

**CULTURAL HERITAGE DESK BASED
ASSESSMENT**

Neston Town Centre

For

CTP Ltd

March 2008

**CULTURAL HERITAGE DESK BASED
ASSESSMENT**

Neston Town Centre

For

CTP Ltd

March 2008

CTP Ltd, Neston Town Centre Cultural Heritage Assessment, March 2008				
Issue		Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by
V1	03-08			
V2	-			
V3	-			
V4	-	Kirsten Holland	Guy Kendall	Peter Harrison
V5	-	Senior Archaeologist	Principal Archaeologist	Regional Director
N:\Projects\A034501-A035000\A034931\reports\DBA Report Neston v1.doc				
White Young Green Environmental Limited, Armdale Court, Headingley, Leeds. LS6 2UJ. Telephone: 0113 278 7111 Facsimile: 0113 275 0623 E-Mail: enviro.leeds@wyg.com				

CULTURAL HERITAGE DESK BASED ASSESSMENT**Neston Town Centre****For****CTP Ltd****March 2008****CONTENTS**

	<u>Page No</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Aims and Objectives	4
2.0 METHODOLOGY	4
2.1 Assessment Methodology	4
2.2 Sources Consulted	5
3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION	5
4.0 GEOLOGY	5
5.0 LEGISLATION AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT	6
5.1 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979	6
5.2 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990	6
5.3 Planning Policy Guidance 16: Planning and Archaeology - 1990	6
5.4 Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning and the Historic Environment - 1994	6
5.5 Other Policy and Guidance	6
6.0 CONSULTATION	7
7.0 BASELINE DATA	7
7.1 Listed Buildings	7
7.2 Scheduled Monuments, Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and ancient woodland.	7
7.3 Conservation Areas	7
7.4 Archaeological and Historic Background	7
7.4.1 Prehistoric (up to 43AD)	7
7.4.2 Roman/Romano British (43AD to c.450AD)	7
7.4.3 The Early Medieval Period (c.450AD to 1066AD)	8
7.4.4 Medieval Period (1066 AD to c.1540AD)	8
7.4.5 Post Medieval (c.1540AD to 1900AD) and Modern (1900AD to present)	8
8.0 HISTORIC MAPPING SURVEY	9
9.0 WALKOVER SURVEY	10
10.0 GEOENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION RESULTS	11
11.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT	11
12.0 EVALUATION AND MITIGATION	15
13.0 RESIDUAL IMPACTS AND CONCLUSIONS	16
14.0 REFERENCES	19

APPENDICES

Appendix A	-	<u>Assessment Methodology</u>
Appendix B	-	<u>Proposed Development Designs</u>
Appendix C	-	<u>Site Photographs</u>
Appendix D	-	<u>Recorded Cultural Heritage Sites</u>
Appendix E	-	<u>Historic Mapping</u>
Appendix F	-	<u>Development Impact Zones</u>
Appendix G	-	<u>Report Conditions</u>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An archaeological desk-based assessment was undertaken to inform the proposed development of car parks in Neston town centre.

Data was collected from the National Monuments Record, Cheshire Historic Environment Record, English Heritage, Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council, documentary sources, historic mapping, geotechnical results and a site visit. A study area of 1km radius around the proposed development site was examined.

There are no recorded cultural heritage sites within the proposed development site boundary. Historic mapping demonstrates that the area was partially developed in the late post-medieval period. The morphology of the townscape and built environment in the vicinity of the site indicates that the medieval core of the town was located in this area. The medieval core of the town has been designated as an Area of Archaeological Potential. This area partially encompasses the proposed development site.

The proposed development may impact directly upon previously unrecorded archaeological remains within the site boundary. The proposed development site has been zoned according to the archaeological potential of the site and the impact of the proposed development.

Consultation was undertaken with Mark Leah, Cheshire County Council Historic Environment Department and it was recommended that an evaluation programme of 5% evaluation excavation within the Area of Archaeological Potential, and further evaluation excavation outside the Area of Archaeological Potential, subject to logistical arrangements, should be undertaken in the first instance. The results of this evaluation programme will inform any future mitigation strategy.

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

The report was commissioned by CTP Ltd.

The report was prepared by Kirsten Holland, Senior Archaeologist at White Young Green Environmental, Arndale Court, Headingley, Leeds, LS6 2UJ.

The site was visited on 7th February 2008.

1.1 **Aims and Objectives**

In accordance with the IFA *Standard* definition of a Desk-based Assessment (IFA 1994), this report seeks to identify and assess the known and potential archaeological resource within a specified area ('the site'), collating existing written and graphic information and taking full account of the likely nature and extent of previous impacts on the site, in order to identify the likely character, extent, quantity and worth of that resource in a regional and national context as appropriate.

A further objective is to define and comment on the likely impact of works (e.g. site clearance/reduction, construction, infrastructure etc) resulting from the proposed scheme on the surviving archaeological resource.

The IFA *Standard* states that the purpose of a desk-based assessment is so that appropriate Responses can be made, which may consist of one or more of the following:

- The formulation of a strategy to ensure that the recording, preservation or management of the Resource.
- The formulation of a strategy for further investigation, whether or not intrusive, where the Character and value of the resource is not sufficiently defined to permit a mitigation strategy or other response to be devised.
- The formulation of a project design for further archaeological investigation within a programme of research.

This desk-based assessment considers the archaeological potential within the site itself and the surrounding area. This assessment does not attempt to plot and review every archaeological find and monument; rather it aims to examine the distribution of evidence and to use this to predict the archaeological potential of the study area and the likely significance of the development proposals on those remains.

2.0 **METHODOLOGY**

2.1 **Assessment Methodology**

Impact assessment has been carried out through the consideration of baseline conditions in relation to the elements of the scheme that could cause cultural heritage impacts. Baseline conditions are defined as the existing environmental conditions and in applicable cases, the conditions that would develop in the future without the scheme. In accordance with best practice this report assumes that the scheme will be constructed, although the use of the word 'will' in the text should not be taken to mean that implementation of the scheme is certain.

No standard method of evaluation and assessment is provided for the assessment of impact significance upon cultural heritage, therefore a set of evaluation and assessment criteria have been developed using a combination of the Secretary of State's criteria for Scheduling Monuments (PPG16, Annex 3), Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Part 3, Section 2, HA 208/07 and Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG Unit 3.3.9, Heritage of Historic Resources Sub-Objective). Professional judgement is used in conjunction with these criteria to undertake the impact assessment. The full assessment methodology can be seen in Appendix A.

The principles of the impact assessment methodology rest upon independently evaluating the value of the cultural heritage resource and the predicted magnitude of impact (both positive and negative) upon the resource. By combining the value of the cultural heritage resource with the predicted magnitude of impact, the significance of the impact can be determined. The impact significance can be beneficial or adverse. The evaluation of magnitude of impact and impact significance is undertaken both before and after mitigation measures are proposed.

2.2 Sources Consulted

This study has been undertaken taking into consideration the historical and archaeological background of the proposed development area. The sources of supporting reference information consisted of:

- County Historic Environment Record (HER) (Cheshire County Council)
- National Monuments Record (NMR) (English Heritage)
- Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (www.magic.gov.uk) and English Heritage for designated sites
- Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council for Conservation Areas
- Geological Maps
- Cartographic sources including relevant Ordnance Survey Maps
- Appropriate documentary sources and archaeological journals, where available.

Due to the urban nature of the site which had been developed by the turn of the 20th century it was considered that aerial photography would be unlikely to yield information about potential archaeological sites.

Data was collected for a 1km radius around the proposed development site to consider the proposed development site within the context of the archaeological record in the immediate area.

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is located at Brook Street, Neston, CH64 9XL (NGR: SJ 2920 7752; E 329205, N 377520). The site is at approximately 30m AOD and slopes to the south and east. The site is currently in use as a car park and contains a number of buildings in the west of the site including a sub-station, public toilet block and offices. The surrounding area is primarily used for commercial and retail uses. The site is bounded by the railway to the east.

The proposed development is to provide a Sainsburys supermarket (with associated delivery area and good storage), a multi-storey car park and a regenerated market place area. Proposed development design plans and layout are included in Appendix B.

Photographs of the site can be seen in Appendix C.

4.0 GEOLOGY

The site is underlain by Triassic Bunter pebble beds which are now termed Sherwood Sandstone (BGS, 1975, Crossfield Consulting, 2006). Glacial drift deposits have been recorded in the eastern half of the site during site investigation, although the published geological maps did not indicate superficial deposits in the vicinity of the site. Glacial deposits of boulder clay, sands and gravels are recorded in the wider area (BGS, 1975). The sandstone and glacial drift is overlain by varying thicknesses of made ground associated with the development of the site as a carpark, previous buildings and leveling activities (Crossfield Consulting, 2006).

5.0 LEGISLATION AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

5.1 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

Scheduled Monuments are designated by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport on the advice of English Heritage as selective examples of nationally important archaeological remains. Under the terms of Part 1 Section 2 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 it is an offence to damage, disturb or alter a Scheduled Monument either above or below ground without first obtaining permission from the Secretary of State. This Act does not allow for the protection of the setting of Scheduled Monuments.

5.2 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

The Act outlines the provisions for designation, control of works and enforcement measures relating to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. Section 66 of the Act states that the planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of any Listed Building that may be affected by the grant of planning permission. Section 72 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

5.3 Planning Policy Guidance 16: Planning and Archaeology - 1990

PPG16 sets out the government's policy with respect to archaeology and planning. If development is likely to impact upon archaeological remains the guidance stresses the need for early consultation between developers and planning authorities plus the need for an archaeological assessment to be carried out early on in the process. Where nationally important remains, whether scheduled or not, and their setting are adversely affected by proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their preservation. Where important archaeological remains may exist, field evaluation can help to define the character and extent of the remains and so assist in identifying potential options for minimising or avoiding damage. In cases involving archaeological remains of lesser importance the planning authority will need to weigh the relative importance of the archaeology against other factors, including the need for the proposed development. Where it is not feasible to preserve remains, an acceptable alternative may be to arrange prior excavation and recording of archaeological remains and the publication of the results by means of granting planning permission subject to a negative condition.

5.4 Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning and the Historic Environment - 1994

PPG15 emphasises the importance that the Government gives to preserving and enhancing Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and their settings and other aspects of the historic environment including Registered Parks and Gardens, World Heritage Sites and the wider historic landscape.

5.5 Other Policy and Guidance

The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (2006) contains one policy relevant to cultural heritage. Policy EM1 states the need for policies and plans to protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment and encourage conservation led regeneration.

The Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Local Plan (adopted 2002) contains numerous policies relating to heritage that have been 'saved' under the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. These include:

- ENV13 Development within Conservation Areas
- ENV15 Conservation of Listed Buildings and their settings
- ENV16 Non-Listed Buildings and Structures of Architectural and Historic Interest
- ENV17 Sites of Special Archaeological Interest

The Neston Conservation Area Appraisal (2001) forms a Supplementary Planning Document and is a consideration within the planning process. It does not contain specific recommendations but supports policy ENV13 in the Local Plan.

6.0 **CONSULTATION**

Consultation was undertaken with the Cheshire County Historic Environment Record, English Heritage and Cheshire Archives and Local Studies Service for the provision of data for this report. Further consultation was undertaken with Mark Leah, Cheshire County Council regarding the proposed development, its impact upon cultural heritage and mitigation strategies in their role as Archaeological Advisor to the local planning authority. The comments from these consultations are included in the report where relevant and appropriate.

7.0 **BASELINE DATA**

7.1 **Listed Buildings**

There are 28 Listed Buildings within a 1km radius of the proposed development site, however due to the urban character of the area these buildings will not have their setting impacted due to the intervening built landscape. Within a 250m radius of the site there are eighteen Listed Buildings, however these are also sufficiently screened by the built landscape that they will not be impacted. These buildings are largely residential and are Grade II Listed, with the exception of St Mary's and St Helen's Church which is Grade II* Listed. A complete table of Listed Buildings is included in Appendix D and their locations are shown on Figure 01.

7.2 **Scheduled Monuments, Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and ancient woodland.**

Within a 1km radius of the proposed development site there are no recorded Scheduled Monuments, Registered Battlefields, Registered Parks and Gardens or ancient woodland.

7.3 **Conservation Areas**

The Neston Conservation Area lies to the west of the proposed development site and abuts the site boundary. The Conservation Area encompasses the medieval layout of the town of Neston although the church is the only extant medieval building. The majority of the built heritage dates to the expansion of the town in the 18th and 19th centuries as a transshipment port for Chester. The extent of the Conservation Area can be seen on Figure 02.

The Parkgate Conservation Area lies just outside of the study area to the north-west.

7.4 **Archaeological and Historic Background**

The NMR holds records for fourteen archaeological sites and the HER holds records for an additional six sites. Details of these sites can be seen in Appendix D and their locations can be seen on Figure 02. The archaeological and historical background for the town of Neston has been examined in detail for the Cheshire Historic Town Survey (Devine and Clark, 2003). The results of the survey are summarised here to provide context to this assessment. Additional information was obtained from the Neston Market Town Initiative and Neston Civic Society websites.

7.4.1 **Prehistoric (up to 43AD)**

There has been no evidence of prehistoric activity recorded in the Neston area. It is unclear whether the dearth of recorded sites indicate a presence below archaeologically visible levels, a lack of archaeologically monitored development, or a genuine absence of prehistoric activity.

7.4.2 **Roman/Romano British (43AD to c.450AD)**

The recorded sites of Roman date within the study area are restricted to isolated findspots of material (Devine and Clark, 2003; Ordnance Survey 1994). There is no evidence for settlement within the area and therefore these finds are likely to represent accidental losses from people travelling through the area. The findspots include several coins and some pottery. A Roman road

has been postulated to run from Chester to Meols through Neston, however this has not been substantiated and therefore remains supposition (Devine and Clark, 2003).

7.4.3 The Early Medieval Period (c.450AD to 1066AD)

The only direct evidence of early medieval settlement in the region is in the form of several fragments of early medieval stone crosses held in the Church of St Helen and St Mary. The findspots of these crosses are unknown but it is considered likely that they were found in the vicinity of the church. They are of a form which is relatively common along the coast between Anglesey and Cumbria and have often been associated with Viking settlement.

There is indirect evidence of early medieval settlement. The Domesday Book (1086) records that there was a priest at Neston and that the parish was relatively large with eight townships. This has been used to suggest that Neston may have been an ecclesiastical centre in the early medieval period. In addition to this the limited areas of taxable land which are recorded may also indicate ecclesiastical exemption (Devine and Clark, 2003).

The place-name Neston is also derived from Old English indicating early medieval origins for the town. Nes- is derived from the Anglo-Saxon word for headland which was *nesse* or *naze*. -ton is a typical ending for a township (Peerson, 1985).

The historic town assessment for Neston has estimated the potential extent of early medieval settlement within the town (Devine and Clark, 2003). This extent is focused around the church of St Helen and St Mary and is bounded by the High Street to the east and Church Lane to the west.

7.4.4 Medieval Period (1066 AD to c.1540AD)

St Helen and St Mary's Church was founded in 1140 and was recorded in the chronicles of St Werburgh's Abbey. It is unclear if this church was built on the site of the anticipated early medieval church. Although the present church dates largely from the 19th century, the 15th century tower, which also contains Norman masonry fragments, has been retained. These are the only physical medieval remains in the town.

The morphology and layout of the town indicates that there was medieval settlement within the centre of the town, however none of the buildings survive. Post-medieval mapping shows a layout which indicates medieval burbage plots were present along the line of the modern High Street extending eastwards into the proposed development site. It is also probable given the predicted size of the town that there was a market place, although Neston was not given a charter to hold a market until 1727 (Devine and Clark, 2003).

Documentary evidence records ships anchoring off Neston during the war between Wales and England in the 1180s. Chester customs accounts also document cargo ships anchoring off Neston in the 14th and 15th centuries. The wharf is likely to have been to the south-west of the town. This is where the later post-medieval port developed (Devine and Clarke, 2003). The coastline at this time would have looked substantially different and ships would have been able to sail and anchor in this area of the estuary which has now silted up.

The primary industry in the area is likely to have been agriculture and the historic landscape characterisation for the area indicates isolated evidence of pre-enclosure field systems to the east of the study area. Most medieval agricultural remains are likely to have been removed by later post-medieval and modern agriculture or development.

7.4.5 Post Medieval (c.1540AD to 1900AD) and Modern (1900AD to present)

The parish remained largely manorial until 1849. The Mostyn family had acquired the estate in 1672 until it was split and sold in 1849. Neston's development as a port and town meant that it went through numerous phases of rebuilding to demonstrate its prosperity. The earliest remaining structures in the town are dated to the mid 18th century. Neston established itself in the mid 16th century as a port when due to the silting of the River Dee larger ships could no longer reach Chester. Construction on the quay started in the 1540s, however it was not until the turn of the

century that it was completed. It became the principle departure point for Ireland and developed coaching links to the rest of the country. Much of the cargo landed here was then loaded onto smaller boats to be taken to Chester.

Gradual silting up of the river led to the port activities transferring to Parkgate from the mid 18th century. Parkgate was also developed as a fashionable tourist resort during this period. Both tourism and shipping went into decline from the early 19th century due to the continued silting of the river, accelerated by canalisation works in the south of the estuary (Devine and Clark, 2003)..

The industrial industries in Neston were also important in its growth. The area which is now marshland to the west of the town was the industrial hub of the area. Industries included brickworks, tileworks, metal smelting, limeworks and collieries. The first mine opened in 1759 and a subsequent mine in 1819. These mines thrived until the mid nineteenth century when they closed due to the most accessible coal having been worked. A further colliery opened in 1870 and continued in use until the 1920s when it closed due to competition from larger mines in the region.

The proximity to the coast made transportation for industry easy and hence aided development until the silting up of the River Dee forced industries to turn to rail transport as an alternative. Several railways were built although only the mainline through Neston remains and the branch railways have been dismantled.

The growth of Neston continued in the modern period. The urban area of the town expanded and subsumed the outlying areas of Parkgate, Ness, Little Neston and Denhall. The expansion has included residential development, associated amenities and industrial complexes. There are few sites of historical interest recorded within the area with the exception of defence remains such as pillboxes from the Second World War homeland defences.

The Morris and Kelly's Directory entries from 1874 to 1939 recorded a number of different trades and professions practiced by people resident in Brook Street and Raby Road. These included farmer, coal merchants, builders, a motor garage, a nurse, an Inland Revenue officer and a piano teacher.

8.0 HISTORIC MAPPING SURVEY

Extracts of selected historic maps can be seen in Appendix E. The earliest map examined for the Neston area is Saxton's Map of the County of Cheshire dated 1577. The map shows the headland, named *The Newkeye*, which was the site of the port of Neston. The map does not show the town of development site in detail, however a church is depicted. Speed's map of 1662 also shows the headland and a church, but again does not depict the site in detail.

The first mapping examined to depict the site in detail is an estate map from the Mostyn estate dated 1732. There were buildings fronting the High Street and along Brook Street. Raby Road appears to have been a very minor road at this time, however there are buildings fronting the alignment. Several boundaries bisected the western half of the site, particularly in the south-western corner. There were also at least two buildings set back from the street frontages within where the proposed development site boundary is anticipated to be. The eastern half of the site was not shown, however it appeared that boundaries from the western half extended into the eastern portion of the site in an east-west orientation. A map dated 1772 to depict land belonging to the River Dee Company between Chester and Parkgate does not show the town in detail. It is considered that the church surrounded by houses is representational rather than accurate.

The Great Neston Tith map (1847) is the first mapping of the site which appears to have been based upon measured survey. The High Street, Brook Street and Raby Road have buildings along their frontages to the west. The western half of site contains little detail and it is possible that this area was exempt from tithes and therefore not mapped. The eastern half of the site was sub-divided into four fields aligned east-west. Neston remained in this period centred around the High Street and Park Street and the surrounding area was mainly agricultural fields.

A map was produced to accompany the sales particulars for the sale of the Mostyn estate in 1849. The majority of buildings within the proposed development site were in the same location as those depicted on the tithe map, although there were a small number of additional buildings in the south of the site. The sales particulars indicate that the buildings are mainly houses with associated gardens, however they also record a public house, bakehouse, druggists shop, stables and barns.

The first edition Ordnance Survey mapping (1881) demonstrates an increase in buildings both within the development site and the town as a whole. The buildings to the south of the site appear to be in the same locations as those depicted on the tithe map, although a greater degree of detail and sub-division was recorded. The High Street frontage and buildings to the rear of these, are largely located just to the west of the proposed development site boundary. The buildings include a Drill Hall, hotel, post office and public house. The central area of the site is largely given over to gardens and the east of the site remained in agricultural use.

The 1899 Ordnance Survey map depicts numerous changes to the site and its surrounding area. Many of the buildings around the site on Brook Street, Raby Road and the High Street had been rebuilt and their extent increased by this period. The Drill Hall had been replaced by the Town Hall and the hotel had also been replaced. The railway bounding the east of the proposed development site had also been built by this period.

There were few changes to the proposed development site by the time of the 1912 Ordnance Survey map. The town itself had continued to grow, however it had not expanded significantly by this period. The site had been converted to car parking by the time the 1979 Ordnance Survey mapping was published.

9.0 WALKOVER SURVEY

A site walkover survey was undertaken on 7th February 2008. Photographs of the site can be seen in Appendix C. The weather conditions were overcast but dry. This site is largely under hard standing and the majority of the site is in use as a car park. The site slopes from the west to the east and south. This change in height is generally gradual across the site, with the exception of the area of buildings to the rear of the Town Hall where there is a distinct break of slope between that level and the car park, and the south-east corner of site where the recycling area is located and Brook Street.

The public toilets, substation and two buildings in use as offices are of modern date and are not of historic interest. Surrounding these buildings are areas of hardstanding, car parking and a small garden area.

The wall bisecting the car park into the north-east and south-west portions contains at least two phases of building. Efforts have been made to match the later phases to the earlier ones. The wall is not considered to be of historic interest.

The area of gardens to the south-west corner of the site was inaccessible and therefore could not be surveyed. The wall dividing this portion of the site from the car park appear to be of post-medieval date. Its location correlates with a wall shown on the first edition Ordnance Survey mapping and therefore may predate 1881.

Outside of the proposed development site the surrounding area is largely composed of residential and commercial properties. These are of mixed historic interest. The buildings and townscape of historic interest is located to the west of the site and is focussed on the High Street and The Cross. The buildings along Raby Road and Brook Street are of negligible historic townscape value.

Belmont Cottage on Brook Street was identified as a possible candidate for Listing, however a review by English heritage did not support this view. It is currently shuttered and the surrounding yard is in use as a Council storage yard. It is of local interest only and of low heritage value.

10.0 GEOENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION RESULTS

Geoenvironmental site investigations were undertaken by Crossfield Consulting Ltd in August 2006 (Crossfield Consulting, 2006) and the results are summarised here. Within the boundary of the proposed development eleven window samples were excavated and four dynamic probe tests were undertaken.

The investigations generally recorded made ground (or topsoil in landscaped areas), overlying glacial drift deposits of sand and clays, which in turn overlay Sherwood sandstone deposits. Window Samples 8 and 8a in the south-west area of the lower car park could not be fully excavated due to concrete obstructions. The depth of made ground across the site varies from 0.25m to 0.9m with the depth generally being about 0.7m. The shallowest depth of made ground is in the northern portion of the site in the area currently amenity grassland.

The investigations were not archaeologically monitored and therefore 'made ground' can not automatically be ascribed a modern interpretation. The descriptions of made ground describe inclusions of brick, coal and clinker, indicating that the made ground is of modern or late post-medieval origin and is likely to be the remains of foundations or demolition layers from previous buildings on the site. The width of the window sample borehole was 0.1m and therefore features and deposits of archaeological interest would not have been recorded during these excavations.

11.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT

There are no recorded cultural heritage sites within the proposed development site. Analysis of historic mapping has indicated that a number of potential features may be present within the site boundary. These features include the relict remains of medieval burbage plots running east from the High Street into the site and a number of buildings of post-medieval date within the central, southern area of the site.

An Area of Archaeological Potential has been designated within the town centre of Neston (Cheshire County Council and English Heritage, 2003). This Area of Archaeological Potential has been designated on the basis of anticipated archaeological remains, particularly of medieval date and represents the anticipated medieval core of the town. The linear burbage plots running at right angles from the High Street into the proposed development site have been identified as a primary characteristic. This Area of Archaeological Potential encompasses part of the proposed development.

To aid the assessment of potential and gauge the magnitude of impact across the site a figure showing archaeological zones had been developed (Figure 07). This figure was developed by overlying modern mapping, historic mapping, the Area of Archaeological Potential and the proposed development. The figures generated from this process can be seen in Appendix F (Figures 03-06). It should be noted that there is a degree of inaccuracy in the overlaying of modern information with historical maps. This is due partly to the accuracy of the historical map surveys and the subsequent distortion of the map during copying and scanning. The map to accompany the sales particulars could not be overlain due to the very high level of distortion created by the tear in the map across the site.

These overlays were then used to determine areas which are likely to have been substantially disturbed or truncated by late post-medieval and modern development, areas of archaeological potential that are subject to minimal development impacts and areas of archaeological potential subject to significant development impacts. Figure 07 can be seen in Appendix F.

The identified zones are described in the table below. The cultural heritage values ascribed are based upon the predicted extent of survival. These values may change as further evidence becomes available.

There will be no impact upon Listed Buildings, the Conservation Area or their settings as a result of the proposed development. The Listed Buildings and Conservation Area are sufficiently screened from the proposed development by the existing built landscape. The height of the

proposed development means that it will not significantly alter the skyline in the town or impact upon the setting of the tower of St Mary and St Helen's Church.

Zones of Archaeological Potential and Impact

Zone	Colour on Fig 07	Zone History	Archaeological Potential	Proposed Development	Cultural Heritage Value	Potential Magnitude of Impact	Potential Significance of Effect
1a	Blue	1732 – One building within area, the remainder open ground to rear of buildings fronting High Street. 1847 – Open ground and linear plots to rear of buildings fronting High Street. 1881 – West of zone partially occupied by buildings to rear of High Street frontage. East of zone partially occupied by gardens. 1899 – Two small buildings to south of Town Hall, the rest open ground. Extant – All previously mapped buildings have been demolished. Two buildings to rear/south of Town Hall, public toilets, substation, garden and car parking.	Located within Area of Archaeological Potential. Significant potential for medieval and early post-medieval settlement remains. Slight possibility for early medieval remains. This area is considered likely to have been substantially disturbed by the late post-medieval and modern buildings and their associated services. Any stratified archaeological remains were likely to be shallow given the shallow depth of underlying geology. If features were cut into the sandstone these may remain.	The west of the zone lies within the proposed development area of the market place. Construction impacts in this area are anticipated to be minimal and limited to removal of existing ground surfaces, grading of levels, including import of material and replacement of ground surfaces with new materials.	Low to Negligible.	Slight Negative	Minor Adverse
				The east of the zone lies within the proposed footprint of the underground car park. Deep excavation will therefore be required in this area resulting in complete removal of all remains.	Low to Negligible	Substantial Negative	Intermediate Adverse
1b	Blue	1732 – Buildings front Brook Street and one building set back from street frontage. 1847 – Three buildings fronting Brook Street and two buildings to the rear extending into the site. 1881 – Buildings fronting Brook Street to east have gone. Several building fronting Brook Street to west and several buildings built away from street frontage extending into central portion of the site. 1899 – Buildings fronting Brook Street built. Extant – All previously mapped buildings have been demolished.	Located within Area of Archaeological Potential. Significant potential for medieval and early post-medieval settlement remains. Slight possibility for early medieval remains. This area is considered likely to have been substantially disturbed by the late post-medieval services. There is the potential that pockets of archaeological remains may have survived within in the open areas, such as yards, between buildings. Any stratified archaeological remains were likely to be shallow given the shallow depth of underlying geology. If features were cut into the sandstone these may remain.	The majority of the zone lies within the proposed footprint of the underground car park. Deep excavation will therefore be required in this area resulting in complete removal of all remains. Some limited areas lie within the area of the market place and therefore construction impacts in this area are anticipated to be minimal.	Low to Negligible	Substantial Negative	Intermediate Adverse
2	Red	1732 – Zone bisected by boundaries of uncertain nature. 1847 - Open ground and linear plots to rear of buildings fronting High Street. 1881 – Area shown as gardens. Bisected by several boundaries. 1899 – Area remains undeveloped. No longer shown as gardens. Extant – West is within undeveloped wasteground/garden area. East is utilised for car parking. Bisected by wall and overlain by ramp to rear of Town Hall.	Located within Area of Archaeological Potential. Significant potential for medieval and early post-medieval settlement remains. Slight possibility for early medieval remains. Any stratified archaeological remains are likely to be shallow given the shallow depth of underlying geology. If features were cut into the sandstone these will remain. Post-medieval garden features and boundaries may cut medieval features.	The zone lies within the proposed development area of the market place. Construction impacts in this area are anticipated to be minimal and limited to removal of existing ground surfaces, grading of levels and replacement of ground surfaces with new materials. There will be some building up of the existing ground level to provide a shallow gradient between the rear of the Town Hall and Brook Street which will retain their existing levels.	Medium	Slight Negative to Negligible	Minor Adverse
3	Sea Green	1732 – Area probably off edge of map. Boundaries appear to continue east into this zone. 1847 – Zone partially open and partially subdivided by field boundaries. 1881 – Area shown as gardens. 1899 – North of zone no longer gardens. 1912 – Single building in centre of zone. Extant – Zone utilised for car parking bisected by wall running N-S.	Located within Area of Archaeological Potential. Significant potential for medieval and early post-medieval settlement remains. Slight possibility for early medieval remains. Any stratified archaeological remains are likely to be shallow given the shallow depth of underlying geology. If features were cut into the sandstone these will remain. Single building may have impacted upon remains in that isolated area.	The zone lies within the proposed footprint of the underground car park. Deep excavation will therefore be required in this area resulting in complete removal of all remains.	Medium	Substantial Negative	Intermediate Adverse
4	Bright Green	1847 – Zone subdivided by field boundaries. 1881 – Majority fields with gardens at far west. Two isolated buildings in south. 1899 – Area constrained by railway. Gardens no	Located outside of Area of Archaeological Potential. Some potential does remain for discovering previously unrecorded archaeological sites. These are most likely to be sites of early	The zone lies within the proposed footprint of the underground car park. Deep excavation will therefore be required in this area resulting in complete removal of all remains.	Medium to Low	Substantial Negative	Intermediate Adverse

Zone	Colour on Fig 07	Zone History	Archaeological Potential	Proposed Development	Cultural Heritage Value	Potential Magnitude of Impact	Potential Significance of Effect
		longer extant. Extant – Area fully utilised for car parking. Bisected by wall forming entrance to car park from Brook Street.	medieval, medieval or early post-medieval date, which are associated with the support functions for the town e.g. agricultural remains, middens etc.				
5a and 5b	Yellow	1847 and 1881 – Within fields 1899 – Area constrained by railway. Open ground. Extant – Area fully utilised for car parking.	Located outside of Area of Archaeological Potential. Some potential does remain for discovering previously unrecorded archaeological sites. These are most likely to be sites of early medieval, medieval or early post-medieval date, which are associated with the support functions for the town e.g. agricultural remains, middens etc.	These areas are proposed to be at the present ground level Construction impacts in this area are anticipated to be minimal and limited to removal of existing ground surfaces, grading of levels and replacement of ground surfaces with new materials.	Medium to Low	Slight Negative	Minor Adverse

12.0 **EVALUATION AND MITIGATION**

During the schemes development certain mitigation measures have been incorporated into the scheme design, the scheme description and the landscape design. In these cases, this mitigation is known as primary mitigation and is a result of avoidance through design. Therefore, information provided in the development description or construction method statement which will result in avoidance of impacts have been taken into consideration in the initial impact assessment. For this project these measures relate to the integration of the proposed development with the surrounding townscape and Conservation Area.

Consultation with Mark Leah at Cheshire County Council was undertaken regarding evaluation and mitigation strategies. Mr Leah indicated that they would consider an evaluation of 5% of the Area of Archaeological Potential (Zones 1, 2 and 3) to be sufficiently detailed to allow informed mitigation decisions to be made within this area. This equates to approximately 94 linear metres of evaluation trenches of 2m width.

Within Zones 4 and 5 evaluation excavations would be required if possible, to allow informed mitigation strategy decisions to be made. It was accepted however that the existing car park and its use as the market place did place logistical constraints on undertaking additional evaluation.

The following evaluation strategy has been proposed based upon the results of this desk-based assessment and consultation, as the first stage in a phased evaluation and mitigation strategy for the proposed development site. This first phase of evaluation should be undertaken prior to the determination of planning permission, allowing informed decisions regarding the final mitigation strategy to be undertaken and appropriate conditions attached to the planning permission.

The trench locations and alignments proposed below are suggested to maximise the amount of archaeological information that may be obtained from the evaluation. It is anticipated that all evaluation trenches would be at least 2m in width. These locations are not fixed and the final locations and alignment of the evaluation excavation trenches should be determined in consultation with Mr Leah at Cheshire County Council. The evaluation should be subject to a Written Scheme of Investigation prepared and agreed in advance of any site works with Mr Leah. The evaluation excavations should be designed and undertaken in a manner to minimise disruption to the existing car park and markets days as far as practicably possible.

Zone 1

Archaeological evaluation excavations should be undertaken in this zone to confirm and determine the extent of previous disturbance in the area. Zone 1a is where the existing buildings, toilets etc. are located. Due to the constraints of the existing buildings a trench located in this area are likely to be relatively small (maximum 10m length) and located in the area of hardstanding to the rear of the Town Hall and Post Office. It may not be possible to undertake evaluation in this area until clearance of the existing buildings. Zone 1b is currently in use as car parking. A trench aligned east-west parallel with southern boundary of approximately 15m length should yield sufficient information to determine the extent of disturbance in this area.

Zone 2

Evaluation excavation should be undertaken in this area to confirm the extent of made ground overlying archaeological deposits and the extent, form, depth and period of archaeological deposits present. Evaluation should be undertaken on both sides of the wall dividing the garden areas from the car park. It is anticipated that a maximum trench size of 10m would be excavated within the garden area.

Zone 3

Evaluation excavations should be undertaken across this area to determine the extent, character, depth and survival of archaeological remains. This area is in use as car parking and is divided by the wall running NW-SE. The area to the south-west of the wall may be best evaluated using a T-shaped trench with each line 15-20m in length (this may also partially

encompass Zone 2). The area to the north east of the wall should be evaluated with a trench running NW-SE of approximately 20m length (this will also partially encompass part of Zone 4). A small evaluation trench (approximately 10m) within the garden area in the north of Zone 3 should also be considered to determine the extent of preservation in this area.

Zone 4

Archaeological evaluation excavations should be undertaken across this area to determine whether archaeological remains are present. It is recommended that trenches are excavated in the northern and southern portions of the car park block. These should be staggered so that one is in the northern portion of the car park block and one in the southern portion.

Zone 5

Archaeological evaluation excavations should be undertaken across this area to determine whether archaeological remains are present. These evaluation excavations may be incorporated into the trenches excavated for Zone 4 evaluation.

The results of these evaluation excavations will be used to inform the requirement for further archaeological survey or a detailed mitigation strategy for the site. Preservation *in situ* should be the preferable mitigation option in line with PPG16, however it is recognised that significant re-design of the proposed development is not feasible at this stage. Consideration should be given to minor design alterations that could be easily incorporated into the scheme if the opportunity arises.

Alternative mitigation and further evaluation strategies may be employed where preservation *in situ* is not feasible. These may include, but not be limited to, the following options:

- Open area excavation – open area excavation in advance of development may be required where evaluation excavation indicate that archaeological remains of sufficient importance and integrity are present within the site. These remains would have the potential to contribute to the regional and local research objectives of the region. The extent of the open area excavation and excavation strategy would be dependent upon the results of the evaluation. The excavation area is likely to be limited to targeted regions of the highest potential and the extent of excavation may include 100% excavation and/or a percentage sample of features.
- Watching brief – this may result from the evaluation excavations demonstrating that whilst archaeological remains survive, their value is not considered to warrant full excavation. The watching brief would target areas which are considered likely yield archaeological remains of a quality sufficient allow meaningful interpretation. A watching brief may also be required if archaeological evaluation can not be undertaken across the site.
- No further archaeological work required – this may result from the evaluation excavations demonstrating that the archaeological resource has been disturbed or truncated sufficiently that little of archaeological value remains. Areas outside the Area of Archaeological Potential which are evaluated are appear to be ‘archaeologically blank’ may also be classed in this category.

Any archaeological work for evaluation or mitigation should be undertaken in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation, agreed in advance with the Cheshire County Council Historic Environment Department and following Institute of Field Archaeologists Standards and Guidance.

13.0 RESIDUAL IMPACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The residual impacts of the proposed development upon the cultural heritage of the site can not be accurately predicted at the current stage. The following assessment is based on existing knowledge and anticipated evaluation and mitigation strategies to be adopted prior to and during development. The confidence level of assessment will be improved after the completion of the first phase of the evaluation strategy.

The residual impacts of the development upon key aspects of cultural heritage are summarised in the table below.

The overall residual significance of effect of the proposed development is considered to be **minor adverse** based on current knowledge.

Residual Impacts Upon Cultural Heritage

Cultural Heritage Feature	Value	Initial Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation	Residual Magnitude of Impact	Residual Significance of Effect	Confidence
Listed Buildings and Conservation Area	High to Medium	No impact	None	No impact	Neutral	High
Area of Archaeological Potential - Zone 1a west	Low to Negligible	Slight Negative	Evaluation excavation in first instance. Mitigation strategy appropriate to results.	Negligible Negative	Neutral	Low
Area of Archaeological Potential - Zone 1a east	Low to Negligible	Substantial Negative	Evaluation excavation in first instance. Mitigation strategy appropriate to results.	Slight Negative	Neutral	Low
Area of Archaeological Potential - Zone 1b	Low to Negligible	Substantial Negative	Evaluation excavation in first instance. Mitigation strategy appropriate to results.	Slight Negative	Neutral	Low
Area of Archaeological Potential - Zone 2	Medium	Slight Negative to Negligible	Evaluation excavation in first instance. Mitigation strategy appropriate to results.	Negligible Negative	Neutral	Low
Area of Archaeological Potential - Zone 3	Medium	Substantial Negative	Evaluation excavation in first instance. Mitigation strategy appropriate to results.	Slight Negative	Minor Adverse	Low
Previously unrecorded archaeological remains - Zone 4	Medium to Low	Substantial Negative	Evaluation excavation in first instance. Mitigation strategy appropriate to results.	Slight Negative	Minor Adverse	Low
Previously unrecorded archaeological remains - Zone 5a and 5b	Medium to Low	Slight Negative	Evaluation excavation in first instance. Mitigation strategy appropriate to results.	Negligible Negative	Neutral	Low

14.0 REFERENCES

- British Geological Survey (1975) *Liverpool Sheet 96. Drift Edition.*
- Cheshire County Council and English Heritage (2003) *Cheshire Historic Towns Survey. Neston and Parkgate. Archaeological Strategy.* Cheshire County Council and English Heritage
- Cheshire County Council (1992) *Great Neston Township Pack No. 35*
- Crossfield Consulting Ltd (2006) *Brook Street Neston, Site Investigation Report.* Unpublished report.
- Devine and Clark (2003) *Cheshire Historic Towns Survey. Neston. Archaeological Assessment.* Cheshire County Council and English Heritage.
- DoE (1990) Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 Archaeology and Planning.
- DoE (1994) Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 Planning and the Historic Environment.
- Harris BE and Thacker AT (1987) *Victoria County History Volume 1: Chester*
- HMSO (1979) Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act.
- HMSO (1990) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act.
- Kelly Directory entries for Neston. 1892, 1914 and 1939. Within the Great Neston Township Pack.
- Multi Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (www.magic.gov.uk). Accessed February 2007.
- Peerson, J. (1985) *Neston and Parkgate.* Birkenhead: Countrywise
- <http://www.neston.org.uk/history/> Accessed February 2008.
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neston,_Cheshire Accessed February 2008.
- http://www.nestoncivicsociety.org.uk/about_neston.htm Accessed February 2008.
- Historic Mapping*
- Saxton (1577) Map of Cheshire CRO PM 12/10
- Speed (1662) Map of Cheshire CRO PM 1/11
- Mostyn Estate Map (1732)
- Boydell (1772) Lands and premises belonging to River Dee Company between Chester and Parkgate CRO PM 11/7
- Great Neston Tithe Map (1847) EDT 176/2 and Apportionment (1847) EDT 176/1
- Sales Particulars and Plans of Neston Estate (1849) D5232/7
- Ordnance Survey Mapping 25" to 1mile 1881, 1899, 1912 and 1979

APPENDIX A

Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Methodology

Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Methodology

No standard method of evaluation and assessment is provided for the assessment of significance of effects upon cultural heritage, therefore a set of evaluation and assessment criteria have been developed using a combination of the Secretary of State's criteria for Scheduling Monuments (PPG16, Annex 3), Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Part 3, Section 2, HA 208/07 and Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG Unit 3.3.9, Heritage of Historic Resources Sub-Objective). Professional judgement is used in conjunction with these criteria to undertake the impact assessment.

Value

The table below provides guidance on the assessment of cultural heritage value on all archaeological sites and monuments, historic buildings, historic landscapes and other types of historical site such as battlefields, parks and gardens, not just those that are statutorily designated.

Value	Examples
Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ World Heritage Sites ▪ Assets of acknowledged international importance or can contribute to international research objectives ▪ Historic landscapes and townscapes of international sensitivity, whether designated or not or extremely well preserved historic landscapes and townscapes with exceptional coherence, integrity, time-depth, or other critical factor(s)
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scheduled Monuments ▪ Undesignated assets of national quality and importance or than can contribute to national research objectives ▪ Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings ▪ Other listed buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association not adequately reflected in the listing grade ▪ Conservation Areas containing very important buildings ▪ Designated & undesignated historic landscapes and townscapes of outstanding interest, quality and importance and of demonstrable national sensitivity or well preserved and exhibiting considerable coherence, integrity time-depth or other critical factor(s)
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Designated or undesignated assets of regional quality and importance that contribute to regional research objectives ▪ Grade II Listed Buildings ▪ Historic (unlisted) buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association ▪ Other Conservation Areas ▪ Designated or undesignated special historic landscapes and townscapes with regional sensitivity or with reasonable coherence, integrity, time-depth or other critical factor(s) ▪ Assets that form an important resource within the community, for educational or recreational purposes.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Undesignated assets of local importance ▪ Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations but with potential to contribute to local research objectives. ▪ 'Locally Listed' buildings or historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association ▪ Historic landscapes and townscapes with specific and substantial importance to local interest groups, but with limited sensitivity or whose sensitivity is limited by poor preservation, historic integrity and/or poor survival of contextual associations. ▪ Assets that form a resource within the community with occasional utilisation for educational or recreational purposes.
Negligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assets with very little or no surviving cultural heritage interest. ▪ Buildings of no architectural or historical note. ▪ Landscapes and townscapes that are badly fragmented and the contextual associations are severely compromised or have little or no historical interest.

Magnitude

The magnitude of the potential impact is assessed for each site or feature independently of its archaeological or historical value. Magnitude is determined by considering the predicted deviation from baseline conditions. The magnitude of impact categories are adapted from the Transport Assessment Guidance (TAG Unit 3.3.9) and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Part 3, Section 2, HA 208/07.

Magnitude of Impact	Typical criteria descriptors
Substantial	<p>Loss of asset and/or quality and integrity; severe damage to key characteristic features or elements. Almost complete loss of setting and/or context of the asset. (Negative)</p> <p>The proposals would remove or successfully mitigate existing damaging and discordant impacts on assets; or allow for the restoration or enhancement of characteristic features; or the re-establishment of the integrity, understanding and sense of place for an area or group of features; or halt rapid degradation and/or erosion of the heritage resource, safeguarding substantial elements of the heritage resource. (Positive)</p>
Moderate	<p>Substantial impact on the asset, but only partially affecting the integrity. Partial loss of, or damage to, key characteristics, features or elements. Substantially intrusive into the setting and/or would adversely impact upon the context of the asset. Loss of the asset for community appreciation. (Negative)</p> <p>Benefit to, or restoration of, key characteristics, features or elements; improvement of asset quality. Degradation of the asset would be halted. The setting and/or context of the asset would be enhanced and understanding substantially improved. The asset would be bought into community use. (Positive)</p>
Slight	<p>Some measurable change in assets quality or vulnerability; minor loss of or alteration to, one (or maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements. Change to the setting would not be overly intrusive or overly diminish the context. Community use or understanding would be reduced. (Negative)</p> <p>Minor benefit to, or partial restoration of, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements; some beneficial impact on asset or a reduced risk of negative impact occurring. Slight improvements to the context or setting of the site. Community use or understanding would be enhanced. (Positive)</p>
Negligible / No Change	<p>Very minor loss or detrimental alteration to one or more characteristics, features or elements. Minor changes to the setting or context of the site. No discernible change in baseline conditions (Negative).</p> <p>Very minor benefit to or positive addition of one or more characteristics, features or elements. Minor changes to the setting or context of the site No discernible change in baseline conditions. (Positive).</p>

Impacts may be of the following nature and will be identified as such where relevant:

- Negative or Positive.
- Direct or indirect.
- Temporary or permanent.
- Short, medium or long term.
- Reversible or irreversible.
- Cumulative.

An assessment of the predicted magnitude of impact is made both prior to and after the implementation of secondary mitigation. This demonstrates the effectiveness of secondary mitigation.

Significance

By combining the value of the cultural heritage resource with the predicted magnitude of impact, the significance of the effect can be determined. This is undertaken following the table below. The significance of effects can be beneficial or adverse.

Significance of Effects	Magnitude of Impact			
	<i>Substantial impact</i>	<i>Moderate impact</i>	<i>Slight impact</i>	<i>Negligible /No impact</i>
Cultural Heritage Value				
<i>Very High</i>	Major	Major or Intermediate	Intermediate	Minor or Neutral
<i>High</i>	Major or Intermediate	Intermediate	Intermediate or Minor	Neutral
<i>Medium</i>	Intermediate	Intermediate or Minor	Minor	Neutral
<i>Low</i>	Intermediate or Minor	Minor	Minor or Neutral	Neutral
<i>Negligible</i>	Minor or Neutral	Minor or Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Where a choice of two significance of effect descriptors is available only one should be chosen. This allows for professional judgement and discrimination in assessing effects on assets. Significance should always be qualified as in certain cases an effect of minor significance could be considered to be of great importance by local residents and deserves further consideration. To aid in the assignment of significance the following significance criteria have been developed to enable effective and transparent discrimination between categories.

The significance of effect is considered both before and after secondary mitigation measures have been taken into account.

Significance of Effect	Criteria
Major	<p>These effects are considered to be very important in the decision making process. These effects are important at a national level and to statutory bodies.</p> <p>Adverse – these effects will damage or destroy cultural heritage assets, their setting or context, so that their integrity or understanding is almost wholly destroyed or is severely compromised, such that the resource can no longer be appreciated or understood. Effects will seriously conflict with national, regional and local policies. Mitigation measures may not deal appropriately with all aspects of the impact.</p> <p>Beneficial – these effects will halt rapid degradation or erosion of assets of national or regional importance, or result in significant restoration of setting and reestablishment of significance to heritage assets. Previous negative impacts may be reserved. Effects will significantly contribute to international, national, regional and local policies for the enhancement and promotion of heritage.</p>
Intermediate	<p>These effects are likely to be important to considerations, but not key factors, in the decision making process, unless cumulative effects combine to raise the overall significance. These impacts are likely to be important at a regional level and to statutory bodies.</p> <p>Adverse – these effects will damage cultural heritage assets, or their setting, so that their integrity or understanding is compromised but not destroyed. Effects will be at odds with local and regional policies for heritage. Adequate mitigation measures can be specified.</p> <p>Beneficial – these effects are likely to result in the halting of degradation or erosion of heritage assets or result in the restoration of characteristic features or setting so that understanding and appreciation is improved. Effects will positively contribute to local and regional heritage policies.</p>
Minor	<p>These effects are unlikely to be critical factors in the decision making process, but are likely to be important factors in the design of a project. These effects are important at a local level. There may be some contribution to, or variance with local heritage policies.</p> <p>Adverse – the proposals will damage cultural heritage assets, or their setting, so that their integrity or understanding is diminished but not compromised. Adequate mitigation measures can be specified.</p> <p>Beneficial – the proposals will stabilise cultural heritage assets or enhance their setting, so that their integrity is maintained or understanding is improved.</p>
Neutral	<p>No effects upon cultural heritage or the effects are negligible. There is no conflict with, or contribution to, policies for protection of heritage resources.</p>

Level of Confidence

Given that predictions can only be as accurate as the data they are based on it is important to attribute a level of confidence to which the significance of cultural heritage effects has been assessed. The table below defines the confidence levels referred to in this report.

Confidence Level	Description
High	<p>The significance of the cultural heritage effect is an informed estimate likely to be based on reliable data or subjective judgement with reference to similar schemes. Further information would not result in any change to assessment of significance.</p>
Low	<p>The significance of the cultural heritage effect is a best estimate likely to be based on subjective judgement without reference to similar schemes. Further information would be needed to confirm assessment of significance.</p>

APPENDIX B

Proposed Development Designs

APPENDIX C

Site Photographs



Photograph 1: Looking south-east across car park



Photograph 2: Looking north-east across car park



Photograph 3: Looking north-west across car park to buildings to rear of Town Hall



Photograph 4: Garden area to rear of Town Hall



Photograph 5: Old wall dividing garden areas from car park in south-west of site



Photograph 6: Belmont Cottage, Brook Street to south of site

APPENDIX D

Recorded Cultural Heritage Sites

Listed Buildings (HER and English Heritage)

Identifier	Easting	Northing	Description	Grade
475631	32969	377119	Newstead House, 14 Burton Road	II
475633	329481	3176989	Presbytery to Church of St Winefride, Burton Road	II
475645	329162	377279	Church Lane Bridge, Church Lane	II
475646	329029	377482	Holly Tree House, Church Lane	II
475647	329040	377437	Springfield, Church Lane	II
475648	329008	377441	The Hermitage, Church Lane	II
475655	329236	377439	Church House Chambers, High Street	II
475657	329150	377442	Church of St Mary and St Helen	II*
475658	329134	377420	Churchyard Sundial west of Church of St Mary and St Helen	II
475659	329117	377449	Hearse House north west of Church of St Mary and St Helen	II
475660	329123	377631	The Barn, High Street	II
475663	328896	377968	Old Windmill, Leighton Road	II
475675	328999	377558	Sea View, 2 Mill Street	II
475676	328530	377495	Moor End, Moorside Lane	II
475677	328524	377482	Spring Vale, Moorside Lane	II
475691	329099	377508	The Greenland Fishery Hotel, 1 and 2 Parkgate Road	II
475694	329108	377526	The Tower, 2 Parkgate Road	II
475695	329103	3377524	Old Bank House and attached gateway at left 4,6 and 6a Parkgate Road	II
475696	329011	377555	Vine House, 26 Parkgate Road	II
475697	329041	377569	Garden Walls of Vine House, Parkgate Road	II
475698	329010	3377576	Outbuildings of Vine House, Parkgate Road	II

475699	328901	377594	Beech House, 36 Parkgate Road	II
475700	328851	377607	Numbers 1 and 2 Elm Grove House, 44 Parkgate Road	II
475701	328864	377600	Elmhurst, Parkgate Road	II
475702	329080	377527	Gittins Building, Parkgate Road	II
475703	328787	377611	Moorside House and attached railings, Parkgate Road	II*
475704	328698	377652	The Manse, 59 Parkgate Road	II
475792	328775	377563	Barn End, Village Street	II
475834	329930	376714	The Rocklands, Woodfall Lane	II

Recorded Cultural Heritage Sites (NMR and HER)

Site Number	Easting	Northing	Period	Description
37	329000	377600	Post-Medieval	Large amount of post-medieval pottery found in an old well including the rims, bases and body sherds of a slipware mug and dishes, iron-glazed pancheons and storage jars.
46	329500	378400	Post-Medieval	Brewhouse Croft. Place name from the tithe award for Great Neston indicates a brewhouse in this location.
47	328900	378100	Post-Medieval	Site of a windmill shown on maps of 1777, 1819, 1830 and 1831.
2/1/2	329150	377440	Early Medieval	Neston Crosses. Group of five late Saxon crosses. They are decorated and include the figure of a priest, two figures fighting with daggers and quarupeds as well as typical decorative motifs.
4365	329220	377410	Post-Medieval	Brewery marked on the first edition OS mapping.
30/3	328820	376900	Post-Medieval	Denna Colliery Railway Link was built between the Wirral Colliery (Denna/Denhall Colliery) and Birkenhead railway after the silting up of the estuary.
UID66171	328780	377610	Post-Medieval	Moorside House. Early 18th century.

Site Number	Easting	Northing	Period	Description
UID1420659	328340	377860	Modern	Hexagonal World War II concrete pillbox. It was constructed in the period 1940 to 1941 and seen in a fair condition during field visits in 1995. The type 24 pillbox is situated on the south side of Parkgate Road between Parkgate and Neston. It is covering
UID1370541	328628	382187	Post-Medieval	The Birkenhead and Connah's Quay Railway opened from Hawarden Bridge to Bidston, Dee Junction in 1896. It took the name of the North Wales and Liverpool Railway in August 1896 and was absorbed by the Grand Central Railway in 1905.
UID66268	324811	382581	Post-Medieval	Disused railway between Parkgate and West Kirby, opened in 1886 and closed in 1962.
UID1370561	331682	377212	Post-Medieval	The Parkgate Railway opened as a single track railway between Hooton and Parkgate in 1866. Closed in 1962.
UID500163	329721	377299	Post-Medieval	Site of Neston South railway station on the Parkgate Railway, opened in 1866, closed to passengers in 1956 and closed entirely in 1962.
UID1319948	328400	377900	Modern	Second World War Type 24 pillbox.
UID66163	329500	377500	Roman	In April 1866 a number of Roman silver and copper coins were found near Neston, beneath the roots, by some men who were stubbing up an old oak tree. Two coins examined were of Constantine.
UID500168	328365	377971	Post-Medieval	Site of Parkgate railway station on the Parkgate Railway, opened in 1866, closed to passengers in 1956 and closed entirely in 1962.
UID66167	328500	377500	Roman	Roman coin of Diocletian
UID1463076	329296	377539	Post-Medieval	Belmont Cottage. An agricultural cottage thought to have been built between 1850 and 1872, though no exact date is known. The building has a two storey central section, flanked by two one and a half storey lean-tos. It is constructed of coursed red sandstone rubble with a slate roof.

APPENDIX E
Historic Mapping
1577-1912

All Ordnance Survey Mapping Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Map with the Permission of Her Majesty's Stationary Office, © Crown Copyright White Young Green License No AL100017603

APPENDIX F

Development Impact Zones

APPENDIX G
Report Conditions

WHITE YOUNG GREEN ENVIRONMENTAL LTD

REPORT CONDITIONS

This report is produced solely for the benefit of CTP Ltd and no liability is accepted for any reliance placed on it by any other party unless specifically agreed in writing otherwise.

This report is prepared for the proposed uses stated in the report and should not be used in a different context without reference to WYGE. In time improved practices, fresh information or amended legislation may necessitate a re-assessment. Opinions and information provided in this report are on the basis of WYGE using due skill and care in the preparation of the report.

This report refers, within the limitations stated, to the environment of the site in the context of the surrounding area at the time of the inspections. Environmental conditions can vary and no warranty is given as to the possibility of changes in the environment of the site and surrounding area at differing times.

This report is limited to those aspects reported on, within the scope and limits agreed with the client under our appointment. It is necessarily restricted and no liability is accepted for any other aspect. It is based on the information sources indicated in the report. Some of the opinions are based on unconfirmed data and information and are presented as the best obtained within the scope for this report.

Reliance has been placed on the documents and information supplied to WYGE by others but no independent verification of these has been made and no warranty is given on them. No liability is accepted or warranty given in relation to the performance, reliability, standing etc of any products, services, organisations or companies referred to in this report.

Whilst skill and care have been used, no investigative method can eliminate the possibility of obtaining partially imprecise, incomplete or not fully representative information. Any monitoring or survey work undertaken as part of the commission will have been subject to limitations, including for example timescale, seasonal and weather related conditions.

Although care is taken to select monitoring and survey periods that are typical of the environmental conditions being measured, within the overall reporting programme constraints, measured conditions may not be fully representative of the actual conditions. Any predictive or modelling work, undertaken as part of the commission will be subject to limitations including the representativeness of data used by the model and the assumptions inherent within the approach used. Actual environmental conditions are typically more complex and variable than the investigative, predictive and modelling approaches indicate in practice, and the output of such approaches cannot be relied upon as a comprehensive or accurate indicator of future conditions.

The potential influence of our assessment and report on other aspects of any development or future planning requires evaluation by other involved parties.

The performance of environmental protection measures and of buildings and other structures in relation to acoustics, vibration, noise mitigation and other environmental issues is influenced to a large extent by the degree to which the relevant environmental considerations are incorporated into the final design and specifications and the quality of workmanship and compliance with the specifications on site during construction. WYGE accept no liability for issues with performance arising from such factors

September 2006