

9 Built Heritage

9.1 Introduction

- 9.1.1 This chapter assesses Built Heritage. The chapter has been prepared by Richard Smalley BA (Hons) FSA, MCIFA, AssocIHBC, Senior Director at RPS Consulting Ltd (a Tetrattech Company).
- 9.1.2 This chapter details the methodology followed, a review of the baseline conditions in the defined study area, the results of the assessment and suggested mitigation.
- 9.1.3 This chapter is supported by the following figures and appendices:
- Figure 9.1 – Map of Built Heritage Receptors
 - Appendix 9.1 – Built Heritage Statement
- 9.1.4 A description of the Proposed Development can be found in Chapter 3 (Description of Development, Design and Mitigation), prepared by Savills.

Planning Policy Context

Local Planning Policy

- 9.1.5 Reference should be made to the Planning Statement for a detailed summary of the Policy context. However, for the purposes of this chapter the following local planning policy remains relevant. The Site is situated within the jurisdiction of Wokingham Borough Council.
- 9.1.6 The assessment contained within this Chapter and the accompanying Built Heritage Statement (RPS, 2025) (Appendix 9.1) has been conducted in line with the following legislation, national and local planning policy, and guidance:
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990;
 - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024 with minor updates in 2025);
 - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (DCLG, 2019);
 - Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (English Heritage, 2008);
 - Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2nd ed., 2017);
 - Wokingham Borough Council Local Plan (Core Strategy) Adopted 2010)

9.2 Assessment methodology

- 9.2.1 Assessment of likely significant environmental effects on cultural heritage resources within the Site has been conducted in line with the latest and most comprehensive guidance provided in the “Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK” published by Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (ISEP – then IEMA) in July 2021.
- 9.2.2 The assessment methodology has also been guided by Historic England’s Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets.

Study Area

- 9.2.3 A study area extending 1km from the Site boundary has been applied. This is considered appropriate given the scale of the Proposed Development and the character of the surrounding landscape, being sufficient to gather background data and to identify assets where there is potential for significant effects to occur as a result of change to their setting.

Data Sources

The following data sources have been drawn upon for the purposes of the assessment:

- Historic England National Heritage List for England (NHLE);
- Berkshire Historic Environment Record (HER);
- Historic mapping;
- Environment Agency LiDAR data;
- Satellite imagery;
- Site visits over a number of occasions including May 2022, September 2023 and May 2025;
- Geophysical survey;
- Multispectral survey.

Significance Criteria

- 9.2.4 The sensitivity of heritage receptors reflects their relative importance which will depend on factors such as condition, rarity, potential as an information source, associations with events or people, and architectural or historic interest. Importance and hence sensitivity has been defined here with reference to designation, where applicable, and professional judgement. Table 9.1 sets out the guidance criteria for assessing sensitivity.

- 9.2.5 The assessment methodology stages, can be outlined as follows:

Table 9.1 Value/sensitivity assessment

Receptor value / sensitivity	Receptor type
High	Heritage assets of national importance, e.g., Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings, Grade I and Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens and non-designated built heritage assets demonstrably of listing quality.
Medium	Grade II Listed Buildings, Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas. Heritage assets of regional importance such as buildings with potential to meaningfully contribute to regional research objectives.
Low	Heritage assets of local importance, e.g., local listed buildings and archaeological assets of value in the local context.
Negligible	Heritage assets of very low significance such as buildings, structures and remains identified through the application of

Receptor value / sensitivity	Receptor type
	professional judgement which are of sufficiently low significance that are not formally recognised by the LPA as a heritage asset.

- 9.2.6 Magnitude of impact has been considered in terms of change in the cultural significance (as defined in NPPF) of the heritage receptor. Such change may be beneficial or adverse. Beneficial effects may occur where, for example, a proposal arrests on-going loss of physical fabric, thereby preventing the loss of cultural significance, or removes elements of the receptor's setting that hinder the appreciation of its cultural significance. Adverse effects may occur where a proposal results in the loss of physical fabric and hence cultural significance or introduces features to the receptor's setting that detract from the appreciation of its cultural significance. As different elements of a heritage asset or its setting will make differing contributions to its cultural significance, the level of contribution and whether this is positive or negative, or neutral, is taken into account when determining magnitude. For this reason, a relatively small change in a receptor's fabric might result in a high magnitude of effect, whilst a large change in its setting might result in a low magnitude of effect, or vice versa. Furthermore, as elements of an asset's setting may make a neutral contribution to its cultural significance, it is possible for even relatively large changes in setting to have no impact upon its cultural significance, resulting in a neutral change. Guidance criteria for assessment of magnitude are provided in Table 9.2.

Table 9.2 Magnitude of impact

Magnitude	Description
High	<p>Beneficial: Proposal would provide for the long-term conservation/survival of the heritage receptor where this is otherwise threatened or would remove elements of its setting that substantively detract from the receptor's cultural significance or prevent its appreciation.</p> <p>Adverse: Proposal would result in total or substantial destruction of the heritage receptor or change in its setting resulting in the complete or near complete loss of its cultural significance or the ability to appreciate it.</p>
Medium	<p>Beneficial: Proposals would reduce rate of current degradation thereby preserving the receptor's cultural significance or remove elements of its fabric or setting that detract from its cultural significance or the ability to appreciate it.</p> <p>Adverse: Proposal would result in change in setting or loss of fabric resulting in partial loss of the receptor's cultural significance or the ability to appreciate the receptor.</p>
Low	Beneficial: Proposal would result in changes in the receptor's fabric or setting that slightly increase its cultural significance or the ability to appreciate the receptor.

Magnitude	Description
	Adverse: Proposal would result in change in setting or loss of fabric leading to a slight loss of the receptor's cultural significance or the ability to appreciate the receptor.
Negligible	Change to a heritage receptor or its setting that leads to a very slight loss of the receptor's cultural heritage or the ability to appreciate the receptor.

- 9.2.7 Magnitude of effect is determined through professional judgement with reference to the sensitivity of the receptor and magnitude of impact. Table 9.3 provides guidelines to assist in the consistent application of professional judgement. Medium or high magnitude impacts on a medium or high sensitivity receptor are classified as significant effects for the purposes of this assessment; these may be adverse or beneficial.

Table 9.3 Magnitude of effect

Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	Major Adverse or Beneficial	Moderate Adverse or Beneficial	Minor Adverse or Beneficial	Negligible
Medium	Moderate Adverse or Beneficial	Moderate to Minor Adverse or Beneficial	Minor Adverse or Beneficial to Negligible	Negligible
Low	Minor Adverse or Beneficial	Minor Adverse or Beneficial to Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

Geographic Scope

- 9.2.8 The geographic scope for this assessment includes the Site and area up to 1km from its boundary. This is deemed sufficient to assess potential impacts of the Proposed Development on nearby built heritage receptors. This was determined based on the topography of the Site, the high levels of woodland planting and the edge of settlement nature context within which much of the Site sits.

Temporal Scope

- 9.2.9 No defined temporal scope is used in the assessment. As the receptors are all existing, standing buildings, the assessment has assumed that effects will be present for the duration of the receptors' physical presence in the landscape and the length of the Proposed Development's construction and occupation.

Consultation

- 9.2.10 Consultation has been undertaken, through scoping, with Wokingham Borough Council's Heritage Officer and Historic England.

9.2.11 Consultation is summarised in Table 6.4, below.

Table 9.4 Consultation

Consultee	Date/Time	Comments	Outcomes/Actions
Wokingham Borough Council – Heritage Officer	28-02-2025	Scoping opinion letter	Heritage Officer agreed with intended approach for EIA with a number of caveats regarding the scoping in of non-designated built heritage assets as well as designated built heritage assets.
Guy Robinson, Historic England	08-07-2025	Email to open discussions regarding the possibilities for providing heritage benefits through the conservation of the Scheduled Monument within the Site.	Historic England confirmed that there is no existing project in place for the conservation of the asset. Requested to see Heritage reports when ready.

Assumptions and Limitations

9.2.12 Built heritage receptors were on private land, so the interior of these structures was not inspected during the Site and surrounds walkover. The built heritage receptors were assessed from the Site and, where necessary, the Site visit assessed relevant built heritage receptors from public rights of way.

9.3 Baseline conditions

9.3.1 This section summarises the results of the baseline studies which comprised a Built Heritage Statement. The full results are presented in the appendices. The built heritage baseline study included assessments of significance and of impact, which were carried out in line with guidance contained in Historic England's Advice Note 12 (HEAN12) (2019) and Historic England Good Practice Advice 3 (HEGPA3) (2017). This study, which can be found in the Built Heritage Statement at Appendix 9.1, was informed by a search of national and local databases of known built heritage receptors (including the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) and the Berkshire Historic Environment Record (HER); an historic map regression; historic research; and a visual assessment undertaken to determine how the Proposed Development would have a bearing on the surrounding historic built environment.

Current Baseline

9.3.2 Built heritage receptors have been assessed in the Built Heritage Statement (Appendix 9.1), and that assessment is not repeated here. A list of built heritage receptors, along with their level of sensitivity is included in Table 9.4 below:

Table 9.5 Built Heritage Receptors

Receptor	Name	Details	Sensitivity
LB1	Hall Place Farmhouse	Grade II listed farmhouse in the southern part of the Site	Medium
LB2	Simonds Family Tomb	Grade II listed tombstone in the southern part of the Site	Medium
LB3	St Bartholomew's Old Church	Grade II listed remains of church in the southern part of the Site. Also a Scheduled Monument	High
LB4	Bridge House	Grade II listed house immediately to the south of the Site	Medium
LB5	Old Rectory	Grade II listed rectory located immediately to the south of the Site	Medium
LB6	St Bartholomew's Church	Grade II listed church located immediately to the south of the Site	Medium
LB7	Mole Bridge Farmhouse	Grade II listed farmhouse located 100m south-east of the Site	Medium
LB8	The Glen	Grade II listed house located immediately to the south-east of the Site	Medium
LB9	Carters Hill	Grade II listed house	Medium
LB10	West Lodge	Grade II listed building within Bearwood Park, immediately east of the Site	Medium
LB11	Park Lodge	Grade II listed building within Bearwood Park, immediately east of the Site	Medium
LB12	Oak Cottage	Grade II listed cottage approximately 60m north-east of the Site	Medium
LB13	Cutbush	Grade II listed building approximately 530m north-west of the Site	Medium
LB14	Barn	Grade II listed barn approximately 530m north-west of the Site	Medium
LB15	Old House	Grade II listed house, located approximately 140m west of the Site	Medium
LB16	Barn	Grade II listed barn, located approximately 140m west of the Site	Medium
LB17	Mill	Grade II listed building, located approximately 345m west of the Site	Medium
LB18	Masonic Centre	Grade II listed building, located approximately 670m north-east of the Site	Medium
RGB1	Bearwood Park	Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, located immediately to the east of the Site	High

CA1	Arborfield Conservation Area	Conservation Area located approximately 520m south of the Site	Medium
CA2	Sindlesham Conservation Area	Conservation Area located approximately 555m east of the Site	Medium
BH1	Shinfield Grange	Non-designated built heritage asset, located approximately 245m west of the Site	Low
BH2	Reading Room	Non-designated built heritage asset, located approximately 22m east of the Site	Low
BH3	Mole Lodge Gasworks	Non-designated built heritage asset, located approximately 20m east of the Site	Low

Future Baseline

- 9.3.3 Beyond any future changes to the fabric of the buildings, the likely evolution of the current built heritage environment would include further imminent or potential changes to the wider setting of the above built heritage receptors. For the purposes of this assessment no imminent or potential changes are identified for the wider setting.

9.4 Inherent design mitigation

- 9.4.1 With the exception of the construction of a spine road, there is no built development proposed to the north-west of the River Loddon, this area being identified for public open space. This will effectively preserve the setting and significance of **LB13 – LB17** and **BH1**. The remainder of the Site is located at a sufficient distance from the assets and screened by topography and vegetation so as to not result in any meaningful impact.
- 9.4.2 The design allows for the retention of the existing immediate setting of **LB2** and **LB3** to the north, east and west. Designs also include the retention of **LB1** and a number of buildings in close proximity to it, albeit with proposals for changes in use which may some loss of original fabric consistent with any repurposing of agriculturally orientated buildings.
- 9.4.3 The Proposed Development includes the separation of new built development from **LB6** with the provision of a new extension to the existing burial ground in the area of the Site immediately to the north of **LB6**.
- 9.4.4 The design retains agricultural land in the areas to the north of **LB7**, and to the north of **LB8**. Therefore, the proposals currently preserve the existing immediate and intermediate setting of these two built heritage receptors. This drawing back of development from the eastern boundary of the Site also protects the setting of **RGB1**, **LB10**, **LB11** and **BH3**.

9.5 Potential effects prior to additional mitigation

Construction Phase

- 9.5.1 Proposals include for the change of use of **LB1**. This will involve refurbishment of **LB1** which could result in loss of fabric resulting in partial loss of the receptor's cultural significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a medium magnitude of impact to a Medium sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Moderate** adverse magnitude of effect.

- 9.5.2 Receptor **LB2**, the Simonds family tomb, derives its significance from its age, preservation, fabric and its relationship with St Bartholomew's Old Church (**LB3**). The proposed development on the Site will have no effect on these elements of the receptor's significance.
- 9.5.3 Receptor **LB3**, St Bartholomew's Old Church, derives the majority of its significance from its historic fabric, age, and state of preservation. The proposed development would have no physical impact on these elements of its significance. **LB3** also derives significance from its setting, which comprises the surrounding landscape, but principally its relationship with **LB2** and **LB1**. The proposed development will result in a change to the setting of **LB3**, but not to such a degree so as to result in a complete or near complete loss of significance. There would be a slight loss of significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a low magnitude of impact to a High sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Minor** adverse magnitude of effect.
- 9.5.4 Receptor **LB4** is the grade II listed Bridge House. The receptor derives the majority of its significance from its age and physical fabric. The Site forms part of the setting of **LB4**, but only in that it forms a surrounding agricultural landscape that formed the basis of the settlement's economy in which Bridge House forms a part of. As such, the contribution setting makes to **LB4** is considered secondary. The proposed development will result in a change to the setting of **LB4**, but this change will not be to such a degree as to result in a complete or near complete loss of significance. There would be a slight loss of significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a low magnitude of impact to a Medium sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Minor** adverse magnitude of effect.
- 9.5.5 Receptor **LB5**, The Old Rectory, derives the majority of its significance by being a 19th century house associated with the church. **LB5** is no longer in Church ownership but retains some value from its group relationship with church. The Site forms part of the setting of **LB5**, but only in that it forms a surrounding agricultural landscape that formed the basis of the settlement's economy. As such, the contribution setting makes to **LB5** is very secondary. The proposed development will result in a change to the setting of **LB5**, but not to such a degree so as to result in a complete or near complete loss of significance. There would be a slight loss of significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a low magnitude of impact to a Medium sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Minor** adverse magnitude of effect.
- 9.5.6 Receptor **LB6**, St Bartholomew's Church, derives its significance primarily from its architectural and historic special interest as a nineteenth century continuously operated place of worship, through its design and materials used. It shares a group value with the former parish church from which parts of its built fabric originates, as well as the Old Rectory. It is a rural parish church with an extensive wider setting, largely limited to longer distance views of the spire. Setting, including the Site, makes a positive, though secondary, contribution to the overall significance. The proposed development will result in a change to the setting of **LB6**, but this change will not be to such a degree as to result in a complete or near complete loss of significance. There would be a slight loss of significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a low magnitude of impact to a Medium sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Minor** adverse magnitude of effect.
- 9.5.7 The current design retains agricultural land in the areas to the north of **LB7**, and to the north of **LB8**. Therefore, the proposals currently preserve the existing immediate and intermediate setting of these two built heritage receptors. This drawing back of development from the eastern boundary of the Site also protects the setting of **RGB1** and the built heritage receptors within it (**LB10**, **LB11**, **BH3**). Therefore, there will be no impact to the significance of these built heritage receptors.

- 9.5.8 Receptor **LB9** is the grade II listed Carters Hill, derives its significance from its architectural and historic special interest as a former farmhouse. The cessation of an agricultural role for the heritage asset and formerly associated farm buildings has impacted the significance. Setting makes a secondary contribution to the overall significance, limited the wider rurality which remains. The proposed development will result in a change to the setting of **LB9**, but this change will not be to such a degree as to result in a complete or near complete loss of significance. There would be a slight loss of significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a low magnitude of impact to a Medium sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Minor** adverse magnitude of effect
- 9.5.9 Receptor **LB12**, Oak Cottage, derives its significance from its architectural and historic special interest as a vernacular sixteenth century rural worker dwelling as evidenced through its design and materials used. Setting helps to make a positive, though secondary, contribution to the overall significance through helping to provide the rural context to the dwelling and the Site forms part of this contribution. The proposed development will result in a change to the setting of **LB12**, but not to such a degree so as to result in a complete or near complete loss of significance. There would be a slight loss of significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a low magnitude of impact to a Medium sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Minor** adverse magnitude of effect.
- 9.5.10 With the exception of the construction of a spine road, there is no built development proposed to the north-west of the River Loddon, this area being identified for public open space. Due to the large distance between the receptors and the area of built development, it is considered that there will be no impact on built heritage receptors **LB13-17** and **BH1**.
- 9.5.11 The significance of **LB18**, the Masonic Centre, is largely derived from its architectural and historic special interest as an eighteenth century large rural dwelling. The loss of a residential use and the later extensions and surrounding car parking has much impacted the significance. Setting makes very little, if any, contribution now to the significance on account of these changes. The change to setting is not considered to impact its cultural significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a negligible magnitude of impact to a Medium sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Negligible** adverse magnitude of effect.
- 9.5.12 Arborfield Conservation Area, **CA1**, shares some limited intervisibility with the Site, primarily the southernmost reaches. Development on the wider Site could increase the degree of urbanisation in the wider surrounds, though it is recognised that there is a belt of rural landscape between the Site and **CA1**. It should also be noted that the designation itself has seen urbanising change, such as a roundabout in the core of the village, and previous twentieth century housing estates which have impacted the overall significance.
- 9.5.13 The current proposal sees a robust tree planting along the southern edge of the Site which will provide a strong screening and will help to preserve some degree of rurality, though it is likely that there would still be some intervisibility with built development. The proposed development will result in a change to the setting of **CA1**, but not to such a degree so as to result in a complete or near complete loss of significance. There would be a slight loss of significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a low magnitude of impact to a Medium sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Minor** adverse magnitude of effect
- 9.5.14 The significance of Sindlesham Conservation Area, **CA2**, derives its significance from the evidential value which the largely planned Victorian village, surrounding a playing field, alongside the northern reaches of the former Bearwood estate through legibility of the historic settlement pattern and its relationship to the principal house; the relative density, planned nature and group value of historic buildings and the historic layout of the development and infrastructure; linking the village through to the house and estate. **CA2**'s significance is also

derived from some aesthetic value in terms of its heavily landscaped setting within the conservation area, and the associated visual ties between the estate houses in the village and the main house. The significance of **CA2** is also derived from the architectural and historic interest of many of the Victorian buildings within the designation, built to provide accommodation to estate workers, and the special interest of its listed buildings and the planned nature of not only the parkland but the communal recreation ground onto which the estate workers houses were built to enjoy and make use of. The Site is located at distance and separated from **CA2**, and the proposed development is not considered to have any material impact on the significance of the receptor.

9.5.15 **BH2**, Reading Room Cottage, is a heritage asset of low (local) interest only. Its significance primarily derives from its architectural interest, and to a lesser degree its historic interest as a former village reading room and community facility. The changes to its fabric have already impacted to a high degree its significance, as has the conversion of the remaining reading room to a residential use. Setting can be said to make a secondary contribution, with any contribution largely defined by its village location to once serve its residents. The proposed development will result in a change to the setting of **BH2**, but not to such a degree so as to result in a complete or near complete loss of significance. There would be a slight loss of significance. In accordance with Table 9.2 this represents a low magnitude of impact to a Low sensitivity receptor. This would result in a **Negligible** adverse magnitude of effect.

9.5.16 Vibration and noise effects are assessed in Chapter 15. That Chapter concluded that construction noise and vibration have the potential to cause impacts at nearby receptors. However, with the implementation of mitigation outlined within the CEMP, significant adverse effects can be avoided. It is considered that noise and vibration will not impact the significance of built heritage receptors.

Table 9.6 Magnitude of Effect on Built Heritage Receptors

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Magnitude of effect
LB1	Medium	Medium	Moderate Adverse
LB2	Medium	None	None
LB3	High	Low	Minor Adverse
LB4	Medium	Low	Minor Adverse
LB5	Medium	Low	Minor Adverse
LB6	Medium	Low	Minor Adverse
LB7	Medium	None	None
LB8	Medium	None	None
LB9	Medium	Low	Minor Adverse
LB10	Medium	None	None
LB11	Medium	None	None
LB12	Medium	Low	Minor Adverse
LB13	Medium	None	None
LB14	Medium	None	None
LB15	Medium	None	None
LB16	Medium	None	None
LB17	Medium	None	None
LB18	Medium	Negligible adverse	Negligible
RGB1	High	None	None
CA1	Medium	Low	Minor Adverse

CA2	Medium	None	None
BH1	Low	None	None
BH2	Low	Low	Negligible
BH3	Low	None	None

Operational Phase

9.5.17 Potential operation phase effects, such as noise, activity and light spill associated with the Proposed Development are considered to equate to the same impacts as those identified for the construction phase.

9.5.18 No significant adverse noise and vibration effects are identified in Chapter 15.

9.6 Additional Mitigation

Construction Phase

9.6.1 The refurbishment of **LB1** will need to be carried out sensitively and with Listed Building Consent. This is likely to include a programme of historic building recording carried out in line with guidance provided by Historic England.

Operational Phase

9.6.2 **LB3** is also a Scheduled Monument (see Chapter 8 SM1) and is included on Historic England's *At Risk Register*. The condition is described by Historic England as "very bad" and being at "immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric", with "no solution agreed". **LB2** is not specifically named, but being part of the same site, is likely to be also at risk. A programme of repair and stabilisation will be put in place following construction of the Proposed Development, including for the management of the grounds and vegetation to ensure the survival of **LB2** and **LB3**, as well as allow for possible public accessibility and better revealing the significance of the former church.

9.7 Residual effects

Construction Phase

9.7.1 The historic building recording of **LB1** during the sensitive refurbishment of **LB1** will preserve by record the current state of the structure. This will not completely negate the impact to **LB1** but will reduce the **Moderate** magnitude of impact to **Minor**.

9.7.2 The Landscape and Visual Chapter (Chapter 14) confirms that there will be no significant landscape effects on areas of the Site which also relate to the setting of built heritage receptors.

Operational Phase

9.7.3 The programme of management, stabilisation and repair of **LB2** and **LB3** will have a positive effect on the significance of these receptors.

9.7.4 The Landscape and Visual Chapter (Chapter 14) confirms that there will be no significant landscape effects on areas of the Site which also relate to the setting of built heritage receptors.

9.8 Implications of Climate Change

9.8.1 No climate change implications are anticipated for Built Heritage.

9.9 Cumulative effects

Loddon Valley Garden Village Strategic Development Location

9.9.1 The Loddon Valley Garden Village Strategic Development Location includes the phased delivery of around 3,930 dwellings, expansion of the Thames Valley Science and Innovation Park, neighbourhood centres (including retail, leisure, sports, cultural, health and service facilities), and education provision.

9.9.2 No significant built heritage cumulative impacts are anticipated.

Wider Committed Development

9.9.3 The following applications have been assessed for cumulative impacts:

- Land north of Arborfield Road, west of Shinfield Eastern Relief Road (Application No. 242484). No comments from the LPA built heritage officer were noted on the application.
- Land north of Reading Road, Arborfield (Application No. 243099). This application was refused. Built heritage was not included as a reason for refusal.

9.9.4 The remaining cumulative sites are not considered relevant due to their distance from the Site.

9.9.5 No cumulative effects are anticipated.

9.10 Summary

9.10.1 This Chapter concludes that the Proposed Development has the potential to have a moderate adverse effect on the significance of **LB1**. However, the sensitive change of use and historic building recording can reduce this to minor.

9.10.2 The residual effects on the remaining built heritage receptors are considered to be no more than minor.

9.10.3 None of the effects are considered to be significant in terms of EIA Regulations.

9.10.4 A summary of the assessment is set out in Table 9.8 overleaf.

9.11 References

- Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (updated 2023) *National Planning Policy Framework*
- Historic England (2017) Good Practice Advice in Planning 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets: 2nd edition
- IEMA (2021) Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK

9.12 Assessor information

Table 9.7 Assessor Information

Chapter	Responsibility	Name	Qualifications	Assessor information
Built Heritage	RPS Consulting Services Ltd	Richard Smalley	BA (Hons), FSA, MCIfA, AssocIHBC	Richard Smalley is Senior Director for RPS Consulting. He has a degree in Archaeology from the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (BA Hons), is a Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (MCIfA), a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries (FSA) and an Associate Member of the Institute for Historic Building Conservation (IHBC). Richard has over 20 years' experience working in the archaeology sector including fieldwork (geophysics, trial trenching, excavation), research, graphics, and consultancy. As a consultant Richard has provided archaeology and heritage advice and project management to clients for a variety of developments including residential, infrastructure, commercial and renewable energy. He has also acted as an expert witness in Public Inquiries.

Table 9.8 Summary of effects

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Construction Phase					
LB1	Medium	Moderate Adverse	Sensitive design of any proposed changes of use. Listed Building Consent required. Historic Building Recording.	Minor Adverse	Not significant
LB2	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB3	High	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	Not significant
LB4	Medium	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	Not significant
LB5	Medium	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	Not significant
LB6	Medium	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	Not significant
LB7	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB8	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB9	Medium	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	Not significant
LB10	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB11	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB12	Medium	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	Not significant
LB13	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB14	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB15	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB16	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB17	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant
LB18	Medium	Negligible	None	Negligible	Not significant
RGB1	High	None	None	None	Not significant
CA1	Medium	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	Not significant
CA2	Medium	None	None	None	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
BH1	Low	None	None	None	Not significant
BH2	Low	Negligible	None	Negligible	Not significant
BH3	Low	None	None	None	Not significant
Operation Phase					
LB3	High	Minor Adverse	Programme of stabilisation and repair of the ruins.	Minor Adverse	Not significant
All other Receptors	As per construction phase	As per construction phase	As per construction phase	As per construction phase	As per construction phase

9.13 Mitigation commitments Summary

Table 9.9 Summary for Securing Mitigation

Identified receptor	Type and purpose of additional mitigation measure (prevent, reduce, offset, enhance)	Means by which mitigation may be secured (e.g. planning condition / legal agreement)	Delivered by	Auditable by
Construction Phase				
LB1	Historic building recording and sensitive design. Listed Building Consent.	Planning condition	Applicant/developer	LPA / Historic England
Operation Phase				
LB3	Programme of stabilisation and repair of the ruins. Management Plan.	Planning condition	Applicant/developer	LPA / Historic England