed development area. Figure 3 shows the historic landscape in the wider area.

4.2 Recorded archaeological remains in the wider area range in date from the prehistoric to the modern period.

Background

4.3 There are few recorded assets in the vicinity of the proposed development area. An enclosure, apparently dating from the Iron Age and/ or Romano British period, with an associated road or track leading to its south is recorded located some 340m southwest of the proposed development area at the summit of the hill overlooking the canal (HER numbers 02330/1, 02330/02, NMR number 1025457).

4.4 There is some evidence for the wider area being heavily wooded during the early Medieval period. The place name 'Barnsley' derives from the Old English meaning 'Beorn's glade or forest clearing' (Smith 1961). Aldham Mill was located on the River Dove some 990m southeast of the proposed development area (HER number 02220/1). The mill was established by 1252 (OS edition of 1929, cited in Umperley (2000: 189) shows the mill with a weir and sluice and other water control features. The site of Old Hall moated site, Ardsley is located on the northeast side of Wombwell Lane, some 530m northeast of the proposed development area (HER number 04997). There appear to be no traces of the moat on early OS maps and the site has apparently been destroyed. A silver coin of medieval date had been found apparently though metal detecting, in the large field south of Caulk Lane, some 340m south of the proposed development area (SYPAS2014).

4.5 The Stairfoot Bleach and Dye Works, located some 420m north of the proposed development area was apparently built during the 18th century (HER number 04596, NHRE number 946753), although its proximity to the canal must have been convenient in terms of moving materials.

4.6 The historic landscape characterisation indicates that the proposed development area lies within an area of *commercial retail park* character type (HSY7790). The character type is not of significance and would have a high capacity to withstand change. Immediately south of the proposed development area, the character type is one of agglomerated fields, which are modern in origin (HSY 7801). The character type is not of great significance and this area too would have a high capacity to withstand change.

4.7 There is no evidence for the proposed development area to contain early remains. The overall potential for the survival of archaeological remains pre-dating the canal is low.

The Canal System

4.8 The proposed development area is located within a system of former canals which linked the River Don with the Aire and Calder Navigation, via several south Yorkshire towns.

4.9 Joseph Priestly noted that the Barnsley Canal commenced from the River Calder, some three quarters of a mile below Wakefield Bridge, then led to the south, passed the Heindly Reservoir which supplied it with water, crossed the River Dearne on an aqueduct and some ten miles (Hadfield – 1972: 174, notes that it was 11 miles in length between these points and 15 to Barnby Basin) from its northern junction with the Aire and Calder, joined the Deane and Dove Canal. This Barnsley Canal then turned west and terminated at Barnby Basin (Priestly 1830: 52-53).

4.10 Priestly went on to record that the Dearne and Dove Canal began in a side cut leading from the River Don Navigation in Swinton. The canal then headed northwest through a short tunnel, through Wath, Brampton, Wombwell and Ardsley to a terminus at the aqueduct carrying the Barnsley Canal over the River Dearne at Barnsley, a length of some 9.25 miles (Priestly 1830: 185).

4.11 The construction of the Don Navigation made Swinton a transhipment point for traffic from Barnsley. The road was seen as 'almost impassable' (Hadfield 1973: 280) and so the Dearne and Dove Canal was constructed following an Act of Parliament of 1793. Two branches, one to Elsecar and the other to Worsbrough were proposed and the canal was constructed in stages. The canal from Elsecar to the Don Navigation was open by the end of 1798 (Glister 2004: 50) and opened along its full length in 1804. Glister (2004: 48) notes that by the time the Dearne and Dove Canal opened the Barnsley Canal has been open for almost three years and had built up a good trade. When the Dearne and Dove became operational, nearly half the tonnage shipped from Barnby Basin headed down the new canal.

4.12 The first edition Ordnance Survey (OS) six-inch map of 1855 shows the Barnsley Canal running from its western terminus at Barnby Basin, located some 7.75km northwest of the proposed development area(and now immediately west of the M1 motorway) and passing Dearne Hall and Gawber Colliery as well as at least three bleach works, including the Stairfoot Bleach and Dye Works. The line of the canal traversed what was at that time the countryside to the north and east of Barnsley and meeting the Dearne and Dove Canal at the River Dearne.

4.13 In the area of Wombwell Lane the first edition six inch OS map indicates that the towing path lay on northern side of canal. The Dearne and Dove Canal crossed the parish boundary at the north-western end of the proposed development area and passed under the Cork Bridge (as it is named on the OS (although other publications, including Glister 2004 refer to it as 'Caulk') at its south-eastern end. To the south of the bend in the canal south of the Cork Bridge the canal then joined the 'Eight Locks' leading towards The Don Navigation at Swinton and the Worsborough Branch, leading to Worsborough Basin, located some 2.75km to the southwest.

4.14 Later editions of the OS, beginning with the twenty-five inch edition of 1893 (see Appendix 2), show a feature marked 'Stone' on the southwestern side of the canal at the parish boundary at the northern end of the proposed development area. Immediately north of the canal, west of the Dob Syke, a well is marked. By the OS edition of 1906 the stone to the northwest of the proposed development area is shown a few metres north of the parish boundary with a further stone located on the south side of the canal a few metres northwest of the Cork Bridge. Other than these stones and the Cork Bridge, no canal features are shown on early maps within or adjacent to the proposed development area. In the wider area, the 1906 edition of the OS shows a cricket ground and a brick works, the latter perhaps located to take advantage of the railway rather than the canal.

4.15 The Manor Flint Glassworks (HER number 03534/01) was located some 440m north of the proposed development area between the canal and Wombwell Lane, apparently slightly west of its location on

the HER map. Ashurst (1990: 80) notes that the works was in operation between 1895 and 1938. Presumbaly the location of the canal was a factor in its location. The works are not marked on the OS edition of 1894 and the foundation date would seem correct, but Ashurst's information is from trade directories, does not preclude a later continuation and the works is shown as extant on the OS edition of 1948. Ashurst also notes that the site has been destroyed.

4.16 The Worsborough Branch of the Dearne and Dove Canal was closed in 1906, largely because subsidence due to coal working had made it uneconomic to maintain. The OS edition of 1907 indicates that the section of the Dearne and Dove Canal below the Eight Locks was marshy rather than free flowing at that time. The Elsecar Branch was closed for similar reasons to that of the Worsborough Branch in 1928 (Glister 2004: 50). It became difficult to maintain a sufficient depth of water to operate boats along the length of the Dearne and Dove Canal and the last boat travelled to Barnsley in 1934.The Dearne and Dove canal effectively closed then except to a short length at each end. The Barnsley Canal closed in 1942 and the Dearne and Dove Canal finally closed to traffic in 1952, with abandonment taking place in 1961. (Glister 2004: 50, Rotherham Library 15/1-3). The 1962 edition of the OS 1:2500 map shows the canal as an earthwork within the proposed development area, apparently drained and subsequent editions indicate that this has remained the case until recently.

4.17 Glister (2004: 50) estimates that 70% of the Dearne and Dove Canal has disappeared completely. A review of aerial; photography from Google Earth and of plans presented by The Barnsley, Dearne and Dove Canals Trust (BDDCT) bears out this estimate. The BDDCT was formed in 1984 as the Barnsley Canal Group, became a limited company and registered charity in 1991 and was relaunched under its present name in 2000. (http://www.bddct.org.uk/home.html). This website notes that the aims of the trust are to:

- *Reinstate a vital missing link in the national waterways network*
- *Breath new life and prosperity into an area which has suffered economic decline, by creating employment opportunities throughout the region.*
- *Create a focus for community, recreational and educational opportunity and involvement.*
- *Create a green corridor, which can be used by walkers, cyclists, anglers and wildlife.*
- *Restore an important historic element in the region's industrial heritage*
- *Create new leisure and tourism opportunities*

4.18 The BDDCT has made proposals for the restoration of both the Barnsley Canal and the Dearne and Dove Canal. The BDDCT notes that *the Barnsley Canal route is relatively intact and reusable. However the Dearne & Dove Canal route has been obliterated by major roads and other development, and the feasibility study recommends a new route which parallels the old route for a significant proportion of its length* (BDDCT 2013: 5). It is understood that these canal restoration plans are tentative and unfunded.

4.19 It is proposed to divert the line of the Dearne and Dove Canal from the B6273 Pontefract Road, some 4.8km to the south of the proposed development area along to the junction of Wombwell Lane and the A635 Doncaster Road some 600m to the north of the proposed development area. In the vicinity of the proposed development area the new canal would run parallel with and on the northeast side of

Wombwell Lane (http://www.waterwayroutes.co.uk/wr/wr-15m31-barnsley-dearne-dove-canals-restoration.pdf, BDDCT 2013: 9). The existing route of the canal would not form part of the restored route in this area. It is noted that HS2 is proposed to traverse the area and the new route northeast of Wombwell Lane proposed for the restoration of the Dearne and Dove Canal along is intended to be used notwithstanding this proposal (BDDCT 2013: 9).

4.20 A site visit was carried out in February 2016. The blocked Cork Bridge to the southeast of the proposed development area survives. The site visit has indicated that the canal has been entirely removed from approximately 3 metres northwest of the Cork Bridge (at which point the bridge appears to have been previously blocked) for an estimated distance of some 150 metres. The remainder of the canal to the north of this point remains as a largely filled in shallow earthwork feature.

Designated Assets

4.21 There are a number of designated assets in the area around the proposed development area.

4.22 There are no World Heritage Sites, scheduled monuments registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields or conservation areas within 1km of the proposed development area. There are six listed buildings within a 1km radius of the proposed development area. Of these five listed at Grade II and one Swaithe House (list entry number 1286701 and located some 840m to the southwest of the proposed development area) is listed at Grade II*.

4.23 Those designated assets located within 1km of the proposed development area are summarised in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Designated Assets located within 1km of the proposed development area

Listed Buildings		
List Entry Number	**Name**	**Grade**
1286701	Swaithe House	II*
1151076	Swaithe Hall Farmhouse, Rosebower Cottage and Swaithe Hall	II
1151077	Cruck Barn at east side of Entrance to Swaithe Hall Farm	II
1151156	Ardsley Church Of England Cemetery Chapel (To West)	II
1192045	Stable Block at west side of Entrance to Swaithe Hall Farm	II
1286983	Non Conformist Cemetery Chapel (To East)	II

5 ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON BELOW GROUND ARCHAEOLOGY AND SETTINGS OF HERITAGE ASSETS

5.1 The proposed development area does not contain any designated assets. The nearest designated asset is the Cruck Barn at east side of Entrance to Swaithe Hall Farm (listed at Grade II, list entry number 1151077). The proposed development would have no effect on this asset or its setting, or on the settings of any other heritage assets, which are hidden from the proposed development area by the landform.

5.2 The significance of the Dearne and Dove Canal heritage asset is assessed below. The heritage values of the Dearne and Dove Canal are as follows:

- Evidential and Historical – The evidential value derives primarily from the earthworks, buried archaeological remains and fabric in terms of structures such as bridges, locks etc. of the canal. The historical value is partly illustrative, but also comprises associations with known individuals, events and sites. Much of the evidential value of the canal has been lost through filling of the watercourse and/ or redevelopment.
- Aesthetic - The value derives from the design value of the canal in terms of its expression of the development of transportation infrastructure. Much of this value has again been lost through later development and removal of the watercourse.
- Communal – The value of the canal derives from its symbolic value as part of the local community.

5.3 The Dearne and Dove Canal is fragmented and incomplete and large sections have been removed entirely. There are very few designated assets along the length of the canal and none in the vicinity of the proposed development area. None of the identified values described above are high. On this basis and on the basis that within the proposed development area the canal survived intact (rather than the actual position which is that part of it has been removed), the canal is assessed as being of local significance. The section proposed for development makes a minor contribution to the asset as a whole and its recent partial removal has not significantly reduced the value or significance of the Dearne and Dove Canal.

5.4 Undesignated assets in the wider area would not be affected by the proposed development.

5.5 On this basis the potential for the survival of coherent below ground archaeological remains that may be affected by the proposed development is as follows:

- Prehistoric – low
- Roman - low
- Medieval – low
- Post Medieval - low

6 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 This study has revealed that there are no designated sites (e.g. scheduled monuments, listed buildings) within the proposed development area.

6.2 There are a number of designated assets in the wider area. An assessment has been carried out to assess the effects if any on these assets and their settings as a consequence of the proposed development and there are none.

6.3 The Dearne and Dove Canal was constructed during the late 18th century and opened in 1804. The canal was abandoned during the late 1950s. Since then it has been heavily degraded and much of the original structure has been removed or infilled. It no longer survives as a coherent structure along its length and in places the line of the canal is now difficult to trace. The canal is of local significance. The section proposed for development makes a minor contribution to the asset as a whole and its recent partial removal has not significantly reduced the value or significance of the Dearne and Dove Canal.

6.4 Although there are tentative and unfunded plans to restore the Dearne and Dove Canal these, if enacted would be undertaken on an alignment to the north of Wombwell Lane. In any event the development proposal would not preclude the future restoration of the canal along its original alignment.

6.5 The proposed footpath to be formed adjacent to the original line of the canal as part of the development proposals may be seen as a public benefit

6.6 The proposed development area and the wider area have been used as a canal since the early 19th century. In conclusion there is no evidence for the proposed development area to contain below ground remains of the highest significance, or of sufficient significance to warrant preservation *in situ*.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

Published

Ashurst, D. (1990) *The History of South Yorkshire Glass* Sheffield

Brabner, J.H.F. ed. (c.1893). *The Comprehensive Gazetteer of England and Wales.* London: William Mackenzie.

Barnsley Canal Group (1984) *The Barnsley Canal A Forgotten Waterway* Sheffield: Barnsley Canal Group

Barnsley Canal Group (1991) *Dearne and Dove Canal – The Vital Link* Barnsley: Barnsley Canal Group

Barnsley Dearne and Dove Canals Trust (2013) *Barnsley, Dearne & Dove Canals – HS2 Mitigation Options* Wakefield: BDDCT

Glister, R (1995) The Conception and Construction of the Barnsley Canal in Elliott, B (ed 1995) *Aspects of Barnsley 3* pp 116-132 Barnsley: Wharncliffe

Glister, R (1996) The Conception and Construction of the Barnsley Canal in Elliott, B (ed 1996) *Aspects of Barnsley 4* pp 215-224 Barnsley: Wharncliffe

Glister, R (2004) *The Forgotten Canals of Yorkshire* Barnsley: Wharncliffe

Hadfield, C (1972) *The Canals of Yorkshire and North East England Volume 1* Newton Abbott: David and Charles

Hadfield, C (1973) *The Canals of Yorkshire and North East England Volume 2* Newton Abbott: David and Charles

Hey, D (1979) *The Making of South Yorkshire* Ashbourne: Moorland

Hey, D (1986) *Yorkshire from AD 1000* London: Longman

Priestly, J. (1830) *Navigable Rivers and Canals* London: Longman

Tate, W.E. and Turner, M.E. (1978) *A Domesday of English Enclosure Acts and Awards.* Reading: University of Reading.

Umperley, T (2000) *Water Mills and Furnaces on the Yorkshire Dearne and its Tributaries* Wakefield

Williams, A. and Martin, G.H. (eds) (1992) *Domesday Book.* London: Penguin.

Unpublished Documents

Rotherham Library *Wath Upon Dearne UDC: Minutes of Meetings and correspondence regarding the proposed abandonment of the Dearne and Dove Canal* 1955-58 (15/1-3).

Published Maps

Ordnance Survey (1994) *Historical Map and Guide Roman Britain* Southampton: Ordnance Survey

FIGURES

APPENDIX 1: HER ENTRIES (SUPPLIED BY SOUTH YORKSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGY SERVICE)

APPENDIX 2: HISTORIC MAPS (SUPPLIED BY GROUNDSURE MAPPING)