



Norfolk County Council

Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan

**MIN 96 – land at Grange Farm (between Spixworth Road and
Coltishall Lane), Spixworth**

**Heritage Impact Assessment including
Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment**



John W Percival (Senior Officer – Archaeology)
Caroline Jeffery (Principal Planner - Minerals and Waste Policy)
Richard Drake (Senior Planner)

November 2023

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1 What is the purpose of a heritage impact assessment? | 3 |
| 1.2 Standards and Guidance | 3 |
| 1.3 Significance of Heritage Assets..... | 4 |
| 1.4 Levels of Impact..... | 4 |
| 1.5 Mitigation and Levels of Harm..... | 4 |
| 1.6 Site Details | 5 |
| 1.7 Planning History..... | 5 |
| 2. Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment..... | 6 |
| 2.1 Existing Norfolk Historic Environment Records | 6 |
| 2.2 Heritage Impact Assessment – Below-Ground Archaeological Remains | 7 |
| 2.3 Archaeological assessment conclusions | 7 |
| 3. Built Heritage..... | 8 |
| 3.1 Heritage Impact Assessment – Built Heritage | 8 |
| 3.2 Built Heritage Conclusions | 15 |
| 4. Bibliography | 17 |
| Appendix 1 – Views to/from Designated Heritage assets..... | 18 |
| Appendix 2 – Map of designated heritage assets and site MIN 96..... | 27 |

1. Introduction

1.1 What is the purpose of a heritage impact assessment?

The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) Glossary defines heritage assets as being “*a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest*”. All heritage assets have a significance, and it is the purpose of a heritage impact assessment to explore the significance of the identified heritage assets in order to understand what impact new development may have on them. In accordance with paragraph 199 of the NPPF great weight is to be given to the conservation of a heritage asset, noting that the more important the asset the greater the weight that should be afforded to its conservation. Any harm or loss to a designated heritage asset (including its setting) requires clear and convincing justification, and in some cases should only occur in wholly exceptional circumstances.

The setting of a heritage asset can contribute to its significance. Where appropriate consideration must be given to the setting of the identified heritage asset and how this influences our understanding of its importance. The relationship between heritage assets can also impact on our understanding of the past and therefore can play an important role in their significance. The setting of a designated heritage asset is not purely visual; noise, dust and vibration during active mineral extraction can also affect the setting of a designated heritage asset.

Therefore, the purpose of the heritage impact assessment is to:

- identify key heritage assets and settings that may be affected by potential mineral extraction site MIN 96 considered for inclusion within the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan;
- understand the significance of the heritage asset, including the features that contribute to its significance;
- explore the impact of development on the significance of the heritage asset and/or the setting;
- consider possible mitigation measures or enhancement opportunities that may arise from the proposed development; and
- determine the impact new development would have on the heritage asset with mitigation measures in place.

1.2 Standards and Guidance

The following standards and guidance documents have been adhered to:

- Historic England, Mineral Extraction and Archaeology (Historic England, 2020)
- Norfolk County Council, Standards for development Led Archaeology in Norfolk (Robertson et al , 2018)
- Historic England, The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (Historic England, 2015a)
- Historic England, Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England 2015b)
- Historic England, The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England 2017)

1.3 Significance of Heritage Assets

Identification of the significance value of heritage assets can be a value judgement. The following categories have been used to assess the significance of heritage assets:

High – Heritage assets of international or national significance and/or of extraordinary merit. This can include Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

Medium – Heritage assets that are considered important at a national or regional level due to their special interest. This can include Grade II listed buildings and Conservation Areas.

Lesser – Locally important heritage assets, including historic townscapes (outside of Conservation Areas).

Negligible – Heritage assets of limited local importance with little special interest.

Unknown – The importance of the heritage asset has not been determined.

1.4 Levels of Impact

Following categorisation of significance, the potential levels of impact of the proposed development on the heritage asset has also been considered and has been determined as falling into one of the categories listed below. Impacts could be either positive or negative and this is reflected in the individual assessments.

Major Adverse – complete destruction/removal of the heritage asset, e.g., removal of below-ground archaeological remains by mineral extraction

Minor Adverse – A change adversely affecting the significance of a heritage asset, e.g., a minor visual change to the setting of a listed building

Neutral – The proposed mineral extraction and associated activities have no effect on the heritage assets.

Minor Beneficial – The proposed mineral extraction contributes positively to the significance of a heritage asset e.g., an area containing below-ground archaeological remains adjacent to mineral extraction is removed from cultivation and preserved under grassland.

Major Beneficial - The proposed mineral extraction significantly enhances the significance of a heritage asset e.g., removal of industrial buildings/plant from the setting of a heritage asset.

1.5 Mitigation and Levels of Harm

Levels of impact are then reconsidered in the light of proposed or existing mitigation/enhancement measures.

A final review of the findings determines the level of harm on the identified heritage asset:

Substantial Harm

Less Than Substantial Harm

Neutral

Less Than Substantial Positive

Substantial Positive

1.6 Site Details

Site Name: land at Grange Farm (between Spixworth Road and Coltishall Lane), Spixworth

Minerals and Waste Plan site allocation reference: MIN 96

National Grid Reference: TG 2321 1565

Area: c. 39 ha

Estimated mineral resource: 1.6 million tonnes of sand and gravel

Estimated extraction rate: 150,000 tonnes per annum over 11 years

Proposed restoration scheme: Restoration to arable agriculture with wide field margins, hedgerow formation and woodland planting.

NCCES Consultation Number: CNF41468

1.7 Planning History

MIN 96 has been allocated in the Norfolk Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) since it was adopted in 2013.

The Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (NM&WLP) is planning for the quantum of mineral required in Norfolk for a Plan Period to the end of 2038. To meet the forecast need for sand and gravel the allocation of specific sites will be required. Site MIN 96 was proposed for allocation by Tarmac Aggregates Ltd. A number of other sites were also proposed by various mineral operators and landowners across the county. Following two rounds of consultation including with statutory consultees and assessment of the sites by planning officers it has been concluded that MIN 96 is one of the sites that is suitable for allocation in the NM&WLP when considered against the reasonable alternatives. The site allocation is for 1.6 million tonnes of sand and gravel which would be extracted in 11 years based on the 150,000 tonnes estimated annual extraction rate.

MIN 96 has been the subject of rapid assessment for impacts related to below-ground archaeology by Norfolk County Council Environment Service Historic Environment Strategy and Advice team in 2017 and 2019. In the Red-Amber-Green assessment it was rated amber: "Development of the site could have a detrimental impact on a designated or non-designated heritage asset or the setting of a designated or non-designated heritage asset, but the impact could be reasonably mitigated".

The Publication version of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (NM&WLP) (2022) contains the following assessment of the historic environment for site MIN 96:

M96.3 Historic environment: The historic landscape character of the site is Twentieth Century agriculture with boundary loss and agriculture with 18th to 19th Century piecemeal enclosure. The site is within a wider historic landscape character of 20th century agriculture with boundary loss and enclosure, and agriculture with 18th to 19th century piecemeal enclosure. The wider historic landscape character also includes Norwich Airport, industry, enclosed wetland meadow, informal parkland and 18th to 20th century plantation woodland.

M96.4 The nearest Listed Buildings are Grade II Meadow Farmhouse (210m away), Grade II Barn at Grange Farm (240m away), Grade II Grange Farmhouse (260m away) and Grade I Church of St Peter (300m away). There are 29 Listed Buildings within 2km of the site. 11 of these are within Horsham St Faiths Conservation Area, which is 650m from the site. The only Scheduled Monument within 2km of the site is St Faith Priory, which is 1.08km away. There are no Registered Historic Parks and Gardens within 2km of the site. A planning application for mineral extraction at this site would need to include a Heritage Statement to identify heritage assets and their settings, assess the potential for impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures if required.

M96.5 Archaeology: The site is located within an area of interest, and there are Historic Environment records of multi period finds, within the site boundary, and a possible medieval trackway crossing the site. The site is close to the boundary of the historic parkland associated with Spixworth Hall, and is in a wider landscape with a very significant number of finds and features from multiple periods. Therefore, there is the potential that unknown archaeology exists on the site and an assessment of the significance of archaeological remains will be required at the planning application stage, in order to protect and mitigate the impact of mineral extraction in this site. The archaeology assessment may initially be desk-based but may need to be followed up with field surveys and trial-trenching.

2. Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment

2.1 Existing Norfolk Historic Environment Records

No formal professional archaeological investigations have taken within MIN 96. Existing information on the Norfolk Historic Environment Record within the MIN 96 area is tabulated below.

| NHER Number | Summary | Date range/period | Additional comments |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 34267 | Horse harness pendant found during metal detecting 1998 | Medieval | Probable casual loss |
| 34605 | Metal detecting between 1998 and 2016 recovered three Roman coins and metal objects of medieval and post-medieval date | Multi-period | None |
| 39565 | Pottery of medieval date found by metal-detectorist 2003 | Medieval | Occupation or manuring |
| 35672 | Jetton and scabbard chape of medieval date recovered by metal detecting 1999 and 2007 | Medieval | None |
| 34607 | Metal detecting between 1998 and 2016 recovered as small fragment of socketed axe of late Bronze Age date, one Roman coin and a number of objects of medieval including a silver brooch and a book fitting | Multi-period | Some objects indicative of occupation |
| 21784 | Metal detecting between 1985 and 2011 recovered one Roman coin and number of objects of medieval date including pottery and a copper alloy cooking vessel fragment | Multi-period | Some objects indicative of occupation |

The relative density of artefacts of prehistoric and Roman date are very much at the level of 'background noise' to be expected in any area that has undergone repeated episodes of metal-detecting.

There are some hints of occupation activity or adjacent occupation activity within the assemblage of objects of medieval date from the western part of MIN 96.

Similar scatters of multi-period artefacts have been recorded west and south of MIN 96 (NHER [33788](#), NHER [55069](#), NHER [40848](#), NHER [36153](#), NHER [20913](#))

Significant quantities of coins and other objects of Roman date have been recovered from the field immediately north of MIN96 and the existing Tarmac quarry (NHER [30074](#)). The nature and density of these object points to settlement activity of Roman date.

Existing aerial photographs were systematically examined by the specialist Aerial Investigation and Mapping with Norfolk County Council in 2010. No cropmarks or other evidence of below-ground archaeological remains were recorded with MIN 96 itself. Within the existing quarry west of MIN 96 a single linear double-ditched trackway (NHER[53605](#)) was visible as crop-marks. Crop-marks of possible linear and curvilinear features, and a possible partial ring-ditch (NHER [53610](#)) have been recorded northwest of MIN 96. A large number of geological features were also visible within NHER53610. It may be that some or all of the features recorded are not of archaeological origin.

An examination of Google earth images dating from 1985 to 2023 have been examined. The features of probable geological origin are visible on images dated 2006 and 2022.

Prior to planning consent being granted for the existing quarry west of MIN 96 an archaeological evaluation by trial trenching was undertaken in September 2003 (Roberts 2003). The NHER53605 trackway was found to contain artefacts of late post-medieval date. It was part of two separate field systems, both of post-medieval date (NHER [39675](#)).

For the past several years the existing quarry west of MIN 96 has been used for processing mineral from a separate quarry site approximately 1km south of MIN 96. There are no records of archaeological work taking place prior to mineral extraction at this site.

2.2 Heritage Impact Assessment – Below-Ground Archaeological Remains

If/when planning consent is sought for mineral extraction at MIN 96 as archaeological advisors to the local planning authority we would advise that results of archaeological evaluation by geophysical survey and trial trenching be submitted with any applications.

Based on currently available information impacts on below-ground archaeology are summarised below.

Description of heritage assets: Below ground archaeological remains including NHER34267, NHER34605, NHER39565, NHER35672, NHER35672, NHER21784, objects of Roman and Medieval date.

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Significance: | Lesser |
| Level of Impact: | Major Adverse |
| Mitigation: | Preservation by record (archaeological Excavation) agreed |
| Level of Harm: | Less than substantial harm |

2.3 Archaeological assessment conclusions

One of the authors of this document is the leader of the team that advises all Local Planning Authorities in Norfolk, including The Broads Authority and Norfolk County Council on matters related to below-ground archaeology. In relation to MIN 96 all the iterative phases of archaeological investigation normally undertaken in advance of the determination of a Town and Country Planning Act application will need to be undertaken.

Heritage assets affected by the site allocation: Below ground archaeological remains, including NHER34267, NHER34605, NHER39565, NHER35672, NHER35672, NHER21784, objects of Roman and Medieval date.

Contribution the site in its current form makes to the significance of the heritage assets: Current arable use of the site preserves below-ground archaeological remains below the current level truncation caused by cultivation.

Impact the allocation might have on that significance: Major adverse, mineral extraction will remove/destroy all conventional Holocene archaeological remains.

Enhancements and avoiding harm: Evaluation is required in order to decide if Preservation by Record (archaeological Excavation) will be required.

Is site allocation appropriate? Yes

The above is in line the principles set out in 'Historic England, Mineral Extraction and Archaeology' (Historic England, 2020)

3. Built Heritage

3.1 Heritage Impact Assessment – Built Heritage

The site comprises arable land on gently undulating land above the valley of Crostwick Beck. It is divided by hedgerows with small field size in the east with many hedgerow trees. Field size increases to the west with fewer hedgerow trees. The western part of the site is bisected by Marketfield Lane a road used as a public path.

There is an obvious and important cluster of designated heritage assets (Listed buildings), whose significance may be affected through change in setting caused by the proposed quarrying, located southeast of MIN 96. These include Grange Farm farmhouse and associated barn, the dovecote south of Grange Farm, St Peter's church and associated Rectory. The significance of many Norfolk churches is not just through their intrinsic historic, archaeological and architectural value. The setting of many churches through views approaching/from churches enhances significance as do views encountered in the landscape that take in more than one church.

There is also one undesignated building within this group, Parsonage Farm.

There is a second cluster of designated heritage assets approximately 600m south of MIN96, associated with the site of the now demolished Spixworth Hall. Spixworth Hall was a Jacobean style E-plan House, constructed in 1609 and demolished in the early 1950s (Williamson et al 2015, 237-238). A number of subsidiary buildings of 17th to 19th century date survive west of the site of the hall.

There are also a small number of designated heritage assets north and west of MIN 96, on the eastern edge of Horsham St Faith.

The Specific Site Allocation Policy for MIN 96 with the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (NM&WP) specifies a standoff area and screening for properties 1 and 2 Church Lane, Spixworth, which is shown on the Policies Map as an indicative 100m standoff area around the two properties and screening along the eastern site boundary nearest to Grange Farm.

In the Publication version of the NM&WLP (2022) the Specific Site Allocation Policy for MIN 96 contains the following requirements of particular relevance to this assessment:

- The submission of an acceptable Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which will identify any potential impacts on the wider landscape and suggest appropriate mitigation measures, particularly regarding views from the nearby properties, Marketfield Lane, and surrounding roads, and provide protection of the setting of nearby listed buildings;
- The submission of acceptable noise and dust assessments and a programme of mitigation measures to deal appropriately with any amenity impacts, including a standoff area and screening for properties 1 and 2 Church Lane;
- The submission of an acceptable Heritage Statement to identify heritage assets and their settings (including the Grade II Listed Grange Farm House, Grade II Listed Barn at Grange Farm, Grade II Listed Meadow Farmhouse, Grade I Listed Church of St Peter, Grade I Listed

Church of the Blessed Virgin and St Andrew, the Schedule and Grade I Listed St Faiths Priory, and the Horsham St Faiths Conservation Area), assess the potential for impacts and identify appropriate mitigation measures if required;

- The submission of an appropriate archaeological assessment, which must be prepared in consultation with Norfolk County Council; this may initially be desk-based but may need to be followed up with field surveys and trial-trenching. The archaeological assessment will be used by Norfolk County Council/Historic Environment Service to agree appropriate mitigation measures;
- The submission of an acceptable scheme of phased working and progressive restoration including the direction of working (to assist in the mitigation of amenity impacts), and landscaping;
- Submission of an acceptable progressive restoration scheme to agriculture with wide field margins, hedgerow formation and some woodland planting to provide landscape and biodiversity net gains;
- Highway access to be via A1270 Broadland Northway roundabout at Norwich Airport; improvements will be required at the roundabout to formalise access to the site; and
- The removal of the HGV access at Buxton Road and relocation of the processing plant to south of C250 Church Lane.

Planning conditions used on the existing planning permissions for mineral extraction and processing at Spixworth, and which are frequently used on other mineral extraction permissions, include:

- Date at which extraction shall cease and the site shall be restored.
- Operational hours limited to 07.00 – 18.00 Mondays to Fridays and 07.00 – 13.00 on Saturdays, with no operations taking place on Sundays or public holidays.
- Requirement for the agreed programme of archaeological work to be undertaken before development can take place.
- Limit on the level of noise emissions from the site at noise sensitive receptors.
- Plant and machinery used on site to be maintained in a condition where it is efficiently silenced in accordance with the manufacturer's specification.
- Measures to be taken to prevent dust nuisance cause by operations, including spraying as necessary.
- No external lighting to be installed or used on site unless it will not cause glare beyond the site boundary.
- Compliance with an approved landscaping scheme.
- Compliance with an approved phasing and restoration scheme.
- Compliance with an approved aftercare scheme to bring the land to the required standard for agricultural use.

Designated heritage assets within approximately 1km of the proposed quarry which have some potential intervisibility have been considered in the following tables. A map of the location of the designated heritage assets in relation to site MIN 96 is contained in Appendix 2.

The mineral extraction proposal is for a total of 1.6 million tonnes of sand and gravel to be extracted over an 11-year period followed by restoration back to arable agriculture with wide field margins, hedgerows and woodland planting. The restoration is proposed to include importation of inert waste to enable the site to be restored back to existing ground levels. Therefore, following restoration back to agricultural land, it is concluded that there would be no impacts on the significance of the heritage assets. The assessment tables have therefore focused on the potential impacts during the 11-year extraction phase.

The [Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning \(2016\)](#) published by the Institute of Air Quality Management states that for sand and gravel workings adverse dust impacts

are uncommon beyond 250m from the nearest dust generating activities. The guidance also states that it is commonly accepted that the greatest impacts will be within 100m of a source.

Vibration is not a significant factor in sand and gravel extraction in Norfolk due to the method and depth of working the mineral and therefore vibration has been excluded from the assessment tables below as there would be no adverse impacts.

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states that a noise impact assessment should be carried out by the proposer of a mineral development at the planning application stage. The NPPG (Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 27-021-20140306) contains information on appropriate noise standards for normal mineral operations as follows: "Mineral planning authorities should aim to establish a noise limit, through a planning condition, at the noise-sensitive property that does not exceed the background noise level (LA90,1h) by more than 10dB(A) during normal working hours (0700-1900). Where it will be difficult not to exceed the background level by more than 10dB(A) without imposing unreasonable burdens on the mineral operator, the limit set should be as near that level as practicable. In any event, the total noise from the operations should not exceed 55dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field)."

The traffic route for MIN 96 is proposed to be from the southeastern part of the site allocation to the roundabout on the A1270 Broadland Northway adjacent of the northernmost parts of Norwich International Airport.

The assessment in the following tables takes the policy requirements in Policy MIN 96 in the NM&WLP as the baseline and considers whether any further mitigation measures would be required.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Description of heritage assets | The Rectory , Buxton Road Grade II Listed, NHER 46100 , NHLE 1372966 | Church of St Peter , Buxton Road Grade I Listed, NHER 8027 , NHLE 1152695 | Grange Farm House , Church Lane, Grade II Listed, NHER 45861 , NHLE 1050915 | Barn at Grange Farm , Church Lane, Grade II Listed, NHER 18822 , NHLE 1372984 |
| Location | Buxton Road, Spixworth TG 24140 15713 | Buxton Road, Spixworth TG 24068 15770 | Church Lane, Spixworth TG 24006 15745 | Church Lane, Spixworth TG 23976 15745 |
| Significance | Medium | High | Medium | Medium |
| Distance from site boundary | 390m | 300m | 260m | 240m |
| Assessment of level of Visual Impact | Neutral. The Rectory has a thick screen of hedging and mature trees on its western, northern and eastern sides large Leylandii separate the old Rectory from 20 th century rectory and church car park. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. | Neutral. Grange Farm farmhouse, barn and the large agro-industrial buildings northwest of Grange Farm shield St. Peter's Church from MIN 96. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. | Neutral. Grange Farm, barn and the large agro-industrial buildings northwest of Grange Farm shield Grange Farm farmhouse from MIN 96. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. | Neutral. The large agro-industrial buildings northwest of Grange Farm shield Grange Farm barn from MIN 96. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. |
| Contribution of MIN 96 to significance | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 |
| Assessment of noise and dust impact | Neutral. Site MIN 96 is 390m from The Rectory, so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. | Neutral. The boundary of site MIN 96 is 300m from the Church, and the extraction area would be at least 390m from the Church so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. | Neutral. The boundary of site MIN 96 is 260m from Grange Farm House, and the extraction area would be at least 330m from Grange Farm House so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. | Neutral. The boundary of site MIN 96 is 240m from the Barn, however, the extraction area would be at least 290m from the Barn so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. |
| Assessment of traffic impact | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 69 and at least 750m from The Rectory. | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 69 and at least 700m from the church. | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 69 and at least 650m from Grange Farm House. | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 69 and at least 610m from the barn. |
| Mitigation | No mitigation required. | No mitigation required. | No mitigation required. | No mitigation required. |
| Level of Harm | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Description of heritage assets | Meadow Farm House , Meadow Farm Lane Grade II Listed, NHER 43944 , NHLE 1050902 | Mill Farm House , Mill Lane Grade II Listed, NHER 8026 , NHLE 1152508 | The Lilacs , Meadow Farm Lane Grade II Listed, NHER 12250 , NHLE 1152516 |
| Location | Meadow Farm Lane, Horsham St Faith TG 22773 15923 | Mill Lane, Horsham St Faith TG 22235 15798 | Meadow Farm Lane, Horsham St Faith TG 22275 15568 |
| Significance | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Distance from site boundary | 210m | 440m | 370m |
| Assessment of level of Visual Impact | Neutral. Meadow Cottage is located at a relatively low point in the landscape. The existing hedge on the north side of Meadow Farm Lane blocks views towards MIN 96. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. | Minor Adverse. Mill Farm House is located at a relatively low point in the landscape. There is very limited intervisibility with MIN 96. | Minor Adverse. The existing hedging around The Lilacs block views to MIN 96. There is very limited intervisibility with MIN 96. |
| Contribution of MIN 96 to significance of heritage asset | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 | Low to minimal. There is very limited intervisibility with MIN 96 | Low to minimal. There is very limited intervisibility with MIN 96 |
| Assessment of noise and dust impact | Neutral. Site MIN 96 is 210m from Meadow Farm House, therefore noise and dust impacts would be able to be mitigated and controlled so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. | Neutral. Site MIN 96 is 440m from Mill Farm House, so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. | Neutral. Site MIN 96 is 370m from The Lilacs, so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. |
| Assessment of traffic impact | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 96 and at least 580m from Meadow Farm House. | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 96 and at least 760m from Mill Farm House. | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 96 and at least 580m from The Lilacs. |
| Level of Harm | Neutral | Less than substantial harm | Less than substantial harm |
| Mitigation | No additional mitigation required. Standard noise and dust mitigation measures would be conditioned at the planning application stage, similar to the conditions in the current Spixworth mineral extraction planning permission listed on page 8 of this HIA. | Landscaping / screening planting and/or bunding along the north-western site boundary. | Landscaping / screening planting and/or bunding along the north-western site boundary. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Description of heritage assets | Barn at site of Spixworth Hall Grade II Listed, NHER 8022 , NHLE 1050874 | Gaffers Cottage , Church Lane Grade II Listed, NHER 8022 , NHLE 1372985 | Garden wall and gatepiers south of barn and Gaffer's Cottage, Grade II Listed, NHER 8022 , NHLE 1050875 | Granary to west of barn , Church Lane Grade II Listed, NHER 8022 , NHLE 1050876 |
| Location | Church Lane, Spixworth TG 23767 15235 | Church Lane, Spixworth TG 23784 15244 | Church Lane, Spixworth TG 23789 15221 | Church Lane, Spixworth TG 23740 15230 |
| Significance | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Distance from site boundary | 390m | 400m | 410m | 370m |
| Assessment of level of visual impact | Neutral. The existing screen of trees and former poultry house block views to/from the Spixworth Hall buildings to MIN 96. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. | Neutral. The existing screen of trees and former poultry house block views to/from the Spixworth Hall buildings to MIN 96. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. | Neutral. The existing screen of trees and former poultry house block views to/from the Spixworth Hall buildings to MIN 96. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. | Neutral. The existing screen of trees and former poultry house block views to/from the Spixworth Hall buildings to MIN 96. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. |
| Contribution of MIN 96 to significance | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 |
| Assessment of noise and dust impact | Neutral. Site MIN 96 is 390m from the Barn, so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. | Neutral. Site MIN 96 is 400m from Gaffers Cottage, so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. | Neutral. Site MIN 96 is 410m from the listed structures, so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. | Neutral. MIN 96 is 370m from the Granary, so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. |
| Assessment of traffic impact | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 96 and at least 390m from Spixworth Hall Barn. | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 96 and at least 400m from Gaffers Cottage. | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 96 and at least 410m from the Spixworth Hall Buildings. | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 96 and at least 370m from the Granary. |
| Level of Harm | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
| Mitigation | No mitigation required. | No mitigation required. | No mitigation required. | No mitigation required. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Description of heritage assets | Parsonage Farm , Buxton Road, undesignated, NHER 12271 | Square brick post-medieval dovecote , undesignated, NHER 12274 |
| Location | Buxton Road, Spixworth TG 21412 15629 | Buxton Road, Spixworth TG 24010 15580 |
| Significance | Medium | Medium |
| Distance from site boundary | 440m | 390m |
| Assessment of level of Visual Impact | Neutral. The existing hedging on both sides of Buxton Road blocks views from Parsonage Farm to MIN 96. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96. | Minor Adverse. The dovecote is located at a relatively low point in the landscape. The existing hedging on both sides of Church Lane block views from the Dovecote to MIN 96. There is very limited intervisibility with MIN 96. |
| Contribution of MIN 96 to significance | Minimal. There is no intervisibility with MIN 96 | Low to minimal. There is very limited intervisibility with MIN 96 |
| Assessment of noise and dust impact | Neutral. MIN 96 is 440m from Parsonage Farm, so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. | Neutral. MIN 96 is 390m from the dovecote, so there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts due to distance. |
| Assessment of traffic impact | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 96 and at least 730m from Parsonage Farm. | Neutral due to distance. The HGV access point to the A1270 would be at the south of site MIN 96 and at least 610m from the dovecote. |
| Level of Harm | Neutral | Less than substantial harm |
| Mitigation | No mitigation required. | No additional mitigation required. The proposed stand-off and screening of the extraction area from 1 and 2 Church Lane would mitigate any visual impact on the setting of the dovecote. |

3.2 Built Heritage Conclusions

Site MIN 96 is currently allocated for sand and gravel extraction in the adopted Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD (2013). It is also proposed to be allocated in the Publication version of the NM&WLP (2022). The site is currently arable agricultural fields. The mineral extraction proposal is for a total of 1.6 million tonnes of sand and gravel to be extracted over an 11-year period followed by restoration back to arable agriculture with wide field margins, hedgerows and woodland planting. The restoration is proposed to include importation of inert waste to enable the site to be restored back to existing ground levels. Therefore, following restoration back to agricultural land, it is concluded that there would be no impacts on the significance of the heritage assets. The assessment has therefore focused on the potential impact during the 11-year extraction phase.

Visual impact

The visual impact of the proposed mineral extraction is concluded to be neutral for the majority of the built heritage assets due to a lack of intervisibility between site MIN 96 and the heritage assets. The visual impact of the proposed mineral extraction is concluded to be minor adverse for the undesignated dovecote, Mill Farm House and The Lilacs due to very limited intervisibility between site MIN 96 and these heritage assets.

There is very limited intervisibility between the dovecote and site MIN96 and the existing hedging on both sides of Church Lane block views from the Dovecote to site MIN 96. Policy MIN 96 requires a standoff area and screening for properties 1 and 2 Church Lane. We consider that, due to the location of the dovecote, the screening and standoff for 1 and 2 Church Lane would also mitigate any visual impact for the dovecote.

In order to ensure that there is no harm to Mill Farm House or The Lilacs, mitigation measures of landscaping/ screening/ bunding along the north-western boundaries of the site will be required. Therefore, a modification should be made to paragraph M96.4 of the NM&WLP to clarify that appropriate mitigation measures should include landscape, screening and bunding, particularly along the north-western and south-eastern boundaries of the site. The MIN 96 policy wording criteria (a) already requires a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to include mitigation measures to protect the setting of nearby listed buildings and criteria (c) requires a Heritage Statement to identify heritage assets and their settings, assess the potential for impacts and include mitigation measures. A modification should be made to Policy MIN 96 to add a new sentence to the end of criteria (a) stating: "Mitigation measures should include screen planting and/or bunding as appropriate, particularly along the north-western and south-eastern site boundaries."

Noise and dust

The impacts of noise and dust on the significance of all the built heritage assets is concluded to be neutral due to the distance of the extraction area of site MIN 96 being over 250m from all the built heritage assets except for Meadow Farm House. Meadow Farm House is 210m from the site boundary and at this distance standard noise and dust mitigation and control measures would be able to ensure that there would be no adverse noise and dust impacts. Such measures are included in the current planning permission for mineral extraction and processing at Spixworth, as set out on page 8 of this HIA. The site allocation policy MIN 96 states that development will require the submission of acceptable noise and dust assessments and a programme of mitigation measures to deal appropriately with any amenity impacts, including a standoff area and screening for properties 1 and 2 Church Lane. As there are residential properties closer to the site than the heritage assets, any mitigation measures that are suitable for amenity impacts would also appropriately address any potential noise and dust impacts relevant to the heritage assets.

Traffic

The impact of traffic on the significance of all the built heritage assets is concluded to be neutral due to the distance of the likely location of the HGV access route from the heritage assets.

Conclusion of extraction phase assessment

No further mitigation measures are required to deal with these potential impacts because the Specific Site Allocation Policy MIN 96 already contains sufficient requirements regarding noise, dust, landscape, heritage, archaeology, highways and restoration.

Restoration

The restoration scheme should retain screen planning and include the restoration and reinstatement historic hedgerows and field boundaries informed by Historic Landscape Characterisation. A modification should be made to paragraph M96.16 (restoration) to include this information. Policy MP7: 'Progressive working, restoration and afteruse' states that restoration proposals must demonstrate that "the scheme has been informed by the historic environment and historic landscape character assessments and the restoration enhances the historic environment". Therefore, no changes to Policy MIN 96 are required.

Overall conclusion

The proposed specific site allocation MIN 96 will play a part in meeting the forecast need for sand and gravel during the Plan Period to 2038. It is considered that the site allocation can achieve this without causing unacceptable impacts and specific to this assessment will not result in unacceptable harms to the significance of the built heritage assets in proximity to the site.

The proposed site allocation policy is justified in terms of the potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures, is deliverable, and is consistent with the NPPF including the need to conserve heritage assets, including archaeology, in a manner appropriate to their significance.

4. Bibliography

| Author | Publication date | Document title | Publisher |
|---|------------------|--|---|
| Historic England | 2015a | The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans | Historic England |
| Historic England | 2015b | Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2 | Historic England |
| Historic England | 2017 | The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) | Historic England |
| Historic England | 2020 | Mineral Extraction and Archaeology | Historic England, Swindon |
| Roberts, B | 2003 | Grange Farm Extraction Pit, Spixworth, Norfolk. An Archaeological Evaluation | Archaeological Solutions Report 1425, unpublished |
| Robertson, D., Albone, J., Watkins, P., Percival, J. W., Hickling, S., Hamilton, H., Heywood, S., Shoemark, J., Tremlett, S and Jarvis, C. | 2018 | Standards for Development-Led Archaeological Projects in Norfolk | Norfolk County Council, unpublished |
| Williamson, T., Ringwood, I and Spooner, S. | 2015 | Lost Country House of Norfolk, History, Archaeology and Myth | Boydell Press |

Appendix 1 – Views to/from Designated Heritage assets



Plate 1 Looking southwest from the driveway of The Old Rectory towards MIN96



Plate 2 Front façade of The Old Rectory.



Plate 3 Looking west from St. Peter's Church towards MIN96, roof of large agro-industrial building visible in background



Plate 4 Looking west from top of tower, St. Peter's Church towards MIN96, large agro-industrial building visible behind Grange Farm house and barn



Plate 5 West front of St. Peter's Church



Plate 6 looking northwest at main façade of Grange Farm House



Plate 7 looking northwest from Church Lane towards MIN96, roof of Grange Farm Barn is on right of frame



Plate 8 looking northwest at southern façade of Grange Farm Barn



Plate 9 looking northwest from entrance to Parsonage Farm towards MIN96



Plate 10 looking north from north side of Spixworth Hall Granary and Barn towards MIN96. Former poultry houses in foreground, tree screen in background



Plate 11 looking north at southern façade of Spixworth Hall Granary, gate piers and garden wall are on right of frame



Plate 12 looking northeast at southern façade of Spixworth Hall Barn



Plate 13 looking northeast at southern façade of Gaffers Cottage



Plate 14 looking southeast from Meadow Farm Lane, The Lilacs is on the right of the frame



Plate 15 Looking southeast from Mill Lane towards MIN96, Mill Farm House is on left of frame



Plate 16 Looking southeast at northern façade of Mill Farm House



Plate 17 Looking south from Meadow Farm House towards MIN96



Plate 18 Looking north from Meadow Farm Lane towards Meadow Farm House

