CAS-03463-R2W9C2 - Kronospan Low Carbon CHP Facility

Environmental Statement

Vol2: Chapter 8.0 – Historic Environment

Prepared for

December 2025
DNS5-2-008

Document Control

Revision	Date	Prepared By	Reviewed / Approved By
DNS5-2-008	December 2025	HK	BC
DNS5-2-008 Rev 1			
DNS5-2-008 Rev 2			

Well House Barns, Chester Road, Bretton, Chester, CH4 0DH
1st Floor, Barfield House, Alderley Road, Wilmslow, SK9 1PL
Maling Exchange, Studio 307, Hoults Yard, Walker Road, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE6 2HL

T: 0344 8700 007
enquiries@axis.co.uk
www.axis.co.uk

CONTENTS

TABLES

FIGURES

APPENDICES

8.0 HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

8.1 Introduction

Introduction

8.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES), along with the accompanying **Figure 8.1**, **Figure 8.2** and **Appendix 8A**, addresses the potential effects on the historic environment during the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. A description of the Proposed Development is provided in **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development).**

8.1.2 The Proposed Development is entirely within the footprint of the existing Kronospan Facility. That facility was built in the 1970s and has developed throughout the later 20th and early 21st century. The Proposed Development would be within an area of hard standing that has been previously disturbed. This was evident during the site visit and is documented by modern aerial photographs. Furthermore, no historic assets are recorded within the Proposed Development Site and historic mapping does not indicate any unrecorded historic assets within the Proposed Development Site. Consequently, no direct physical impacts on any historic assets are anticipated and consequently construction phase effects on archaeology are **scoped out** of the ES.

8.1.3 Given the proximity of the Proposed Development Site to known historic assets (described further below) a heritage impact assessment relating to the potential impacts arising from development within the buffer zone of the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal World Heritage Site (WHS), and an assessment of the potential effects on the settings of historic assets has been undertaken.

8.1.4 This chapter is supported by **Appendix 8A** (Historic Environment Background Data and Setting Assessment).

Competence

8.1.5 This chapter has been prepared by Heritage Archaeology Ltd. The author is a full member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists and has a degree in Heritage Conservation. She is a Director of Heritage Archaeology Ltd with over 30 years' experience of planning and the historic environment. She has worked in both local

authority advisory roles and in consultancy organisations and her experience includes the preparation of historic environment assessments for numerous Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) projects across the UK, including several projects in Wales, in a range of sectors including energy projects. She has provided historic environment input to EIA projects determined under local planning consent, as well as Developments of National Significance in Wales.

8.1.6 The chapter has been reviewed by Bobby Clayton. Bobby has been a chartered member of the Royal Town Planning Institute since 2007 and has over 20 years' experience in the coordination and preparation of major planning applications, including those prepared and submitted in accordance with the various EIA Regulations.

8.2 Planning Policy, Legislation and Guidance

National Planning Policy

8.2.1 The following national planning policy is relevant to the assessment:

Planning Policy Wales, Edition 12, Welsh Government, February 2024

8.2.2 Paragraph 6.1.5 of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) identifies that "*The planning system must take into account the Welsh Government's objectives to protect, conserve, promote and enhance the historic environment as a resource for the general well-being of present and future generations*."

Local Planning Policy

Overview

8.2.3 The adopted local development plan for Wrexham County Borough Council (WCBC) comprises the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 (the UDP)[1] which was adopted in February 2005. However, the local development plan has been through significant upheaval in recent years. WCBC adopted the Local Development Plan 2013-2028 (the LDP)[2] on 20 December 2023, however, the decision to adopt the LDP has subsequently been quashed by a High Court Order issued on 12 June

[1] Wrexham County Borough Council, adopted 2005. *Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011*
[2] Wrexham County Borough Council, adopted 2023. *Wrexham County Borough Local Development Plan 2013-2028*

2025. The LDP has therefore been returned to unadopted status and the UDP has been returned to being the adopted development plan. Further information regarding the status of the UDP and LDP is provided in the Planning Statement (**DNS4-001**).

8.2.4 In the above context, relevant policies from the UDP and LDP are set out below.

Unitary Development Plan

8.2.5 Policies EC7, EC9 and EC11 of the UDP set out provisions in relation to Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and Archaeology.

Local Development Plan

8.2.6 Policy SP15 (Historic and Cultural Environment), which states that *"Development will only be supported where it conserves, protects, preserves or enhances the following cultural and historic assets of the County Borough and their setting: i. Listed Buildings; ii. Conservation Areas; iii. Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal World Heritage Site; iv. Registered Historic Parks, Gardens and Landscapes; and v. Scheduled Monuments and Archaeological Remains."*

8.2.7 Policy BE1 (Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal World Heritage Site) states that *"Development will only be permitted where it would not harm the attributes which justified the inscription of the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal as a World Heritage Site and the site's Outstanding Universal Value. The following are considered to be key material considerations: i. The authenticity and integrity of the attributes that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site including views, and features of cultural, artistic, historical, social and natural environmental importance; ii. The setting of the World Heritage Site and attributes important to the Outstanding Universal Value of the site present within the Buffer Zone. Where there is a demonstrable need for essential non-residential visitor attraction facilities for the World Heritage Site which cannot be provided within the settlement limit, their location outside settlement limits will be permitted where there is no adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value."*

8.2.8 WCBC has published supplementary planning guidance relating to the WHS; Local Planning Guidance Note 33 Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal World Heritage Site (2012).

Legislation and Guidance

8.2.9 The following key pieces of legislation and guidance are considered relevant to this assessment.

Legislation

Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2023

8.2.10 Section 11 sets out that works cannot be carried out on or adjacent to a Scheduled Monument (SM) without SM Consent. This Act makes no reference to the setting of SMs.

8.2.11 In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the decision maker shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting (Section 96). Special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area (Section 160).

Guidance

8.2.12 The following guidance documents are considered relevant to this assessment:

- Technical Advice Note 24 (TAN24): The Historic Environment (Welsh Government, 2017).
- Guidance and toolkit for impact assessments in a World Heritage Site Context (UNESCO et al 2022).
- Setting of Historic Assets in Wales (Cadw 2017).
- Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment in Wales (Conservation Principles) (Cadw 2011).
- Heritage Impact Assessment in Wales, (Cadw, 2017).
- Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (IEMA, IHBC and CIFA, 2021).
- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment, published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA; 2022).

8.3 Consultation

EIA Scoping Direction

8.3.1 In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Wales) Regulations 2017 (The EIA Regulations), a formal request for a Scoping Direction was submitted to Planning and Environment Decisions Wales (PEDW) on 30 May 2024 and was accompanied by a Scoping Report (**Appendix 1C**) which set out the proposed EIA scope of the Proposed Development.

8.3.2 A formal Scoping Direction (**Appendix 1D**) was issued by PEDW on 31 July 2024 which confirmed that the Proposed Development would fall under Schedule 1, Part 10 of the EIA Regulations (and would therefore require EIA) and provided PEDW's opinion regarding the proposed EIA scope of the Proposed Development.

8.3.3 A response to the Scoping Direction setting out how each matter is addressed in the ES and details of where areas of disagreement are clarified and/or resolved is provided at **Appendix 1G**.

8.3.4 A summary of the Scoping Direction responses (and the Applicant's response) relevant to the historic environment is provided at **Table 8.1** below.

Table 8.1 – Summary of (Historic Environment) Scoping Direction Responses

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
Cadw	Cadw expect the potential impact of the proposed development on the settings of all designated historic assets within a 3km study area to be considered in accordance with the Welsh Government guidance given in the document "The Setting of Historic Assets in Wales". With, at a minimum a stage 1 assessment to be carried out.	The relevant best practice guidance is set out above and has been followed.
Cadw	The study area for all designated historic assets should be 3km not 2km.	A 3km Study Area has been used to determine baseline conditions in relation to designated historic assets.
Cadw	The Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2023 will be enacted before the EIA is	The relevant legislative and best practice framework is

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
	produced. This will replace The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979; The Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.	set out above and has been followed.
Cadw	Whilst off-site landscaping, proposed in 9.7.1i, may lead to views of the proposed development being screened thereby and therefore reducing its impact can be considered to be mitigation. The proposals given in 9.7.1ii and 9.7.1iii will not reduce the impact of the proposed development on the historic environment. As such they should be considered to be offsetting or compensatory measures rather than mitigation.	An overview of proposed biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures are described in **Section 8.9** below; however, such measures would not result in any reduction in historic environment effects, and no historic environment mitigation is considered necessary or is proposed.
Glandŵr Cymru	It is unclear how any identified adverse impact from the development can be effectively mitigated given then scale/height of the development, especially as the stack has been determined principally by ecology/air quality modelling factors and as such a reduction in height would not be possible.	Refer to **Section 8.6** for details of mitigation measures, **ES Chapter 3.0 (Alternatives)** for details of alternative design approaches (including reduction in stack height) and to **ES Appendix 3A (Colour Study)** for visualisation material presenting different treatments for the appearance of the proposed development. As demonstrated by the viewpoint visualisation presented on **Figures 7.2a-t** and **Figures 7.3a-d**, the stack would be a slender feature and would be less prominent than other proposed structures and existing structures, and consequently its particular influence upon the surrounding area would be limited. In terms of the

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
		historic environment effects, the Proposed Development would be consistent with the extant built form of the existing Kronospan Facility and no increased visibility is anticipated.
Glandwr Cymru (Canal & River Trust in Wales)	Agree that the topic be scoped into the EIA. There will be cross over with the LVIA. It is unclear how any identified harm to the significance of heritage assets would be mitigated.	Inter-topic liaison has been undertaken between historic environment and LVIA. An overview of proposed biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures are described in **Section 8.9** below; however, such measures would not result in any reduction in historic environment effects, and no historic environment mitigation is considered necessary or is proposed.

EIA Scoping Direction – Addendum

8.3.5 Following receipt of the Scoping Direction (**Appendix 1D**), formal pre-application advice from PEDW (received 19 June 2024), further informal discussions with PEDW and informal pre-application discussions with WCBC, the Applicant issued (on 15 October 2024) a document to PEDW entitled 'EIA Scoping Direction Clarification and Update to the Proposed Development Design' (**Appendix 1E**). This document provided details of the proposed changes to the Proposed Development which arose since the initial pre-application advice was sought, as well as setting out broad areas of agreement and disagreement/clarification with the EIA Scoping Direction referred to above. A summary of the main Proposed Development design changes made at this point is provided below:

- The status of the existing K7 Biomass Plant would change from 'remaining in operation' to 'remain in situ but be used as a back-up biomass plant only' – as a result, the existing K7 Biomass Plant feedstock would be re-directed for use in the proposed Low Carbon CHP Facility.

- A detailed review of CHP Facility feedstock generated on-site was undertaken to understand the maximum wood residue feedstock that would be generated from existing and planned manufacturing operations.
- The proposed use of Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) was removed.

8.3.6 The proposed change to the Proposed Development design also confirmed that the proposed electrical generating capacity of the proposed Low Carbon CHP Facility would increase from 30 megawatts (MW) to 40MW.

8.3.7 An EIA Scoping Direction Addendum (see **Appendix 1F**) was issued by PEDW on 14 January 2025 and provides PEDW's updated opinion regarding the proposed EIA scope of the Proposed Development.

8.3.8 A response to the Scoping Direction Addendum setting out how each matter is addressed in the ES and details of resolution of areas of disagreement is provided at **Appendix 1G**. The Scoping Direction Addendum provided no additional comments in relation to the historic environment.

Other Engagement with Stakeholders

8.3.9 Ongoing consultation has been undertaken with relevant stakeholders as required to ensure that key issues were identified and discussed prior to the completion of the EIA. A summary of the stakeholder responses and how they have been addressed are provided in **Table 8.2** below.

Table 8.2 – Summary of Other Stakeholder Engagement

Consultee	Date	Summary of Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
National Trust	24 June 2024 and 13 August 2025	The Applicant provided an overview of the Proposed Development to National Trust. National Trust requested that the Applicant / Maesgwyn Estate discuss the potential for off-site priority habitats improvements as mitigation (similar to that suggested (but not deemed as	See **Section 8.9** for an overview of the proposed biodiversity mitigation /enhancement measures; however, such measures would not result in any reduction in historic environment effects, and no historic environment mitigation is considered necessary or is proposed.

Consultee	Date	Summary of Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES
		required by the Applicant and WCBC) during the Kronospan North Access Road planning application).	
Cadw	06 June 2024	Email sent to Cadw outlining the project and offering a preliminary meeting to discuss any historic environment issues/concerns.	No direct engagement was requested but the assessment provided by this chapter and Appendix 8A is consistent with the best practice guidance provided by Cadw.
Heneb: Clwyd Powys Archaeological Trust		Historic Environment Record (HER) data request.	HER data has been used in this assessment to establish baseline historic environment conditions.

Statutory Pre-Application Consultation

8.3.10 Section 7, 8, 9, and 11 of the Developments of National Significance (Procedure) (Wales) Order 2016 (as amended) ('the DNSPWO) and Section 61Z of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require the Applicant to undertake statutory consultation prior to submitting a Development of National Significance (DNS) application. The statutory pre-application consultation period was between (insert date) and (insert date). THIS PARAGRAPH IS A PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE FINALISED UPON COMPLETION OF PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION – THE PAC REPORT IS NOT YET AVAILABLE.

8.3.11 A series of responses from consultees received in month 2025 identified issues relating to historic environment matters, as set out in **Table 8.3** below. Full consultee responses (and how each has been addressed) is provided in the Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) Report (**DNS4-009**). THIS PARAGRAPH IS A PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE FINALISED UPON COMPLETION OF PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION – THE PAC REPORT IS NOT YET AVAILABLE.

Table 8.3 – Summary of (Historic Environment) Pre-Application Consultation Responses

Consultee	Summary of Consultee Response	How Response has been Addressed in the ES

8.4 Assessment Methodology

Study Area

8.4.1 The following Study Areas were used to inform the assessment. These were determined based on the preliminary zone of theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development and relative sensitivity of receptors to harm resulting from changes to their settings:

- A 3km Study Area for designated historic assets.
- A 1km Study Area for non-designated historic assets.

Data Sources

8.4.2 The following sources were consulted in compiling the baseline data for this assessment:

- Clwyd Powys, including any relevant records of previous archaeological investigations.
- Cadw data for designated historic assets (SMs, listed buildings, Historic Parks and Gardens, landscapes, Conservation Areas).
- Data held by the National Library of Wales (NLW) and the Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments in Wales (RCAHMW).

- National Heritage List for England (NHLE), the list of designated heritage assets maintained by Historic England.
- The Historic England Archive.
- Historic mapping.
- Local archive data.
- Aerial photography.
- Site walkover and setting assessment.

8.4.3 In addition, work undertaken for the recent Kronospan North Access Road planning application has also been referenced, including:

- historic mapping regression analysis;
- reports on previous archaeological field work; and
- baseline assessment of the contribution made by setting to the value of historic assets within the Study Area.

8.4.4 Relevant data generated by other environmental disciplines has also been used, particularly the landscape and visual impact assessment Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and visualisations.

Impact Assessment

8.4.5 In accordance with the policy and guidance outlined above, a staged assessment has been undertaken to determine the likely significance of effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment. This compares the receptor importance (heritage value throughout this ES chapter) against the magnitude of impact (the degree of change to the asset's heritage value) to determine the significance of effect.

8.4.6 The tables used to determine the heritage value, magnitude of impact and significance of effect are provided in **Appendix 8A**.

8.4.7 Assets of Very High value are those that meet those criteria in their own right, and attributes which strongly convey Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the WHS. Effects assessed as being of a Major or Moderate level are significant in EIA terms, effects assessed as being of a Minor or Negligible level are not significant.

Assessment Assumptions and Limitations

8.4.8 There is a limitation to the data sources set out above, generic to any historic environment assessment, as there is often an element of uncertainty regarding the precise survival, condition and extent of a historic asset. However, this potential limitation has been taken into account in preparing the baseline assessment, for example by augmenting desk-based material with a site walkover/setting assessment survey. A precautionary approach has been taken in determining heritage value; where value is uncertain, the assessment assumes the higher likely value.

8.4.9 A thorough assessment has therefore been made and that on this basis the assessment is believed to be accurate and correct.

8.5 Baseline Environment

Historic Context

8.5.1 No finds or features of prehistoric date are recorded within the 1km Study Area.

8.5.2 A Roman marching camp at Pen-plaenau, Ceiriog Ucha, to the southwest of the Study Area, provides evidence for the establishment of Roman military infrastructure in North Wales. Similarly, the Roman military site at Rhyn Park to the east of Chirk, which includes a Roman camp and vexillation fortress (a fort occupied on a temporary basis by a campaigning army) illustrates the Roman military campaign in North Wales. The possible course of the Rhyn Park to Rhug Roman road is the only evidence for this period recorded within the Study Area.

8.5.3 Two linear earthwork monuments dating to the early medieval period, Wat's Dyke and Offa's Dyke, attest to activity in the area during the early medieval period. Both were most likely built as boundaries demarking land by territorial grouping either in relation to the kingdom's that emerged following the withdrawal of Roman rule or later associated with the development of systems of Anglo-Saxon lordships.

8.5.4 Further reorganisation of the landscape followed the Norman conquest of England by William I in 1066. The Norman conquest did not immediately impact the majority of Wales, as William I sought to solidify his grip on England. Motte Castles were built throughout England to provide strongholds for military operations, residences for the local aristocrat and administrative centres. An example of this is the motte castle at

Oaklands Hall, Chirk Bank, next to the River Ceiriog. On the opposite side of the River Ceiriog is Castell y Waun castle mound, which was established within the borough of Chirk. The border between England and Wales was ruled by the Marcher Lords during the medieval period. Chirk Castle was built in the late 13th century for Roger Mortimer, the then newly created Marcher Lord of Chirkland. A deer park with a timber fence at Chirk Castle is referenced in documents form the late 14th century. Chirk itself developed as a market town with the first market chartered granted in 1324.

8.5.5 In 1595 Chirk Castle was sold to a merchant, Thomas Myddleton. Chirk Castle was seized during the Civil War (1640s) and was partly destroyed. It was rebuilt in the 1650s and was remodelled in the 18th and 19th centuries. The medieval deer park at Chirk Castle was extended in the 17th century. By the mid-18th century, the park included formal designed elements, but that layout was changed in the 1760s and 70s by the landscaping scheme undertaken by William Emes for Richard Myddleton.

8.5.6 The park is recorded on 19th century mapping occupying a large area with Chirk Castle central to the formal parkland. The Myddleton family estate was larger than the park and included farmland beyond. The 17th century walled garden to Chirk Castle at Whitehurst is a Grade II* registered Historic Park and Garden. It was laid out by Sir Thomas Myddleton II in about 1651.

8.5.7 The Industrial period saw further changes to the landscape around Chirk. Demand for materials including coal, iron, slate and limestone to be moved from the mines and quarries of Wales to industrial areas at the height of the canal building era during the industrialisation of Britain led to the construction of the Ellesmere Canal, later known as the Welsh Arm of the Shropshire Union Canal or the Llangollen Canal. The canal had to cross two major river valleys and the ridge between them. It was built between 1795 and 1808 by Wiliam Jessop and Thomas Telford. The canal features cuttings, tunnels, embankments and bridges and the Chirk and Pontcysyllte viaducts. It is recognised as an outstanding feat of canal building and is designated a WHS.

8.5.8 Thomas Telford's Holyhead Road, built to improve the journey between London and Ireland via Holyhead, was designed using existing sections of turnpike roads. Work on the road began in 1815, the Menai Bridge opened in 1826. The Glyn Valley Tramway runs to the south of the Study Area, and then north south parallel to the Llangollen Canal. It was built in 1873 and originally trams were pulled by horses

along some of the route. The Tramway then linked into the Chester and Shrewsbury branch of the Great Western Railway which had been built in 1846.

8.5.9 The Proposed Development Site lies within the existing Kronospan industrial complex. This was first established in the 1960s or 1970s and developed throughout the later 20th century. It now covers an area of approximately 40 hectares and includes stacks and buildings with heights ranging up to 70m.

Designated Historic Assets

8.5.10 There are 155 designated historic assets within the 3km Study Area. The Proposed Development is adjacent to the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS, which is also a SM, and within the buffer zone of the WHS. There are a further 14 SMs (of which nine relate to sections of Offa's Dyke), four registered Historic Parks and Gardens, three Grade I listed buildings, 11 Grade II* listed buildings, 120 Grade II listed buildings and one Conservation Area.

8.5.11 The above assets were considered as part of Stage 1 setting assessment, which concluded that the following assets have settings that include the Proposed Development Site and should therefore be taken forward to Stage 2- 4 assessments.

The Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal World Heritage Site and Scheduled Monument

8.5.12 The Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS is approximately 200m to the east of the Proposed Development Site at its closest point, the Site is within the WHS buffer zone. The WHS boundary coincides with a SM on both the Welsh and English sides of the River Ceiriog. The WHS Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) describes the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal as "…a pioneering masterpiece of engineering and monumental architecture by the famous civil engineer Thomas Telford. It was constructed using metal arches supported by tall, slender masonry piers. The Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal are early and outstanding examples of the innovations brought about by the Industrial Revolution in Britain, where they made decisive development in transport capacities possible. They bear witness to very substantial international interchanges and influences in the fields of inland waterways, civil engineering, land-use planning, and the application of iron in structural design".

Offa's Dyke

8.5.13 Offa's Dyke, a boundary earthwork, believed to be of early medieval date running, with some gaps, for roughly 220km through the border area between Wales and England, the following sections are to the west of the Proposed Development Site:

- DE133 Offa's Dyke: Caeau-Gwynion Section stretches for 650m across Caeaugwynion farm towards Wern Wood.
- DE134 Offa's Dyke: Chirk Castle Section extending NE from Castle Mill measures 400m, running from Castle Mill to Home Farm, within Chirk Castle Registered Park and Garden.
- DE135 Offa's Dyke: Chirk Park Section extending NE from the Lake runs north-north-east from the ornamental lake for 810m, where it is truncated by a road cutting.
- DE138 Offa's Dyke: Section N & S of Plas-Offa is a 700m long stretch of the Dyke located just over 1km to the north-west of the Site. It is cut by the A5 in the centre and by the Llangollen Canal to the north.
- DE198 Offa's Dyke: Chirk Park Section extending 340m NE of Home Farm runs north of DE134 across Chirk Castle Registered Park and Garden.
- DE140 Offa's Dyke: Section N & S of Tan-y-Cut runs for c. 500m north-east from the Llangollen Canal to the River Dee.

Chirk Conservation Areas

8.5.14 Chirk Conservation Area is within 500m of the Proposed Development Site. The Conservation Area includes the historic core of the medieval settlement and extends west to Station Avenue and Castle Road and south to include Chirk aqueduct and viaduct. The majority of the buildings in the Conservation Area date to the late 18th century and early 19th century, and the development of Chirk following the construction of the canal, the Holyhead Road, and the railway. There are several Grade II listed buildings within the Chirk Conservation Area.

Chirk Castle (Grade I Listed Building and Grade I Registered Park and Garden)

8.5.15 Chirk Castle (PGW(C)63(WRE) is a Grade I listed park that forms the grounds of Chirk Castle (a Grade I listed building). The park has its origins in the 14th century, in the late 17th century it was developed to include a Baroque layout with formal

gardens and avenues. However, most of this layout was superseded by a new landscape design, created by the English landscape designer William Emes for Richard Myddelton in the late 18th century. There are 26 listed buildings within the park, which include Grade I Chirk Castle and several parkland structures such as gates, entrance lodges, formal garden walls and ornaments, and estate workers' cottages.

8.5.16 Chirk Castle is a Grade I listed building. The castle was built c.1295 for the Marcher lord Roger Mortimer. The castle was bought by the merchant Sir Thomas Myddelton in 1595. It remained in the Myddelton family until it was transferred to the National Trust in 1981.

8.5.17 There are two main entrances into the park, one of which is through ornamental wrought iron gates and gatescreen which date to 1712-19 by Robert and John Davies of Bersham (Grade I listed).

Non-designated Historic Assets

8.5.18 There are no non-designated historic assets within the Proposed Development Site.

8.5.19 There are 33 recorded non-designated assets within the 1km Study Area. These are described in more detail in **Appendix 8A**. These assets were considered as part of Stage 1 setting assessment, which concluded that no non-designated historic assets have settings that include the Proposed Development Site, and none were therefore taken forward to Stage 2- 4 assessments.

Future Baseline

8.5.20 It is assumed that future baseline conditions would continue to include the extant and proposed industrial development of the existing Kronospan Facility. The existing Kronospan Facility has extant planning permission for a number of developments, including the erection of two raw material silos, extension to the existing chip preparation building, and the erection of three silos and associated works (planning reference P/2022/0765) and a proposed new access road (North Access Road), lorry park, weighbridge, 132kV substation and associated infrastructure on land immediately north of the existing Kronospan Facility (planning reference P/2022/1080). These applications have been considered in the assessment, and

there are no other anticipated changes to the baseline conditions within or close to the Site that would materially alter the assessment that follows.

8.5.21 Changes to the historic environment baseline conditions could occur because of:

- Additional surveys identifying currently unknown heritage assets within the Study Area.
- Changes to the designation status of the known assets within the Study Area.
- Changes to the condition of the known assets within the Study Area (for example removal of assets or changes to an asset's setting because of other development proposals).

8.5.22 There are no anticipated changes to the baseline date as set out above that would materially alter the assessment that follows.

8.6 Initial Development Design and Impact Avoidance/Reduction Measures

8.6.1 General design measures to avoid or minimise the potential for significant effects are described in **ES Chapter 4.0 (Description of the Proposed Development).**

8.6.2 Design measures to avoid or minimise the potential for significant effects on the historic environment are summarised below.

Construction and Decommissioning

8.6.3 Effects that relate to the settings of historic assets could commence during the construction phase but will be either temporary and reversible (relating to, for example, machine movement) and are not significant or will continue throughout the operation phase. To avoid duplication these effects are assessed as operation phase effects. No significant effects on the historic environment are predicted because of either the construction or decommissioning of the Proposed Development and no mitigation is therefore proposed in relation to this.

Operation

8.6.4 The Proposed Development has been sited within the existing Kronospan Facility to co-locate it to an area that already includes industrial infrastructure. The facility has been specifically designed to be within this context, with the aim of limiting the

change to baseline and impacts arising from development within the settings of historic assets.

8.7 Assessment of Potential Effects

Introduction

8.7.1 The following section sets out the assessment of effects taking into consideration the initial development design and impact avoidance/reduction measures detailed in **Section 8.6** above.

Potential Effects during Construction and Decommissioning

8.7.2 The Proposed Development Site is within the existing Kronospan Facility, an area that has been developed since the 1970s. Below ground works associated with the construction of previous developments within the Site will have impacted any archaeology that may have previously been present. No historic assets are recorded within the Site, and it has negligible archaeological potential.

8.7.3 The construction of the Proposed Development has the potential to impact the heritage value of assets through changes to their settings. Changes limited to construction activities would be short-term, temporary and reversible. These are not significant effects. Effects resulting from the presence of the Proposed Development in the settings of historic assets are discussed as operation phase effects below.

8.7.4 No significant historic environment effects are predicted during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.

8.7.5 Any below ground works associated with decommissioning will be within an area of previously disturbed land that has no/negligible archaeological potential. Following decommissioning, assuming the removal of above ground infrastructure, the effects described below as occurring during the operational phase of the development would be reversed. Therefore, no significant historic environment effects are predicted during the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development.

Potential Effects during Operation

Introduction

8.7.6 The operation phase of the Proposed Development has the potential to affect the setting of the heritage assets and impact the contribution that setting makes to their heritage value. An assessment of these potential impacts has been undertaken in accordance with *Setting of Historic Assets in Wales* (Cadw, 2017) and *Guidance and* Toolkit for Impact Assessment in a World Heritage Context" (UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN, 2022).

8.7.7 These assessments are set out in full in **Appendix 8A**. This includes the 'Stage 1' assessment for all of the historic assets within the 1km and 3km Study Area. The Stage 1 assessment concludes that for the majority of assets, the distance of separation and intervening topography, mature trees and/or built form is such that the Proposed Development would not be capable of affecting the contribution made by setting to the heritage value of the asset.

8.7.8 A number of assets have been identified to have settings that include, or potentially include, the Proposed Development Site. These assets have been taken forward to assessment Steps 2 - 4, as described below.

Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal World Heritage Site and Scheduled Monument (asset reference WHS1 and (SM) DE175)

8.7.9 The Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS comprises the 18km long canal and associated infrastructure built by Thomas Telford in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The canal's construction reflects the challenging terrain through which the canal passes and the structure is illustrative of the technical developments and innovations associated with the period of industrialisation. The canal has also acquired a leisure function and has, historically as well as currently, been celebrated for its aesthetic value and that of the picturesque landscape through which it passes. The Site is not within the WHS but is within its buffer zone.

8.7.10 The rural and 19th century industrial setting of the canal makes a positive contribution to appreciating the very high historic, evidential, aesthetic and communal heritage values of this asset. The existing Kronospan Facility does not make a positive contribution to appreciating the heritage value of the asset and there are no features

which convey the OUV of the WHS within or close to the Site, other than the canal itself.

8.7.11 The WHS at its closest point to the Site comprises the canal and tow path. These are within a deep cutting, with wooded banks and the railway beyond. This creates a sense of separation between the canal and surrounding landscape, particularly to the west, and prevents the existing Kronospan Facility from being a particularly detracting element in these close views from within the canal corridor.

8.7.12 In wider views of the WHS from the surrounding landscape, the course of the canal can be traced by its linear form in the landscape, the canal itself is not visible as it runs past the Site. In these views, the WHS is backdropped by the existing Kronospan Facility. This includes the built industrial form of the buildings, which include existing tall vertical elements such as the existing stacks and cyclones.

8.7.13 The landscape through which the canal passes would include, within a small element, views of additional industrial infrastructure. However, this is restricted to views that are already industrial in character. By co-locating within the existing Kronospan Facility, the Proposed Development would avoid any increased or broader industrialisation of the WHS's buffer zone and setting. Photomontages from Viewpoints K and M (**Figures 7.2k i & ii and 7.2m i & ii**) show the Proposed Development as a continuation of the existing facility.

8.7.14 The majority of the features that contribute to the OUV of the WHS would be unaffected by the Proposed Development. There would be an increase in the industrial mass of the existing Kronospan Facility, but this would only affect views from the tow path in close proximity to the Site. In wider views, the Proposed Development would be less readily apparent other than as a continuation of the existing industrial features.

8.7.15 Therefore, the Proposed Development would result in a negligible magnitude of impact and minor (adverse) level of effect on the heritage value (OUV) of the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS and SM (an asset of very high value). This would be a permanent effect at a local level. This is not a significant effect in EIA terminology.

Chirk Castle Grade I Registered Historic Park and Garden and Grade I Listed Gates, Screen and Piers (asset reference RPG1 and LB1)

8.7.16 Chirk Castle dates from the end of the 13th century. It was built for Roger Mortimer, the Marcher Lord of Chirkland A fenced deer park was created around the castle in the later 14th century. This was extended by Sir Thomas Myddelton in the 17th century. In the 18th century, a formal baroque garden was laid out. That garden was largely swept away by the landscaped park and gardens created in the 1760s and 70s by Willian Emes for Richard Myddelton. There are two main entrances into the park, one of which is through ornamental wrought iron gates and gatescreen which date to 1712-19 by Robert and John Davies of Bersham (Grade I listed).

8.7.17 The parkland is largely owned and managed by National Trust. It is managed as formal gardens, parkland, parkland pasture and the large lake. Higher ground within the parkland allows for views over the wider area, which convey the grandeur and high status of the land owned and occupied by the Myddeltons and the strategic significance of the location of the castle within the border region. The setting of the park and garden therefore includes the wider agricultural landscape in which it is experienced, and which can be experienced in views from within it. This setting makes a positive contribution to the very high heritage value (historic, evidential, aesthetic and communal) of the Grade I registered Historic Park and Garden. The setting of the Grade I gates, screen and piers is largely defined by their immediate surroundings and relationship to the parkland. Wider views are less significant in terms of appreciating the heritage value of this asset, although some views towards Chirk are available and do make a positive contribution to appreciating its heritage value.

8.7.18 Viewpoint U (**Figure 7.2q i & ii**) is a ground level view from the entrance into Chirk Castle (asset reference LB34) and demonstrates that both the topography and mature trees prevent intervisibility with the Site from this location. Viewpoint V (**Figure 7.2r i & ii**) provides a wireframe model from the roof of Chirk Castle and shows that the Proposed Development would be screened from views by mature woodland (even in winter month) within the park and garden. Views of and including the principal building within the parkland (Chirk Castle) would be unaffected by the Proposed Development and the heritage value of that asset would be unaffected (the castle itself was therefore scoped out of the setting assessment at Stage 1).

8.7.19 Viewpoint D (**Figure 7.2d i & ii**) includes a wireframe from the Grade I listed Chirk Castle Gates. The existing Kronospan Facility is evident in views from this point and the wireframe indicates some additional visibility of the proposed stack in views from this location. This would be viewed in the context of the existing industrial elements within this view and the change from baseline would be perceptible but would not result in any increased industrialisation or change to the character of the surroundings in which the parkland is experienced.

8.7.20 Viewpoint W (**Figure 7.2s i & ii**) show that the Proposed Development would be largely screened by existing mature vegetation. Viewpoint L (**Figure 7.2l i & ii**) demonstrates that the topography would limit the visibility of the Site from within large sections of the park and garden. These viewpoints also demonstrate that the available views from within the park and garden towards the Site are already industrial in character.

8.7.21 The distance of separation is such that the key relationships between the parkland and the landscape within which it is experienced would be unchanged and the ability to understand and appreciate the designed landscape within the wider agricultural landscape over which it has views would be unchanged. There would be no additional light, noise or odour effects, again given the distance of separation.

8.7.22 In relation to the Grade I listed building Chirk Castle, Grade I listed building Chirk Castle, gates screens and piers and Grade I Registered Historic Park and Garden, Chirk Castle, the magnitude of impact and level of effect would be none.

Offa's Dyke Scheduled Monument (asset reference SM7)

8.7.23 Offa's Dyke is a linear earthwork, dating to approximately the 8th century, and demarking a boundary between territories in England and Wales. It comprises a large ditch with a bank to the east. It is an asset with very high heritage value, predominantly being of evidential and historic interest. It follows the terrain, often being placed along ridges or escarpments and in these elevated locations the dyke has wide ranging views over the surrounding landscape. This landscape, while changed through development and land enclosure, continues to readily convey the route of Offa's Dyke relative to England and Wales and the terrain in which it was constructed.

8.7.24 The section off Offa's Dyke which runs through countryside to the northeast of Chirk allows for views over the surrounding landscape (SM DE133, asset reference SM7).

8.7.25 These views include the existing Kronospan Facility. The Proposed Development would be viewed in this context and over this distance would be a barely perceptible increase in the overall mass of industrial development in this view. The context provided by the views to understanding and appreciating the heritage values of Offa's Dyke would not be altered. The contribution made by setting to the heritage values of the monument would be unaltered. This is demonstrated by Viewpoints B and X (**Figure 7.2b i & ii** and **Figure 7.2t i & ii**). The magnitude of impact and level of effect would be none.

Chirk Conservation Area (CA1)

8.7.26 The Chirk Conservation Area occupies the historic core of the village between Castle Street and Station Avenue and includes some development and open space along Church Street/ Holyhead Road. The setting of the Conservation Area includes the valley of the River Ceiriog to the south, the course of the canal through Chirk Tunnel to the west, modern housing estates to the east and the industrial complex including the existing Kronospan Facility to the north. The setting to the east and north is significantly changed from that of the 19th century and earlier settlement, which was set within an area of farmland and farmsteads until the later 20th century. That rural character is no longer evident in views from within the Conservation Area, or on approaches into it from these directions. The value of the asset is high, associated with its historic, evidential, aesthetic and communal heritage value.

8.7.27 The photomontage from Viewpoint A (**Figure 7.2a i & ii**) demonstrates that the Proposed Development would introduce additional industrial development in views from the northern extent of the Conservation Area. However, as these are views that are already industrial in character, they do not contribute to appreciating the heritage values of Chirk as a small historic settlement set within an agricultural landscape. The change from baseline would not introduce an industrial element into currently rural views and does not introduce any significantly detracting or visual prominent elements, relative to baseline conditions. The Conservation Area would continue to be understood and appreciated as currently experienced. The magnitude of impact and level of effect would be none.

8.8 Inter-Relationship of Potential Effects

8.8.1 The historic environment effects, and any works that are carried out to mitigate those effects, are not likely to lead to effects on other topics considered in the ES technical chapters. Potential effects (and mitigation works) for other environmental topics interact with the historic environment as follows:

8.8.2 **ES Chapter 5.0 (Noise and Vibration)** was consulted to determine whether additional effects were likely to contribute to changes within the settings of heritage assets. Largely that assessment concluded neutral to minor adverse effects. These effects do not contribute to the assessed effects described above.

8.8.3 Mitigation/enhancement proposals are provided in the Biodiversity Assessment Report (**DNS4-007**). Areas of proposed biodiversity mitigation/enhancement have been checked against historic environment baseline data to determine that no significant adverse effects on the historic environment are predicted as a result of these proposals

8.9 Further Mitigation and Monitoring

8.9.1 Mitigation/enhancement measures will be implemented to increase the resilience of the ecological habitats to the likely air quality impacts. Further details of the biodiversity mitigation/enhancement proposals are provided in the Biodiversity Assessment Report (**DNS4-007**) and are illustrated on the drawing provided at **DNS3-012**. Such measures would not result in any reduction in historic environment effects, and no historic environment mitigation is considered necessary or is proposed.

8.9.2 The predicted effect assessed during the operational phase of the Proposed Development takes account of the mitigation described in **Section 8.6** above, and no further mitigation is proposed.

8.10 Summary of Potential Residual Effects

8.10.1 As no further mitigation measures are proposed, residual historic environment effects would be as stated in **Section 8.7** above. The Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS and SM is the only historic asset where the potential for an adverse effect (minor) has been identified; this would be a permanent effect at a local level and would not be significant in EIA terms.

8.11 Cumulative Effects

8.11.1 There is the potential for the effects of the Proposed Development to interact with the effects of other projects or activities in the surrounding area. These are 'inter-project' cumulative effects and includes projects that are under construction, projects that are approved but awaiting implementation, and projects awaiting determination within the planning process with design information in the public domain. Such projects are required to be within a geographical scope where environmental impacts could act together to create a more significant overall effect on a receptor and where sufficient environmental information is available.

8.11.2 The method for identifying other projects and activities is provided within **ES Chapter 2.0 (EIA Methodology)**; this includes a list of the specific projects and activities identified, which also takes into consideration the other Kronospan development proposals that are being progressed separately by the Applicant. The cumulative effects Study Area and the locations of the other projects and activities are illustrated on **Figure 2.1** and **Figure 2.2** respectively.

8.11.3 Cumulative schemes 1.1 and 1.2 are under construction, and for the purposes of the heritage setting assessment are considered as part of the baseline conditions and not cumulative development.

8.11.4 Cumulative scheme 1.5 includes a series of new silos, the largest two of which are also proposed as part of the Proposed Development. As such, the two larger silos are not considered as a component of cumulative scheme 1.5 to avoid any potential double counting of effects.

8.11.5 **Table 8.4** below provides a summary of each of the cumulative developments set out in **ES Chapter 2.0 (EIA Methodology)** and draws a conclusion as to whether cumulative historic environment effects would occur, and if so whether these would be significant effects.

Table 8.4 – Assessment of Cumulative Historic Environment Effects

ID Ref	Details	Significant Cumulative Effect
1.1	P/2017/0699. Kronospan Chipper and Flaker. Consented and under construction.	Scheme under construction and is therefore considered as part of the baseline conditions
1.2	APP/H6955/A/19/3227571. Kronospan OSB Facility. Consented and under construction	Scheme under construction and is therefore considered as part of the baseline conditions

ID Ref	Details	Significant Cumulative Effect
1.3	P/2022/0336. Kronospan Covered Loading Yard. Consented	The scheme would comprise relatively limited change to structures towards the south-eastern boundary of the Kronospan Facility, and existing intervening structures would limit any intervisibility with the Proposed Development. There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative historic environment effects. No cumulative effect.
1.4	P/2022/0615. Kronospan Engineering Store. Consented	The scheme would comprise a relatively limited extension to the Kronospan Facility and would be similar is height and appearance to the far more extensive existing building immediately to its north. There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative historic environment effects. No cumulative effect.
1.5	P/2022/0765. Kronospan Chip Preparation Building Extension and Storage Silos. Consented. Two of the consented silos form part of the Proposed Development. The remainder of the scheme would include three smaller new silos (height 24m) and an extension to an existing building (height 29m)	The scheme would introduce new structures and extend an existing structure, immediately adjacent to the Proposed Development. They would comprise a limited addition to the Kronospan Facility, and would result in only localised, limited and incremental change to the influence of this established industrial development. Cumulatively, when the further presence of the Proposed Development is also considered, there would be a greater, but still incremental increase in the influence of development at Kronospan upon the surrounding area, but the combined influence of the two schemes along with the existing structures would not result any change to the settings of heritage assets that would give rise to additional effects on the historic environment, other than those described above. No cumulative effect
1.6	P/2022/1080. Kronospan North Access Road. Consented. The scheme would comprise a new access road and HGV parking area for the Kronospan Facility, new external storage areas, a new weighbridge building and a new 132kV substation.	The scheme would introduce new structures to the north of the existing Kronospan Facility, and a new HGV park and access road further to the north. These would be well enclosed by perimeter earthworks and planting and would be less prominent than existing larger structures. Mitigation and enhancement measures would reduce the visibility of Kronospan generally. Cumulatively, when the further presence of the Proposed Development is also considered, there would be a very incremental increase in the

ID Ref	Details	Significant Cumulative Effect
		influence of development at Kronospan upon the surrounding area, but the combined influence of the two schemes along with the existing structures would not result in any change views that would give rise to additional effects on the historic environment, other than those described above. No cumulative effect
1.7	P/2022/0066. Extension to Lady Margaret's Caravan Site, Chirk. Consented.	The caravan site extension would be small in extent and would comprise structures that are low in height. Additionally, it would be relatively well enclosed by existing vegetation cover. There is a considerable amount of existing industrial development, including large structures in the intervening landscape. No cumulative effect
1.8	Allocation for 180 housing units in the WCBC LDP.	The land allocated for housing is separated from the Site by modern housing and the existing Kronospan Facility. The distance of separation and intervening built form would prevent the combined influence of these two schemes giving rise to additional effects on the historic environment, other than those described above. No cumulative effect.
1.9	Kronospan 132kV underground cable from Scheme 1.6 to the existing overhead line. An application for this scheme has yet to be submitted. It is assumed to be predominately within the existing highway corridor.	The 132kV cable would be buried and result in no medium-term, long-term or permanent above ground changes. There would be no interaction between this scheme and the Proposed Development that would give rise to any cumulative historic environment effects. No cumulative effect
2.1	22/03924/FUL. Demolition of existing industrial development at Weston Rhyn, and replacement with 61 no. residential dwellings. Consented.	The scheme would be at an existing developed site within a corridor of built development c.2.45km from the Site, and separated from it by existing industrial structures, and other built development. No cumulative effect
2.2	24/01380/FUL. 1.13MW solar array at Rhoswiel, Weston Rhyn. Refused. 25/01572/FUL. 1.28MW solar array at Rhoswiel, Weston Rhyn. Consented.	The solar array would be small in extent and would comprise structures that are low in height, c.2km south of the Site and separated from it by existing industrial structures, and other built development. No cumulative effect
2.3	21/01230/FUL. 12 no houses, 10 no. bungalows and 18 no. apartments at Weston Rhyn. Consented.	The scheme would comprise a limited addition to the southern edge of an existing village over 2.5km from the Site, and separated from it by existing industrial structures, and other built development. No cumulative effect

8.11.6 The Kronospan North Access Road (and associated development) (Scheme 1.6) was assessed to result in a Minor (adverse) effect on the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS (WHS1). This assessment also predicts a Minor (adverse) effect on this asset. The two developments in combination would slightly increase the overall industrial appearance of the Kronospan Facility in views of and from the WHS. This combined effect, while marginally greater than each individual effect, would not result in an increase in the assessed level of effect above the predicted negligible impact and minor adverse effect in each case.

8.11.7 The remaining committed development applications within the existing Kronospan Facility have also been assessed to have no impact on heritage assets common to this assessment. Scheme 1.5 (the erection of two raw material silos, extension to the existing chip preparation building, and the erection of three silos and associated works) has been considered as part of the assessment provided above as it forms part of the Proposed Development and has also been considered as part of the future baseline conditions for the Site. In relation to that application, it was concluded that being similar in appearance to existing buildings and plant within the existing Kronospan Facility, the development would also not significantly affect the Pontcysyllye Aqueduct and Canal WHS and SM, as described in **Table 8.4** above.

8.11.8 None of the other committed developments identified in **ES Chapter 2.0 (EIA Methodology)** would result in any cumulative effects on the historic assets assessed in this chapter. For the majority this is due to the locations of the developments and lack of interaction with the heritage assets within the baseline data for this assessment.

8.12 Enhancement Measures

8.12.1 No enhancement measures are required or proposed.

8.13 Conclusions

8.13.1 In accordance with the relevant planning policy and guidance context, a historic environment assessment has been undertaken for the Proposed Development.

8.13.2 The assessment identified the following baseline conditions for the historic environment:

- The Proposed Development Site is within the existing Kronospan Facility, an industrial complex dating to the late 20th century. The Site is previously developed and any archaeology that may have been present (although none is indicated by the HER and historic mapping) would have been already impacted. The Proposed Development site does not include any recorded designated or non-designated historic assets and has negligible archaeological potential.
- The Proposed Development is adjacent to the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS (also a SM) and is within the buffer zone of the WHS.
- The Proposed Development is within the setting of the Grade I listed Registered Park and Garden at Chirk Castle, associated with the Grade I listed building Chirk Castle, and the Grade I listed Chirk Castle, gates, gate screens and piers.
- The Proposed Development is within the setting of Offa's Dyke SM, an asset whose landscape position and prominence in places, allows for views over the wider landscape which contribute to appreciating its heritage values.
- The Proposed Development is to the north of Chirk Conservation Area and is within the setting of that asset, although modern change to views in this direction are such that this aspect of the asset's setting does not make a positive contribution to appreciating its heritage value.

8.13.3 In relation to the assets within the historic environment baseline data, the following level of effect is predicted:

- The effect predicted in relation to Offa's Dyke SM (SM7) is **none**. This is because only occasional views of the Proposed Development would be available along relatively short sections of the monument, and in those views (given the distance of separation) the Proposed Development would form a contiguous part of the pre-existing industrial character of those views. The change from baseline conditions would be imperceptible and the contribution made by setting to the heritage values of the asset would be unaltered.
- The effect predicted in relation to Grade I listed Chirk Castle (LB34), Chirk Castle Historic Park and Garden (RPG1) and Grade I listed Chirk Castle gates, gate screens and piers (LB1) is **none**. This is because the topography and mature trees largely screen the Proposed Development in views from these assets. In the few available views of the Proposed Development, it would be seen in the

context of the existing Kronospan Facility. There would be no increased industrialisation of views or loss of heritage value as a result.

- The effect predicted in relation to Chirk Conservation Area is **none**. Views towards the Proposed Development already include the existing industrial character of the existing Kronospan Facility. These views are already significantly altered from the historic context of the settlement and do not contribute to appreciating the heritage value of the Conservation Area. There would be no increased industrialisation of views or loss of heritage value as a result.
- A **minor (adverse)** effect is predicted in relation to the Pontcysyllte Aqueduct and Canal WHS (also a SM) (WH1). This is because in close views there would be an increase in the scale and mass of the industrial character of the existing Kronospan Facility. Although only a marginal increase, which is less perceptible in wider views, the proximity of the Proposed Development to the monument and location within its buffer zone is such that the change to baseline conditions would result in a very slight loss of heritage value (a negligible magnitude of impact). This would result, given the sensitivity of the asset, in a **minor (adverse)** significance of effect. This is not a significant effect in EIA terminology.

8.13.4 None of the predicted effects are significant and no further mitigation beyond those included in the design of the Proposed Development are proposed.

Appendix 8A – Historic Environment Background Data and Setting Assessment