

Heritage Note – Response to Rule 6 Statement of Case Addendum.

On behalf of Econergy International Ltd.

Date: 22 January 2024 | Pegasus Ref: P22-0034_HT_R002v1_SB_GS

PINS Ref: APP/L3245/W/23/3332543 | LPA Ref: 22/O4355/FUL

Author: Simon Britt, IHBC MRTPI Associate Heritage Consultant



Document Management.

Version	Date	Author	Checked/ Approved by:	Reason for revision
1	22/01/2024	Simon Britt IHBC MRTPI	GS	-



Contents.

1. Author’s Background	1
2. Introduction.....	2
3. Key Issues	3
4. Planning Policy.....	3
5. Methodology.....	3
6. Heritage Assets, Significance, and Impact.....	4
Cantlop Bridge – Grade II* Listed Building	4
Berrington Farmhouse- Grade II Listed Building	6
Newman Hall Cottages – Grade II Listed Building	7
Pump approximately 2 Metres to West of Newman Hall Cottages – Grade II Listed Building	9
Cantlop Mill –Non-Designated Heritage Asset	10
7. Conclusion and Summary.....	11

Appendices contents.

Appendix 1: Planning Policy	12
Legislation.....	12
The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).....	2
Local Planning Policy	7
Appendix 2: Methodology	9
Appendix 3: List Entries.....	15



1. Author's Background

- 1.1. My name is Simon Britt. I am an Associate Heritage Consultant at Pegasus Group. I am a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) and a full member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC). I have a BSc (Honours) Degree in Archaeology and a Post Graduate Diploma in Urban and Regional Planning.
- 1.2. For 15 years I worked as a Conservation Officer for Local Planning Authorities and have been in my current role in the private sector for the past 5 years. I have advised on numerous large-scale developments, including solar schemes, on behalf of Local Planning Authorities and developers.
- 1.3. I regularly undertake assessments of heritage significance, including setting, and potential impacts on heritage assets, and my role necessitates close liaison with heritage stakeholders, including Historic England and Local Planning Authority heritage officers.
- 1.4. The information which I have prepared for this appeal is true and has been prepared and given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institutions. I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true professional opinions.



2. Introduction

- 2.1. This Heritage Note had been prepared on behalf of Econergy International Ltd (the 'Appellant') following the Rule 6 Party (Flour not Power) addendum to their Statement of Case in respect to the following appeal:
- 2.2. **Appeal against the refusal by Shropshire Council of an application (ref 22/O4355/FUL) for erection of an up to 30 mw solar PV array, comprising ground mounted solar PV panels, vehicular access, internal access tracks, landscaping, and associated infrastructure, including security fencing, CCTV, client storage containers and grid connection infrastructure, including substation buildings and off-site cabling, at land West of Berrington, Shrewsbury, Shropshire.**
- 2.3. Application 22/O4355/FUL was submitted to Shopshire Council and was accompanied by a Built Heritage Statement (CD 1.6 – Pegasus Group, August 2022).
- 2.4. The application was refused on 16th May 2023 but when consulted on the application Shropshire Council's Conservation Team did not identify any harm to heritage assets or object to the proposals and the Planning Officer in their committee report did not identify any harm to heritage assets when determining the application. Accordingly, Shropshire Council Planning Committee did not refuse the application for Planning Permission on heritage grounds.
- 2.5. However, the Addendum to the Statement of Case by the Rule 6 Party considers several heritage assets would be adversely affected by the appeal proposals.
- 2.6. This Heritage Note summarises the significance of the heritage assets raised by the Rule 6 Party and assesses any impact of the appeal proposals on them.

3. Key Issues

3.1. The Rule 6 Party has stated that the following heritage assets would be adversely affected by the appeal proposals.

- Cantlop Bridge – Grade II* Listed Building (NHLE 1366715);
- Berrington Farmhouse – Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1177114);
- Newman Hall Cottages – Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1176937), and associated pump, also Grade II Listed (NHLE 1055579); and
- Cantlop Mill – A Non-Designated Heritage Asset and on the Shropshire Historic Environment Record (HER).

3.2. These heritage assets were assessed as part of the Built Heritage Statement submitted with the application for Planning Permission (**CD 1.6** –Pegasus Group, August 2022), however for robustness their significance and the impact of the proposed development is clearly set out within this Note.

4. Planning Policy

4.1. Details of the heritage legislation and planning policies which are considered relevant to this Appeal are provided at Appendix 1.

4.2. It is noted that the NPPF has been updated since the original Built Heritage Statement (**CD 1.6** – Pegasus Group, August 2022) was prepared. Whilst paragraph numbers in Section 16 of the NPPF have been amended the content of the paragraphs remains unchanged.

5. Methodology

5.1. The full methodology utilised in the preparation of the assessments which are set out within this report is provided at Appendix 2. The methodology is the same that was used in the preparation of the Built Heritage Statement (**CD 1.6**– Pegasus Group, August 2022) submitted originally with the application for Planning Permission.

5.2. In addition to the site visit undertaken during the preparation of the original Built Heritage Statement a further site visit was undertaken on the 20th of January 2024.

6. Heritage Assets, Significance, and Impact

Cantlop Bridge – Grade II* Listed Building

- 6.1. Cantlop Bridge was added to the National List at Grade II* on 8th May 1972 (NHLE 1366715). The List Entry states the reason for its designation as follows:

“Cantlop Bridge, erected in 1813 to a Telford-approved design is listed at Grade II* for the following principal reasons:

Architectural interest: * Design: it is an important and early example of a single-span, cast-iron bridge which displays particularly well-executed detailing; * Survival: it survives in its original form and retains its original ironwork and masonry.

Historic interest: * Rarity: it is considered to be the only Telford-approved cast-iron bridge remaining in situ in Shropshire; * Technological interest: it will add to our understanding of the casting and assembly methods employed during this pioneering age and as a surviving testament to the evolution of bridge construction during this period.”

- 6.2. A full copy of the List Entry is provided in **Appendix 3**.
- 6.3. The immediate setting and surrounds of the bridge comprise the road to its north and south and land that formed part of the original alignment of the road; the modern concrete bridge to its west, which was constructed to replace the 19th century bridge in the 1970s; Cantlop Brook, which the bridge was built to span; and agricultural fields. The wider and extended surrounds of the bridge comprise arable fields and woodland in all directions.
- 6.4. The Grade II* Listing of the building highlights it is a heritage asset of the highest significance as defined by the NPPF.¹ The heritage significance of the bridge is principally embodied in its architectural and historic interest as defined in the List entry.
- 6.5. The setting of the bridge also contributes to its significance, although the significance derived from the setting is less than that derived from its historic fabric. The principal elements of the physical surrounds and experience of the asset (its "setting") which are considered to contribute to its heritage significance comprise:
- The Cantlop Brook which the bridge spans and its reason for being constructed.
 - The road to its north and south and the areas of the original road alignment approaching the bridge.
 - The fields in its immediate surrounds which provide a setting that is likely to closely resemble the setting at the time it was constructed.
- 6.6. The application site is approximately 125m to the northwest, at its closest point, of the bridge and at an elevated position, with intervening woodland. There is no identified

¹ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 206. **CD 6.1**

historic economic or functional association of the bridge with the application site, and the southwestern boundary of the application site is visible in filtered views only from, or in views with the bridge. In the summer months when the trees are fully in leaf it is anticipated that there would be no view. Overall, it is considered that the application site makes a **neutral** contribution to the heritage significance of the bridge.



Plate 1: View of Cantlop Bridge looking to the northwest towards the intervening woodland and the application site behind.

Impact of the Proposals on Cantlop Bridge

- 6.7. The Landscape Masterplan (CD 1.34 – Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-L-8001 Rev 15) and proposed Site Layout Plan (CD 1.33 – Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-PL-8000 Rev 12) submitted with the application shows the existing hedgerow boundary to the southwest of the site to be retained and the solar arrays set within the site and at distance from the southwest boundary. The intervening distance and the extent of tree screening would ensure that the proposed boundary deer fence and dispersed CCTV poles would not be highly discernible, (and not visible at all in the summer months), the positioning of the solar arrays, being set further north and away from the site boundary will ensure that they are not visible in any view from, or with the bridge. Overall, it is considered that the proposals would not affect the heritage significance of the bridge or how it is experienced, the proposals would thereby have a **neutral** impact.

Berrington Farmhouse– Grade II Listed Building

- 6.8. Detailed discussion on the Grade II Listed Building – Berrington Farmhouse, and its heritage significance and any contribution made by its setting is provided at paragraphs 5.37 – 5.49 in the Built Heritage Statement (CD 1.6 – Pegasus Group, August 2022). A copy of the List Entry is provided in **Appendix 3**.
- 6.9. The Built Heritage Statement concluded that the Grade II Listed Building, the farmhouse is a designated heritage asset of the less than highest significance as defined by the NPPF.² The heritage significance of this Listed Building is principally embodied in its:
- Architectural interest: as a –century, but later extended farmhouse which retains its historic fabric.
 - Historic interest: as a farmhouse it represents agricultural domestic accommodation, especially from the 17th to 19th centuries and reflects change over this period.
- 6.10. The principal elements of the physical surrounds and experience of the house (its ‘setting’) which are considered to contribute to its heritage significance comprise:
- Its immediate garden and the access lane from where the external appearance of the building can best be appreciated and experienced.
 - Associated traditional farm buildings and yard.
 - Some elements of its associated historic agricultural landholding.
- 6.11. The application site is approximately 275m to the southwest, at its closest point, to the farmhouse. Whilst there was an historic functional relationship between the farmhouse and the site, having once formed part of its agricultural landholding, this is now best understood from archival sources as the physical relationship of the site with the farmhouse is generally weak, with it being severed by the intervening road and the field parcels (which are outside of the application site boundary). It is anticipated that views from the farmhouse of the application site would only be obtained from upper floor side windows, or attic windows, and at an oblique angle. The application site does not allow for significant views of the farmhouse and where there are clear views of the farmhouse from the track off Cliff Hollow to Cantlop Mill, these are across the field to the north of the application site and would not be affected. Overall, it is considered that the application site makes a **minor** contribution to the heritage significance of the farmhouse from its historic association.

² DLUHC, NPPF, para. 206. **CD 6.1**



Plate 2: The view from the southwest corner of the front garden boundary of Berrington Farmhouse in the direction of the application site. The application site cannot be seen from here.

Impact of the Proposals on Berrington Farmhouse

- 6.12. The Landscape Masterplan (**CD 1.34** – Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-L-8001 Rev 15) and proposed Site Layout Plan (**CD 1.33**- Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-PL-8000 Rev 12) submitted with the application shows the field parcels to the north of the site will be retained and undeveloped and the northern boundary of the site enhanced with new trees. Any view of the development across the intervening fields would thereby be further filtered by trees and would not affect the heritage significance of the farmhouse or how it is experienced, the proposals would thereby have a neutral impact. The historic connection will however be perpetual, and the landscape will still be capable of being understood to be former agricultural land, the proposals would thereby have a **neutral** impact.

Newman Hall Cottages – Grade II Listed Building

- 6.13. Detailed discussion on the Grade II Listed Building – Newman Hall Cottages, and its heritage significance and any contribution made by its setting is provided at paragraphs 5.72 – 5.76 in the Built Heritage Statement (**CD 1.6**- Pegasus Group, August 2022). A full copy of the List Entry is provided in **Appendix 3**.
- 6.14. The Built Heritage Statement concluded that the Grade II Listed Building, the Cottages is a designated heritage asset of the less than highest significance as defined by the NPPF.³ The heritage significance of this Listed Building is principally embodied in its:
- Architectural interest: as a 17th-century house and later remodelled but retains historic fabric and as such reflects architectural styles from the 17th to the early 20th century.

³ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 206. **CD 6.1**

6.15. The principal elements of the physical surrounds and experience of the house (its 'setting') which are considered to contribute to its heritage significance comprise:

- The immediate garden and access drive, especially those elements consistent with its historic garden/orchard footprint, and from where the exterior of the building can be best appreciated and experienced.

6.16. There is no identified historic functional or economic relationship of the application site with the cottages and the application site is approximately 150m from the asset at its closest point to the northwest of the Listed Building and does not provide for any significant view from it, or with the building. Most windows within the cottage face towards the southwest or northwest and not towards the application site. The element of the building closest to the application site is a modern two storey extension. Views from within the site are obtained from the eastern parcel and focus on the modern two-storey extension and the roof of the building, and are incidental only, the building was clearly not designed to take advantage of views toward it from the site. Overall, it is considered that the application site makes a **neutral** contribution to the heritage significance of the Listed Building.



Plate 3: View from eastern parcel of site looking southwards towards Newmans Cottages (circled) note only one window in the modern extension faces towards the application site.

Impact of the Proposals on Newman Hall Cottages

6.17. The Landscape Masterplan (**CD 1.34** – Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-L-8001 Rev 15) and proposed Site Layout Plan (**CD 1.33**- Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-PL-8000 Rev 12) submitted with the application show enhanced tree planting along the site boundary which will further filter any views from the immediate surrounds of the Listed Building or in any view from windows. Furthermore, the proposed siting of the solar arrays in relation to the southwestern site boundary will further limit the potential to see the arrays in filtered views through the existing retained hedgerow and additional tree planting. Overall, it is considered that the proposals would not affect the heritage significance of the Listed Building or how it is experienced, the proposals would thereby have a **neutral** impact.

Pump approximately 2 Metres to West of Newman Hall Cottages – Grade II Listed Building

6.19. The pump was added to the National List at Grade II on 14th May 1986 (NHLE 1055579). The List Entry reads as follows:

“Pump. Mid- to late C19. Cast iron. Fluted columnar shaft with splayed spout, fluted top, and straight handle. Maker’s plate on shaft. Cap missing at time of survey (March 1985). Included for group value.”

6.20. A full copy of the List Entry is provided in **Appendix 3**.

6.21. The setting and surrounds of the pump is Newman Hall Cottages and its curtilage.

6.22. The pump is a designated heritage asset of the less than highest significance as defined by the NPPF.⁴ The heritage significance is principally embodied in its:

- Architectural interest: being made from traditional cast iron with architectural detailing e.g. fluting.
- Historic interest: as a functional structure that illustrated how water was drawn for consumption and daily needs prior to national water infrastructure.

6.23. The List entry is also explicit that it has been included on the List for group value only. Group value is defined as:

6.24. ***“The extent to which the exterior of the building contributes to the architectural or historic interest of any group of buildings of which it forms part, generally known as group value.”⁵***

6.25. The principal elements of the physical surrounds and experience of the pump (its ‘setting’) which are considered to contribute to its heritage significance comprise:

- Newman Hall Cottages, which the pump was installed to serve.

6.26. There is no identified historic functional or economic relationship of the pump with the application site, and the application site is approximately 150m at its closest point to the northwest of the pump, but due to its minor scale it cannot be seen from the site. It is anticipated⁶ that the application site might be seen in distance views from, and with the pump from the curtilage of Newman Cottages, across the intervening field and hedgerow. Overall, it is considered that the application site makes a **neutral** contribution to the heritage significance of the Listed pump.

6.27.

⁴ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 206. **CD 6.1**

⁵ DCMS. 2018. Principles of Selection for Listed Buildings. Pg. 6 **CD 6.22**

⁶ The pump is on private land which has not been accessed for the purposes of this report.

Impact of the Proposals on the Pump approximately 2 Metres to West of Newman Hall Cottages

- 6.28. The Landscape Masterplan (**CD 1.34** – Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-L-8001 Rev 15) and proposed Site Layout Plan (**CD 1.33** – Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-PL-8000 Rev 12) submitted with the application show enhanced tree planting along the site boundary which will further filter any views from the immediate surrounds of the Listed pump. Furthermore, the proposed siting of the solar arrays in relation to the southwestern site boundary will further limit the potential to see the arrays in filtered views through the existing retained hedgerow and additional tree planting. Overall, it is considered that the proposals would not affect the heritage significance of the Listed pump or how it is experienced, the proposals would thereby have a **neutral** impact.

Cantlop Mill –Non-Designated Heritage Asset

- 6.29. Detailed discussion on the non-designated heritage asset – Cantlop Mill and its heritage significance and any contribution made by its setting is provided at paragraphs 5.90 – 5.101 in the Built Heritage Statement (**CD 1.6** –Pegasus Group, August 2022). The mill is understood to have been a corn mill.
- 6.30. The Built Heritage Statement concluded that the mill complex, as non-designated heritage assets, might be considered to be of the lowest significance in terms of the NPPF, and their heritage significance is principally embodied in their:
- Architectural interest: Through the use of vernacular material and where their former use can be identified in their design.
 - Historic Interest: From being a site of industrial use that utilised a technology that pre-dates the Industrial Revolution and remained in use until the early 20th century.
- 6.31. The principal elements of the physical surrounds and experience of the mill complex (its ‘setting’) which are considered to contribute to its heritage significance comprise:
- Its garden and drive area from where the buildings are best experienced and appreciated.
 - Cound Brook and the mill race, where identifiable, which provide evidence of how the mill was powered.
- 6.32. In the 19th century the tithe apportionment confirms that the occupier (tenant) of the Mill also occupied several fields that comprise the application site, but it is likely that these were used for potato growing and not wheat or corn, and thereby there was no functional association of the application site with the mill, however, this is only understood from archival sources.
- 6.33. Whilst the application site is approximately 40m to the north of the Mill at its closest point, the extent of intervening vegetation and topography, with the mill complex being significantly lower than the application site, limits the ability to see the application site from, or with the Mill, or the Mill from the site. Overall, it is considered that the application site makes a **neutral** contribution to the heritage significance of this non-designated heritage asset.

Impact of the Proposals on Cantlop Mill

- 6.34. The Landscape Masterplan (**CD 1.34** – Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-L-8001 Rev 15) and proposed Site Layout Plan (**CD 1.33**- Dwg No. 1051487-ADAS-XX-XX-DR-PL-8000 Rev 12) submitted with the application shows the solar arrays will be positioned away and to the north of the southern site boundary closest to the Mill. No view of the application site from the mill has been identified⁷ and it is anticipated that any view would be heavily filtered by existing intervening vegetation. The historic connection will however be perpetual, and the landscape will still be capable of being understood to be former agricultural land. Overall, it is considered that the proposals would not affect the heritage significance of the Mill complex or how it is experienced, the proposals would thereby have a **neutral** impact.

7. Conclusion and Summary.

- 7.1. Sufficient information has been provided on the built heritage resource in the Built Heritage Statement (**CD 1.6** –Pegasus Group, August 2022) and by this Heritage Note, to satisfy Paragraph 200 of the NPPF and the Local Plan.
- 7.2. The assessments given in the Built Heritage Statement (**CD1.6** – Pegasus Group, August 2022) and this Heritage Note confirms that the application site makes a neutral contribution to the significance of most of the heritage assets, with only a minor contribution to Berrington Farmhouse via its historic functional association. However, the proposal development will result in a neutral impact on all heritage assets via a change in their setting. A neutral impact preserves the special interest and thereby is not harmful, ensuring that the proposals are in accordance with the statutory duty of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Local Plan policy and policy contained in the NPPF.

⁷ Cantlop Mill is private land which has not been accessed for the purposes of this report.

Appendix 1: Planning Policy

Legislation

Legislation relating to the built historic environment is primarily set out within the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*, which provides statutory protection for Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.⁸ It does not provide statutory protection for non-designated or Locally Listed heritage assets.

Section 66(1) of the Act states:

“In considering whether to grant planning permission [or permission in principle] for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”⁹

In the 2014 Court of Appeal judgement in relation to the Barnwell Manor case, Sullivan LJ held that:

“Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given “considerable importance and weight” when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise.”¹⁰

A judgement in the Court of Appeal (‘Mordue’) has clarified that, with regards to the setting of Listed Buildings, where the principles of the NPPF are applied (in particular paragraph 134 of the 2012 version of the NPPF, the requirements of which are now given in paragraph 208 of the current, revised NPPF, this is in keeping with the requirements of the 1990 Act.¹¹

7.3. In addition to the statutory obligations set out within the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

⁸ UK Public General Acts, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

⁹ UK Public General Acts, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 66(1).

¹⁰ Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v (1) East Northamptonshire DC & Others [2014] EWCA Civ 137. para. 24. **CD 7.30**

¹¹ Jones v Mordue [2015] EWCA Civ 1243. **CD 7.31**



The National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)

National policy and guidance is set out in the Government's *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)* published in December 2023. This replaced and updated the previous *NPPF* (September 2023). The *NPPF* needs to be read as a whole and is intended to promote the concept of delivering sustainable development.

The *NPPF* sets out the Government's economic, environmental and social planning policies for England. Taken together, these policies articulate the Government's vision of sustainable development, which should be interpreted and applied locally to meet local aspirations. The *NPPF* continues to recognise that the planning system is plan-led and that therefore Local Plans, incorporating Neighbourhood Plans, where relevant, are the starting point for the determination of any planning application, including those which relate to the historic environment.

The overarching policy change applicable to the proposed development is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This presumption in favour of sustainable development (the 'presumption') sets out the tone of the Government's overall stance and operates with and through the other policies of the *NPPF*. Its purpose is to send a strong signal to all those involved in the planning process about the need to plan positively for appropriate new development; so that both plan-making and development management are proactive and driven by a search for opportunities to deliver sustainable development, rather than barriers. Conserving historic assets in a manner appropriate to their significance forms part of this drive towards sustainable development.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and the *NPPF* sets out three 'objectives' to facilitate sustainable development: an economic objective, a social objective, and an environmental objective. The presumption is key to delivering these objectives, by creating a positive pro-development framework which is underpinned by the wider economic, environmental and social provisions of the *NPPF*. The presumption is set out in full at paragraph 11 of the *NPPF* and reads as follows:

"Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

For plan-making this means that:

all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects;

strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless:

the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area; or

any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

For decision-taking this means:

approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

the application policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.”¹²

However, it is important to note that footnote 7 of the NPPF applies in relation to the final bullet of paragraph 11. This provides a context for paragraph 11 and reads as follows:

“The policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to: habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 187) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 72); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.”¹³ (our emphasis)

The NPPF continues to recognise that the planning system is plan-led and that therefore, Local Plans, incorporating Neighbourhood Plans, where relevant, are the starting point for the determination of any planning application.

Heritage Assets are defined in the NPPF as:

“A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).”¹⁴

The NPPF goes on to define a Designated Heritage Asset as a:

“World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under relevant legislation.”¹⁵

As set out above, significance is also defined as:

“The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the

¹² DLUHC, NPPF, para. 11. **CD 6.1**

¹³ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 11, fn. 7. **CD 6.1**

¹⁴ DLUHC, NPPF, Annex 2. **CD 6.1**

¹⁵ DLUHC, NPPF, Annex 2. **CD 6.1**



cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.”¹⁶

Section 16 of the NPPF relates to ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ and states at paragraph 201 that:

“Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.”¹⁷

Paragraph 203 goes on to state that:

“In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.”¹⁸

With regard to the impact of proposals on the significance of a heritage asset, paragraphs 205 and 206 are relevant and read as follows:

“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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.”¹⁹

“Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;

assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”²⁰

Section b) of paragraph 206, which describes assets of the highest significance, also includes footnote 72 of the NPPF, which states that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest which are

¹⁶ DLUHC, NPPF, Annex 2. **CD 6.1**

¹⁷ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 201. **CD 6.1**

¹⁸ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 203. **CD 6.1**

¹⁹ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 205. **CD 6.1**

²⁰ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 206. **CD 6.1**

demonstrably of equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

In the context of the above, it should be noted that paragraph 207 reads as follows:

“Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and

no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and

conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and

the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.”²¹

Paragraph 208 goes on to state:

“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”²²

With regards to non-designated heritage assets, paragraph 209 of NPPF states that:

“The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”²³

Overall, the NPPF confirms that the primary objective of development management is to foster the delivery of sustainable development, not to hinder or prevent it. Local Planning Authorities should approach development management decisions positively, looking for solutions rather than problems so that applications can be approved wherever it is practical to do so. Additionally, securing the optimum viable use of sites and achieving public benefits are also key material considerations for application proposals.

National Planning Practice Guidance

The then Department for Communities and Local Government (now the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC)) launched the planning practice guidance web-based resource in March 2014, accompanied by a ministerial statement which confirmed that a number of previous planning practice guidance documents were cancelled.

²¹ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 207. **CD 6.1**

²² DLUHC, NPPF, para. 208. **CD 6.1**

²³ DLUHC, NPPF, para. 209. **CD 6.1**



This also introduced the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which comprised a full and consolidated review of planning practice guidance documents to be read alongside the NPPF.

The PPG has a discrete section on the subject of the Historic Environment, which confirms that the consideration of 'significance' in decision taking is important and states:

“Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals.”²⁴

In terms of assessment of substantial harm, the PPG confirms that whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgement for the individual decision taker having regard to the individual circumstances and the policy set out within the NPPF. It goes on to state:

“In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm.”²⁵ (our emphasis)

²⁴ DLUHC, PPG, paragraph 007, reference ID: 18a-007-20190723. **CD 6.2**

²⁵ DLUHC, PPG, paragraph 018, reference ID: 18a-018-20190723. **CD 6.2**

Local Planning Policy

Local Planning Policy

- 7.4. Planning applications are currently considered against the policy and guidance set out within Shropshire Local Plan formed of the 'Core Strategy DPD' adopted 24th February 2011 and the 'Site Allocations and Management of Development Adopted Plan' or 'SAMDev Plan' adopted 17th December 2015.
- 7.5. There are no specific 'Core Strategy DPD' policies that are focused on the historic environment, however one policy regarding sustainable design refers to the protection of the historic environment regarding development:

CS6: Sustainable Design and Development Principles

'And ensuring that all development:

... Protects, restores, conserves and enhances the natural, built and historic environment and is appropriate in scale, density, pattern and design taking into account the local context and character, and those features which contribute to local character, having regard to national and local design guidance, landscape character assessments and ecological strategies where appropriate...

- 7.6. The 'SAMDev' Policy MD13 relates to conserving and enhancing the historic environment and reads as follows:

MD13: The Historic Environment

In accordance with Policies CS6 and CS17 and through applying the guidance in the Historic Environment SPD, Shropshire's heritage assets will be protected, conserved, sympathetically enhanced and restored by:

Ensuring that wherever possible, proposals avoid harm or loss of significance to designated or non-designated heritage assets, including their settings.

Ensuring that proposals which are likely to affect the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset, including its setting, are accompanied by a Heritage Assessment, including a qualitative visual assessment where appropriate.

Ensuring that proposals which are likely to have an adverse effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, including its setting, will only be permitted if it can be clearly demonstrated that the public benefits of the proposal outweigh the adverse effect. In making this assessment, the degree of harm or loss of significance to the asset including its setting, the importance of the asset and any potential beneficial use will be taken into account. Where such proposals are permitted, measures to mitigate and record the loss of significance to the asset including its setting and to advance understanding in a manner proportionate to the asset's importance and the level of impact, will be required.

Encouraging development which delivers positive benefits to heritage assets, as identified within the Place Plans. Support will be given in particular, to proposals which appropriately conserve, manage or enhance the significance of a heritage asset



including its setting, especially where these improve the condition of those assets which are recognised as being at risk or in poor condition.

Appendix 2: Methodology

Assessment of significance

In the *NPPF*, heritage significance is defined as:

“The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.”²⁶

Historic England's *GPA:2* gives advice on the assessment of significance as part of the application process. It advises understanding the nature, extent, and level of significance of a heritage asset.²⁷

In order to do this, *GPA 2* also advocates considering the four types of heritage value an asset may hold, as identified in English Heritage's *Conservation Principles*.²⁸ These essentially cover the heritage ‘interests’ given in the glossaries of the *NPPF* and the *PPG* which are archaeological, architectural and artistic, and historic.²⁹

The *PPG* provides further information on the interests it identifies:

Archaeological interest: As defined in the *Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework*, there will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.

Architectural and artistic interest: These are interests in the design and general aesthetics of a place. They can arise from conscious design or fortuitously from the way the heritage asset has evolved. More specifically, architectural interest is an interest in the art or science of the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures of all types. Artistic interest is an interest in other human creative skills, like sculpture.

Historic interest: An interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material record of our nation’s history, but can also provide meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity.³⁰

Significance results from a combination of any, some, or all of the interests described above.

²⁶ DLUHC, *NPPF*, Annex 2. **CD 6.1**

²⁷ Historic England, *GPA:2*. **CD 6.21**

²⁸ Historic England, *Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment* (London, April 2008). These heritage values are identified as being ‘aesthetic’, ‘communal’, ‘historical’ and ‘evidential’, see *idem* pp. 28–32. **CD 6.19**

²⁹ DLUHC, *NPPF*, Annex 2; DLUHC, **CD 6.1 PPG**, paragraph 006, reference ID: 18a-006-20190723. **CD 6.2**

³⁰ DLUHC, *PPG*, paragraph 006, reference ID: 18a-006-20190723. **CD 6.2**

Historic England guidance on assessing heritage significance, *HEAN:12*, advises using the terminology of the *NPPF* and *PPG*, and thus it is that terminology which is used in this Report.³¹

Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas are generally designated for their special architectural and historic interest. Scheduling is predominantly, although not exclusively, associated with archaeological interest.

Setting and significance

As defined in the *NPPF*:

“Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.”³²

Setting is defined as:

“The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.”³³

Therefore, setting can contribute to, affect an appreciation of significance, or be neutral with regards to heritage values.

Assessing change through alteration to setting

How setting might contribute to these values has been assessed within this Report with reference to *GPA:3*, particularly the checklist given on page 11. This advocates the clear articulation of *“what matters and why”*.³⁴

In *GPA:3*, a stepped approach is recommended, of which Step 1 is to identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected. Step 2 is to assess whether, how and to what degree settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated. The guidance includes a (non-exhaustive) checklist of elements of the physical surroundings of an asset that might be considered when undertaking the assessment including, among other things: topography, other heritage assets, green space, functional relationships and degree of change over time. It also lists aspects associated with the experience of the asset which might be considered, including: views, intentional intervisibility, tranquillity, sense of enclosure, accessibility, rarity and land use.

Step 3 is to assess the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the asset(s). Step 4 is to explore ways to maximise enhancement and minimise harm. Step 5 is to make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

A Court of Appeal judgement has confirmed that whilst issues of visibility are important when assessing setting, visibility does not necessarily confer a contribution to significance and factors other than

³¹ Historic England, *Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets*, *Historic England Advice Note 12* (Swindon, October 2019). **CD 6.20**

³² DLUHC, *NPPF*, Annex 2. **CD 6.1**

³³ DLUHC, *NPPF*, Annex 2. **CD 6.1**

³⁴ Historic England, *GPA:3*, pp. 8, 11 **CD 6.18**.

visibility should also be considered, with Lindblom LJ stating at paragraphs 25 and 26 of the judgement (referring to an earlier Court of Appeal judgement):

Paragraph 25 – “But – again in the particular context of visual effects – I said that if “a proposed development is to affect the setting of a listed building there must be a distinct visual relationship of some kind between the two – a visual relationship which is more than remote or ephemeral, and which in some way bears on one’s experience of the listed building in its surrounding landscape or townscape” (paragraph 56)”.

Paragraph 26 – “This does not mean, however, that factors other than the visual and physical must be ignored when a decision-maker is considering the extent of a listed building’s setting. Generally, of course, the decision-maker will be concentrating on visual and physical considerations, as in Williams (see also, for example, the first instance judgment in R. (on the application of Miller) v North Yorkshire County Council [2009] EWHC 2172 (Admin), at paragraph 89). But it is clear from the relevant national policy and guidance to which I have referred, in particular the guidance in paragraph 18a-013-20140306 of the PPG, that the Government recognizes the potential relevance of other considerations – economic, social and historical. These other considerations may include, for example, “the historic relationship between places”. Historic England’s advice in GPA3 was broadly to the same effect.”³⁵

Levels of significance

Descriptions of significance will naturally anticipate the ways in which impacts will be considered. Hence descriptions of the significance of Conservation Areas will make reference to their special interest and character and appearance, and the significance of Listed Buildings will be discussed with reference to the building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

In accordance with the levels of significance articulated in the *NPPF* and the *PPG*, three levels of significance are identified:

Designated heritage assets of the highest significance, as identified in paragraph 206 of the *NPPF*, comprising Grade I and II* Listed Buildings, Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Monuments, Protected Wreck Sites, World Heritage Sites and Registered Battlefields (and also including some Conservation Areas) and non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments, as identified in footnote 72 of the *NPPF*;³⁶

Designated heritage assets of less than the highest significance, as identified in paragraph 206 of the *NPPF*, comprising Grade II Listed Buildings and Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens (and also some Conservation Areas);³⁷ and

Non-designated heritage assets. Non-designated heritage assets are defined within the *PPG* as “buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified by plan-making bodies as having a

³⁵ *Catesby Estates Ltd. V. Steer* [2018] EWCA Civ 1697, paras. 25 and 26. **CD 7.2**

³⁶ *DLUHC, NPPF*, para. 206 and fn. 72. **CD 6.1**

³⁷ *DLUHC, NPPF*, para. 206. **CD 6.1**

*degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets”.*³⁸

Assessment of harm

Assessment of any harm will be articulated in terms of the policy and law that the proposed development will be assessed against, such as whether a proposed development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of a Conservation Area, and articulating the scale of any harm in order to inform a balanced judgement/weighting exercise as required by the NPPF.

In accordance with key policy, the following levels of harm may potentially be identified for designated heritage assets:

Substantial harm or total loss. It has been clarified in a High Court Judgement of 2013 that this would be harm that would *“have such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced”*;³⁹ and

Less than substantial harm. Harm of a lesser level than that defined above.

With regards to these two categories, the *PPG* states:

“Within each category of harm (which category applies should be explicitly identified), the extent of the harm may vary and should be clearly articulated.”⁴⁰

Hence, for example, harm that is less than substantial would be further described with reference to where it lies on that spectrum or scale of harm, for example low end, middle, and upper end of the less than substantial harm spectrum/scale.

With regards to non-designated heritage assets, there is no basis in policy for describing harm to them as substantial or less than substantial, rather the *NPPF* requires that the scale of any harm or loss is articulated whilst having regard to the significance of the asset. Harm to such assets is therefore articulated as a level of harm to their overall significance, using descriptors such as minor, moderate and major harm.

It is also possible that development proposals will cause no harm or preserve the significance of heritage assets. Here, a High Court Judgement of 2014 is relevant. This concluded that with regard to preserving the setting of a Listed building or preserving the character and appearance of a Conservation Area, *“preserving”* means doing *“no harm”*.⁴¹

Preservation does not mean no change, it specifically means no harm. *GPA:2* states that *“Change to heritage assets is inevitable but it is only harmful when significance is damaged”*.⁴² Thus, change is accepted in Historic England’s guidance as part of the evolution of the landscape and environment. It is whether such change is neutral, harmful or beneficial to the significance of an asset that matters.

³⁸ DLUHC, *PPG*, paragraph 039, reference ID: 18a-039-20190723. **CD 6.2**

³⁹ Bedford Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2013] EWHC 2847 (Admin), para. 25. **CD 7.3**

⁴⁰ DLUHC, *PPG*, paragraph 018, reference ID: 18a-018-20190723. **CD 6.2**

⁴¹ R (Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin). **CD 7.32**

⁴² Historic England, *GPA:2*, p. 9. **CD 6.21**

As part of this, setting may be a key consideration. When evaluating any harm to significance through changes to setting, this Report follows the methodology given in *GPA:3*, described above. Fundamental to this methodology is a consideration of “*what matters and why*”.⁴³ Of particular relevance is the checklist given on page 13 of *GPA:3*.⁴⁴

It should be noted that this key document also states:

“Setting is not itself a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation...”⁴⁵

Hence any impacts are described in terms of how they affect the significance of a heritage asset, and heritage interests that contribute to this significance, through changes to setting.

With regards to changes in setting, *GPA:3* states that:

“Conserving or enhancing heritage assets by taking their settings into account need not prevent change”.⁴⁶

Additionally, whilst the statutory duty requires that special regard should be paid to the desirability of not harming the setting of a Listed Building, that cannot mean that any harm, however minor, would necessarily require Planning Permission to be refused. This point has been clarified in the Court of Appeal.⁴⁷

Benefits

Proposed development may also result in benefits to heritage assets, and these are articulated in terms of how they enhance the heritage interests, and hence the significance, of the assets concerned.

As detailed further in **Appendix 1**, the *NPPF* (at Paragraphs 207 and 208) requires harm to a designated heritage asset to be weighed against the public benefits of the development proposals.⁴⁸

Recent High Court Decisions have confirmed that enhancement to the historic environment should be considered as a public benefit under the provisions of Paragraphs 207 to 209.⁴⁹

The *PPG* provides further clarity on what is meant by the term ‘public benefit’, including how these may be derived from enhancement to the historic environment (‘heritage benefits’), as follows:

“Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 8). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to

⁴³ Historic England, *GPA:3*, p. 8. **CD 6.18**

⁴⁴ Historic England, *GPA:3*, p. 13. **CD 6.18**

⁴⁵ Historic England, *GPA:3*, p. 4. **CD 6.18**

⁴⁶ Historic England, *GPA 3*, p. 8. **CD 6.18**

⁴⁷ *Palmer v Herefordshire Council & Anor* [2016] EWCA Civ 1061. **CD 7.4**

⁴⁸ *DLUHC, NPPF*, paras. 207 and 208. **CD 6.1**

⁴⁹ Including – *Kay, R (on the application of) v Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government & Anor* [2020] EWHC 2292 (Admin); *DLUHC, NPPF*, paras. 207 and 209. **CD 7.33**



be genuine public benefits, for example, works to a listed private dwelling which secure its future as a designated heritage asset could be a public benefit.

Examples of heritage benefits may include:

sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting

reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset

securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation.”⁵⁰

Any "heritage benefits" arising from the proposed development, in line with the narrative above, will be clearly articulated in order for them to be taken into account by the decision maker.

⁵⁰ DLUHC, PPG, paragraph 020, reference ID: 18a-020-20190723. **CD 6.2**

Appendix 3: List Entries

Cantlop Bridge

Official list entry

Heritage Category: **Listed Building**

Grade: **II***

List Entry Number: **1366715**

Date first listed: **08-May-1972**

Date of most recent amendment: **09-Aug-2017**

List Entry Name: **Cantlop Bridge**

Statutory Address 1: **538m north-west of Cantlop Mill, Barrington, Shrewsbury, SY5 6HQ**

This List entry helps identify the building designated at this address for its special architectural or historic interest.

Unless the List entry states otherwise, it includes both the structure itself and any object or structure fixed to it (whether inside or outside) as well as any object or structure within the curtilage of the building.

For these purposes, to be included within the curtilage of the building, the object or structure must have formed part of the land since before 1st July 1948.

[Understanding list entries \(https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/understanding-list-entries/\)](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/understanding-list-entries/)

[Corrections and minor amendments \(https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/minor-amendments/\)](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/minor-amendments/)

Location

Statutory Address: 538m north-west of Cantlop Mill, Barrington, Shrewsbury, SY5 6HQ

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

District: **Shropshire (Unitary Authority)**

Parish: **Berrington**

National Grid Reference: **SJ5173806242**

Summary

Bridge over the Cound Brook, erected 1813, to a design approved by Thomas Telford.

Reasons for Designation

Cantlop Bridge, erected in 1813 to a Telford-approved design is listed at Grade II* for the following principal reasons:

Architectural interest: * Design: it is an important and early example of a single-span, cast-iron bridge which displays particularly well-executed detailing; * Survival: it survives in its original form and retains its original ironwork and masonry.

Historic interest: * Rarity: it is considered to be the only Telford-approved cast-iron bridge remaining in situ in Shropshire; * Technological interest: it will add to our understanding of the casting and assembly methods employed during this pioneering age and as a surviving testament to the evolution of bridge construction during this period.

History

This section of the Shrewsbury-Acton Burnell road was turnpiked in 1797, at which time the crossing over the Cound Brook to the north of the hamlet of Cantlop was a narrow bridge. There are references to an agreement to make repairs to a bridge over the Cound in 1713. Sources indicate that money was raised by public subscription in 1812 for the construction of a new carriage bridge. It is not clear whether Thomas Telford, County Surveyor between 1787 and 1834, personally designed the new bridge as he did not list it in his autobiography, but it appears to have been built to a design approved by him. The castings for the bridge were supplied probably by

William Hazeldine.

Cantlop Bridge was closed to vehicles in the 1970s when a new road bridge was erected immediately to the west and was taken into the guardianship of the Secretary of State for the Environment (now Culture, Media and Sport) in 1977 and is in the care of English Heritage.

Details

Bridge over the Cound Brook, erected 1813, to a design approved by Thomas Telford.

MATERIALS: cast-iron superstructure and railings; abutments of coursed red and grey sandstone with ashlar dressings.

DESCRIPTION: the surface of the roadway is formed of cast-iron deck plates, tarmacked and now gravelled over. The deck is carried on five cast-iron transverse members that are supported by four parallel, arched cast-iron ribs braced laterally to each other, and forming a single segmental span of 9.5m. The ribs spring from the stone abutments via a pair of transverse cast-iron plates set in rebates. The battered abutments have moulded string courses and chamfered ashlar quoins, and are topped with cornices. They curve outwards into the river bank to either side, giving the bridge a fan-shaped plan at either end. To the north-west and south-west sides are later stone revetment walls. The delicate cast-iron railings are painted and have a dog rail, dog bars and shaped balusters to the ends. A plaque on the bridge engraved: THOMAS TELFORD ESQR/ ENGINEER/ 1818, is not extant.

Legacy

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System number: **259711**

Legacy System: **LBS**

Sources

Books and journals

Pevsner, N, Newman, J, *The Buildings of England: Shropshire*, (2006), 144

Hill, MC, 'Iron and Steel Bridges in Shropshire' in *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, , Vol. 56, (1956-1960), 114-115

Websites

Cantlop Bridge, HER 01062, accessed 21 June 2017 from

http://search.shropshirehistory.org.uk/collections/getrecord/CCS_MSA775/

[\(http://search.shropshirehistory.org.uk/collections/getrecord/CCS_MSA775/\)](http://search.shropshirehistory.org.uk/collections/getrecord/CCS_MSA775/)

Discovering Shropshire's History, accessed 21 June 2017 from

http://search.shropshirehistory.org.uk/collections/search/?q=cantlop+Bridge&cb_submit=Search

[\(http://search.shropshirehistory.org.uk/collections/search/?q=cantlop+Bridge&cb_submit=Search\)](http://search.shropshirehistory.org.uk/collections/search/?q=cantlop+Bridge&cb_submit=Search)

Legal

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.



Map

This map is for quick reference purposes only and may not be to scale.

This copy shows the entry on 22-Jan-2024 at 12:01:04.

BERRINGTON FARMHOUSE

Official list entry

Heritage Category: **Listed Building**

Grade: **II**

List Entry Number: **1177114**

Date first listed: **14-May-1986**

List Entry Name: **BERRINGTON FARMHOUSE**

Statutory Address 1: **BERRINGTON FARMHOUSE**

This List entry helps identify the building designated at this address for its special architectural or historic interest.

Unless the List entry states otherwise, it includes both the structure itself and any object or structure fixed to it (whether inside or outside) as well as any object or structure within the curtilage of the building.

For these purposes, to be included within the curtilage of the building, the object or structure must have formed part of the land since before 1st July 1948.

[Understanding list entries](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/understanding-list-entries/) (<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/understanding-list-entries/>)

[Corrections and minor amendments](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/minor-amendments/) (<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/minor-amendments/>)

Location

Statutory Address: **BERRINGTON FARMHOUSE**

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

District: **Shropshire (Unitary Authority)**

Parish: **Berrington**

National Grid Reference: **SJ 52767 06868**

Details

BERRINGTON C.P. BERRINGTON SJ 5206-5306 11/47 Berrington Farmhouse GV II

Farmhouse. Late C17 with early-C18 and mid-to late C19 alterations and additions. Timber framed with red brick nogging on squared and coursed red sandstone plinth, partly refaced and extended in red brick; plain tile roof. 2 framed bays with C18 L-plan house added to north-east and other additions. One storey and attic, 2 storeys, and 2 storeys and attic. Dentil brick eaves cornice (bricks laid on edge), parapeted gable ends, 2 large panelled external brick end stacks to C18 block, and external brick end stack to C19 addition at right; 2 brick eaves dormers to C18 block with parapeted gables and 2-light segmental-headed wooden casements. Framing: square panels, 4 from sole-plate to wall-plate. C18 block: 2-window front; first floor segmental-headed late C19 wooden cross-casements, ground floor late C19 canted bay to left; mid-C19 four-panelled door to right (top 2 panels glazed) and brick porch with parapeted gable and round archway; formerly 3-bays with blocked central window and door. C17 part set back to right has brick eaves dormer to right with parapeted gable and segmental-headed 2-light wooden casement, and ground-floor segmental-headed 2-light wooden casement; left-hand gable end has exposed collar and tie-beam truss with queen struts and V- struts. Mid-to-late C19 block set back to right has first floor wooden cross casement and ground floor canted bay. Gabled stair wing at rear of C18 part and gabled mid-to late C19 wing at rear of C17 part. Interior: early C18 dog-leg staircase with winders, closed string, turned balusters, moulded handrail and square newel posts; early C18 corner buffet in kitchen with flanking pilasters and shaped shelves; 2-panelled cupboards flanking fireplace; internal window shutters; C17 and C18 boarded and plank and muntin doors with strap hinges.

Listing NGR: SJ5276706868

Legacy

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System number: **259701**

Legacy System: LBS

Legal

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.



Map

This map is for quick reference purposes only and may not be to scale.
This copy shows the entry on 22-Jan-2024 at 17:58:23.

© Crown Copyright and database right 2024. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey
Licence number 100024900. © British Crown and SeaZone Solutions Limited 2024. All
rights reserved. Licence number 102006.006.

NEWMAN HALL COTTAGES

Official list entry

Heritage Category: **Listed Building**

Grade: **II**

List Entry Number: **1176937**

Date first listed: **14-May-1986**

List Entry Name: **NEWMAN HALL COTTAGES**

Statutory Address 1: **NEWMAN HALL COTTAGES**

This List entry helps identify the building designated at this address for its special architectural or historic interest.

Unless the List entry states otherwise, it includes both the structure itself and any object or structure fixed to it (whether inside or outside) as well as any object or structure within the curtilage of the building.

For these purposes, to be included within the curtilage of the building, the object or structure must have formed part of the land since before 1st July 1948.

[Understanding list entries](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/understanding-list-entries/) (<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/understanding-list-entries/>)

[Corrections and minor amendments](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/minor-amendments/) (<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/minor-amendments/>)

Location

Statutory Address: **NEWMAN HALL COTTAGES**

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

District: **Shropshire (Unitary Authority)**

Parish: **Berrington**

National Grid Reference: **SJ 52918 06066**

Details

BERRINGTON C.P. - SJ 5206-5306 11/29 Newman Hall Cottages - GV II House, now divided. Mid-C17, remodelled in the early C18 and extended c.1900. Timber framed with brick nogging, largely refaced or rebuilt and extended in red brick; plain tile roofs with partial catslide over later outshut to rear. L-plan; 2 bays with one-bay rear wing. 2 storeys and 2 storeys with gable-lit attic. Plat band and eaves band; dentil brick eaves cornice; integral brick corner stack to north-west, large brick ridge stack to rear wing with pilaster shafting and over-sailing top, and integral brick cornerstack to c.1900 addition at rear. Framing: square panels (internal). 2-window front; first floor 2-light segmental-headed wooden casements and ground floor 3-light segmental-headed wooden casements; pair of central segmental-headed boarded doors, that to right with gabled wooden porch, 2-light segmental-headed attic casements in gable ends. Flanking c.1900 outbuildings set back, that to left with integral brick end stack and 2-light segmental-headed wooden casement to front, and that to right with integral brick end stack and segmental-headed boarded door to front. Boarded door in outshut to rear too. Interior: exposed square panel framing in former wall of south range; chamfered beams encased in probably C18 plaster; bread oven; earth floor to south range. Other C17 fixtures and fittings might remain concealed. V.C.H., Vol. VIII, p.18.

Listing NGR: SJ5291306071

Legacy

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System number: **259681**

Legacy System: **LBS**

Sources

Books and journals

Page, W, The Victoria History of the County of Shropshire, (1908), 18

Legal

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.



Map

This map is for quick reference purposes only and may not be to scale.
This copy shows the entry on 22-Jan-2024 at 17:58:02.

© Crown Copyright and database right 2024. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey
Licence number 100024900. © British Crown and SeaZone Solutions Limited 2024. All
rights reserved. Licence number 102006.006.

PUMP APPROXIMATELY 2 METRES TO WEST OF NEWMAN HALL COTTAGES

Official list entry

Heritage Category: **Listed Building**

Grade: **II**

List Entry Number: **1055579**

Date first listed: **14-May-1986**

List Entry Name: **PUMP APPROXIMATELY 2 METRES TO WEST OF NEWMAN HALL COTTAGES**

Statutory Address 1: **PUMP APPROXIMATELY 2 METRES TO WEST OF NEWMAN HALL COTTAGES**

This List entry helps identify the building designated at this address for its special architectural or historic interest.

Unless the List entry states otherwise, it includes both the structure itself and any object or structure fixed to it (whether inside or outside) as well as any object or structure within the curtilage of the building.

For these purposes, to be included within the curtilage of the building, the object or structure must have formed part of the land since before 1st July 1948.

[Understanding list entries](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/understanding-list-entries/) (<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/understanding-list-entries/>)

[Corrections and minor amendments](https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/minor-amendments/) (<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/minor-amendments/>)

Location

Statutory Address: **PUMP APPROXIMATELY 2 METRES TO WEST OF NEWMAN HALL COTTAGES**

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

District: **Shropshire (Unitary Authority)**

Parish: **Berrington**

National Grid Reference: **SJ 52913 06069**

Details

SJ 5206-5306; 11/30

BERRINGTON C.P., Pump approx. 2 metres to west of Newman Hall Cottages

GV

II

Pump. Mid- to late C19. Cast iron. Fluted columnar shaft with splayed spout, fluted top, and straight handle.

Maker's plate on shaft. Cap missing at time of survey (March 1985). Included for group value.

Listing NGR: SJ5291306071

Legacy

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System number: **259682**

Legacy System: **LBS**

Legal

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.



Map

This map is for quick reference purposes only and may not be to scale.
This copy shows the entry on 22-Jan-2024 at 18:06:12.

© Crown Copyright and database right 2024. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey
Licence number 100024900. © British Crown and SeaZone Solutions Limited 2024. All
rights reserved. Licence number 102006.006.

Use of this data is subject to **Terms and Conditions**
(<https://historicengland.org.uk/terms/website-terms-conditions/>).

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Manchester

Queens House, Queen Street,
Manchester, M2 5HT
T 0161 3933399
E Manchester@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Offices throughout the UK.

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE



Pegasus_Group



pegasusgroup



Pegasus_Group

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RQ

We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK