Spink Quarry, Knockbaun, Abbeyleix, Co. Laois

Spink Quarry

Environmental Impact Assessment Report

Appendix 12

Cultural Heritage

2021



Prepared by:

J Sheils Planning & Environmental Ltd

31 Athlumney Castle, Navan, Co. Meath

TABLE OF CONTENTS

12	APPENDIX - CULTURAL HERITAGE	
12.1	RMP SITES WITHIN THE STUDY AREA	
	IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE 2.1 Potential Impacts on Archaeological Remains 2.2 Predicted Impacts	
12.3 12.	MITIGATION MEASURES AND THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE 3.1 Definition of Mitigation Strategies REFERENCE	Brilds
12.4	REFERENCE	10
	lien	
	Council Plaining Authority,	
	ill Office	
	ADIL	
	ding	
	Olain	
	cilly	
	COUIT	
	attle of the state	
- O		
.5		
O,		
ois		

12 APPENDIX - CULTURAL HERITAGE

12.1 RMP SITES WITHIN THE STUDY AREA

RMP No.:	LA024-047	
Townland:	Garrintaggart	
Classification:	Earthwork	
Description:	Not marked on the 1841 edition of the OS 6-inch map; on the 1909 edition, hachures indicate a narrow earthwork (dims. c. 40m NE-SW, 15m NW-SE) clipped by field boundary at SW. No visible surface remains.	
Reference:	RMP file: www.archaeology.ie	
RMP No.:	LA024-048	
Townland:	Cleanagh	
Classification:	Standing stone	
Description:	Reference to a standing stone here (Roe, c. 1940). Not marked on the 1841 edition of the OS 6-inch map. In an upland area. No visible surface remains.	
Reference:	RMP file: www.archaeology.ie	
c,0		
RMP No.:	LA024-049002-	
Townland:	Knockbaun	
Classification:	Linear earthwork	
Description:	Linear features visible on aerial photograph (GSI, S 66-7). In an upland area. No visible surface remains.	
Reference:	RMP file: www.archaeology.ie	
1 17		

	Spink Quarry	<i>,</i>
RMP No.:	LA024-050	
Townland:	Knockbaun	OUL
Classification:	Standing stone	S
Description:	Marked only on the 1909 edition of the OS 6-inch map. An irregular shaped stone, tapering towards the top (H c. 1.3m; max. Wth c. 1.25m, min. Wth c. 0.65m, T. c. 0.38m).	0505
Reference:	RMP file: www.archaeology.ie	
RMP No.:	LA024-051	
Townland:	Knockbaun	
Classification:	Redundant record	
Description:	The source of this record is the minor name 'Battle (Site of)' which was first recorded on the OS 1:2500 survey (1906) of Sheet 24, Plan 16. Based on its inclusion on subsequent 6-inch mapping the site was listed in the non-statutory 'Sites and Monuments Record' (issued 1987) as 'Battlefield site'. The source of the OS representation probably derives from Daniel O'Byrne's history of Queen's County which makes reference to a battle having taken place in the vicinity of eight standing stones (1856, 17). An assessment of this source indicates that this battle was mythical and was probably developed either to provide an explanation for the standing stones or the requirement to rationalise, according to O'Byrne, the 'dissevering of Ossory from the Kingdom of Leinster, and the infliction of the Boromean tribute which subsequently caused so much bloodshed in the country' (ibid.). The evidence is not sufficient to warrant accepting it as a battle proper.	
Reference:	RMP file: www.archaeology.ie	
RMP No.:	LA024-052	
Townland:	Knockbaun	
Classification:	Megalithic structure	
Description:	Marked only on the 1909 edition of the OS 6-inch map. Situated on a rock-strewn SW-facing slope, this feature consists of a stone, 1.40m by 1.30m by 690 cm thick, resting horizontally above a slight hollow in the ground. On its upper surface are portions of a circular groove which seems to have been about 1m in diameter. The groove	



	T
	is 1cm wide and 0.05cm deep. The hill-top on which the stone stands is littered with natural blocks of stone
Reference:	RMP file: www.archaeology.ie
1.37	
RMP No.:	LA024-053
Townland:	Knockbaun
Classification:	Standing stone
Description:	Marked only on the 1909 edition of the OS 6-inch map. An irregular shaped stone (H c. 1.05m, Wth c. 0.75m, T. c. 0.3m) lying horizontally.
Reference:	RMP file: www.archaeology.ie
n object nen de aces persone de	E ACHIENTO CACO RECUERTO DE COMO DE CO
RMP No.:	LA024-054
Townland:	Knockbaun
Classification:	Enclosure
Description:	A circular area (max. diam. c. 53m) defined by an inner bank (Wth c. 3m; int. H c. 0.15m, ext. H 0.6m), a shallow intervening fosse and an outer bank (Wth 1,3m, int. H c. 0.1m, ext. H c. 0.45m) except at S. It is cut by a field boundary at S and NNW. No trace of original entrance. This site is visible on aerial photographs (GSI, S 66-7).
Reference:	RMP file: www.archaeology.ie
RMP No.:	LA024-055
Townland:	Knockbaun
Classification:	Megalithic structure
Description:	Marked only on the 1909 edition of the OS 6-inch map. Situated in an upland area, no surface remains visible. There is no trace of this feature nor does there appear to be any information about it.
Reference:	RMP file: www.archaeology.ie
	I .



12.2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE

12.2.1 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS

Impacts can be identified from detailed information about a project, the nature of the area affected, and the range of archaeological resources potentially affected. Quarry developments can affect the archaeological resource of a given landscape in a number of ways:

- Permanent and temporary land-take, associated structures, landscape mounding, and their construction may result in damage to or loss of archaeological remains and deposits, or physical loss to the setting of historic monuments and to the physical coherence of the landscape;
- Archaeological sites can be affected adversely in a number of ways: disturbance by excavation, topsoil stripping and the passage of heavy machinery; disturbance by vehicles working in unsuitable conditions; or burial of sites, limiting accessibility for future archaeological investigation;
- Visual impacts on the historic landscape sometimes arise from construction traffic and facilities, built earthworks and structures, landscape mounding and planting, noise, fences and associated works. These features can impinge directly on historic monuments and historic landscape elements as well as their visual amenity value;
- Landscape measures such as tree planting can damage sub-surface archaeological features, due to topsoil stripping and through the root action of trees and shrubs as they grow;
- Ground consolidation by construction activities or the weight of permanent embankments can cause damage to buried archaeological remains;
- Disruption due to construction also offers in general the potential for adversely affecting archaeological remains. This can include machinery, site offices, service trenches etc;
 and
- Although not widely appreciated, positive impacts can accrue from permitted developments. These can include positive resource management policies, improved maintenance and access to archaeological monuments and the increased level of knowledge of a site or historic landscape as a result of archaeological assessment and fieldwork.

12.2.2 PREDICTED IMPACTS

There is no standard scale against which the severity of impacts on the archaeological and historic landscape may be judged. The severity of a given level of land-take or visual intrusion varies with the type of monument, site or landscape feature and its existing environment. Severity of impact can be judged taking the following into account:

 The proportion of the feature affected and how far physical characteristics fundamental to the understanding of the feature would be lost;

- Consideration of the type, date, survival/condition, fragility/vulnerability, rarity, potential
 and amenity value of the feature affected; and
- Assessment of the levels of noise, visual and hydrological impacts, either in general or site-specific terms, as may be provided by other specialists.

Impacts are defined as:

Laois County Council Planning Authority,

s are defined as.

"the degree of change in an environment resulting from a development" (Environmental Protection Agency 2002, 30).

Impacts are described as imperceptible, not significant, slight, moderate, significant, very significant or profound on archaeological, architectural and cultural heritage remains (Details with respect to Significance Criteria are provided in Appendix 3.

12.3 MITIGATION MEASURES AND THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE

Mitigation is defined as features of the design or other measures of the proposed development that can be adopted to avoid, prevent, reduce or offset negative impacts.

The best opportunities for avoiding damage to archaeological remains or intrusion on their setting and amenity arise when the site options for the development are being considered. Damage to the archaeological resource immediately adjacent to developments may be prevented by the selection of appropriate construction methods. Reducing adverse impacts can be achieved by good design, for example by screening historic buildings or upstanding archaeological monuments or by burying archaeological sites undisturbed rather than destroying them. Offsetting adverse impacts is probably best illustrated by the full investigation and recording (preservation by record) of archaeological sites that cannot be preserved *in situ*.

12.3.1 DEFINITION OF MITIGATION STRATEGIES

The ideal mitigation for all archaeological sites is preservation *in situ*. This however is not always a practical solution, and a series of recommendations are therefore offered to provide ameliorative measures where avoidance and preservation *in situ* are not possible.

Preservation by record through archaeological excavation involves the scientific removal and recording of all archaeological features, deposits and objects to the level of geological strata or the base level of a given development. Full archaeological excavation is recommended where initial investigation has uncovered evidence of archaeologically significant material and where avoidance of the site is not possible.

Archaeological test trenching is defined as:

"that form of excavation where the purpose is to establish the nature and extent of archaeological deposits and features present in a location which it is proposed to develop (though not normally to fully investigate those deposits or features) and allow an assessment to be made of the archaeological impact of the proposed development" (Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands 1999, 27).

12.4 **REFERENCE**

DoAHGI (1999). Framework and Principles for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage.

Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands (DoAHGI), Dublin, Ireland.