

## SUMMARY

S.1 As I have explained using recent guidance (CD-N3 and appendix 11) and Terence O'Rourke's own methodology in determining significance of effects (appendix 10), there is a particular process to assessing the impact of new development on the setting of cultural heritage sites or areas. There are three stages to adopt;

- a. Identify the historic assets that may be affected
- b. Define the setting, its qualities and extent and describe how the surroundings contribute to ways in which the asset is understood and appreciated
- c. Assess how any new development would impact upon that setting.

The original cultural heritage assessment in the ES (chapter 14, CD-A8), further clarification in the Regulation 19 (CD-A11) and the detailed assessment presented in this proof of evidence are in line with a robust, comprehensive and transparent assessment of the potential effects of the CERC proposal.

S.2 There are six factors that should be considered in assessing the impact of any new development on the setting of a cultural heritage asset (appendix 11, 6), and include:

- a. The visual impact of the proposal relative to the scale of the asset and its setting
- b. The visual impact of the proposal relative to the current place of the asset in the landscape

- c. How the proposal compares to the character of the built environment within the surroundings of the asset
  - d. The magnitude and cumulative effect of the proposed change on ones ability to appreciate a particular asset
  - e. The ability of the landscape, comprising the setting of any/all assets, to absorb new development without eroding an assets key characteristics
  - f. The effect of the proposal on qualities of an assets setting such as sense of place, remoteness, cultural identity, spiritual responses or evocation of the past
- All of these factors are considered in this proof and I believe that the CERC proposals satisfy all of them.

S.3 As Mr Greenwood states in his proof of evidence, the emerging WDF identified the CERC site as one of only two preferred sites in the Central Cornwall Area of Search suitable for a large scale EfW plant. The Minerals Local Plan identified part of the site as an area for industrial plant development, with the land to the north of the CERC site earmarked for the continued disposal of china clay. These allocations illustrate the council's consideration that the CERC site was a viable and suitable extension to the extant industrial/china clay works.

S.4 Of the five cultural heritage assets assessed here, there would be substantial or moderately significant effects on the setting of two assets as a consequence of the CERC proposal – St. Denys Church and Parkandillick engine house, both of which are nationally designated grade II\*. With regards to the effects on historic landscape character, which is afforded no statutory protection, the

CERC site within an area of recently enclosed land (REL) is a small impact upon this landscape zone, which covers 17.44% of Cornwall.

S.5 Recently enclosed land is a descriptive, non-designated character type that was never intended to imply value judgments on landscape significance or acceptability of development impact. However, there are usually two stages to the historic landscape characterisation process (appendix 12, 6): firstly the landscape is identified, mapped, described and interpreted, ie. ‘this is what we have’ (CD-N13, appendix 5) and a second stage in which judgements about value are applied to this initial assessment and objectives are agreed, ie. ‘this is what we wish to do with it’. Cornwall was the first county in England to pioneer this landscape characterisation process in 1994 (*ibid.*), but no follow up work on its application has been undertaken on the second stage judgement on value in relation to land management and conservation applications across Cornwall’s historic environment. The recent re-evaluation of character types resulting in the CERC site being REL and not AEL as previously described is perhaps the start of the second stage by the council (see figure 14, appendix 2; appendix 14 correspondence).

S.6 The predicted substantial significant effect to the setting of St. Denys Church, as originally stated in the ES chapter 14 (CD-A8) varies across the three identified areas of the curtilage, which I contend should be viewed as three distinct parts. While there would be a substantially significant effect when viewed from the car park, the effect reduces as one enters the church green and walks towards the church. The enclosure and strong sense of place of the

churchyard and its grove of trees dominate impressions once within this space. The CERC would be behind the viewer in this approach with no juxtaposition or competition between either the stack of the CERC or the 55ft church tower. There would be glimpses of the stack height and possibly the roofline of the main building (winter views only) from particular points of the northern graveyard (figure GC059 Mr Coulsons proof). The topography of Carne Hill drops away from the northern graveyard wall allowing no other third point from the vicinity of the church where the CERC would be juxtaposed with this grade II\* listed building (plate 9, appendix 3). Importantly, from the wider landscape, such as Goss Moor to the north, it is the distinctive and now densely tree-covered Carne Hill top that is identifiable and not the church tower or any other historic structures.

S.7 Parkandillick engine house is contained within the relict china clay working area. Long section 02 in appendix 6 of the Regulation 19 information (CD-A11) shows the topographical relationship of the engine house within these industrial workings and the proposed CERC site (also shown in plate 5, appendix 3). The building form of the engine house, in particular the slate roofline and gable ends, are distinctive amongst the modern industrial sheds and Parkandillick dryers. The discordant presence of several lines of conifers close to the northern elevation of the asset also assists with recognition in the wider landscape, as these trees are not common amongst the areas of revegetated waste tips. The internal beam engine is partly reflective of this assets high grading as a grade II\* listed building, whilst the functional relationship to both chimney and drying pans in its immediate vicinity are

other factors. It is my opinion that the CERC site is not part of the internal or external functional relationship to this asset – either historically (see figure 3, appendix 2), or considered of similar character in the present day (see figure 7 and 8, appendix 2). As photomontage and representative viewpoint GC058, produced as part of Mr Coulson’s evidence clearly illustrates, there will be no view of CERC and stack in relation to the engine house and chimney from what the council contend is the primary setting to the south. Therefore, I believe that the CERC proposals would result in a small change to the setting of this asset with an effect of moderate significance predicted.

S.8 In the course of my work on the assessment of CERC, there have been several versions of the HLC data (CD-A8, figure 14.5; figures 7, 8 and 14, appendix 2). The reappraised HLC zones (figure 14, appendix 2) describe the CERC site as predominantly REL with a thin section of AEL. Neither zone is designated by national, regional or local policies and are therefore not afforded any form of protection. The CERC site did not contain features of AEL that the recent HLC evaluation deemed to be either prehistoric or medieval in origin, but likely to be the consequence of later amendments of field boundaries during the post medieval or 20<sup>th</sup> century. The CERC proposals are a small development footprint that would not undermine the legibility or character of the REL at the site to an unacceptable degree.

S.9 English Heritage conservation principle 5 (CD-N3) states:

*“Decisions about change must be reasonable, transparent and consistent.”* It

is my opinion that the council has not adequately explained how it has

determined levels of acceptable harm on the key cultural heritage assets in the reason for refusal no.3 (CD-B2). The subsequent conservation principle, no.6 states that:

*“Documenting and learning from decisions is essential. Managers of significant places should monitor and regularly evaluate the effects of change and responses to it and use the results to inform future decisions.”*

It is my opinion that the council has not properly evaluated the effects of change as a consequence of the china clay industry on the landscape surrounding the CERC site and in not doing so, has failed to appreciate the degree of absorption and assimilation that the current industry offers the CERC proposals.

S.10 It is my opinion that the immediate and wider historic environment surrounding the CERC site does not possess a rich resource of cultural heritage assets, with only 10 listed buildings accorded national protection, with seven of these within the St. Denys Church complex. I contend that the council has failed to consider the English Heritage concept of ‘tradable historic environment capital’ in accepting a degree of change to the setting of a small number of ‘critical capital’ assets in exchange for benefits to achieving renewable energy and waste targets.

S.11 English Heritage (CD-N3, 60) states that changes which would harm the heritage values of a significant place should be unacceptable unless:

*“a. Changes are necessary either to make the place sustainable, or to meet an overriding public policy objective or need...and*

*d. It has been demonstrated that the predicted public benefit decisively outweighs the harm to the values of the place, considering;*

*its comparative significance*

*the impact on that significance*

*the benefits to the place itself and/or wider community or society as a whole.”*

S.12 The underlying considerations in striking the balance should be applying:

*“proportionality and reasonableness, whether in relation to the place or society, the predicted benefits of change outweigh the residual, unavoidable harm that would be done to the significance of the place. The balance lies between retaining significance, the sum of the heritage values ascribed at the point of change to something, which, if lost, cannot be replaced, and the predicted benefits of development. The benefits, including those of strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, need to be subject to scrutiny in proportion to their impact on heritage values.” (CD-N3, 61)*

S.13 On the basis of this evidence I conclude that all potential cultural heritage impacts and concerns have been fully taken into account. In the context of the clearly established need for this facility, as set out in the evidence of others, I conclude, on balance, that the local impacts on the cultural heritage assets are acceptable.