

Mansfield District Council

Heritage Impact Assessment

Prepared for: Mansfield District Council

Prepared by: Aurora Heritage Planning Ltd

May 2026



Mansfield District Council

Heritage Impact Assessment

Sign-off history

issue no.	Version Type	prepared by	reviewed by	approved by	Date
1	Draft	KD	MS	RL	10/04/2026
2	Revision	KD	RL	-	29/04/2026
3	Revision	KD	RL	-	21/05/2026
4	Final	-	-	LPA	28/05/2026

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Methodology	3
3.	Overview of Heritage Constraints.....	8
4.	Site Assessment Findings (Summary)	10
5.	Policy Implications and Recommendations	28
6.	Conclusions	29
	Appendices	31

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of the Assessment

This Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been prepared on behalf of Mansfield District Council to inform the preparation of the emerging Local Plan and to assess the potential effects of proposed site allocations on the historic environment.

The assessment provides a proportionate, evidence-based appraisal of the relationship between potential development sites and designated and non-designated heritage assets. It identifies where heritage considerations are likely to influence the suitability of sites for allocation and establishes the extent to which potential impacts can be avoided, minimised or mitigated through appropriate design and policy responses.

The HIA is intended to support the Council in demonstrating that site allocations are justified, effective and consistent with national policy, including the requirement to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out in Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

As this assessment has been undertaken at the plan-making stage, it considers likely effects under a notional development scenario rather than detailed proposals. It therefore focuses on identifying constraints, sensitivities and opportunities, rather than undertaking a full planning balance.

1.2. Scope of the Assessment

The assessment considers sites identified through the Council's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) where there is potential for interaction with heritage assets. A 250m study area has been applied to each site to identify heritage assets within the immediate zone of influence, with a wider study area used where necessary to understand broader setting relationships.

A total of 58 sites were initially identified through GIS-based screening as having heritage assets within 250m. Following verification and refinement of the dataset, 52 sites have been taken forward for detailed assessment. Six sites were scoped out where heritage assets were either no longer extant, located outside the site boundary

with no meaningful relationship, or otherwise considered unlikely to be affected by development.

The assessment considers designated heritage assets, including listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments, alongside non-designated heritage assets identified through the Nottinghamshire County Council and Derbyshire Historic Environment Records (HER). Archaeological potential and the contribution of setting to significance have also been considered.

1.3. Policy Context

This assessment has been prepared in accordance with relevant national policy and guidance, including the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024), which requires applicants and plan-makers to identify and assess the significance of heritage assets and to consider the impact of development on that significance.

The assessment also draws on Historic England guidance, including *The Historic Environment in Local Plans* (GPA1), *Site Allocations in Local Plans* (Advice Note 3), and *The Setting of Heritage Assets* (GPA3). These documents establish a proportionate and evidence-led approach to understanding heritage significance and managing change.

Statutory duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 have also been considered, particularly the requirement to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their setting, and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

2. Methodology

2.1 Overview of Approach

The methodology adopts a staged and proportionate approach aligned with Historic England Advice Note 3, combining desk-based analysis, GIS screening and site verification to ensure a consistent and robust assessment of heritage sensitivities across all sites.

For each site, the assessment identifies relevant heritage assets, considers their significance, evaluates the contribution made by the site to that significance (including through setting), and assesses the likely effects of development under a notional scenario. The process also identifies constraints, opportunities and potential mitigation measures to inform site allocation and policy development.

The level of detail applied to each site is proportionate to its sensitivity, ensuring that higher-risk sites are subject to more detailed analysis.

2.2 Baseline Data and Screening

A comprehensive baseline was established using Historic Environment Record data, the National Heritage List for England, conservation area appraisals, historic mapping, aerial imagery and other relevant sources. An initial wider study area was used to understand broader spatial and cumulative relationships, before applying a consistent 250m buffer to identify assets within the immediate zone of influence.

The 250m screening exercise formed the basis for identifying sites requiring detailed assessment and ensured a consistent and transparent approach across the study area. Where assets identified within the buffer were subsequently determined to have no meaningful relationship with the site, they were scoped out of detailed assessment following professional judgement and verification.

2.3 Site Verification

Targeted site visits were undertaken to verify desk-based findings and to understand the relationship between sites and heritage assets in practice. These visits have informed the assessment of intervisibility, townscape character, spatial relationships and the presence of intervening development.

The baseline dataset has been treated as a live working resource throughout the assessment, with updates made where discrepancies or inaccuracies were identified during the verification process.

2.4 Assessment Framework

Each site has been assessed using a consistent framework based on national policy and guidance. The significance of heritage assets has been considered with reference to the NPPF heritage interests of archaeological, architectural, historic and, where relevant, artistic value.

The contribution of setting has been assessed in accordance with Historic England GPA3, considering the contextual, intimate and experiential (prospect) relationships between sites and heritage assets.

Sensitivity to change has been evaluated having regard to factors such as scale, massing, layout, urban grain, skyline and views. The likely nature of impact has then been identified based on a notional development scenario, recognising that detailed design will be established at application stage.

The assessment identifies constraints and opportunities for each site and establishes appropriate mitigation measures and design principles. Impacts are expressed qualitatively and are intended to inform plan-making rather than represent a definitive planning judgement.

2.5 Risk-Based Categorisation

Sites have been categorised according to their relative heritage sensitivity, reflecting the nature and extent of their relationship with heritage assets. High sensitivity sites are typically those where designated assets are located within or immediately adjacent to the site, or where there is a strong and direct relationship with the historic environment. Medium sensitivity sites are characterised by meaningful but less direct relationships, often influenced by distance, intervening development or fragmented character. Low sensitivity sites are those where relationships are limited, indirect or primarily archaeological in nature.

All sites have been assessed, with the level of detail proportionate to their sensitivity.

Detailed site-specific assessments have been prepared for all sites and form the evidential basis for the summary findings presented within this report.

2.6 Assessment of Sensitivity, Impact and Risk

The assessment of heritage sensitivity, potential impact and overall risk has been undertaken using a structured process of professional judgement, informed by national policy and guidance, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and relevant Historic England advice. The approach reflects the need for a proportionate and consistent framework at the plan-making stage, allowing sites to be compared on a like for like basis.

Sensitivity reflects the extent to which a site has the potential to influence the significance of heritage assets. In assessing sensitivity, regard has been given to the type and designation of assets, their level of significance, and the contribution made by the site to that significance, including through setting, both proximate and intimate. This includes consideration of intervisibility, spatial and functional relationships, and the extent to which these relationships remain intact or have been altered by modern development or changes in landscape or townscape character. On this basis, sites have been grouped into high, medium and low sensitivity categories, reflecting whether relationships are strong and direct, more limited or indirect, or minimal in nature.

The likely impact of development has been assessed under a development scenario, recognising that detailed proposals will be established at application stage. This considers the nature of the relationship between the site and heritage assets, the aspects of significance that may be affected, and the extent to which change could alter setting, views or key characteristics. Impacts are expressed qualitatively, ranging from negligible impact, where no meaningful change would occur, through to low or moderate/medium impact where change may be more noticeable but remains localised. At this stage, the assessment identifies the likely nature of change.

It is noted that the type of proposed development, specifically redevelopment or refurbishment, was also accounted for in the impact assessment for the sites.

Risk, as mentioned above, reflects the level of heritage constraint associated with each site and is derived from the relationship between sensitivity and likely impact.

Sites identified as low risk are those where heritage assets are unlikely to be materially affected, and where any impacts can be addressed through standard design approaches. Medium risk sites are those where development has the potential to affect heritage significance, but where impacts are generally capable of mitigation through appropriate layout, scale and design. High risk sites are those where there is a greater likelihood of harm to heritage significance, often requiring a more careful, design led approach and potentially more significant constraints. This categorisation provides a clear and consistent basis for comparing sites and informing decisions.

For clarity, these categories are defined as follows:

- **Low risk** sites are those where heritage assets are unlikely to be materially affected, and where any impacts would be negligible or capable of being addressed through standard design measures.
- **Medium risk** sites are those where development has the potential to affect heritage significance, but where impacts are generally localised and capable of mitigation through appropriate layout, scale and design.
- **High risk** sites are those where there is a greater likelihood of harm to heritage significance, often involving strong relationships with designated assets, and requiring a design-led approach to avoid or minimise harm.
- **Very high-risk** sites are those where development has the potential to result in substantial harm, including the loss of, or major impact on, designated heritage assets. These sites are subject to significant constraint and would require clear and convincing justification in line with national policy.

2.7 Application of Policy and Limitations

The assessment aligns with the requirements of the NPPF, including the need to identify and assess significance, give great weight to conservation, and understand the potential for harm. This is explicitly stated in paragraph 213 of the NPPF: "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 a clear and convincing justification."

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) further confirms the importance of understanding significance and setting when assessing development proposals. The PPG paragraph 007 notes that: "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."

At this stage, the assessment identifies likely levels of impact but does not undertake a full paragraph 215 planning balance, which will be addressed through site-specific proposals.

In addition to national policy and guidance, this assessment has had regard to the adopted development plan for Mansfield District, including policies relating to the conservation of heritage assets and the design of new development. These policies reinforce the requirement to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the historic environment, and to ensure that new development responds positively to local character, setting and townscape context.

Conservation Area Appraisals and other supporting evidence have also been used to inform the understanding of significance and the assessment of setting.

The assessment is based on available data and site observations and does not replace the need for detailed Heritage Statements at application stage.

2.8 Scoped-Out Sites

Several sites were scoped out of detailed assessment where there was no meaningful relationship with heritage assets, including where assets were no longer extant, located beyond the study buffer, or where there was no intervisibility or functional relationship. These sites are listed in Appendix B.

3. Overview of Heritage Constraints

This section provides a strategic overview of the distribution and nature of heritage sensitivities across the district, drawing together the findings of the site-specific assessments to identify key patterns and constraints relevant to site allocation.

3.1 Mansfield District Heritage Context Summary

Mansfield District contains a varied historic environment shaped by its evolution from a medieval market town into an industrial and modern urban area. The historic core of Mansfield remains an important focus of heritage significance, whilst the wider District includes several smaller settlements such as Mansfield Woodhouse, Warsop and Pleasley, each contributing to the overall character of the area.

The District's heritage resource includes a concentration of designated assets within Mansfield town centre, including Conservation Areas focused around Market Place, West Gate and Bridge Street, alongside several high-status listed buildings, including the Grade I Church of St Peter and St Paul. Elsewhere, smaller centres such as Mansfield Woodhouse and Warsop contain historic cores characterised by traditional High Street development and associated listed buildings. Industrial heritage, including former mills and associated infrastructure along the River Maun, also forms an important component of the District's historic environment, although in many cases these assets are now fragmentary or in a degraded condition.

The District's development has been strongly influenced by its industrial past, alongside earlier phases of settlement and land use. This has resulted in a diverse heritage resource, including historic buildings, former industrial sites, areas of designed landscape and archaeological remains. These elements combine to form a layered historic environment, the character and integrity of which varies across the District.

3.2 Site Heritage Context and Description

Heritage sensitivity within the district is not uniform and reflects the historic development of Mansfield, with the highest concentrations of heritage assets located within the town centre and its immediate surroundings. These areas, including the principal conservation areas of West Gate, Market Place, Bridge Street and Nottingham Road, are characterised by a dense and cohesive historic townscape,

where significance is derived not only from individual assets but from their collective form, enclosure and spatial relationships.

Sites within these areas are typically more sensitive to change due to the proximity of listed buildings, the consistency of building lines and frontage rhythm, and the importance of views and landmarks within the townscape. Development in these locations has the potential to affect both individual assets and the wider character of the conservation area.

In contrast, sites located on the urban edge or within more suburban or transitional environments tend to exhibit lower levels of sensitivity. In these areas, heritage assets are more dispersed and relationships are often influenced by distance, intervening development or limited intervisibility. Whilst heritage considerations remain relevant, they are less likely to represent a primary constraint on development.

Across the study area, several recurring themes have been identified. Conservation areas represent a key constraint, particularly where their significance is derived from collective townscape character rather than individual buildings. The setting of listed buildings is also a critical consideration, especially where assets form part of a cohesive group or are experienced within a consistent historic context.

Archaeological potential is present across several sites, particularly within historic cores and areas of former land use such as parkland or industrial activity. While this does not preclude development, it introduces a requirement for appropriate investigation and mitigation.

The presence of modern development within the urban area has, in some cases, altered or diluted historic character. This demonstrates that the historic environment is dynamic and has evolved over time, and that sensitivity to change is often related to the retention of key defining characteristics rather than the absence of change altogether. This creates opportunities for well-designed development to enhance the historic environment, particularly where existing buildings detract from character.

Overall, the assessment indicates that heritage constraints vary significantly across the district and should be considered as part of a proportionate and context-led approach to site allocation.

4. Site Assessment Findings (Summary)

This section summarises the findings of the detailed site assessments and identifies the key sensitivities and constraints that are likely to influence site suitability and development parameters.

A total of **58 sites** were initially identified as having heritage assets within a 250m study area. Following refinement, **six sites** were scoped out where heritage assets were either no longer extant or did not have a meaningful relationship with the site. The remaining **52 sites** have been assessed in detail and form the basis of this summary. The individual site assessments can be found in **Appendix A**.

The distribution of sensitivity across the assessed sites reflects the pattern identified in Section 3, with a relatively small number of sites exhibiting high sensitivity and the majority falling within medium or low sensitivity categories. High sensitivity sites are predominantly located within the town centre and are characterised by direct relationships with designated heritage assets, including conservation areas and listed buildings. Development in these locations has the greatest potential to affect heritage significance and requires a design-led approach to avoid harm.

Medium sensitivity sites are generally those where heritage assets are present within the wider setting but relationships are less direct or have been altered by modern development. In these cases, impacts are typically localised and capable of mitigation through appropriate design, layout and scale.

Low sensitivity sites are characterised by limited or indirect relationships with heritage assets, often due to distance, intervening development or the absence of intervisibility. In these locations, heritage considerations are unlikely to represent a significant constraint on development, although archaeological potential may still require consideration.

Across all sites, several consistent themes have emerged. Sites within or adjacent to conservation areas are generally more sensitive, particularly where they form part of a cohesive historic townscape. The setting of listed buildings is most sensitive where assets are experienced as part of a group or where key views contribute to their significance. Modern development within the wider setting often reduces sensitivity by interrupting historic relationships, although it can also highlight opportunities for

enhancement.

The findings demonstrate that, whilst heritage constraints are a material consideration across several sites, the majority are capable of accommodating development subject to appropriate mitigation and design.

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
8	Former Sherwood Hall School	Site is an NDA. Other NDAs within site boundary	Medium	Development within historic parkland context affecting evidential and landscape value	Low to moderate	Retention of key landscape features; sensitive layout and groundworks strategy	Medium	Yes with constraints	Development acceptable subject to retention of parkland character and design response.
22	Playing Field Sandy Lane	Designated assets [Conservation Area and Listed Building] within the buffer (100m of the site)	Medium	Relationship to Conservation Area setting and nearby listed building	Low to moderate	Control of scale, massing and boundary treatment; respect key views and setting	Medium	Yes with constraints	Development acceptable subject to protecting setting through design and layout.
29	Sherwood Rise	Listed building in the buffer (between 100m - 270m from the site)	Low	Separation and lack of intervisibility with listed building	Negligible	Scale and layout to respect wider setting	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage constraints.
31	Land at New Mill Lane	Non-designated assets within buffer, not site boundary	Low	Archaeological assets with no direct relationship	Negligible	Standard archaeological consideration	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to standard archaeological measures.
44	Land off Baums Lane	Designated assets [Conservation Area] within the buffer (100m of the site)	Medium	Potential effect on Conservation Area setting and edge character	Low to moderate	Appropriate scale and integration with surrounding townscape	Low	Yes with constraints	Development acceptable with sensitive design respecting CA setting
46	Land at Debdale Lane/Burlington Drive	Listed buildings and structures and non-designated assets in the buffer but not within the site boundary	Low	Distance and intervening development	Negligible	Sensitive design	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with limited design considerations

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
		(between 150m - 250m from the site)							
48	Small holding off Peafield Lane	Non-designated asset within buffer, not site boundary	Low	Limited relationship to archaeological asset	Negligible	Basic archaeological awareness	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.
49	Land off Mansfield Road (A60)	Non-designated asset longer extant & within site boundary	Low	Previously disturbed site conditions	Negligible	Minimal constraints	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.
53	Land between Old Mill Lane and New Mill Lane	Mix of extant and no longer extant NDAS. Within the buffer but not the site boundary.	Low	Archaeological interest with limited expression	Negligible	Archaeological mitigation if required	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to proportionate archaeological mitigation.
64	Pheasant Hill and Highfield Close	Listed Building and non-designated assets within the buffer, not in the site boundary (One at 15m and 225m from the site)	Low	Proximity but weak setting relationship	Low	Scale and boundary treatment	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minor design considerations.
67	Land at Peafield Lane	Non-designated asset within buffer, not site boundary	Low	Indirect relationship to archaeological asset	Negligible	Basic archaeological awareness	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.
72	Land at Clipstone Road West	Non-designated asset within buffer, not site boundary	Low	Limited contribution to setting	Negligible	Minimal design control	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
78	Land off Bosworth Street	Listed building and non-designated assets within the buffer, not within the site boundary	Low	Urban separation and limited intervisibility	Negligible	Design response to context	Low	Yes	Development acceptable within existing urban context.
83	Grove Street Car Park	Partial Nottingham Road CA; GII LBs; NDAs	High	Transitional site affecting setting of nearby listed buildings and CA	Low to moderate (with potential for enhancement)	Control of height, massing and response to adjacent heritage assets; reinforce townscape grain	Medium	Yes with constraints	Development possible but requires very careful, design led approach to avoid harm and deliver enhancement.
94	Bath Mill	GI LB within site; Park CA within wider setting	Very High	Severely degraded listed industrial structure within river valley setting	Substantial harm (if demolition), though condition reduces retention potential	Robust justification required; Level 3 building recording; archaeological investigation; sensitive response to river corridor and landscape setting	Very High	Potential only with good justification & mitigation / highly constrained	Development involving demolition would result in substantial harm and requires clear justification.
117	Ravensdale Allotment Site	Designated assets [Conservation Area and Listed Buildings] within the buffer, not within the site boundary (within 20m, 100m and 250m)	Medium	Proximity to multiple designated assets and cumulative setting relationship	Moderate (localised)	Careful layout, height control and buffering to protect setting	Medium	Yes with constraints	Development acceptable subject to careful control of scale and layout.

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
118	Land and buildings off Debdale Lane	Designated assets [Conservation Area, Grade II* and II Listed Buildings] and Non-designated assets within the buffer, not within the site boundary (between 100m - 200m from the site)	Low	Urban context reduces setting relationship	Low	Height, massing and layout	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.
127	Former Bus Station	Designated asset [Conservation Areas, Grade II* and II Listed Buildings] and non-designated assets within buffer, not site boundary	Low	Dense urban context and separation	Negligible to low	Contextual design	Low	Yes	Development acceptable within existing urban context.
134	Land at Belvedere Street	Designated assets [Conservation Area, Grade II* and II Listed Buildings] and Non-designated assets within the buffer, not within the site boundary (between 100m - 200m from the site)	Low	Distance and intervening development	Negligible	Sensitive layout	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal constraints.
165	Ashmead Chambers	Adjacent Market Place CA; West	Medium-High	Poor-quality building detracting from	Beneficial (enhancement-led)	High-quality design; appropriate	Medium	Yes with enhancement	Strong opportunity for enhancement through

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
		Gate CA; NDAs; wider LBs		CA setting and townscape character		scale, massing and materials			redevelopment of a detracting building.
187	Land forming part of Peafield Farm	Non-designated assets within buffer, not site boundary	Low	Archaeological interest only	Negligible	Archaeological consideration	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to appropriate archaeological mitigation.
190	The Birches	Non-designated assets within buffer, and a Non-designated Park and Garden within the site boundary.	Low	Limited evidential assets and wider landscape context	Low	Archaeological mitigation	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to appropriate archaeological mitigation.
192	Land at Ashland Farm	Non-designated assets within buffer, and a Non-designated Park and Garden within the site boundary.	Low	Archaeological remains within site	Low	Mitigation for groundworks	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to appropriate archaeological mitigation.
204	Elkesley House	Non-designated asset within buffer, not site boundary	Low	Limited relationship to asset outside district	Negligible	Minimal constraints	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.
218	Land off Forest Road	Non-designated assets within buffer, and a Non-designated Park and Garden within the site boundary.	Low	Localised archaeological interest	Low	Archaeological mitigation	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to appropriate archaeological mitigation.

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
219	Clipstone Football Ground	Non-designated assets within buffer and site boundary.	Low	Archaeological and historic settlement evidence	Low	Standard mitigation	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation.
268	Land at Church Street/Little Lane	Listed Building and a mix of extant and demolished non-designated assets within buffer, not site boundary	Low	Limited setting relationship in suburban context	Low	Design and layout	Low	Yes	Development acceptable within and considering suburban context.
324	Land off Ridgeway Lane	Conservation Area and non-designated assets outside the buffer and not the site boundary.	Low	No direct relationship with CA	Negligible	Minimal constraints	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.
325	Land off Peafield Lane	Non-designated assets within buffer and site boundary.	Low	Archaeological remains	Low	Mitigation during development	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to mitigation.
331	Land South of Clipstone Road East	Mix of extant and no longer extant NDAS. Within the buffer and outside but not the site boundary.	Low	Archaeological potential across wider site	Low	Archaeological assessment	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to mitigation.
335	Land North of Old Mill Lane	Non-designated assets within the buffer and outside but not the site boundary.	Low	Limited archaeological interest	Low	Standard mitigation	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to archaeological mitigation.
338	Land South East of Mansfield Road	Non-designated assets within the buffer and outside	Low	Wider landscape archaeological context	Low	Minimal constraints	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with negligible impact.

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
		but not the site boundary.							
340	Land South of the A617 and West of Blidworth Lane	Non-designated assets within the buffer and outside but not the site boundary.	Low	Archaeological findspots and features	Low	Archaeological mitigation	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to archaeological mitigation.
351	Bromley Croft, Unit 1 Oxclose Lane	Designated assets [Conservation Area, Grade II and II*] within the buffer (100m of the site)	Medium	Setting of Conservation Area and listed buildings within urban context	Low to moderate	Design response to townscape grain; scale and massing control	Medium	Yes with constraints	Development acceptable within urban context with appropriate design.
352	Corner House, Union Street	Adjacent West Gate CA; GII* and multiple GII LBs	High	Prominent corner site affecting enclosure and historic frontage rhythm	Moderate	Maintain scale, frontage continuity and respond to corner prominence	High	Yes with constraints	Development feasible but must respond precisely to tight historic grain and frontage.
354	18-20 Church Street	Bridge St CA; GI Church; multiple GII LBs	High	Detracting building within highly sensitive historic streetscape and key views	Beneficial (enhancement-led)	Reinstate appropriate height, scale and architectural quality	High	Yes with enhancement	Clear opportunity for enhancement through redevelopment of poor quality building.
365	Former Wilko Site	Designated assets [Conservation Area, Grade II* and II Listed Buildings] and Non-designated assets within the buffer, not within the site boundary.	Low	Urban enclosure and separation	Negligible to low	Design and scale	Low	Yes	Development acceptable within urban setting.

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
372	Former Beales, Stockwell Gate	Market Place CA (partial); GII*, GII LBs; NDAs; archaeology	High	Large-scale building dominating historic townscape and affecting setting	Moderate	Reduce visual dominance; control scale, massing and frontage treatment	High	Yes with constraints	Development acceptable but must address dominance of existing large scale building.
374	32-36 West Gate (former BHS)	GII LB (site); West Gate CA; GII* and GII LBs; archaeology	High	Alteration to listed building and impact on CA and historic plot pattern	Moderate	Conservation-led design; retention of fabric; respect burgage plots	High	Yes with constraints	Sensitive refurbishment required to preserve listed building and historic plot structure.
376	Land East of Park Hall Road/ North of The Fairways	Non-designated asset (MNT26642) within site boundary; associated with historic parkland context.	Medium	Development within historic parkland landscape and associated features	Low to moderate	Retention of landscape character; archaeological consideration	Medium	Yes with constraints	Development acceptable subject to retaining landscape character and mitigation.
377	74-76 High Street	Woodhouse CA; NDA group; nearby GII LBs	Medium-High	Loss of NDA frontage and impact on historic plot structure	Moderate	Maintain frontage continuity and rear plot legibility	Medium	Yes with constraints	Development possible but must preserve frontage continuity and historic plot pattern.
378	Land at 669 Chesterfield Road North	Designated assets [Conservation Area, Grade II Listed Buildings] and Non-designated assets within the buffer, not within the site boundary.	Low	Limited contribution to setting	Low	Contextual design	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with appropriate design.
384	Civic Centre	Designated assets [Grade II Listed Buildings] and	Low	Previously developed site with local assets	Low	Sensitive redevelopment	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
		Non-designated assets within the buffer, not within the site boundary							minimal heritage impact.
385	East of Beck Lane and North of Skegby Lane	Non-designated assets, some within the site boundary, immediate vicinity and outside the buffer.	Low	Archaeological potential within site	Low	Mitigation for groundworks	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to archaeological mitigation.
386	Land at Woburn Lane, Pleasley	Non-designated assets within the buffer, not the site boundary	Low	Archaeological and historic land use evidence	Low	Standard mitigation	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.
387	Land North of Vale Road, Former Community Centre	Non-designated assets within buffer, party in the site boundary.	Medium	Presence of archaeological remains (quarry/lime kiln) within site	Low (given limited survival)	Archaeological mitigation; sensitive groundworks	Low	Yes with constraints	Development acceptable subject to archaeological mitigation.
393	Garage/Filling Station, Church Street	Designated assets [Conservation Area, Grade II Listed Buildings] and Non-designated assets within the buffer, not within the site boundary.	Low	Urban separation and limited setting role	Low	Scale and design	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with sensitive design.
394	Land off Vale Road	Designated assets [Conservation Area] and Non-designated assets within the buffer,	Low	Industrial archaeology with limited setting role	Low	Design and archaeological mitigation	Low	Yes	Development acceptable subject to mitigation.

Site Ref	Location	Designations	Sensitivity	Key Issue	Likely Impact	Constraints	Risk	Suitability	Conclusions
		not within the site boundary.							
395	Toothill Lane Car Park (S)	Bridge St CA; GI Church; GI* St Peter's House; multiple GII LBs	Very High	Elevated site affecting skyline and key views of GI church	Moderate to high	Strict control of height, massing, skyline and key views	Very High	Yes with constraints	Development possible but highly constrained due to impact on skyline and key views.
398	Land opposite 47 Bainbridge Road, Warsop	Designated assets [Conservation Area] and a Non-designated asset within the buffer, not within the site boundary.	Low	Separation and intervening development	Negligible	Minimal constraints	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.
401	Land off Ridgeway Lane	Designated assets [Conservation Area, Grade II* and II Listed Buildings] and Non-designated assets within the buffer, not within the site boundary.	Low	Urban separation from heritage assets	Low - potential for enhancement	Design and layout.	Low	Yes	Development acceptable with minimal heritage impact.
403	Land at Warren Farm	GI LB within buffer; Scheduled Monument c.50m from site; NDAs	Medium	Proximity to Scheduled Monument and contribution of open landscape to its setting	Moderate (setting-related and archaeological)	Setback from monument; retention of openness; control of layout and height; archaeological assessment and mitigation	Medium	Yes with constraints	Development acceptable subject to protecting key views and rural setting.

5. Policy Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this assessment have direct implications for site allocation and policy development within the Local Plan. Heritage considerations should be integrated into the site selection process to ensure that allocations are both deliverable and consistent with national policy.

For higher sensitivity sites, the assessment indicates that development is not precluded but must be carefully managed through a design-led approach. In these locations, site-specific policy wording may be required to ensure that key considerations such as scale, massing, layout, views and the setting of heritage assets are appropriately addressed. This may include requirements for heritage-led design, retention of significant fabric, and the protection of important townscape relationships.

Medium sensitivity sites generally provide greater flexibility but still require a considered response to heritage constraints. Policy should ensure that development proposals respond positively to their context, with particular regard to the setting of heritage assets and the characteristics that contribute to their significance.

Low sensitivity sites are unlikely to be constrained by heritage considerations in principle, although archaeological potential may require further investigation and mitigation. In these cases, standard policy requirements are likely to be sufficient.

Across all sites, the assessment reinforces the importance of a proportionate and context-led approach, where development is informed by an understanding of significance and setting. The detailed site assessments provided in the supporting appendices should be used to inform site-specific requirements and to guide the preparation of planning applications.

6. Conclusions

This Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared to inform the identification and assessment of potential site allocations within the emerging Mansfield Local Plan. It provides a proportionate, evidence-based appraisal of the relationship between development sites and the historic environment, including designated and non-designated heritage assets.

The assessment demonstrates that heritage considerations are a material factor across several sites, but that sensitivity varies significantly depending on location, asset type and the nature of surrounding townscape. The highest levels of sensitivity are typically associated with sites within or immediately adjacent to conservation areas, and those affecting the setting of listed buildings or key landmark assets, particularly within the historic core of Mansfield. In these locations, development has the potential to result in harm if not carefully designed but also presents opportunities for enhancement where existing buildings or townscape detract from character.

The majority of sites fall within low to medium sensitivity categories, where heritage constraints are generally limited to archaeological potential or indirect setting relationships. In these cases, impacts are typically capable of being addressed through appropriate design, layout and mitigation measures, and are unlikely to preclude development in principle.

A small number of sites have been identified as having very high sensitivity, most notably where designated heritage assets are located within the site boundary. In these instances, development may result in substantial harm if not approached through a conservation-led strategy, and careful consideration will be required to determine whether impacts can be avoided or reduced to an acceptable level.

Overall, the assessment confirms that, whilst heritage constraints are present across the study area, they do not, in most cases, preclude development in principle for the majority of sites. Rather, they highlight the need for a proportionate, design-led approach to site allocation and development, informed by an understanding of significance and setting.

The findings of this assessment provide a clear and consistent evidence base to support the Local Plan process. The summary table and supporting site-specific

assessments identify key constraints, sensitivities and opportunities, and should be used to inform site selection, the development of site-specific policy requirements, and the preparation of future planning applications.

Appendices

Appendix A: Site Assessments

Detailed site-specific assessments and GIS mapping outputs are provided separately alongside this report. These documents form part of the evidence base and should be read in conjunction with this HIA.

Appendix B: Scoped-Out Sites

HELAA_refe	Site_name	Settlement	Site_area	Use
9	Land to the East of Helmsley Road	Mansfield	2.82	Housing
10	Former Victoria Courts Flats	Mansfield	2.07	Housing
11	Bellamy Road	Mansfield	2.14	Housing
30	Land at Old Mill Lane/Stinting Lane	Mansfield	5.78	Housing
45	Land at Spion Kop	Warsop Parish	2.47	Housing
50	Land off Peafield Lane	Mansfield Woodhouse	13.37	Housing
51	Land off Netherfield Lane	Warsop Parish	4.2	Housing
66	Harrop White Road Allotments	Mansfield	0.28	Housing
91	Strip of land off Cauldwell Road	Mansfield	1.3	Housing
100	Land to the rear of Cherry Paddocks	Warsop Parish	0.7	Housing
143	Crown Farm Industrial Estate (Site A)	Mansfield	2.77	Economic
186	Kirkland Avenue Allotments	Mansfield	1.39	Housing
189	Land off Holly Road	Mansfield	0.46	Housing
207	Land North of Lime Crescent/Birch Street	Warsop Parish	13.73	Housing
269	Land to the North of Wood Lane	Warsop Parish	1.43	Housing
287	Melville Court	Warsop Parish	0.38	Housing
300	Petrol Filling Station, Clipstone Road West	Mansfield	0.2	Housing
323	Land off Helmsley Road	Mansfield	6.4	Housing

334	Land North of Jenford Street	Mansfield	8.11	Housing
341	Bridleways Guest House and Holiday Homes	Mansfield	1.16	Housing
379	The Local Inn, Armstrong Road	Mansfield	0.13	Housing
390	Land off Woodlands Way, Spion Kop	Warsop Parish	0.3	Housing
39a	Ransom Wood Business Park (Site A)	Housing	1.35	Economic
39b	Ransom Wood Business Park (Site B)	Mansfield	0.26	Economic