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This archaeological assessment has been prepared by the Environmental Dimension Partnership (EDP) on behalf of Barwood Strategic Land II LLP and Mr and Mrs G Skipper and confirms that the application site does not contain any world heritage sites, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields or listed buildings, where there would be a presumption in favour of preservation in situ and against development.

In the wider study area, there is one scheduled monument, one conservation area and nine listed buildings. However, these are located at distance from the application site and their wider settings have no functional, visual or aesthetic relationships to it. Thus they are unlikely to be a constraint to the form of development proposed.

There are no undesignated heritage assets of prehistoric or Roman date within the application site boundary, although a ‘D’ shaped enclosure, identified from aerial photographs in the southernmost field, is of potential archaeological interest. In the wider study area, an undated cropmark enclosure to the north occupies a similar topographic position and may suggest a wider distribution of activity than the HER indicates. However, the two isolated flint findspots and two Roman coins recorded in the east of the study area are probably the result of casual loss.

There is no evidence for archaeological activity of significance within the application site from the Middle Ages onwards, with the likelihood being that it comprised permanent pasture after the clearance of the woodland. Aside from the farm buildings, the application site has remained under farmland to the present day.

The date of the ‘D’ shaped enclosure, indentified in the southernmost field within the application site, has yet to be confirmed. A similar cropmark has previously been identified within the wider study area, and the evidence would suggest that, whilst the upland clays might not be as suitable as the lighter soils within the Trent Valley for the identification of cropmarks, in the right conditions there is evidence that they were occupied in at least the later prehistoric period, albeit not densely.

Whilst further investigation may be required for the D shaped enclosure in the longer term, if preservation in situ cannot be achieved within the masterplan, it has been confirmed by Stephen Dean, the Principal Archaeologist at Staffordshire County Council, that this could be completed as a condition of planning permission and ahead of development. Therefore, it is considered that this assessment provides sufficient information to secure the positive determination of a planning application in the short term.
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Section 1
Introduction

1.1 This report has been prepared on behalf of Barwood Strategic Land II LLP and Mr and Mrs G Skipper, and presents the results of an assessment of the known and potential archaeological resource on land at Red House Farm, Burton upon Trent, Staffordshire.

1.2 The aim of the assessment is to inform on the archaeological implications of future development within the application site.

Location and Boundaries

1.3 The application site is located to the south west of Burton upon Trent and to the west of the A38 dual carriageway. Its northern boundary is defined by residential properties at the south west end of Lower Outwoods Road, while the eastern, southern and western boundaries primarily follow the lines of existing hedgerows.

1.4 The land within the application site comprises approximately 13.38 hectares of commercially grown turf, and farm buildings. It is centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) SK 227 243. Its location and layout are shown on Plan EDP 1.

Geology and Topography

1.5 The underlying geology comprises Mercian Mudstone. This is overlain by superficial deposits of glacial till, comprising mainly sands and gravels (http://maps.bgs.ac.uk).

1.6 Topographically, the application site occupies high undulating ground to the west of the Trent Valley. The land descends southwards at the southern end of the site and westwards, into a shallow V-shaped valley, in the west.

1.7 The highest point within the application site is at its centre, at approximately 105 metres Above Ordnance Datum (AOD).

Land Use

1.8 As set out above, the application site consists entirely of agricultural land and is currently used for the commercial cultivation of turf.
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Section 2
Methodology

2.1 This assessment report has been produced in accordance with the *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment* issued by the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA, 2011). These guidelines provide a national standard for the completion of desk-based assessments.

2.2 The assessment involved consultation of readily available archaeological and historical information from documentary and cartographic sources. The major repositories of information comprised:

- Records of known archaeological sites, monuments and findspots, both within the site and its immediate vicinity, which are maintained by the Staffordshire County Council Historic Environment Record (HER);
- Maps held by the Burton upon Trent Local Studies Library and the Lichfield Record Office;
- The National Heritage List for England, curated by English Heritage;
- Aerial photographs held by the National Monuments Record (NMR); and
- Records made during a site visit in July 2012.

2.3 This report provides a synthesis of relevant information for the application site and a wider study area extending for up to one kilometre from its boundaries. The report concludes with an assessment of its likely archaeological potential, made with regard to current best practice guidelines.

2.4 Following the completion of the preliminary assessment, the report was submitted to Stephen Dean, Principal Archaeologists at Staffordshire County Council, to establish the need for, and scope of, any additional archaeological information required to support the positive determination of a planning application.

2.5 Stephen Dean responded, in an e-mail dated 20 August 2012, by stating that:

“Having reviewed the masterplan for the site and the content of the archaeological DBA I am content that while there is demonstrable archaeological potential within the area of the proposed scheme, that it is unlikely that this has the potential to be nationally significant. As a result I can confirm that further archaeological evaluation/mitigation may be satisfactorily achieved via a condition on any future planning permission.”
I would note however, that should the scheme substantively change between now and submission then my archaeological advice may need to be amended.”
Section 3
Planning Guidance

National Planning Policy

3.1 Following its publication by the Government on 27 March 2012, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out planning guidance concerning archaeological remains and other elements of the wider historic environment (DCLG, 2012).

3.2 The opening paragraph [126] emphasises the need for local authorities to set out a clear strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, where heritage assets are recognised as a finite and irreplaceable resource, which should be preserved in a manner appropriate to its significance.

3.3 Paragraph 128 concerns planning applications, stating that “...local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation”.

3.4 Designated heritage assets are addressed in Paragraph 132, which states that, “...When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional”.

Local Planning Policy

3.5 The Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan was adopted in 1996 and contains saved policies relating to the historic environment.
3.6 Policy NC14 considers sites of archaeological importance, and states that “…. proposals for development or land use change affecting sites of known or potential archaeological importance, and their settings, will be considered in the light of information held by the County or City Councils. Where necessary, developers will be required to supplement this information with the results of desk-based assessments and field evaluations before any decision on the planning application is taken. Where the planning authority decides on the basis of professional advice that archaeological remains are not sufficiently important to warrant physical preservation in situ, developers will be required to make appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of the remains prior to development, and for the publication of the results.”

3.7 Policy NC17 addresses sites of national archaeological importance, stating that:

“….development which would adversely affect Scheduled Ancient Monuments or archaeological sites of national importance or, in either case, their settings, will only be allowed in the most exceptional circumstances.”

3.8 Policy NC18 considers listed buildings and states that “…. there will be a presumption in favour of preserving Listed Buildings and protecting their settings and historic context. In exceptional circumstances, other planning policies may be relaxed to enable the retention or sympathetic reuse of Listed Buildings, or to maintain the integrity of their settings. An historical and architectural evaluation of Listed Buildings may be required as part of the planning process to ensure decision-making is based on a proper understanding of their fabric and structure.”

3.9 The East Staffordshire Borough Council Local Plan was adopted in July 2006. However, no policies relating to the historic environment were saved beyond 2009. Whilst the Borough Council is preparing a Local Development Framework, until it is adopted, the proposed development of the application site will be considered against the adopted national and local planning policies set out above.
4.1 The application site does not contain any nationally designated ‘heritage assets’, such as world heritage sites, scheduled monuments, listed buildings, historic parks and gardens or registered battlefields, where there would be a presumption in favour of preservation \textit{in situ} and against development.

4.2 Furthermore, it does not contain any undesignated heritage assets, as recorded on the Staffordshire County Council HER – the local archaeological database. However, there are records in the wider study area from the prehistoric to modern periods, the locations of which are shown on Plan EDP 1.

**Designated Assets**

4.3 As set out above, there are no designated heritage assets within the application site, where there would be a presumption in favour of preservation \textit{in situ} and against development. However, the following assets are located in the wider study area.

**Scheduled Monuments**

4.4 In the far south of the wider study area, a moated site, within Sinai Park, is designated as a scheduled monument (SM 21535). The moat dates from the 14\textsuperscript{th} century and was in the ownership of Burton Abbey, who used it as a summer retreat for monks undergoing blood-letting.

4.5 It is situated within Sinai Park (see below) and occupies a relatively isolated context; on a ridge of high ground surrounded by pastoral and arable fields, enclosed by woodland belts to the north and south.

**Conservation Areas**

4.6 The Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area (083) was designated, by East Staffordshire District Council, on 6 May 1988.

4.7 It is located approximately 500 metres to the east of the application site and is orientated roughly north-east to south-west. Although a conservation area statement was produced at the same time as its designation, it does not contain any specific information regarding significant views.

4.8 The conservation area follows the immediate line of the canal, although, in areas, it incorporates industrial elements along its course.
Listed Buildings

4.9 There are no listed buildings within the application site and only nine are recorded within the wider study area.

4.10 Of these, a post-medieval farmhouse (LB 1038484) is designated as a Grade II* listed building. It comprises the carcass of a 16th century timber-framed building, although the majority of the remaining fabric relates to remodelling in the later 17th and 18th centuries. Located within an earlier medieval moat, which itself is designated as a scheduled monument (SM 21535), it occupies a prominent position above the Trent Valley, to the east.

4.11 To the east of the application site, and on the very edge of the wider study area, is the Grade II* listed Church of St Paul (LB 1288714). The church, which is located in the middle of sprawling residential estates, was built in 1874 for Michael Thomas Bass. Also to the east, a milepost (LB 1261832) on the Trent and Mersey Canal, which depicts the distances between Shardlow (16 miles) and Preston Brook (76 miles), dates from 1819 and is Grade II listed.

4.12 To the south west of the application site, an isolated milepost (LB 1392732) on Forest Road is listed at Grade II. To the south of Forest Road, Shobnall Grange (LB 1288698) is a Grade II listed building dating from the 17th century. The gate piers to the property, located at the north end of its driveway, are contemporary and also listed at Grade II (LB 1374349).

4.13 To the south east, but also to the south of Forest Road, a group of three Grade II listed buildings is associated with Marston’s Brewery. Dating from 1875, they comprise the brewery itself (LB 1038692), an office block (LB 1038693) and a row of twelve workers cottages (LB 1374338).

Undesignated Assets

Prehistoric (500,000 BC – AD 43)

4.14 There are no previously identified archaeological assets from this period recorded on the Staffordshire County Council HER within the application site.

4.15 The position of a single flint findspot (MST 5047) is recorded in the southern end of the study area. It comprises a knife of possible Neolithic or Bronze Age date. It was found during fieldwalking in Shobnall, and was the only find retrieved from this period.

4.16 To the east, an isolated scraper (MST 16039) of a similar date range was identified during a metal detecting survey. No other finds from this period were recorded during the survey.
4.17 The scarcity of previously recorded prehistoric activity within the study area may either reflect a lack of any systematic fieldwork or its comparative visibility within the archaeological record, with the soils over the gravel terraces being more suitable for revealing cropmarks than the heavy clay soils of the upland areas. However, it could also reflect a preference for activity during this period on the gravel terraces of the Trent Valley. This may reflect the difficulties or movement on the wooded ‘uplands’ in the earlier prehistoric period and the suitability of the lighter and more fertile soils of the valley floor for the cultivation of arable crops from the Neolithic period onwards.

4.18 Beyond the study area, cropmarks have been identified to the north east and south, in Stretton and Branston. In both instances, these include enclosures and possible ring ditches and are of likely later prehistoric and/or Roman date. Although they are beyond the study area considered in this report, they occupy similar topographic positions to the land within the application site (SCC 2012).

4.19 Therefore, the high ground within the application site may have some, albeit limited, potential for later prehistoric activity.

*Romano-British (AD 43 – 410)*

4.20 There are no previously recorded archaeological assets from this period identified on the Staffordshire County Council HER within the application site.

4.21 In the wider study area, as with the prehistoric period, there is a scarcity of previously recorded Romano-British activity, with just two isolated Roman coins (MST 4505) found in a garden off Shobnall Road.

4.22 Whilst there is no other previously recorded Roman period activity within the wider study area, the line of Ryknild Street runs to the east, connecting Roman forts at Wall, near Litchfield and Little Chester, near Derby. It is likely that the line of this road, and the Trent Valley to the east, would have formed the focus of Roman period activity locally.

4.23 Based on the available evidence, and the distance of the application site from the findspots and the line of the Roman road, it is considered to have low potential to contain significant archaeological deposits from this period.

*Early Medieval (AD 410 -1066)*

4.24 There are no previously identified archaeological assets from this period recorded on the Staffordshire HER within the application site or, indeed, the wider study area.

4.25 Early Anglo-Saxon settlement typically comprises isolated farmsteads and small communities widely dispersed with the rural landscape, seemingly with a focus on prehistoric and Roman settlements. As a result, they can be difficult to identify in the
archaeological record. Even so, there is no evidence for early Saxon activity with the application site.

4.26 In the middle Anglo-Saxon period, a monastic site was possibly established in Burton upon Trent by the 7th century, possibly dedicated to St Andrew and located on Andresey Island within the River Trent (SCC, 2012). It is likely that any settlement within the immediate area during this period would have been located close by.

4.27 Given the paucity of information from this period within the study area, it is likely that it comprised woodland and heathland prior to the Norman Conquest and there is low potential for the application site to contain significant archaeological remains of this period.

**Medieval (AD 1066 – 1485)**

4.28 Whilst there are no previously recorded heritage assets from this period within the application site, there is evidence of medieval activity in the wider study area.

4.29 The focus of medieval settlement activity during this period would have been to the north east of the application site, at Burton upon Trent, and its ‘rural’ context is emphasised by the fact that two areas of land within the wider study area were enclosed as deer parks in the Middle Ages. To the west, the eastern boundary of Anslow Deer Park (MST 2142) follows the line of existing parish and field boundaries. It continues beyond the study area, enclosing a roughly circular parcel of land. The park is associated with Tutbury Castle, which is located over five kilometres to the north west.

4.30 To the south, Sinai Park Deer Park (MST 898) was enclosed in the medieval period and parts of its pale survive as a flat topped bank and as a continuous hedge line. The park was in the possession of Burton Abbey who, as previously mentioned, established a moated site within it as a summer retreat (SM 21535). Adjacent to the moat, but probably contemporary with it, is a probable medieval farmstead (MST 12913).

4.31 As well as the above, in 1307 Burton Abbey established Shobnall Grange (MST 1810). Located to the south of the application site, its establishment led to the gradual clearing of Burton Wood for agricultural land and, by the 1340s, it is recorded that a dovecote and ‘great barn’ had been built.

4.32 The emerging agricultural landscape is evidenced by ridge and furrow earthworks, denoting medieval and/or post-medieval arable cultivation. Although there is no evidence for such earthworks within the application site, they are recorded to the north east (MST 5964), north (MST 5553), west (MST 5554 and MST 5577), south (MST 4715) and south east (MST 13484).

4.33 The available evidence indicates that the land within the application site would have formed part of the wider agricultural landscape. Given it occupies high ground, it
probably comprised semi-permanent pasture, which is reflected in the absence of evidence for ridge and furrow earthworks.

**Post-Medieval and Georgian (AD 1485 – 1837)**

4.34 The agricultural nature of the landscape, and the application site within it, was maintained through the post-medieval period.

4.35 At Sinai Park, adjacent to the moat (SM 21535), the medieval farmstead continued to develop, and the earliest extant building comprises a late 15th century timber framed barn. The barn was extended from the early to mid 17th century and, in the late 18th to early 19th century, it and the adjacent buildings were incorporated into a model farm complex (MST 12913).

4.36 At Shobnall Grange, on or near the site of an earlier medieval monastic site, an isolated farm complex (MST 14260), which is organised around a loose courtyard arrangement, dates from the 17th century. The farmhouse and gate piers of the farm are both Grade II listed buildings, as set out in Paragraph 4.12.

4.37 The above farm complexes would have been in the midst of an agricultural landscape, with the remnants of medieval/post-medieval ridge and furrow earthworks (see above) located within the study area. At the same time, a post-medieval trackway (MST 4714), field boundaries (MST 4753) and quarrying activity (MST 4716 and MST 4708) are located in the wider study area.

4.38 With regard to the transport network during this period, the earliest improvement occurred in the 1710s, when the River Trent was made navigable. Although the river is located to the east, beyond the study area, this initiative simulated the growth of industry through the post-medieval and later periods.

4.39 A further stimulus was provided by the construction of the Trent and Mersey Canal (MST 2204), which was built to link the River Trent at Derwent Mouth (in Derbyshire) to the River Mersey. Located to the east of the application site, the Shobnall Canal Basin (MST 2905) and the Dallow Lock Bridge (MST 2906) are located along its course and form recorded elements of the canal infrastructure.

4.40 Despite the growth of Burton upon Trent to the north east, the land within the application site remained as part of the agricultural landscape and has low potential to contain significant archaeological deposits from this period.

**Victorian and Modern (1837 to present)**

4.41 Whilst there are no previously recorded heritage assets from this period within the application site, there is evidence of Victorian activity in the wider study area.
4.42 Albion Brewery is located to the south of the application site. Built around 1875 for Mann, Crossman & Paulin Ltd, the brewery, office buildings and associated workers cottages are designated as Grade II listed buildings, as set out in Paragraph 4.13.

4.43 A range of maltings (MST 3276) are located to the east of the wider study area, beyond the Trent and Mersey Canal. The buildings were constructed between 1873 and 1875 and are currently owned by the Bass Brewery.

4.44 To the east of the application site, the Union Workhouse (MST 6477) was constructed in 1884. Buildings within the workhouse are recorded on the Staffordshire County Council HER, including the Master’s House (MST 18460), the offices and boardroom block (MST 18407) and finally the accommodation blocks (MST 18408).

4.45 The HER also records the locations of Victorian buildings within the study area. These include, to the north east of the application site, two chapels (MSTs 18509 and 18510) and to the south, a primary school (MST 13343) to the north of Forest Green and two pumping stations, one to the north of Shobnall Road (MST 18416) and the other within the grounds of Sinai Park (MST 4712).

4.46 Aside from the pumping station within Sinai Park, which itself occupies an isolated position in the northern woodland plantation, the above buildings are located within the urban landscape of Burton upon Trent. Whilst these buildings will not be affected by the form of development proposed within the application site, their locations are nonetheless shown on Plan EDP 1.

Undated

4.47 Whilst there are no undated heritage assets within the application site, a cropmark enclosure (MST 4761) is recorded to the north.

4.48 However, the enclosure could not be identified on aerial photographs held at the National Monuments Record, and its location and nature could not be confirmed.

Historic Landscape Characterisation

4.49 The area of the site has previously been subject to characterisation within the Historic Landscape Characterization (HLC) for Staffordshire. The most relevant zone to the site is defined by the HLC as planned 18th to 19th century enclosure (HST 5938).

4.50 The HLC states that the previous landuse comprised open common fields. This pattern of enclosure is also reflected in the wider area.
Early Maps

4.51 The earliest depictions of the wider study area are on small scale county maps from the mid 18th century onwards. Whilst these maps provide little detail of the application site, they do depict it and the wider study area as open countryside.

4.52 The parish Tithe maps of Horninglow (1848), Burton Extra (1847) and Branston (1847) were consulted, but none of them depicts the land within the application site, which presumably was not subject to tithe-rent charges.

4.53 Nonetheless, they depict the landscape in the wider study area as enclosed farmland, and the field pattern was largely maintained through to the first edition of the Ordnance Survey, in 1883-4.

4.54 At this time, the land within the application site comprised a series of irregularly shaped land parcels, although the fields themselves were defined by linear boundaries, typical of planned enclosure. The majority of the external field boundaries to the application site remain, although internally, the majority have since been removed.

4.55 Lower Outwoods Road is depicted on the first edition map, although no farm buildings are depicted at its south west end. Aside from the encroaching development to the east of the application site, which by the 1960s had extended to its boundaries, and the development of the farm complex within the application site, the later Ordnance Survey maps provide no additional information of significance.

Secondary Sources

4.56 The available secondary sources, which were examined at the Burton upon Trent Local Studies Library, Lichfield Record Office and English Heritage’s NMR in Swindon, have provided no additional information on the archaeological interest of the site.

4.57 Nonetheless, there is documentary evidence, from 1324, for a vast tract of woodland on the outskirts of Burton. At this time, it was called ‘forensic wood’, literally meaning that outside of Burton. By 1372, the woodland was called Outward (VCH, 2008).

Aerial Photographs

4.58 A total of 32 vertical aerial photographs and 20 specialist oblique photographs, covering the application site and its immediate environs, were identified within the collections maintained by English Heritage. They span the period from May 1948 to July 1992 and add detail to the land use and development sequence shown on those historic maps available at the Lichfield Record Office.
4.59 The early post-war aerial photographs provide little additional information, although they do confirm that the land within the application site was under agricultural management. An aerial photograph taken in 1962 (Ref RAF/543/1794) depicts a series of circular ‘tracks’ in the north west part of the application site, but these appear to be agricultural in nature; i.e. from vehicle movements; rather than being archaeological.

4.60 However, an aerial photograph taken in 1967 (Ref OS/67014) depicts a feature of potential archaeological interest. Located in the southernmost field and situated on a gentle south-facing slope, it comprises a roughly ‘D’ shaped enclosure orientated approximately north-east to south-west. Smaller enclosures are visible to the south west, beyond the application site, although these are not as clear. In addition, dark circular patches to the south may also be of archaeological interest (see Appendix EDP 1).

4.61 Although the enclosure is undated, similarly shaped enclosures to the north of the study area are of likely later prehistoric and/or Roman date.

**Site Walkover**

4.62 The site was visited in July 2012, in order to assess the current ground conditions and topography, to confirm the continuing survival of any known archaeological remains and to identify any hitherto unknown remains.

4.63 In addition, the locations of designated heritage assets in the wider study area were considered with regard to their sensitivity to proposed development and the likely constraint that they would pose in that regard.

**Designated Heritage Assets**

4.64 The site visit confirmed that the application site does not contain any designated archaeological features or remains. It did, however, identify the location of the one scheduled monument located in the vicinity of the application site.

4.65 It is located approximately 500 metres to the south of the application site and comprises the moat at Sinai Park (SM 21535). Although it occupies high ground, its immediate setting lies within the park’s grounds, which are enclosed by woodland plantations along its northern and eastern edges.

4.66 The enclosed nature of Sinai Park and the undulating nature of the intervening landscape suitably separate it from the land within the application site. Therefore, it is unlikely that the immediate or wider setting of the moat will be a constraint to the form of development proposed within the application site.

4.67 The Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area is located over 500 metres to the east of the application site. The conservation area follows the immediate line of the canal, and also incorporates associated features such as basins etc.
4.68 Being separated from the application site by residential and other development, as well as the line of the A38 dual carriageway, and possessing no functional association, its wider setting will not be adversely affected by the form of development proposed.

4.69 There are two listed buildings in the wider study area located to the east of the application site. The more significant of these is the Grade II* listed Church of St Paul (LB 1288714). Located in the midst of residential estates, it has a very urban setting that has no visual or functional relationship to the application site. As such, it will not be adversely affected by the form of development proposed.

4.70 The second comprises a milepost (LB 1261832) along the Trent and Mersey Canal. Again, this has no functional or visual relationship with the application site and will not be adversely affected by the form of development proposed.

4.71 The listed buildings to the south of the application site, along Forest Road, are all situated in a low lying valley and are not visible from the land within it. Furthermore, with their settings either associated with the line of the road (LB 1392732), grouped as part of a farmstead (LBs 1374349 and 1288698) or forming part of a substantial industrial complex (LBs 1038692, 1038693 and 1374338), their wider settings are not focused on any part of the application site and therefore will not be adversely affected by the form of development proposed.

**Undesignated Heritage Assets**

4.72 The site walkover, which confirmed that the land within the application site is primarily farmed for turf, did not identify any previously unrecorded archaeological remains predating the post-medieval period.

4.73 As previously mentioned, the application site occupies high undulating ground to the west of the Trent Valley and, topographically, may have some potential for hitherto unknown archaeological deposits.

4.74 The central area occupies the highest ground and, from here, the land descends to the south and west, into the shallow valley of the Shobnall Brook. Whilst the western slope is steep, the southern slope is gentler. The northern boundary remains on high ground, although, beyond, it descends to the northeast.

4.75 There are no earthwork features visible within the application site relating to the ‘D’ shaped enclosure identified on historic aerial photographs. However, it occupies a similar topographic position to an undated enclosure (MST 4761) located approximately one kilometre to the north. Furthermore, to the south, and at an equal distance from the application site, a medieval moat occupies a similar position, situated on high ground overlooking the Trent Valley. Although these do not confirm the archaeological nature of the enclosure within the application site, taken together they represent further evidence for activity on the high ground to the west of the Trent valley.
Although no earthwork features pre-dating the post-medieval period were observed within the application site, the remains of former field boundaries depicted on the modern Ordnance Survey mapping were identified, although they are now largely truncated and barely visible as above ground landscape features.
Section 5
Conclusions

5.1 This assessment of archaeological and heritage resources concludes that the application site does not contain any scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields or listed buildings, where there would be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation and against development.

5.2 One scheduled monument, one conservation area and nine listed buildings in the vicinity of the application site have been identified and their settings considered within this report. It is concluded that the form of development proposed for the application site will not adversely impact upon them. This is on the basis that their wider settings have no functional, visual or aesthetic relationships to the land within it. Furthermore, they are distant from the site and screened from it by topographical and built features.

5.3 There are no previously identified undesignated prehistoric or Roman finds or features recorded within the application site and there is very little evidence for activity from these periods within the wider study area. Nonetheless, an undated enclosure, located approximately 600 metres to the north of the application site, may be of archaeological interest. Situated on high ground, it occupies a similar topographic position to the southern part of the application site, where a ‘D’ shaped enclosure has been identified from a review of aerial photographs. Based on similar enclosures on the clay uplands beyond the study area considered here, the enclosures are likely to be of later prehistoric and/or Roman date.

5.4 There are no previously recorded early medieval heritage assets within the application site or the wider study area and it is likely that, prior to the Norman Conquest, the area comprised woodland. In the later medieval period, two deer parks were created in the wider study area, to the west and south of the application site. Outside of these, the landscape gradually came into agricultural management and continued to develop through the post-medieval period. The agricultural nature of the wider study area at this time is further evidenced by ridge and furrow earthworks to the north, west and south of the application site. The absence of ridge and furrow earthworks within the application site suggests it was subject to a pastoral management regime, rather than arable cultivation.

5.5 Whilst there are no undesignated heritage assets within the application site, the identification of a ‘D’ shaped enclosure, which occupies a similar topographic position to a previously recorded enclosure to the north means it is considered that there is some potential for it to contain localised archaeological deposits at and around the southern boundary. However, it is highly unlikely that any potential remains here will be of sufficient importance to be worthy of preservation in situ and can be investigated as a condition of outline planning consent.
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Appendix EDP 1
Aerial photograph taken in 1967
(Ref RAF/543/1794)

The ‘D’ Shaped enclosure in the southernmost field of the application site
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Landmark Historical Map
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Barwood Strategic Land II LLP
and Mr and Mrs G Skipper
Red House Farm, Burton upon Trent, Staffordshire

Plan EDP 2: Extract From The First Edition Ordnance Survey Map of 1883-1884
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