

13 Cultural Heritage

13.1 Introduction

13.1.1 The Cultural Heritage assessment of the proposals is contained in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement dated September 2007 (prepared by WSP Environmental) which dealt with archaeological and built heritage matters. There has since been a scheme change, as reflected in the revised Parameters Plans contained within this supplemental ES.

13.1.2 This supplemental chapter has been prepared by CgMs Consulting and assesses the impact of the revised scheme on built heritage.

13.1.3 Archaeological issues are currently the subject of ongoing field evaluation work. In particular, in response to representations by the County Archaeological Officer, a deposit model is being drafted against which the results of a geophysical (magnetometer) survey can be considered. The methodology for the geophysical survey has been approved and monitored by the County Archaeological Officer and the data gathering stage has recently been completed. Data processing is currently underway. Therefore, this supplemental chapter does not comment on or assess archaeological resources; these will be dealt with separately in a subsequent, standalone report.

13.1.4 Below follows a list of paragraphs within the original ES chapter which no longer forms part of the assessment and are superseded by this supplemental chapter. The paragraph numbers for superseded assessments are:

- 13.5.4
- 13.5.6
- 13.5.8
- 13.5.11
- 13.5.12
- 13.5.13
- 13.6.6
- 13.6.7
- 13.6.8
- 13.6.9
- 13.6.13
- 13.6.15
- 13.6.19

13.1.5 Parts of the Historic Buildings Assessment appended to the ES (Appendix 13.7) are also superseded by this supplemental chapter. The superseded paragraph numbers are:

- 4.2.2
- 4.2.3
- 5.1.3
- 5.1.6

13.2 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

13.2.1 For consistency the assessment methodology and significance criteria follows that of the September 2007 ES, but English Heritage's guidance on the subject, contained in '*Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance*' (published in 2008) have also been followed. This supplemental chapter follows from additional research and site visits, and it contains a more detailed assessment of the settings of the built heritage assets. It should also be noted that impacts on the settings of built heritage assets are considered to be 'indirect' and not 'direct' as in the ES. Direct impacts are those which physically affect the fabric or form of built heritage assets.

13.2.2 Not all of the built heritage assets were reassessed for the supplemental chapter; instead only those within the application site, or closest to it, have been included. That is because the revised Parameters Plans will only materially change the impact assessment for the built heritage assets within, or close to, the application site. The built heritage assets assessed in this supplemental chapter are listed below:

- Barty Barn (grade II listed)
- Woodcut Farmhouse (grade II listed)
- Barty (Bertie) House (grade II listed)
- The Bearsted Conservation Area
- The Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Area

13.3 Baseline Conditions

13.3.1 There is no change to the built heritage baseline conditions under the revised Parameters Plans, but in some instances the assessment expands on the historic background, special interest and/or setting of the assets.

13.4 Potential Impacts of Development

13.4.1 The construction method for the KIG development as set out in the ES will not be affected by the revised Parameters Plans. The indirect impact assessment of the Built Heritage assets included in this supplemental chapter is contained in the following section.

Barty Barn (grade II listed)

13.4.2 Barty Barn lies within the application site. According to *A History of Bearsted and Thurnham* (1988), in the seventeenth century there was a large farm in Thurnham and Bearsted called Barty or Berty. The publication also mentions that the farmhouse was probably a hall-house. Barty Barn is described in *Pastscape* as a seventeenth century timber framed barn with original thick red brick walls. The list description attributes the barn to the late 17th century.

13.4.3 However, cartographic evidence suggests that the barn dates from the 19th century (between 1825 and 1865). There is no building in the location, or of the same orientation as Barty Barn on i) a map of Barty, dated 1781, or ii) the 1797 Ordnance Surveyor's Drawing of Maidstone, or iii) the 1841 Thurnam Tithe map. The 1865 Ordnance Survey map is the first sourced cartographic source that shows Barty Barn in its present location and orientation. However, for the purposes of this assessment the date of the barn has been assumed to be in accordance with the list description.

13.4.4 Listed building consent was granted for the conversion of Barty Barn into a single dwelling in 1993. At the same time consent was given for the conversion of the dairy and stable into two dwellings and the demolition of a modern farm building.

13.4.5 The revised Parameters Plans represent a significant improvement to the submitted plans in terms of the impacts on Barty Barn. The improvements are discussed in more detail under mitigation measures, but in summary the closest building will now be at a distance of 85m, rather than 15m from the barn. That also allows for the redirected watercourse to pass in between the barn and the closest proposed building, rather than close to it along the west.

13.4.6 Another improvement is the retention of the outbuildings (the oast house and byre, now in residential use), which form important elements of the barn's setting (the modern sheds are not considered to be significant contributors in terms of the barn's setting). This group of buildings adds to the contextual appreciation of the barn and aid in its understanding.

13.4.7 Barty Barn will be retained under the proposals and no direct (i.e. physical) impacts are proposed. Both the constructional and operational impacts on Barty Barn will be on its setting (i.e. indirect), although it is possible that there may be an increase of dust during construction.

- 13.4.8 The outer limit or extents of the setting of the barn is essentially undefined by physical features; it can be described as 'fading away' or gradually diminishing in intensity as one move away from the building. As a result of its undefined and 'fading' setting, it is possible that the closest building of the proposed development could be considered as falling within the setting of Barty Barn.
- 13.4.9 If the proposed development is considered as falling within the setting of Barty Barn, it should be noted that this part of its setting is peripheral and at best serves as context or a backdrop to the building. The land on which the closest building would stand does not significantly contribute to the special interest, understanding or the significance of the building. There will also be views to and from the barn which will include the nearest proposed buildings, but none of these are designed views or inherently contribute to the building's special interest. The proposed Unit E will contrast with the barn in terms of scale, bulk and materials. The juxtaposition of an industrial building adjacent to the barn will likewise introduce a change to its wider context. Such a change would not diminish the special interest, understanding or the significance of the building, but for the purposes of this assessment an adverse impact has been ascribed due to the proximity and scale of the nearest proposed building, which could be considered as peripheral to the setting of the barn.
- 13.4.10 The ES considered that Barty Barn should ideally remain in use as a domestic residence. However, the residential use of the building was only introduced in 1993 and that is certainly not the only, or necessarily the most appropriate use for the building. Instead, it is most important that the upkeep and long term maintenance of the building is sought in order to avoid damage through neglect and decay, but the use is less relevant - provided the use does not result in harm to the building. It is noteworthy that the residential conversion of the barn has impacted on its originality, fabric and plan form; a continuation of this use is not necessarily the most suitable or appropriate for the building. Indeed, a positive impact can arguably be achieved by the removal of the 1993 insertions.
- 13.4.11 The proposed scheme's potential visual night-time effects has been assessed as part of the ES. Chapter 7 considers the detailed and technical effects of the lighting of the proposals. Chapter 6 has assessed the effects of the proposed lighting upon the surrounding receptors, including Barty Barn. Although the proposed lighting may affect residents of the listed building, it would not materially change its setting.
- 13.4.12 The effects of the proposed scheme on the air quality have been assessed in Chapter 12. Constructional dust will be reduced in accordance with the air quality mitigation strategy; residual impacts from dust on the listed building would be negligible. In any event the dust would be of a temporary nature and not dissimilar to the dust presently generated by the farming activities.

13.4.13 At most, the proposed development would have a **minor adverse** impact upon the setting of Barty Barn, because of the change to its setting as a result of the juxtapositioning of Unit E nearby. The impact would be **indirect** and **permanent**.

Woodcut Farmhouse (grade II listed)

13.4.14 Woodcut Farmhouse is a timber framed building that dates from the early 17th century, or perhaps earlier (according to the list description). The south elevation had been re-fronted in brick and forms the principal facade. The building's interior was not inspected when the building was listed, but is clear that Woodcut Farmhouse warrants inclusion on the list because of its early origins as a once common vernacular building, which has been altered but nevertheless retained much residual timber framing and a readable form.

13.4.15 There will be no direct (i.e. physical) impacts on Woodcut Farmhouse. As with Barty Barn, the outer extent of the setting of Woodcut Farmhouse is essentially undefined by physical features. Instead it gradually diminishes in intensity as one moves away from the building. The land on which the nearest buildings would stand was once part of Woodcut Farm, but this land does not materially contribute to its special interest, understanding or significance. In itself the fact that this land was once part of Woodcut Farm does not imply it is, or should be, included within the setting of the farmhouse.

13.4.16 Woodcut Farmhouse is not a significant landscape feature and there are no indications that its setting should be taken as extending as far as the nearest proposed buildings. Nevertheless, it would be possible to conclude that part of the proposed landscaping falls within its setting. There will be views to and from the farmhouse, or its immediate environs, which will include the nearest proposed buildings, but the farmhouse would not directly face the proposed buildings and none of the obtainable views of them are designed or formally arranged views. In summary the proposed development, although visible, will not affect the significance or the special interest of the listed building. The closest proposed buildings will contrast with the farmhouse in terms of scale, bulk and materials. The presence of the proposed development near the farmhouse will also introduce a change to its wider context. Such a change would not diminish the special interest, understanding or the significance of the building, but for the purposes of this assessment an adverse impact has been ascribed due to the proximity and scale of the nearest proposed buildings, which could be considered as peripheral to the farmhouse's setting.

13.4.17 As with Barty Barn, the effects of the proposed lighting on the receptors at Woodcut Farm has been assessed in Chapter 6, but the presence of lights would not materially affect the setting of the listed building or compromise its significance or special interest.

13.4.18 The effects of the proposed scheme on the air quality have been assessed in Chapter 12. Constructional dust will be generated, but reduced in accordance with the air quality mitigation strategy; residual impacts from dust on the listed building would be negligible (especially when taking into account the dust generated by agricultural activities at present).

13.4.19 As such the impacts on this building would be, in a 'worst case' scenario, in the **minor adverse** category because of the change to its setting as a result of the proximity and nature of the proposed development. The impacts would be **indirect** and **permanent**.

Barty House - listed as Bertie House (grade II listed)

13.4.20 Barty House is a substantial 18th century dwelling with later extensions, sited on a prominent corner location. It is set within a large, and for the most part well defined, plot of land. The building has been extended in the form of large eastern range, and a new development was under construction at the time of inspection immediately to the rear (north) of the building. The upper rear windows of Barty House overlook the appeal site, beyond the new development in its rear yard, but such views are screened to a degree by trees along its plot boundary. There is no evidence of designed or formally arranged views from the building in the direction of the appeal site.

13.4.21 There will be no direct (i.e. physical) impacts on Barty House. The most significant aspects of Barty House's setting are its prominent corner location and the part it plays in the local street scene. The later extensions, together with the new development to the rear, have changed the listed building's setting. There are no indications that the building's setting extends as far as the land on which the closest proposed building would stand. The proposed development will be visible to varying degrees in some views of or from the listed building, but that would be a change to the wider landscape which is distinct from the setting of the listed building.

13.4.22 The presence of the proposed buildings in the distance beyond Barty House would not affect the special interest or significance of the listed building. None of the views which would include the proposed development are integral to the design or understanding of the building.

13.4.23 The effects of the proposed lighting on the receptors at Barty House have been assessed in Chapter 6. Although the proposed lighting would be visible to some degree, the presence of lights would not cause harm to the setting of the listed building.

13.4.24 The effects of the proposed scheme on the air quality have been assessed in Chapter 12. A degree of dust is presently generated by farming activities at the agricultural fields which borders the building's plot to the north. Any constructional dust will be reduced in accordance with the air quality mitigation strategy; it is not anticipated that there would be any residual impacts from dust on the listed building.

13.4.25 The effects of the proposed scheme on the traffic have been assessed in Chapter 5. In terms of traffic, the increase would not materially affect the setting of the listed building. The effect of the revised scheme on the overall traffic volume is a reduction in traffic of about 11% from that assessed in the ES (for the A20 and the links to it).

13.4.26 The impacts on Barty House will be **negligible**.

The Bearsted Conservation Area

13.4.27 At the time of writing this document, Maidstone Borough Council has not prepared a formal conservation area statement, appraisal or characterisation for the Bearsted Conservation Area. It is understood that the conservation area will be reassessed during the course of the next year. In the absence of such published guidance, a summary of the most important aspects of the conservation area, its setting and views is included below.

13.4.28 The Bearsted Conservation Area is, for the most, part set within an urban context. Almost without exception, the conservation area boundary is bordered by the wider settlement. Parts of its northern edge border the railway line, beyond which is a golf course and loosely grouped development along Thurnham Lane. However, the railway line is on an embankment at this part, which physically and visually separates the conservation area from the land to the north of the railway line; there is no material connection or spatial/visual relation with the land beyond it (apart from a short distance view where the road passes underneath the railway line). The remainder of the conservation area's setting includes the surrounding built-up context, but the countryside (which is in some cases significantly beyond the bounds of the conservation area) does not contribute to, or otherwise affect, the character or appearance of the conservation area.

13.4.29 The conservation area includes two areas of undeveloped land: Hog Hill to the west (private access) and The Green (public access). These give a sense of openness within the built up settlement, but there is no direct or appreciable relation between Hog Hill or The Green and the countryside beyond the settlement.

13.4.30 The surrounding landscape can be glimpsed from various points within the conservation area, and the proposed development will be visible to varying degrees from some of these. However, such views are incidental, not integral to the interest of the conservation area. Nor do they materially contribute to i) the character or ii) the appearance of the conservation area.

13.4.31 There will be no direct (i.e. physical) impacts on the Bearsted Conservation Area. There is no indication that the views which would include the appeal site are to be considered of particular significance to the conservation area's character or appearance. It has been suggested that the setting of the listed oast house complex in the conservation area will be 'ruined' by virtue of the presence of the proposed buildings behind it in some views. However, there is no indication that the setting of the oast house complex extends beyond its immediate context, and certainly not beyond the settlement and onto the application site. The view in question is not of any appreciable significance in terms of either the significance of the oast house complex or the conservation area.

13.4.32 Instead the most important conservation area views are the street scenes along the main thoroughfare (The Street), its branching roads and the development bordering The Green. It is the quality, character and appearance of the buildings within the conservation area collectively, including their spatial and historic relationship (i.e. between the individual buildings, but also between the buildings collectively and The Green), which is most important. Development outside of the conservation area, but which would materially detract from the character and appearance of these street scenes, or views to and from them, could be regarded as forming part of the conservation area's setting and in some way affecting its character or appearance.

13.4.33 Even though the proposed development would be visible from certain points in the conservation area, its presence beyond the settlement would not in itself compromise or otherwise affect the character and appearance of the conservation area. The effects of the proposed lighting on the receptors at Bearsted have been assessed in Chapter 6. The presence of lights would not materially affect the setting of the conservation area. Constructional dust will be reduced in accordance with the air quality mitigation strategy; residual impacts from dust on the character and appearance of the conservation area would be negligible and temporary.

13.4.34 The effects of the proposed scheme on the traffic have been assessed in Chapter 5. In terms of traffic, the increase would not materially affect the character or the appearance of the conservation area. The effect of the revised scheme on the overall traffic volume is a reduction in traffic of about 11% from that assessed in the ES (for the A20 and the links to it).

13.4.35 The effects of the proposed scheme on the noise levels have been assessed in Chapter 11. The noise would not materially affect the setting or the character of the conservation area.

13.4.36 The impacts on the Bearsted Conservation Area will be **negligible**.

The Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Area

13.4.37 As with the Bearsted Conservation Area, there is no formal conservation area statement, appraisal or characterisation for this conservation area. The conservation area is roughly centred on the Holy Cross Church, comprising a loose urban context to the northwest and undeveloped or recreational land to the southeast. The most important views are those along Church Lane, and of the Holy Cross Church and its immediate surroundings. There are no indications that views in the direction of the proposed development from parts of the open area along the east of the conservation area of particular importance in terms of the interest of the conservation area.

13.4.38 Long views from the conservation area towards the application site do little by way of contributing to the conservation area's character or its appearance. There is nothing to suggest that the appeal site materially contributes to the character or the appearance of the conservation area. As with the Bearsted Conservation Area, the proposed development would be visible to varying degrees from certain points within the Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Area. However, the fact that the buildings will be visible will not materially affect the character or the appearance of the Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Area, or its setting.

13.4.39 The effects of the proposed lighting on the receptors at Bearsted has been assessed in Chapter 6, but the presence of lights would not materially affect the setting of the conservation area. The levels of dust during operation would not materially affect the conservation area.

13.4.40 The effects of the proposed scheme on the traffic have been assessed in Chapter 5. In terms of traffic, there is no predicted increase of traffic in the Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Area.

13.4.41 The effects of the proposed scheme on the noise levels have been assessed in Chapter 11. The noise would not materially affect the setting or the character of the conservation area.

13.4.42 The impacts on the Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Area will be **negligible**.

13.5 Mitigation Measures

Barty Barn

13.5.1 The revised Parameters Plans includes a number of changes to the design of the scheme, which were made specifically to reduce the scheme's impacts on Barty Barn, the closest listed building to any of the proposed structures.

13.5.2 The changes are listed below:

- i) The closest proposed building has been moved further away from the listed building. At its closest point under the submitted scheme it would have been located 15m from the listed building. That has been increased to a minimum distance of 85m.
- ii) The redirected watercourse, which would have been channelled in the area between the barn and the closest new building, will now be set back considerably from the building. The increased distance will allow for tree planting along both banks to help visually separate and screen the development from the listed building.
- iii) All of the buildings in the immediate context of the listed building, which fall within its setting and contribute to its understanding and appreciation, will be retained. That includes the oast house and byre, as well as the modern barns and the wall defining the courtyard to the southwest of the barn.

13.5.3 The landscaping and planting to screen the development noted in the ES will still be implemented, but there will be more scope for landscaping under the revised Parameters Plans. In terms of the proposed lighting, the design of lighting ensures that light spill, glare and sky glow are minimised. Careful consideration has also been given to the building layout and the location of new light sources, to reduce the effects on nearby buildings. Mitigation for dust during construction is described in Chapter 5 of the SES.

13.5.4 The residual impact on Barty Barn should be **minor adverse, indirect and permanent**.

Other Built Heritage Assets

13.5.5 The mitigation measures for the remainder of the built heritage assets will not change from the ES. That includes landscaping and planting to help screen the proposed development, fences or hoardings during constructional and operation phases, and the design, use of materials and colours, landscaping, screening and planting to reduce the visual impact of the development on the surrounding historic buildings, aiming to blend it in with its surroundings. Mitigation against dust, noise, artificial light and traffic are discussed in the relevant chapters.

13.6 Cumulative Impacts

13.6.1 There are not considered to be any cumulative impacts under the revised Parameters Plans.

13.7 Overall Appraisal and Residual Effects

13.7.1 Apart from the changes to the scheme to reduce the impacts on Barty Barn, the mitigation measures proposed in terms of the visual presence of the development would at most only reduce its visual presence and therefore to some degree its prominence from the built heritage assets. However, there is a limit to the effectiveness of these measures and they would not completely screen or block views of the proposed development. In most cases the proposed development will still be visible to varying degrees, regardless of the mitigation measures, and as such this assessment concludes that the impacts as previously assessed will not be completely removed. Therefore, the impacts identified following these mitigation measures has been taken as unchanged from those identified in Section 13.4 - Potential Impacts of Development.

13.8 Assumptions and Limitations

13.8.1 With the exception of Barty Barn and Woodcut Farmhouse, the listed buildings and conservation areas were inspected from public areas only.

13.8.2 Wireframe diagrams which show the development in the context of some built heritage assets were used as an aid to inform the assessment. These were generated for only the purpose of providing an indication of the likely scale of the proposed development, but they were not generated to the same degree of accuracy as the photomontages, and as such they have not been included as part of the supplemental ES.

13.9 Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Centre for Kentish History

- Sale Particulars for Oast-House in Bearsted, 1868 [U55 SP/313]
- Sale Particulars for Barty House, 1930 [U1448 6/1285]
- Sale Particulars for Bertie House, 1985
- Conveyance of Woodcut Farm, 1852 [U82 T57]
- Mortgage on Woodcut Estate, 1854 [U82 T57]
- Mortgage on Mantles Ripple and Woodcut Farms, 1865 [U82 T43]
- Plan of Woodcut Farm, 1877-8 [U1431 P9]
- A True and Perfect Map of Millgate and Other Lands belonging to William Cage, 1692 [U1258 P1]

- A True Map of Millgate and the Demensis of Howcourt being the estate of the Right Worshippful William Cage Esq., 1707 [U1258 P2]
- The Topography and Measuration of Millgate being the estate of Lewis Cage, 1746 [U1258 P3]
- A map of Barty which is the earliest found depiction of Barty Farm and Barty House, 1781 [U846 E1]
- Tithe Map and Apportionment of the Parish of Thurnham, 1825
- Tithe Map and Apportionment of the Parish of Hollingbourne, 1839
- Tithe Map of the Parish of Bearsted, 1842
- Ordnance Survey, 1865, 1897, 1908, 1961, 1989

British Library

- Ordnance Surveyor's Drawing, Maidstone, Kent, 1797

Secondary Sources:

Books

- Halstead, Edward, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, vol. 5 (1798)
- *A History of Bearsted and Thurnham* (The Bearsted and Thurnham History Book Committee, 1978, rev. Ed. 1988)
- Newman, John, *The Buildings of England: West Kent and the Weald* (London & New York: Yale University Press, 1980)

Internet

- British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/> [accessed 26.05.09]
- Images of England <http://www.imagesofengland.org.uk/> [accessed 26.05.09]
- Pastscape <http://www.pastscape.org/homepage/> [accessed 26.05.09]
- Access to Archives <http://www.a2a.org.uk/> [accessed 26.05.09]
- Parks and Gardens <http://www.parksandgardens.ac.uk/> [accessed 26.05.09]
- Viewfinder <http://viewfinder.english-heritage.org.uk/home.asp?JS=True> [accessed 26.05.09]

- British Architectural Library, RIBA
http://www.architecture.com/go/Architecture/Reference/Library_897.html [accessed 26.05.09]
- The National Archives <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/> [accessed 26.05.09]
- British Library Online Gallery <http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/index.html> [accessed 26.05.09]

Other

Registered Park and Garden Description and Map, Leeds Castle

Repositories

The Centre for Kentish Studies (CKS)

National Monuments Record (NMR)

British Library (BL)