

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992
TRANSPORT AND WORKS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURES)
RULES 2004
NETWORK RAIL (HUDDERSFIELD TO WESTTOWN
(DEWSBURY) IMPROVEMENTS) ORDER

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT
SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE
KATIE REES-GILL

Document Reference	NR/PoE/KR-G/6.1
Author	Network Rail
Date	5 October 2021

The Network Rail (Huddersfield to Westtown (Dewsbury) Improvements) Order 5 October 2021

Summary Proof of Evidence – Historic Environment

[this page is intentionally left blank]

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE	2
3. APPROACH TO ASSESSMENT	3
3.2 Understanding and Significance	3
3.3 Assessment Methodology	3
3.4 Proposed Mitigation, Compensation and Conditions	4
3.5 Significant Residual Effects.....	4
3.6 Stakeholder Engagement	5
4. REPRESENTATIONS AND OBJECTIONS	6
4.1 Representation 02 Historic England.....	6
4.2 Objection 33 Kirklees Council	6
4.3 Objection 35 Canal & River Trust.....	6
4.4 Objection 23 HD1 Developments Ltd.....	7
4.5 Objection 44 Mrs Newton.....	7
5. WITNESS DECLARATION	8
5.1 Statement of declaration	8

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 I am an Associate Director with Atkins Ltd. I have a BA in History and Archaeology and an MA in Archaeological Heritage Management. I am a full member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeology, with 21 years' experience working within the historic environment profession.
- 1.1.2 I have been the Lead Heritage Consultant for the proposed Order Scheme since April 2018. I have managed a team of heritage professionals in writing 9 Heritage Assessments to accompany Listed Building Consents; 6 Route Section chapters and 1 Scheme-wide chapter for the Environmental Statement (ES) submitted in support of the Order.

2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1.1 My Proof of Evidence addresses the residual effects on the historic environment from the construction and operation of the Scheme as required by legislative and policy framework concerning the historic environment: *Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (as amended); National Planning Policy Framework, 2021: Chapter 16 Conserving and Enhancing the historic environment; and Kirklees Local Plan, Policy LP35: Historic Environment, 2019.*
- 2.1.2 My evidence sets out the understanding and significance of the historic environment (Section 3). I discuss the assessment approach, mitigation of the proposed works, the public benefits, significant residual effects and level of harm, and how the historic environment will be managed during the implementation of the Scheme (Section 4). Representations and objections in respect of the historic environment are addressed in Section 5.

3. APPROACH TO ASSESSMENT

3.1.1 The Scheme has been developed through an iterative design process which has embedded understanding of the historic environment and included extensive engagement with Kirklees Council and Historic England. The design proposals have been developed to ensure great weight has been given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and has included opportunities to sustain and enhance contribution to significance where possible. This is in line with NPPF (para 199) and Kirklees Policy LP35.

3.2 Understanding and Significance

3.2.1 The importance of the Transpennine Route lies in its diverse design influences having been planned and constructed in various phases between 1836-1849 by different companies, engineers and architects; and then subject to widening in the 1880s and 1890s. It contains structures of the highest historic importance, from the Pioneering phase (1825-41) and Heroic phase (1841-50) of railway development in the UK (NR84), including large scale and pioneering examples, designated as Listed Buildings.

3.3 Assessment Methodology

3.3.1 The assessment methodology for the historic environment ES was devised from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, (2020), which was deemed suitable given the linear transportation Scheme.

3.3.2 The nine Listed Building Consent applications (NR 17-25) are accompanied by Heritage Assessments which identify the impacts of the Scheme to the significance of the structures, and the degree of harm to significance. The policy tests set out in NPPF and Kirklees Local Plan LP35 were applied to the Heritage Assessments and the public benefits of the Scheme addressed.

3.4 Proposed Mitigation, Compensation and Conditions

- 3.4.1 The Scheme included embedded mitigation and used design-based solutions to reduce impacts on heritage assets and to enhance elements where reasonably practicable. Eleven Listed Buildings have benefitted from this process.
- 3.4.2 Additional mitigation measures were recommended in the ES and Heritage Assessments to avoid / reduce negative impacts on the historic environment.
- 3.4.3 Compensation measures were recommended in the ES and Heritage Assessments where additional mitigation to reduce impacts is not possible. These measures have not been treated as mitigation for the purposes of determining level of impact and harm.
- 3.4.4 Putative conditions are attached to the LBC applications and deemed planning permission. A number of these have been proposed for revision as a result of ongoing engagement with Kirklees Council and Historic England.

3.5 Significant Residual Effects

- 3.5.1 The construction of the Scheme will result in impacts on the significance of the following Listed Buildings which require Consent.

Table 3-1: Listed Buildings requiring Consent affected by the Scheme

Heritage Asset	Listing Grade	Assessment of Harm under NPPF & Kirklees LP35
Huddersfield Station	Grade I	Less than substantial harm
Huddersfield Viaduct (MVL3/92)	Grade II	Less than substantial harm
Wheatley's Overbridge (MVL3/103)	Grade II	Substantial harm
B6118 Bridge Road Overbridge (MVL3/107)	Grade II	Substantial harm
Mirfield Viaduct (MVN2/192)	Grade II	Less than substantial harm
Wheatley's Viaduct (MVN2/196)	Grade II	Less than substantial harm
Occupation Underbridge (MDL1/10)	Grade II	Less than substantial harm
Toad Holes Underbridge (MDL/12)	Grade II	Less than substantial harm
Ming Hill Underbridge (MDL1/14)	Grade II	Less than substantial harm

3.5.2 There are other heritage assets within the Scheme, not requiring LBC, which stakeholders have identified as of interest.

Table 3-2: Other Heritage Assets of Interest affected by the Scheme

Heritage Asset	Listing	Assessment of Harm under NPPF & Kirklees LP35
Calder and Hebble Underbridge (MDL1/6)	Grade II	Less than substantial harm
River Calder Underbridge (MDL1/8)	Grade II	Less than substantial harm
Railway Coal Chutes and Tramway with Walls and Gates	Grade II	No harm
Riddings Lock (Locks 6&5)	Grade II	No harm
Fieldhouse Lock (Lock 7)	Grade II	No harm
Red Doles Lock	Grade II	No harm
Number 2 Lock	Grade II	Less than substantial harm
Large Brick Warehouse in Good Yard, Huddersfield Station	Grade II	No harm

3.6 Stakeholder Engagement

3.6.1 Engagement with Historic England and Kirklees Council on the Scheme began in December 2018. In total, 25 meetings¹ have been held with the statutory historic environment stakeholders.

¹ These are purely design meetings and do not include meetings held: to develop Huddersfield Station Statement of Significance; Route-Wide Statement of Significance; or post TWAO submission.

4. REPRESENTATIONS AND OBJECTIONS

4.1 Representation 02 Historic England

- 4.1.1 Historic England agrees with the methodology; the level of harm for each of the Listed Buildings requiring consent, under NPPF; and in principle supports the scheme. It has no objection to the Order on heritage grounds, subject to timely production of CIMPs and further visualisations.

4.2 Objection 33 Kirklees Council

- 4.2.1 Kirklees Council responded to the Scheme application (May 2021) stating that they did not have any objections to the nine LBC applications, but would require further commitments. These further commitments have been discussed in a number of Pre-Inquiry meetings and Kirklees Council and NR are working towards a SoCG.
- 4.2.2 Kirklees Council's concern regarding incomplete and poorly defined impact assessment and justification has been addressed through issue of a technical note further explaining the process undertaken in meeting the requirements under NPPF and Kirklees Local Plan LP35. The extensive engagement with the Council during design development set out the operational needs, potential impacts and resultant effects to the historic environment. A thorough account of the optioneering process for each listed building requiring consent was fully explored with the Council; a thorough account is provided in the Heritage Assessments .
- 4.2.3 The Council also raised concern over the inappropriate reliance on recording as a compensatory measure. It is expressed in the ES that recording is not a mitigation measure used to reduce impacts on heritage assets nor has it been used to justify loss of significance (NPPF, para 205).

4.3 Objection 35 Canal & River Trust

- 4.3.1 It is agreed that there will be temporary impacts from construction to the setting of Huddersfield Broad Canal, Riddings Lock (Lock 6), Fieldhouse Lock (Lock 7), Hall Wood Lock (Lock 5) and Red Doles Lock (Lock 9). These impacts are not considered to be significant.
- 4.3.2 In respect of Number 2 Lock, the assessment has found that there will be permanent moderate adverse effect to its setting from loss of tree coverage and introduction of PSP building. It is possible to mitigate this through a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan secured through condition of the deemed planning permission. There is considered to be no impact to

the significance of the Lock's setting from the changes proposed to the Huddersfield Broad Canal bridge (MVL3/108S).

4.4 Objection 23 HD1 Developments Ltd

- 4.4.1 Concern is expressed that the EIA and other documentation provides an inadequate evaluation of the impacts on the Grade II large brick warehouse.
- 4.4.2 The warehouse was given full consideration in the respect of potential impacts to its setting from the Huddersfield Station design. At the time of writing the ES, the requirement for any physical works to the warehouse was unknown. I understand, post submission of the Order, that the only works required are earthing and bonding measures (for safety reasons) which will be undertaken to the existing goods lift building. In my view this would not have an impact to the significance of the Listed Building.

4.5 Objection 44 Mrs Newton

- 4.5.1 The objection does not concern impacts to the significance of the Grade II Listed Occupation underbridge.

5. WITNESS DECLARATION

5.1 Statement of declaration

5.1.1 I hereby declare as follows:

- (i) This Proof of Evidence includes the facts which I regard as being relevant to the opinions which I have expressed, and the Inquiry's attention has been drawn to any matter which would affect the validity of that opinion.
- (ii) I believe the facts which I have stated in this Proof of Evidence are true and that the opinion expressed are correct.
- (iii) I understand my duty to the Inquiry to help it with matters within my expertise and I have complied with that duty.