



# Little Crow

*Solar Park*

*Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe*

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

### CHAPTER 8

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

Revision:  
APFP Reg:  
PINS Reference:

Submission  
5(2)(a)  
EN010101

Author:  
Date:

Cotswold  
October 2020



## **8 CULTURAL HERITAGE**

### **8.1 INTRODUCTION**

8.1.1 This Chapter of the ES presents an assessment of the likely effects of the Proposed Development upon archaeological remains within the Order Limits and the designated assets within its surroundings.

8.1.2 The main element of the proposal is the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of a ground mounted solar park and associated Battery Energy Storage System with an intended design capacity of over 50MWp (megawatts peak). Further detail on the Proposed Development is available in Chapter 4.

8.1.3 A description of the methodology used in the assessment is provided. This is followed by a description of the relevant baseline conditions of the Order Limits and the study area, together with the assessment of the likely effects of the Proposed Development. Appropriate mitigation measures are then identified in order to avoid, reduce or offset any adverse effects and/or provide enhancement. Taking account of the mitigation measures, the likely significance of residual effects is described, followed by a summary of likely significant cumulative effects.

8.1.4 The Chapter is accompanied by the following appendices.

- Document Ref: 7.30 LC TA8.1 (Appendix 8.1): Little Crow, Santon, North Lincolnshire – Cultural Heritage Baseline Study (Pegasus Group, August 2019).
- Document Ref: 7.31 LC TA8.2 (Appendix 8.2): Little Crow, Santon, North Lincolnshire – Geophysical Survey Report (SUMO, September 2018).
- Document Ref: 7.32 LC TA8.3 (Appendix 8.3): Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, DN20 0BG – Archaeological Watching Brief (Cotswold Archaeology, November 2018).
- Document Ref: 7.33 LC TA8.4 (Appendix 8.4): Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, DN20 0BG – Archaeological Fieldwalking Survey (Cotswold Archaeology, November 2018).
- Document Ref: 7.34 LC TA8.5 (Appendix 8.5): Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe, DN20 0BG – Archaeological Evaluation (Cotswold Archaeology, August 2019).

### **8.2 ASSESSMENT APPROACH**

#### **Methodology**

##### Guidance Documents

8.2.1 This ES Chapter, the Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: 7.30 LC TA8.1) and the methodology for the assessment of development effects have been informed by the following documents:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; 2019)<sup>1</sup>;
- NPPF Planning Practice Guidance: Historic Environment (July 2019)<sup>2</sup>;

---

<sup>1</sup> Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2019) National Planning Policy Framework

<sup>2</sup> Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2019) NPPF Planning Practice Guidance: Historic Environment

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

---

- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment, published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA; October 2020)<sup>3</sup>;
- Historic England's Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (published by English Heritage in 2008)<sup>4</sup>;
- Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking (2015)<sup>5</sup>;
- Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017)<sup>6</sup>.

#### Sources of Information

8.2.2 In order to collect historic environment data for the purposes of this Chapter, a minimum 1km study area around the Order Limits was adopted in the Heritage Baseline, as this area was considered to provide sufficient contextual information about the Order Limits and its surrounding landscape, from which to assess the archaeological potential and potential impacts on the archaeological resource. This study area is shown on Figures 1 and 2 of Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**.

8.2.3 The following sources of publicly available archaeological and historical information were consulted as part of the preparation of the Heritage Assessment, completed in August 2019 (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**):

- National Heritage List for England for designated heritage assets, such as Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments;
- Historic England Archive (formerly known as AMIE) data for information on non-designated heritage assets;
- North Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record (HER) for records of archaeology and heritage sites, finds and events recorded within the study area;
- Online sources, including British Geological Survey (BGS) and additional historic mapping.

8.2.4 Recent investigative works within the Order Limits have also contributed to the understanding of the archaeological potential, and will be referred to in this Chapter where appropriate. These works are outlined below, and full reports are available in Document Refs: **TA7.31 LC TA8.2**, **7.32 LC TA8.3**, **7.33 LC8.4** and **7.34 LC TA8.5**.

8.2.5 A geophysical survey was undertaken within the Order Limits in July - September 2018, in accordance with standard and guidance documents produced by CIfA<sup>7</sup> and European Archaeological Council (EAC)<sup>8</sup>. This encompassed all accessible areas proposed

---

<sup>3</sup> Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2020) Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment, <https://www.archaeologists.net/codes/cifa>

<sup>4</sup> English Heritage (2008) Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment, English Heritage

<sup>5</sup> Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking

<sup>6</sup> Historic England (2017) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second Edition)

<sup>7</sup> Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey, [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CifAS%26GGeophysics\\_2.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CifAS%26GGeophysics_2.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> European Archaeological Council (2016) EAC Guidelines for the Use of Geophysics in Archaeology, EAC Guidelines 2

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

### MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

---

for direct impact. The results of the survey will be referred to where appropriate in this Chapter. The full survey report is available in Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**.

8.2.6 In addition, ground investigation works undertaken within the Order Limits were subject to an archaeological watching brief in September 2018. The watching brief was carried out in accordance with relevant CIfA guidance<sup>9</sup>. Nineteen of a total 23 test pits were monitored. No features, deposits, or artefacts of archaeological interest were encountered during these works. The full watching brief report is available in Document Ref: **7.32 LC TA8.3**.

8.2.7 Further, a 24.4% sample of the Order Limits was subject to archaeological fieldwalking in September 2018, carried out in accordance with CIfA guidance<sup>10</sup>. Of the 19kg of artefacts recorded, only 3.6% were considered to be of archaeological interest and significance, including 11 prehistoric flint artefacts and 12th – 16th century pottery focussed in the south of the Order Limits. A small assemblage of Roman material was also recorded in the north and south of the Order Limits. The results of the fieldwalking will be referred to where appropriate in this Chapter. The full report is available in Document Ref: **7.33 LC TA8.4**.

8.2.8 Following on from the above investigations, in June and July 2019, an archaeological evaluation, comprising 155 trial trenches, was carried out across the Order Limits in accordance with CIfA guidance<sup>10</sup>. The evaluation identified a series of ditches and pits, mainly concentrated in the eastern, western and southern parts of the Order Limits and corresponding to anomalies identified by the geophysical survey. A single ditch containing Middle to Late Iron Age pottery and animal bone was recorded in the western part of the Order Limits. To the east, an undated large curvilinear enclosure was revealed, in addition to an undated ring ditch. The results of the evaluation will be referred to where appropriate in this Chapter. The full report is available in Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**.

8.2.9 Further information with regard to the methodologies utilised for these works can be found in their respective appendices, as referred to above.

#### Settings Assessment

8.2.10 The document Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Guidance Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets<sup>6</sup> provides the key industry-standard guidance on setting and development management, including assessment of the implications of development proposals of the significance of heritage assets. In relation to development within the setting of a heritage asset, the guidance states that the protection of the setting of designated assets does not necessarily preclude change.

8.2.11 A staged approach is recommended for settings assessment as this has been utilised as part of the Heritage Assessment, which provides details of the methodologies used (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**). In summary, step 1 requires heritage assets which may be affected by development to be identified. Step 2 of the settings process includes an assessment whether, how and to what degree the setting makes a contribution to the significance of the heritage assets, with the assessment of the effect of a development of the significance of an asset carried out as part of Step 3.

#### Consultation

---

<sup>9</sup> Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Watching Brief, [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GWatchingbrief\\_2.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GWatchingbrief_2.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation, [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GFieldevaluation\\_1.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GFieldevaluation_1.pdf)

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

8.2.12 Discussions have been held with the relevant heritage advisors, Historic England and the Historic Environment Officer at North Lincolnshire Council. These discussions are summarised below:

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>	<b>How response has been addressed</b>
Historic England (September 2018)	Tim Allen, Inspector of Ancient Monuments at Historic England, provided pre-application advice on 21 September 2018 (ref. PA00875765). Mr Allen's comments state that he finds the Proposed Development to be acceptable, taking into account the lack of direct impact to Gokewell Priory. He also states that the in-direct impact to this asset is acceptable when considered against the direct impact of ongoing cultivation, provided that a case for public benefit can be made. No objection was made to the Proposed Development.	No further action required.
Historic England (March 2019)	Mr Allen confirmed that the comments issued in 2018 remain valid (ref. PL00523873),	No further action required.
North Lincolnshire Council (May 2018)	Discussion on archaeological strategy. Alison Williams (AW) Historic Environment Officer argues strongly for a very comprehensive package of archaeological evaluation works, to include Geophysical survey of the whole site, fieldwalking on all arable areas, and Targeted trial trenching. Also requested a large exclusion zone around Gokewell Farm and archaeological fieldwork within the exclusion zone.	Agreed to proceed to prepare an archaeological strategy for discussion with AW. Considered that archaeological fieldwork within the exclusion zone was not appropriate give that there will be no archaeological impacts.
North Lincolnshire Council (June 2018)	Further discussion on archaeology Strategy (a copy of which had been circulated before the meeting). AW unhappy with some elements and is insistent that fieldwalking should form part of the strategy. Agreed that we would look at a targeted fieldwalking strategy. Also agreed to extend the exclusion zone so that at its closest point it no less than 20m from the Gokewell Farm earthwork/AP features.	Exclusion Zone amended and Archaeological Strategy Updated.
North Lincolnshire Council (July 2018)	Email from AW regarding geophysical survey within Gokewell Farm buffer zone. Responded that as exclusion zone had been amended so that no construction would take place within	No further action required.

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

	20m of the known archaeology that this was not directly relevant. AW conceded this to be the case by email on 25 July 2018.	
North Lincolnshire Council (August 2018)	Written Scheme of Investigation for fieldwalking survey forwarded to AW for comment/approval and discussion regarding scope of geophysical survey.	Approved.
North Lincolnshire Council (November 2018)	Provision of draft geophysical survey, GI watching Brief and Fieldwalking reports with an invitation to comment and a request for advice on potential trial trenching on site.	Reports agreed and signed off.
North Lincolnshire Council (January 2019)	Discussion on scope of works for Trial trenching and trench locations. Various amendments requested and suggestions made about scope of works.	All changes requested adopted and all agreed in Written Scheme of Investigation.
Planning Inspectorate (Scoping Opinion) (January 2019)	Issues raised include: Ensure baseline assessment relates to submitted scheme (revised Order Limits); Confirm max height of structures on site; Include assessment of tracking vehicles; Update operation phase effects on non-designated heritage assets and buried archaeology; Assess potential decommissioning impacts; Update references to CIfA Standard & Guidance; Reference standards for archaeological fieldwork; Assess duration of effect; Update magnitude of harm criteria.	All issues addressed and ES chapter updated accordingly.
North Lincolnshire Council (June 2019)	Discussion on site regarding the results of the field evaluation trial trenching. 2 site visits (19 and 27 June) to agree all was in order.	All approved.
North Lincolnshire Council (September 2019)	Comments on Draft Evaluation report from AW.	Comments addressed and report signed off.
North Lincolnshire Council	Comments on mitigation strategy from AW.	All suggested mitigation measures incorporated into the

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

(September 2019)		Proposed Development, including the archaeological exclusion zone, avoidance measures, archaeological monitoring and request for the mitigation strategy to be included within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). These are discussed in detail in Section 8.5
Historic England (April 2020)	Agreement on text for inclusion in Statement of Common Ground	All approved
North Lincolnshire Council (April 2020)	Agreement on text for inclusion in Statement of Common Ground	All approved

**Assessment of Significance**

Assessment of Significance of Heritage Assets

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

8.2.14 Heritage significance is defined as the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of their heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic in nature. The assessment of significance within this chapter has been guided primarily by the key industry-standard policies and guidance contained in Conservation Principles, where it is described with reference to the following four key forms of value:

- Evidential value is derived from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity. It is primarily associated with the physical remains or the historic fabric of the heritage asset. This value is proportionate to the potential of the asset to contribute to the understanding of the past. When there are no written records, such physical remains, including archaeological deposits, may provide the only source of information about the past;
- Historical value derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a site to the present. It can be illustrative or associative in attribution. The illustrative aspect relates to the ability of the asset to provide links and insights into past communities and their activities. The associative aspect derives from the association of the asset with a notable historic family, person, event or movement;
- Aesthetic value is derived from the ways in which people draw intellectual and sensory stimulation from a place. This value may have developed through conscious design or be the result of the fortuitous evolution of the place over time. This aspect

---

may include the physical form of the asset as well as its location within the setting;  
and

- Communal value, which derives from the meaning of a place for the people who relate to it. The commemorative and symbolic aspects of this value reflect the meanings of a heritage asset for the people who draw part of their identity from it or have emotional links to it (such as memorials raised by community effort). The social aspect of this value is associated with places perceived as source of identity or distinctiveness and spiritual value is attached to places of worship.

8.2.15 Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical fabric, but also from its setting. The setting of a heritage asset is defined as the surroundings within which it is experienced; its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. However, setting is not a heritage asset in its own right, nor is it a heritage designation in its own right. Its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset. This contribution may be positive, negative or neutral.

8.2.16 Paragraph 189 of the NPPF is clear in its recognition of the need for local planning authorities to require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. It further states that local planning authorities should require a field evaluation in addition to an appropriate desk-based assessment, where proposals include or have the potential to include heritage assets of archaeological interest. It is also unequivocal on the matter of scope, as it mentions that the level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the asset, and no more than sufficient to understand the potential impact of a development on that significance.

8.2.17 The way in which heritage significance is expressed within this ES Chapter has been specifically developed, based on good practice, to ensure that it is fully aligned with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990<sup>11</sup>, the NPPF<sup>1</sup> and Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment<sup>5</sup>.

8.2.18 The statements of significance development for each of the assets reflect the language of the Planning Act 1990, utilising terms such as character and appearance (of Conservation Areas), and architectural and historic interest (of Listed Buildings). Further frames of reference, found within Conservation Principles, allow for terms such as 'evidential', 'historical', 'aesthetic' and 'communal' to be used to convey the many heritage values that combine to make up the heritage significance of an asset.

8.2.19 The statements of significance describe 'what matters and why', i.e. which aspects of an asset and its setting contribute to the heritage significance of the asset and how. Although the statements rightly acknowledge the fabric of heritage assets as representing the principal embodiment and physical manifestation of their heritage significance, the surroundings of the assets, and the ways in which they can be experienced, often contribute to their overall significance. This will be assessed in line with the settings assessment methodology (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**).

8.2.20 Although terms such as High, Medium or Low value, and National, Regional or Local importance are often adopted in EIA to express a summary description of the 'relative significance' heritage assets, they are not universally recognised or accepted terms within heritage sector guidance and amongst heritage professionals. This is because these concepts require complex definitions to properly allow for their application, and do not

---

<sup>11</sup> Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Act of UK Parliament

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

directly relate to the language or key tests required in determining planning applications or heritage consents.

8.2.21 The criteria adopted for this ES Chapter are laid out in **Table 8.1**, with terminology used derived directly from the NPPF. The language used in this ES Chapter is entirely consistent with the NPPF and the Planning Act 1990, and provides the decision-maker with sufficient information to understand how change could bring benefit or harm to the heritage significance of an asset(s), thus enabling an informed judgement to be reached.

**Table 8.1: Criteria for Assessing the Significance of Heritage Assets**

<b>Heritage Significance</b>	<b>Description of Criteria</b>
Designated heritage assets of the highest significance	As defined in the NPPF, these include: Scheduled Monuments, Protected Wreck Sites, Battlefields, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings, Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens, and World Heritage Sites. Heritage assets displaying considerable evidential, historic, aesthetic or communal value, as identified by Conservation Principles, which are of comparable significance to designated heritage assets of the highest significance, would also fall within this category.
Designated heritage assets of less than the highest significance	In accordance with the NPPF, these include, by elimination, Grade II Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens.
Non-designated heritage assets; significance confirmed	Heritage assets, the significance of which has been ascertained through sufficient evaluation and assessment.
Non-designated heritage assets; significance to be confirmed	Heritage assets the significance of which has not yet been ascertained through sufficient evaluation and assessment.
Negligible	Remains that have been sufficiently demonstrated to have no archaeological interest as defined in the NPPF Glossary.

Assessment of Development Effects

8.2.22 The methodology employed here moves away from the more traditional ‘scalar’, quantitative, matrix-led approach, adopting a descriptive, qualitative presentation of the findings of the assessment. This is because the descriptions of anticipated development impacts upon heritage assets are qualitative rather than quantitative and the adopted approach allows for greater accuracy in understanding the potential harm the proposed development may cause to the significance of heritage assets. As with the approach adopted in assessing heritage significance of heritage assets, this approach directly reflects key concepts in planning policy and heritage guidance with regard to the assessment of development effects upon heritage assets. It therefore offers an appropriate way to define such effects. Clear statements of significance (the ‘what matters and why’ approach), and a sound understanding of the character of the proposed development, as presented in this assessment methodology, allow for a transparent articulation of the nature/degree of any identified effects.

8.2.23 The effects of the Proposed Development arise as a result of change to the heritage assets. The significance of a heritage asset can be harmed or lost through alteration, destruction or development within its setting. In terms of harm though changes to setting, as clearly illustrated within the NPPF, any attempt to convey the impact or harm of a

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

development has to be framed within the tightly-defined parameters of harm to the significance of the heritage asset itself. This is a fundamental principle. In summary, a project could bring about change within the setting of a heritage asset, resulting in harm to its significance, or the way in which that significance is experienced. References such as 'harm to setting' are therefore avoided.

8.2.24 The assessment of the effect of the development upon cultural heritage resource takes into account numerous factors, including the scale of development, the type and extent of physical disturbance and the visual effects. The development effects may be:

- Direct or indirect. Direct effects arise from physical change to the resource, which affects its physical remains or fabric (i.e. excavations which may affect the archaeological remains or alterations to historic buildings). Indirect effects relate to changes within the setting of heritage assets;
- Permanent or temporary. Due to their character, direct effects upon the physical remains of heritage assets are permanent, and not reversible. However, effects on the settings of heritage assets may be temporary, if the development has a limited lifespan. These temporary effects can be short, medium or long-term. With regard to the Proposed Development, short-term effects would extend over a short period (in the context of a solar farm, these are typically associated with the construction or decommissioning periods, or other limited period). Temporary effects which persist for less than the life of a solar farm would be considered medium-term effects, while those experienced throughout the full lifetime of the Proposed Development would long-term effects.
- Beneficial, when the development leads to the enhancement of the heritage resource, or adverse, when it results in harm to, or loss of, the significance of a heritage asset. If the resource will not be affected by the proposed development, there will be no impact.

8.2.25 To further assist in the decision-making process, the following approach to the assessment of effects upon heritage assets (**Table 8.2**) is adopted. This has been done in order to improve the intelligibility of the assessment results for purposes of quick reference and ready comprehension. The language used here is entirely consistent with the NPPF and the Planning Act 1990, and provides sufficient information to reach informed judgement.

**Table 8.2: Magnitude of Effect upon Heritage Assets**

Level of Effect	Description	Applicable Policies
<b>Heritage Benefit</b>	The proposals would enhance the heritage significance of a heritage asset.	Enhancing the significance of a heritage asset is a desirable development outcome in respect of heritage. It is consistent with key policy and guidance, including the NPPF paragraphs 185, 192 and 200.
<b>No harm (neutral effect)</b>	The proposals would preserve the significance of a heritage asset.	Preserving a Listed Building and its setting is consistent with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area is consistent with Section 72 of the Act. Sustaining the significance of a heritage asset is consistent with paragraph 185 of the NPPF and should be at the core of

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

Level of Effect	Description	Applicable Policies
		any material local planning policies in respect of heritage.
<b>Less than Substantial Harm</b>	<p>The proposals would result in a restricted level of harm to the significance of a heritage asset, such that the asset’s contributing heritage values would be largely preserved (lower end).</p> <p>The proposals would lead to a notable level of harm to the significance of a heritage asset. A reduced, but appreciable, degree of its heritage significance would remain (upper end).</p>	<p>In accordance with the NPPF, in determining an application, this level of harm upon designated heritage assets (or assets of equivalent significance) should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals (paragraph 196).</p> <p>Proposals involving change to a Listed Building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, or change to the character or appearance of Conservation Areas, must also be considered within the context of the Planning Act 1990.</p> <p>Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that the in determining planning application, the effects of the proposed development on the significance of non-designated heritage assets needs to be taken into account. A balanced judgement is required to weigh direct or indirect impacts on non-designated assets, having regard for the scale of harm and the significance of the asset.</p>
<b>Substantial Harm</b>	The proposals would very much reduce the heritage asset’s significance or vitiate that significance altogether.	<p>Paragraphs 193, 194 and 195 of the NPPF state that substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets of the highest significance should be wholly exceptional (Scheduled Monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* Listed Buildings, grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens, and World Heritage Sites) and to assets of less than highest significance (grade II Listed Buildings, or grade II Registered Parks or Gardens) – exceptional. Proposed development leading to such harm to designated heritage assets should be refused unless it is demonstrated that this substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits.</p> <p>The effects of the proposed development on the significance of non-designated heritage assets will require a balanced judgement to weigh direct or indirect impacts on non-designated assets, having regard for the scale of harm and</p>

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

Level of Effect	Description	Applicable Policies
		the significance of the asset (paragraph 197).

8.2.26 In line with EIA best practice, it is considered that ‘substantial harm’ to designated heritage asset would equate to a significant adverse effect in line with the language used within the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended 2015). ‘Less than substantial harm’ to designated heritage assets could also trigger the same significant effect, but no prescriptive criteria are proposed to prejudge this threshold, leaving it to professional judgement. With regard to the harm to non-designated assets, professional judgment will be used to ascertain whether the significant effect is triggered, taking into account the relative significance of such assets as well as the level of harm upon them.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Effects

8.2.27 When effects upon the cultural heritage resource have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed in order to prevent, reduce or offset any significant effects. It may also be possible to enhance heritage assets as part of the development. In such circumstances, the weight given to the heritage values of the asset should be proportionate to the significance of the asset and the development effect upon it. In order to assess residual effects following the implementation of the mitigation measures upon the significance of heritage assets, professional judgement is used.

**Legislative and Policy Framework**

8.2.28 The key legislative and policy documents are summarised below, with further details provided in Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

8.2.29 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990<sup>11</sup> states that **“in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses”** (Section 66).

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

8.2.30 The principal national guidance on the importance, management and safeguarding of the historic environment recourse within the planning process in the NPPF Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment<sup>1</sup>. The aim of this section is to ensure that Local Planning Authorities (LPA), developers and owners of heritage assets adopt a holistic and consistent approach to conserving the historic environment.

8.2.31 Heritage assets include designated and non-designated sites, and policies within the NPPF relate to both the treatment of heritage assets themselves, and of their settings, both of which are a material consideration in development decision making.

8.2.32 LPA are urged to request applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposed development, including any contribution made to significance by their setting. The level of detail required in the assessment should be

## **ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT**

### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

proportionate to the importance of the assets, and no more than sufficient to understand the potential effects of the proposal on their significance.

8.2.33 The key tenets of the NPPF are:

- when considering the effect of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be (Paragraph 193);
- significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to, or loss of, a Grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to, or loss of, designated heritage assets of the highest significance, should be wholly exceptional (Paragraph 194);
- where a proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (Paragraph 196); and
- with regard to non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having due regard to the scale of any harm or loss, and to the significance of the heritage asset affected (Paragraph 197).

#### Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)

8.2.34 Section 5.8 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) states that 'the construction, operation and decommissioning of energy infrastructure has the potential to result in adverse impacts on the historic environment' (Paragraph 5.8.1). It then continues to define heritage assets, how the potential impact of development should be assessed, and how this should be regarded in decision making, before detailing why and how to record heritage assets in advance of development. The general principles of the Policy in section 5.8 broadly reflect those of the NPPF, as above.

#### National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)

8.2.35 Further policy on impact assessment principles is provided in EN-3. Paragraph 2.5.33 states that in sites with national designations, 'consent for renewable energy projects should only be granted where it can be demonstrated that the objectives of designation of the area will not be compromised by the development, and any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by the environmental, social and economic benefits.

8.2.36 Paragraph 2.5.34 describes how any impact to the historic environment (as set out in section 5.8 of EN-1) should be weighed against the 'positive role that large-scale renewable projects play in the mitigation of climate change, the delivery of energy security and the urgency of meeting the national targets for renewable energy supply and emissions reductions'.

#### Local Planning Policy

8.2.37 The Order Limits is located within North Lincolnshire Council. North Lincolnshire Local Plan (adopted in March 2003)<sup>12</sup> is the process of being replaced by the Local Development Framework. Currently, planning applications are subject to policy set out

---

<sup>12</sup> North Lincolnshire Local Plan <http://www.northlincs.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/planning-policy/local-plan/north-lincolnshire-local-plan/#>

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

within the Core Strategy (adopted June 2011)<sup>13</sup> and saved policies of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan. Those policies which are relevant to heritage include:

- Core Strategy Policy CS6: Historic Environment;
- Local Plan Policy HE5: Development affecting Listed Buildings;
- Local Plan Policy HE8: Ancient Monuments; and
- Local Plan Policy HE9: Archaeological Evaluation.

8.2.38 Further detail with regard to these policies is included within Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**.

#### **Scoping Criteria**

8.2.39 Prior to the preparation of this ES Chapter, a Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**) was undertaken, which identified the cultural heritage resource receptors that may be sensitive to the Proposed Development and as such need to be considered (scoped in) within the ES. As a consequence, the Cultural Heritage Chapter considers the following potential effects:

- Construction Phase – buried archaeological remains;
- Operational Phase – potential effects on designated heritage assets, and assets of comparable significance, as a result of change within their setting; and
- De-Commissioning Phase - buried archaeological remains.

#### **Limitations to the Assessment**

8.2.40 This section presents the limitations and difficulties encountered in the preparation of this assessment.

8.2.41 The assessment work is principally based on a desk-based study and utilised secondary information derived from a variety of sources, only some of which have been directly examined for the purpose of this assessment. The assumption is made that this data, as well as that derived from other secondary sources, is reasonably accurate. The records held by the HER and Historic England are not a record of all surviving heritage assets, but a record of the discovery of a wide range of archaeological and historical components of the historic environment. The information held within it is not complete and does not preclude the subsequent discovery of further elements of the historic environment that are, at present, unknown.

8.2.42 In order to gain a thorough understanding of the archaeological potential within the Order Limits, a series of archaeological investigations were carried out within the Order Limits in accordance with NPPF 198 and Local Plan policies CS6 and HE9, including a geophysical survey, fieldwalking, a watching brief and an archaeological evaluation. As these investigation strategies were designed to explore a sample of the site, with each stage targeted at the results obtained from earlier stages, the potential exists for archaeological remains which were not detected in the course of the investigations to be present within the Order Limits. However, the results give a good understating of the archaeological potential across the Order Limits and allow for an informed assessment of significance and impact.

---

<sup>13</sup> North Lincolnshire Local Development Framework – Core Strategy (adopted June 2011), <http://www.planning.northlincs.gov.uk/planningreports/corestratergy/adopteddpd/FullCoreStrategy.pdf>

### **8.3 BASELINE CONDITIONS**

#### **Site Description and Context**

8.3.1 This section of the ES Chapter presents a summary of the historical and archaeological background of the Order Limits, based on the Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**) and previous archaeological works (full reports included within Document Refs: **TA7.31 LC TA8.2**, **7.32 LC TA8.3**, **7.33 LC TA8.4** and **7.34 LC TA8.5**). Heritage assets discussed below are illustrated on Figures 1, 2 and 3 of Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1** and on figures within the respective investigation reports.

8.3.2 The Order Limits is located on an area of multiple bands of differing mudstone and limestone bedrock running in a north-south alignment comprising Charmouth Mudstone, Marlstone Rock Formation, Whitby Mudstone, Grantham Formation, Lower Lincolnshire Limestone and Kirton Cementstone Beds. Superficial deposits of the Sutton Sand Formation are recorded sporadically across the Order Limits.

8.3.3 The Order Limits is located on the western face of a north south aligned ridge which extends from High Santon to Sawton. The eastern extent of the Order Limits is located upon the high point of the ridge at a height of c 60m aOD sloping downwards to c 25m aOD at the western edge of the Order Limits.

#### **Baseline Survey Information**

##### Prehistoric

8.3.4 The North Lincolnshire HER records three prehistoric features within the Order Limits, a possible round barrow, a section of the prehistoric route corridor known as the Jurassic Way, and a collection of flints discovered prior to 1976, but with an uncertain provenance (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS22718, MLS20003 and MLS6695). The geophysical survey identified an apparent ring ditch in the east of the Order Limits, although it did not correlate to the recorded position of the round barrow recorded by the HER and is likely to represent a different feature (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**). The HER barrow was also not identified in the evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**, Trench 89). The ring ditch recorded in the geophysical survey was further investigated during the evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**, Trench 99). It had an internal diameter of 12.5m and the contained a clean and sterile fill from which no artefactual material was recovered; additionally, no features were identified within the interior of the ring ditch. This feature could tentatively be interpreted as a prehistoric ring ditch based on its circular shape in plan, perhaps representing a ploughed out Bronze Age barrow.

8.3.5 The fieldwalking within the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.33 LC TA8.4**) led to the recovery of 11 pieces of Neolithic or Bronze Age worked flint, the majority of which were recorded in the south of the Order Limits.

8.3.6 The archaeological evaluation revealed the remains of a substantial north-east/south-west orientated ditch in Trenches 46, 149-150 (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**), which correlated with a linear geophysical anomaly (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**). During the investigations, an assemblage of 25 sherds of Middle to Late Iron Age pottery and associated animal bone (cattle, sheep/goat and pig) was recovered from the ditch. This ditch, located on the top of a small ridge, likely represents a late prehistoric field boundary. The amount of pottery and animal bone are potentially indicative of a relative proximity to an area of settlement, however no further features associated with Iron Age activity were identified and it can tentatively be suggested that such activity may

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

### MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

---

have been centred to the east of it, within the archaeological exclusion zone designed around Gokewell Priory.

8.3.7 In addition to the recorded prehistoric features from within the Order Limits, prehistoric material has been recovered from the wider study area, comprising worked flint and sherds of pottery recovered to the south east of the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS7556, MLS7563, MLS1822, MLS22657 and MLS1818).

#### Romano-British

8.3.8 The only evidence of possible Roman activity within the Order Limits comprises of a very small assemblage of Roman material recovered during the fieldwalking (Document Ref: **7.33 LC TA8.4**). This comprised local greyware pottery in the north and south of the Order Limits, and a very small collection of possible Roman ceramic building material in the south-central area of the Order Limits.

8.3.9 Beyond the Order Limits, the route of Ermine Street, a major Roman road, runs from north to south to the east of the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS100). Within the wider study area, fieldwalking and archaeological investigations have identified areas of Roman activity centred in particular around Raventhorpe to the south (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS26070, MLS26071, MLS26072 and MLS1819).

#### Early Medieval and Medieval

8.3.10 The fieldwalking within the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.33 LC TA8.4**) recovered 35 sherds of 12th to 16th century pottery. These were largely focussed in the south of the Site, although some were recorded immediately to the south of Gokewell Priory. This priory was a small Cistercian nunnery founded in the 12th century and dissolved following the Dissolution of the Monasteries in 1536 (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS1805). The site of the priory later formed the location for Gokewell Priory Farm, with material from the Priory reused in the farm buildings. Archaeological works undertaken in the 1970s in relation to the Priory Farm, during which earthworks to the south and west of the farm were recorded, included a photographic record of the farm area (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 3, ELS4211 and ELS2566).

8.3.11 Despite the proximity to the Priory, the archaeological evaluation recorded sparse evidence of medieval activity, limited to two residual sherds of medieval pottery retrieved from the fill of post-medieval/modern quarry pit in Trench 135 (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**). No cut features or deposits of medieval date were identified during the evaluation.

8.3.12 The deserted medieval village of Manby (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS1806), which has its origins in the early medieval period, is located to the south of the Order Limits and the possible remnants of ridge and furrow, which extend into the southern area of the Order Limits, are likely to represent the open fields of the village during this period. Further south, the Scheduled Monument of Raventhorpe (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 1) is another example of a deserted medieval village which has its origins in the early medieval period.

#### Post Medieval and Modern

8.3.13 Following the dissolution of Gokewell Priory, medieval building material was reused to create Gokewell Priory Farm (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS1027 and MLS25419), also labelled as Cokewell on mapping. The exact date of construction is unknown but it was certainly constructed by the early 19th century, as is demonstrated by its depiction on the 1842 Tithe Map (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Plate 18). The

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

### MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

Tithe Map and apportionment illustrate that Gokewell Priory Farm was the only area of development within the Order Limits during the post-medieval period, the remaining areas under a mixture of arable and pasture agricultural use.

8.3.14 Late 19th and 20th century Ordnance Survey mapping shows the Order Limits to have remained undeveloped although the HER records the site of a World War II Heavy Anti-Aircraft Battery as being located within the eastern area of the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS21408), although no remains were recorded in the trial trench evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**, Trench 83).

8.3.15 Gokewell Priory Farm was demolished in the 1980s and the site cleared. The land within the Order Limits has since been used almost exclusively for arable cultivation.

8.3.16 The geophysical survey undertaken at the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**) identified a number of former field boundaries, which correspond with boundaries shown on historic Ordnance Survey maps. The evaluation also recorded a small number of post-medieval/modern features, including field boundaries and furrows. A modern ditch in Trench 15, and the remains of a modern building in Trench 16 likely represent features associated with Gokewell Priory Farm, whose remains are located within the exclusion area, to the immediate south (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**).

8.3.17 The evaluation recorded an area of limestone extraction in the south-eastern part of the Order Limits. This included a number of large quarry pits, correlating to irregular geophysical anomalies, with associated pottery, ceramic building material, industrial waste and coal of post-medieval/modern date. Quarry pits in Trenches 133-134 contained evidence for in situ burning which could suggest some sort of rudimentary limestone burning within the pits, perhaps for agricultural lime production (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**).

#### Undated

8.3.18 The Heritage Assessment also records a number of potential archaeological features of uncertain date within the Order Limits. These comprise two possible medieval stock enclosures in the southern extent of the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS21941 and MLS21943) and an incomplete ovoid ditch within the north western area (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS22780), which may be associated with the plantation of woodland to commemorate Queen Victoria in the late 19th century. These features were not identified in the geophysical survey (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**) or in the trial trench evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**; Trenches 39-38 targeted the location of MLS22780 and Trench 121 – MLS21941; due to overhead power lines, location of MLS21943 could not be investigated, but no archaeological remains were observed in Trench 116 located as close as feasible to the feature).

8.3.19 The geophysical survey (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**) identified a number of potential undated heritage assets, including possible linear ditches in the north-east, south-west, and south-east, and possible former field boundaries (not shown on any available historic maps) in the centre and south-west of the Order Limits. Undated evidence of ploughing has also been identified throughout the Order Limits.

8.3.20 The archaeological evaluation identified a number of features of unknown date, in addition to the ring ditch discussed above, some of which correlate with the anomalies identified in the geophysical survey. A large curvilinear ditch was revealed in Trenches 32 and 35 in the north-eastern part of the Order Limits, closely corresponding to a geophysical anomaly. Although undated, this ditch likely represents the remains of a large enclosure. A ditch, corresponding with an L-shaped anomaly identified within the interior of the large

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

enclosure, was recorded in Trench 34. This ditch could represent the remains of internal activity within the enclosure. No finds were retrieved from these features and they remain undated. A small number of further undated ditches and pits were recorded in the evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**).

#### The Setting of Heritage Assets

##### Summary of Designated Heritage Assets

8.3.21 Designated heritage assets within 2km of the Order Limits include the Scheduled Monument of Raventhorpe medieval settlement, the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary Broughton and ten Grade II Listed Buildings located to the north, east and south of the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 1). The closest assets to the Order Limits comprise two Grade II Listed Buildings, Springwood Cottage and barn located c 650m to the north east of the Order Limits and Raventhorpe House (a Grade II Listed Building) and the Scheduled Monument of Raventhorpe medieval village, both located c 870m to the south of the Order Limits.

8.3.22 The walkover survey carried out as part of the Heritage Assessment has established that there would no non-physical effects on any of the designated heritage assets located within the environs of the Site. The Heritage Assessment concluded that the Order Limits does not form part of the setting of any of the heritage assets which contribute to their significance, nor is there any intervisibility between the Order Limits and any of the assets due to the distance, topography and tree cover. The Proposed Development will therefore not result in any change to the setting that will cause harm to heritage significance of any of the heritage assets, and as such the proposals are considered to be in accordance with statutory requirements.

8.3.23 The detailed settings assessment, the conclusions of which have been summarised within this ES Chapter, is included within the Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**; chapter 7).

##### Summary of Non-Designated Heritage Assets

8.3.24 The site of the former medieval Gokewell Priory (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**: Figure 2, MLS1805) is located within the northern area of the Order Limits, although this asset, and a buffer area, is not proposed for development. The remains of the priory comprise above-ground remnant earthworks and potential below-ground archaeological remains, and this asset principally derives its significance from the archaeological interest and evidential value of said remains.

##### Assets Scoped Out of the Settings Assessment

8.3.25 It was determined that there would be no in-direct harm to the significance of any other non-designated heritage assets as a result of the proposed development. With reference to the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Guidance Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets<sup>6</sup>: **'Heritage assets that comprise only buried remains may not be readily appreciated by a casual observer. They nonetheless retain a presence in the landscape and, like other heritage assets, may have a setting'** (our emphasis). The guidance also makes it clear that change within the landscape around a particular asset **'...is likely to affect the contribution made by setting to the significance of the heritage asset.'** It also makes it clear that for buried archaeology one of the key considerations is the history of the landscape within which they sit; **'the long-term continuity in the use of the land that surrounds them.'**

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

8.3.26 Some of the potential archaeological features identified in the results of geophysical survey (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**) and trial trench evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**) were considered to establish whether these but may be susceptible to in-direct development effects. In this case, most of the non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest within and in the vicinity if the Order Limits have no surface presence and, additionally, the landscape within which they are present has been fundamentally changed over time. As such, it can be concluded that setting makes no contribution to the significance on the non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest within or close to the Order Limits and their significance derives from the archaeological interest and evidential value of buried archaeological remains.

#### **Significance of Identified Sensitive Receptors**

8.3.27 The following section discusses the heritage significance of potential sensitive cultural heritage receptors with regard to the Proposed Development. This is also summarised in **Table 8.4**, below.

#### Known and Potential Archaeological Remains

8.3.28 The assessment of significance is informed by the results of the Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**), and further investigations within the Order Limits (Document Refs: **TA7.31 LC TA8.2**, **7.32 LC TA8.3**, **7.33 LC8.4** and **7.34 LC TA8.5**). These investigations have allowed a good understanding of the archaeological potential within the Order Limits and there is a limited potential for any further undiscovered archaeological remains to be present. Whilst it cannot be entirely ruled out that additional remains may be encountered, based on the known archaeological potential of the Order Limits, these would be unlikely to comprise assets of highest significance and would most probably comprise non-designated heritage assets.

#### Ring ditches – prehistoric date

8.3.29 The possible remains of a prehistoric round barrow have been identified within the central area of the Order Limits as cropmarks on aerial photographs. However, there were no upstanding physical remains identified within the Site visit, and no such evidence was identified in the results of the geophysical survey (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**). Subsequent trial trench evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**, Trench 89) also did not identify any remains at this location, perhaps as the feature has been incorrectly interpreted or affected/removed by agricultural processes.

8.3.30 However, the geophysical survey recorded a curvilinear anomaly to the east of the Order Limits and the archaeological evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**) confirmed the presence of a ring ditch at this location (Trench 99). Whilst of unconfirmed date, the feature has been tentatively interpreted as a ploughed out prehistoric barrow.

8.3.31 This feature would be of evidential and historical (illustrative) value in its contribution towards our understanding of the nature and extent of prehistoric activity within the local landscape and would constitute a non-designated heritage asset of archaeological interest.

#### Field boundary – prehistoric date

8.3.32 The geophysical survey revealed a linear anomaly in the north-western part of the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**). Subsequent evaluation (Trenches 46, 149-150) confirmed this anomaly relates to a substantial north-east/south-west orientated ditch, likely representing a Middle to Late Iron Age field boundary. No further features associated with later prehistoric were identified in the course of the evaluation and it may

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

---

be that further activity extended into the archaeological exclusion zone designed around Gokewell Priory.

8.3.33 The recorded ditch would be of evidential and historical (illustrative) value as it could contribute towards our understanding of the nature and extent of Iron Age agricultural activity within the surrounding area and it would constitute a non-designated heritage asset of archaeological interest.

#### Artefact scatters – prehistoric date

8.3.34 The results of the archaeological fieldwalking at the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.33 LC TA8.4**) show that there is a potential for the recovery of prehistoric artefacts. However, these are not expected to be in situ. The chance finds of isolated artefacts, whilst indicating a presence within the wider area, are of limited evidential value, and would be of limited archaeological significance.

#### Jurassic Way Trackway – prehistoric date

8.3.35 The line of the prehistoric Jurassic Way trackway from Lincoln to Winteringham has been conjectured as passing through the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**). The location of the Site upon the high ground of a natural ridgeway does suggest a suitable location for an early route of movement but its alignment through the Order Limits is conjectural. If remains were to be encountered, they would be of archaeological interest, however the archaeological investigations (including the geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation) did not reveal any remains which could potentially be associated with this routeway.

#### Agricultural remains of medieval and later date

8.3.36 Ridge and furrow earthworks have been identified within the south of the Order Limits although there were no upstanding remains identified during the Site visit. Modern agricultural ploughing techniques are likely to have removed any upstanding earthworks associated with these features, although archaeological remains may survive beneath the plough soil. The ridge and furrow are believed to be associated with the deserted medieval village of Manby to the south, but the presence of tree cover along the southern edge of the Order Limits provides a tangible barrier between the DMV and the ridge and furrow remains.

8.3.37 The majority of the Order Limits was depicted as agricultural land on the Tithe Map and the whole Order Limits has the potential to contain early medieval – modern agricultural remains, such as infilled boundary and drainage ditches or infilled furrows relating to further areas of ridge and furrow cultivation. Such remains, including post-medieval/modern field boundaries were recorded during the evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**) and the geophysical survey (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**), however no evidence for medieval agriculture was identified.

8.3.38 Post-medieval/modern agricultural remains were record within the Order Limits and there remains some potential for medieval agricultural activity. Such remains have little potential to contribute towards our understanding of medieval and post-medieval farming practices and would comprise non-designated heritage assets of limited, if any, archaeological interest.

#### Cistercian Priory and Gokewell Priory Farm – medieval /post-medieval date

8.3.39 The site of a Cistercian priory is documented as lying beneath the remains of Gokewell Priory Farm, limited upstanding remains of which are visible within the Order

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

### MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

---

Limits. Whilst the later farm buildings reused the architectural fabric of the priory, leaving no original upstanding remains, it is likely that archaeological remains associated with the earlier priory survive within the area of the farm.

8.3.40 The heritage significance of such remains associated with early medieval activity would derive from their evidential and historic values contributing towards our understanding of ecclesiastical land use during the early medieval and medieval periods. Whilst such remains would be of heritage significance, they are unlikely to be of sufficient archaeological interest to comprise heritage assets of the highest significance and would constitute non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest.

8.3.41 During the trial trench evaluation, no cut features or deposits of medieval date were identified (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**) and it is considered that the focus of medieval activity falls within the archaeological exclusion zone defined around Gokewell Priory. Modern activity (a ditch and building remains) were recorded in Trench 16, although these would not be considered heritage assets.

8.3.42 The Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**) concluded that the present agricultural setting of Gokewell Priory, makes contribution to its illustrative historical value (discussed below).

#### Artefact scatters – medieval – post-medieval date

8.3.43 Archaeological fieldwalking at the Order Limits (Document Ref: **7.33 LC TA8.4**) identified a small amount of 12th to 16th century pottery. This was focussed in the south of the Order Limits, with some directly south of Gokewell Priory. Further small amounts of pottery recorded in the evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**). However, it is expected that these artefacts would have been dispersed from their original location through centuries of agricultural activity within the Order Limits, and these are not expected to be of great archaeological interest.

#### Limestone extraction – post-medieval/modern

8.3.44 An area of limestone extraction pits was recorded in the south-eastern part of the Order Limits in the geophysical survey and evaluation (Document Refs: **7.31 LC TA8.2** and **7.34 LC TA8.5**), with some features indicating rudimentary limestone burning, potentially for agricultural lime production. Such remains have little potential to contribute towards our understanding of post-medieval/modern farming practices and would comprise non-designated heritage assets of limited, if any, archaeological interest.

#### Heavy Anti-Aircraft Battery – modern date

8.3.45 The site of a heavy anti-aircraft battery has been recorded in documentary sources as being located within the eastern area of the Order Limits. There is no upstanding evidence to identify the location of the asset, although large pieces of concrete seen within the plough soil may be associated with the structure. Archaeological remains associated with the military use of the Order Limits would be unlikely to be of more than local significance, however no remains of this asset were revealed in the trial trench evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**, Trench 83) and it is unlikely that any associated remains survive at this location.

#### Unidentified cropmarks and earthworks – uncertain date

8.3.46 Aerial photographs and Lidar analysis have identified three possibly archaeological features within the western and south-western area of the Order Limits. The exact nature and date of these features remains uncertain, although their form and location suggest

## **ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT**

### **MAIN STATEMENT**

### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

possible medieval enclosures, which would suggest them to be of evidential and historical (illustrative) value in their contribution towards our understanding of the nature and extent of activity within the local landscape. Whilst such features, if present would most constitute non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, it should be noted that no anomalies of archaeological potential were identified at these locations in the geophysical survey (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**) and no remains were recorded in trial trenches excavated at these locations and in tehri vicinity (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**). As such, it is unlikely that these cropmarks/earthworks represent features of archaeological interest.

#### Features of uncertain date

8.3.47 A number of potential archaeological features of uncertain date have been identified in the results of a geophysical survey (Document Ref: **7.31 LC TA8.2**) and trial trench evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**) undertaken at the Order Limits.

8.3.48 A large curvilinear ditch closely corresponding to a geophysical anomaly was recorded in Trenches 32 and 35 in the north-eastern part of the Order Limits. Although undated, this ditch likely represents the remains of a large enclosure, with potential internal activity in the form of an L-shaped ditch recorded in Trench 34. These features are considered to comprise non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest.

8.3.49 Additional potential archaeological features identified include linear ditches and pits. No concentrations of activity were identified and these features are at most of limited heritage significance.

#### Designated Heritage Assets

8.3.50 As outlined above, the Proposed Development at the Order Limits is not deemed likely to impact on the settings of any designated assets to an extent that it alters the significance of the asset and as such there are no identified designated sensitive receptors. Full details are included within the Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**).

## **8.4 ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

### **Identification of the Effects of the Proposed Development**

#### Construction Phase Effects

8.4.1 The physical effects of the Proposed Development upon the known archaeological resource would primarily result from groundworks associated with the construction of the Proposed Development, which might include:

- Any preconstruction ground investigation works;
- Installation of the solar panel modules/mounting system structures;
- Excavation of any service trenches; and
- Any stripping and excavations associated with the creation of the Battery Energy Storage System, sub-station area, temporary compound and new access tracks.

8.4.2 Development Plans do not propose any modules within the area occupied by the remains of the Priory Farm (archaeological exclusion zone, measuring c. 11.4ha; Drawing A29B0C0: Works Details - Key Plan - Work No. 2A and Drawings A29B0C0: Archaeological Zone Sheet 1, 2 & 3) and as such there should be no impact on any in situ remains associated with the medieval priory from the installation of modules.

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

### MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

---

8.4.3 In the course of the investigations, the following avoidance measures are proposed in relation to identified features sensitive to the Proposed Development and associated physical effects:

- The ring ditch (potential barrow) recorded in Trench 99: a no-dig buffer of minimum of 10m from the barrow ditch is proposed in order to ensure the preservation of the archaeological remains associated with the ring ditch and any related features which may be located in its vicinity, in line with the advice from the Historic Environment Officer at North Lincolnshire Council. Within this Archaeological No-Dig Zone (which measures in total c. 92m by 61m – the 10m buffer is exceeded; Drawing A29B0C0: Works Details - Key Plan - Work No. 2A and Drawing A29B0C0: Works Details - Sheet 5 of 7), concrete pads instead of metal posts will be utilised (Drawing A09B0C0: Works Details – Section Details) and cable trenches have been repositioned around the no-dig area to avoid the ring ditch;
- The plotted cropmark of a ring ditch (probable Bronze Age round barrow; HER ref. MLS22718): this feature was not identified in Trench 89 during the evaluation (Field 12; Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**; Figure 2), but in line with the advice from the Historic Environment Officer at North Lincolnshire Council, the new east-west access track has been redesigned to the south to avoid this potentially sensitive area.

8.4.4 In the course of the investigations, a number of additional areas where features of archaeological interest are/may be present have been identified and the physical effects associated with the Proposed Development could result in significant adverse effects upon the significance of these remains. The sensitive areas include:

- Potential remains within the peripheries of the archaeological exclusion zone defined around Gokewell Priory – these may be affected by the following ancillary works: proposed cable trench which transects the south-east corner of the zone; works around the pylons immediately east of the zone; ecological enhancements; and proposed swale to the west of the zone;
- Area of ditched enclosure, with internal remains, revealed in Field 7 during the evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**; Trenches 32, 34-35);
- The Iron Age ditch (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**; Trenches 46, 149-150) and surrounding area in the north-east corner of Field 10 adjacent to the archaeological exclusion zone (where further remains associated with the priory may be present).

8.4.5 A programme of archaeological recording will be required in these areas to ensure any archaeological remains encountered are preserved by record.

8.4.6 The physical effects associated with the Proposed Development are unlikely to result in significant adverse effects upon the significance of any remaining archaeological features recorded in the course of the archaeological investigations.

8.4.7 Existing and proposed access tracks will be utilised for vehicle movement, limiting potential impacts on buried archaeological remains due to compaction. Additionally, there would be no movement within the Gokewell Priory exclusion zone area, with those sensitive remains protected from any compaction impacts. Any movement across other areas of the Order Limits (outside the tracks) would be limited and would not exceed the impacts currently experienced associated with the farm machinery.

8.4.8 Whilst there may be some temporary impacts during the construction phase upon the designated heritage assets (i.e. scaffolding; movement of machinery), these impacts will be relatively limited and temporary (short-term) when compared with the completed development and therefore it was considered that the discussion of impacts upon designated heritage assets should refer to the Proposed Development in its Operation Phase.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT**

## **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

---

### Operation Phase Effects

8.4.9 No additional direct impacts upon the buried archaeological remains are anticipated following the completion of the Proposed Development. As such, these receptors are scoped out of discussion as part of the Operation Phase.

8.4.10 The Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**) also concluded that the present agricultural setting of Gokewell Priory, while modern in character, is considered to make a moderate contribution to its illustrative historical value by enabling its former location within an agricultural landscape to be appreciated. However, the introduction of the Proposed Development is not considered likely to result in a significant adverse effect overall.

8.4.11 With regard the potential non-physical effects upon heritage assets, it has been demonstrated within the Heritage Statement (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**) that the Proposed Development will not introduce change into the wider environs of any known heritage assets, such that their setting would change to the degree that it impacts upon their significance.

### De-Commissioning Phase Effects

8.4.12 The methodology for removing the mounting system structures is provided in the De-Commissioning Statement. This will involve vibrating the post and lifting it at the same time using a post removal tool attached to a small tracked excavator. Likewise, trenches excavated for the insertion of cabling will be re-cut to the same parameters as in the construction phase. This is expected to result in little or no additional impact to any buried archaeological resource subsequent to the impacts of the construction phase.

8.4.13 The De-Commissioning Statement also details the process for the removal of the fencing around the Gokewell Priory exclusion zone, ensuring no harm occurs to the remains within the exclusion zone.

8.4.14 As per the construction phase, there may be some temporary in-direct impact to heritage assets susceptible to in-direct impact. Likewise, these impacts will be relatively limited and temporary when compared with the lifespan of the solar farm.

## **Evaluation of Identified Effects**

### Construction

8.4.15 The effects of the Proposed Development upon the known and potential archaeological resource within the Order Limits would be direct, permanent, irreversible and adverse and are likely to result in complete or partial loss of heritage significance of any potential buried archaeological features or deposits.

8.4.16 As a result of the construction activities, the archaeological remains are likely to be removed. Within the footprint of the Proposed Development, this includes a number of known and potential non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest. This includes the ring ditch, the Iron Age field boundary and the undated enclosure recorded in the evaluation and the geophysical survey, as well as a small number of further undated or post-medieval/modern remains. The remains recorded in the HER, including the prehistoric round barrow and trackway, and a modern military feature, were not recorded during the investigations at the Order Limits. The site of the medieval priory is not proposed for development. An Archaeological No-Dig Zone (Drawings A29B0C0: General Layout; A29B0C0: Works Details -Sheet 5 of 7; and A09B0C0 Works Details - Section

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

---

Details) is proposed around the potential round barrow recorded in the evaluation and an access track has been redesigned to avoid the potential barrow identified as a cropmark.

8.4.17 The construction activities would lead to harm or total loss of significance of these non-designated heritage assets and without the implementation of appropriate mitigation, this would result in a Significant Adverse Effect.

Operation

8.4.18 As described above, it has been established in the Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**) that the Proposed Development would not affect the significance of any heritage assets within the environs of the Order Limits and as such there would be no development effects upon these assets (Neutral Effects).

---

**8.5 MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT**

8.5.1 Where significant effects are anticipated, mitigation may be necessary to adequately address these effects, in order to reduce or offset the harm (effect on) to the importance (significance) of non-designated heritage assets.

8.5.2 The NPPF makes the following provisions in respect of impacts to the significance of non-designated heritage assets: "the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset" (Paragraph 197). It also states that local councils should "require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact" (Paragraph 200).

**Mitigation by Design**

8.5.3 The Heritage Assessment (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**) has established that the Proposed Development would not lead to harm to any heritage assets located in the vicinity of the Order Limits (Neutral Effect) and no further mitigation with regard to these assets is required (either by design or as additional mitigation).

**Additional Mitigation**

8.5.4 The impacts upon the archaeological remains, which may lead to substantial effects, would occur during the construction phase and therefore any mitigation considered necessary would be implemented prior to or during this phase of development.

8.5.5 The avoidance of any direct impact to Gokewell Priory represents consideration for mitigation by design at an early stage. As the potential for the presence of any further archaeological remains within the Order Limits which would require mitigation was not fully understood, a staged programme of archaeological investigations (geophysical survey, watching brief, fieldwalking and archaeological evaluation) was agreed in liaison with the archaeological advisor to the LPA in order to allow the understanding of the archaeological resource which may be affected by the Proposed Development and inform the scope of the appropriate and proportionate mitigation strategy.

8.5.6 Following the completion of all the surveys, the archaeological mitigation was discussed and agreed with the archaeological advisor to the LPA. The following mitigation proposals have been agreed and will be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

**Gokewell Priory Archaeological Exclusion Zone**

8.5.7 Due to the heritage significance of known and potential remains associated with the priory, it has been agreed to define an archaeological exclusion zone around the area (Drawing A29B0C0: Works Details - Key Plan - Work No. 2A and Drawings A29B0C0: Archaeological Zone Sheet 1, 2 & 3), ensuring the Proposed Development does not lead to any harm upon these remains.

8.5.8 Whilst the area of the priory is excluded from any modules, ancillary works required to facilitate the construction are proposed within the peripheries of the defined archaeological exclusion zone. These include:

- excavation of the cable trench traversing the south-east corner of the zone;

## ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

### MAIN STATEMENT

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

---

- ecological and biodiversity enhancements;
- excavations around the pylon junction adjacent to the eastern boundary of the zone; and
- additional works which may be necessary (i.e. if any excavations are required in relation to the access track).

8.5.9 Archaeological recording of all abovementioned groundworks is proposed. The nature and scope of the recording will be dependent on the extent and impact of the groundworks, and it is anticipated these works are likely to comprise an archaeological watching brief (monitoring during groundworks), investigation and recording.

#### Avoidance measures

8.5.10 The investigations did not reveal concentrations of potentially highly significant archaeological remains (i.e. remains of significance commensurate with designated heritage assets of highest significance) within the Order Limits. However, two features which potentially represent the remains of a Bronze Age round barrows have been recorded, a ring ditch investigated in Trench 99 (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**) and a cropmark MLS22718 identified from aerial photographs (Document Ref: **7.30 LC TA8.1**), but not confirmed in the evaluation. The following avoidance measures are proposed:

- The ring ditch (potential barrow) recorded in Trench 99: a no-dig buffer of minimum of 10m from the barrow ditch will be implemented to ensure the preservation of the archaeological remains associated with the ring ditch and any related features which may be located in its vicinity, in line with the advice from the archaeological advisor to the LPA (Drawing A29B0C0: General Layout and Drawing A29B0C0: Works Details - Sheet 5 of 7). Within this zone (which measures in total c. 92m by 61m – the 10m buffer is exceeded), concrete pads instead of metal posts will be utilised and cable trenches have been repositioned around the no-dig area to avoid the ring ditch (Drawing A09B0C0: Works Details – Section Details);
- The plotted cropmark of a ring ditch (probable round barrow; HER ref. MLS22718): this feature was not identified in Trench 89 during the evaluation (Field 12; Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**; Figure 2), but in line with the advice from the archaeological advisor to the LPA, the proposed new east-west access track has been relocated to the south to avoid this potentially sensitive area.

#### Archaeological monitoring and recording

8.5.11 Following the completion of the archaeological investigations and in the course of the discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA, further areas which may contain remains sensitive to the Proposed Development have been identified. These include:

- Proposed swale to the west of the archaeological exclusion zone – within this area there is the potential for the presence of remains associated with the priory. As such the excavation of the swale is to be subject to archaeological monitoring;
- Area of undated ditched enclosure, with internal remains, revealed in Field 7 during the evaluation (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**; Trenches 32, 34-35). Archaeological monitoring is required during all groundworks associated with new access track, cable trenches and transformer station bases within area of the ditched enclosure and interior;
- The Iron Age ditch (Document Ref: **7.34 LC TA8.5**; Trenches 46, 149-150) and surrounding area in the north-east corner of Field 10 adjacent to the archaeological exclusion zone (where further remains associated with the priory may be present). Archaeological monitoring is required during excavation of cable trenches within these areas.

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

8.5.12 The programme of archaeological mitigation will include monitoring of groundworks by a suitably experienced archaeologist (an archaeological watching brief), with investigation and recording of any encountered remains. This would ensure preservation by record of any archaeological remains which may be affected by the Proposed Development in these areas of the Order Limits.

Completed investigation

8.5.13 With regard to the remaining archaeological features recorded within the Order Limits, it is considered that the information gathered in the course of the investigations provides an appropriate response, proportionate to the heritage significance of the assets and the anticipated physical effects. The completed investigations may be considered to partially offset the anticipated loss through the knowledge gained and, to an extent, reduce the effects on archaeological remains. As such no further mitigation is required for the archaeological remains elsewhere within the Order Limits, as agreed in liaison with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

**Table 8.3: Mitigation**

Ref	Measure to avoid, reduce or manage any adverse effects and/or to deliver beneficial effects	How measure would be secured		
		By Design	By S.106	By Requirements of the DCO
1	Non-designated heritage assets subject to direct impact	X		
2	Archaeological monitoring, investigation, recording and publication (as appropriate) for Proposed swale to the west of the archaeological exclusion zone.			X
3	Archaeological monitoring, investigation, recording and publication (as appropriate) for area of undated ditched enclosure, with internal remains, revealed in Field 7 during the evaluation			X
4	Archaeological monitoring, investigation, recording and publication (as appropriate) for the Iron Age ditch (Document Ref: <b>7.34 LC TA8.5</b> ; Trenches 46, 149-150) and surrounding area in the north-east corner of Field 10 adjacent to the archaeological exclusion zone			X

**Enhancements**

8.5.14 An additional benefit offered by archaeological works may be implemented following the investigations, including the promotion of local history in schools and local communities, and the enhancement of the public’s understanding of past activities in their local area through appropriate signage, interpretation, exhibitions and/or talks. The proposed enhancement here includes interpretation boards to be erected in the vicinity of

## **ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT**

### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

Gokewell Priory (by the Public Right of Way), which will allow for the remains to be appreciated by the wider public.

#### **8.6 CUMULATIVE AND IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS**

8.6.1 The only potential consideration in terms of any cumulative effects to heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development comprises of the 80ha solar farm at Ravensthorpe. However, taking into consideration the mitigation measures associated with both developments, there are no anticipated Significant Adverse Effects to cultural heritage resulting from cumulative effects.

#### **8.7 SUMMARY**

##### **Introduction**

8.7.1 This Chapter has considered the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon the cultural heritage resource, including buried archaeological remains within the Order Limits and heritage assets (including Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings) located within the Order Limits environs. It has been established that subject to appropriate mitigation being implemented, the Proposed Development would not result in significant adverse effects upon the cultural heritage resource within the Order Limits and in its surroundings.

##### **Baseline Conditions**

8.7.2 The heritage resource which has been considered within this Chapter includes the known and potential buried archaeological remains which may be affected as part of the construction stage and heritage assets, located within and in the environs of the Order Limits, which could potentially be affected as a result of change within the settings of these assets introduced following the completion of the Proposed Development.

##### **Likely Significant Effects**

8.7.3 It has been established that the Proposed Development has the potential to affect known archaeological remains associated with possible prehistoric and medieval archaeological remains as well as archaeological remains of uncertain date. The excavation of cable trenches and building foundations, the insertion of new roads, and inserting/removing the mounting system structures (and any associated landscaping or services) have the potential to truncate or totally remove the archaeological remains within their footprint. Such effects would result in harm to or total loss of significance of these buried archaeological features, leading to a Significant Adverse Effect.

##### **Mitigation and Enhancement**

8.7.4 It has been established that the Proposed Development would not lead to harm to any heritage assets located in the vicinity of the Order Limits, including the Scheduled Ravensthorpe deserted medieval village, and no further mitigation with regard to these assets is required (Neutral Effect). Likewise, there are not anticipated to be any significant effects to Gokewell Priory as a result of the proposed development within its setting.

8.7.5 The area of the medieval Gokewell Priory has been designated as an archaeological exclusion zone and therefore there will be no impacts associated with installation of the arrays (works within the peripheries and ecological enhancement works are described in paragraphs 8.5.8 and 8.5.9 and agreed mitigation strategy with regards to these works is described in paragraph 8.7.6, below).

## **ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MAIN STATEMENT**

### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

8.7.6 The archaeological investigations have identified remains associated with prehistoric activity, as well as features of uncertain date within the Order Limits, which may be subject to physical effects as a result of the Proposed Development. In the course of the consultations with the Historic Environment Officer, following the completion of the investigations, the following mitigation strategy was agreed, in addition to the archaeological exclusion zone (and detailed within the Construction Environmental Management Plan):

- A no-dig zone within which concrete pads will be utilised, around the potential prehistoric round barrow (ring ditch).
- In order to avoid the potential barrow recorded as a cropmark, trench cable has been relocated.
- A programme of archaeological recording to be implemented during any works within the peripheries of the archaeological exclusion zone (i.e. around pylons to the east and during cable trench excavations within the south-east corner).
- An archaeological monitoring (watching brief) during ground works within sensitive areas in Fields 7 and 10, and during excavation of the swale to the west of the archaeological exclusion zone.

8.7.7 It was also agreed that the information gathered in the course of the archaeological recording carried out in the course of the investigations provides appropriate and proportionate response with regard to any remaining archaeological features (preservation by record), and no further mitigation is necessary.

### **Conclusion**

8.7.8 The Proposed Development at the Order Limits, if the mitigation measures identified are implemented, is considered acceptable and there would be no adverse significant residual effects. There would be no harm to the heritage assets in the vicinity of the Order Limits and harm to archaeological remains within the Order Limits can be adequately mitigated by preservation in situ and preservation by record (as applicable).

8.7.9 **Table 8.4** provides a summary of effects, mitigation and residual effects.

## **8.8 REFERENCES**

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation, [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GFieldevaluation\\_1.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GFieldevaluation_1.pdf)

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey, [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics\\_2.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics_2.pdf)

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Watching Brief, [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GWatchingbrief\\_2.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GWatchingbrief_2.pdf)

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2020) Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment, [http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA\\_3.pdf](http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA_3.pdf)

English Heritage (2008) Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment, English Heritage

---

European Archaeological Council (2016) EAC Guidelines for the Use of Geophysics in Archaeology, EAC Guidelines 2

Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking

Historic England (2017) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second Edition)

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2019) National Planning Policy Framework

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2019) NPPF Planning Practice Guidance: Historic Environment

North Lincolnshire Local Plan <http://www.northlincs.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/planning-policy/local-plan/north-lincolnshire-local-plan/#>

North Lincolnshire Local Development Framework – Core Strategy (adopted June 2011), <http://www.planning.northlincs.gov.uk/planningreports/corestrategy/adopteddpd/FullCoreStrategy.pdf>

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Act of UK Parliament

## **8.9 GLOSSARY**

- **Archaeological interest:** There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially may hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.
- **Conservation (for heritage policy):** The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.
- **Designated heritage asset:** A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.
- **Heritage asset:** A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets, assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing) and those identified through the planning process.
- **Historic environment:** All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.
- **Historic environment record:** Information services that seek to provide access to comprehensive and dynamic resources relating to the historic environment of a defined geographic area for public benefit and use.
- **Setting of a heritage asset:** The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

---

- **Significance (for heritage policy):** The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.
- **Watching brief:** A formal programme of observation and investigation conducted during any operational phase carried out for non-archaeological reasons. This will be within a specific area or site on land, inter-tidal zone or underwater, whether there is the possibility that archaeological deposits may be disturbed or destroyed.

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**Table 8.4: Summary of Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects.**

<b>Receptor / Receiving Environment</b>	<b>Description of Effect</b>	<b>Nature of Effect *</b>	<b>Sensitivity Value **</b>	<b>Magnitude of Effect **</b>	<b>Geographical Importance ***</b>	<b>Significance of Effects ****</b>	<b>Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</b>	<b>Residual Effects *****</b>
<b>Construction</b>								
Non-designated heritage asset: Gokewell Priory	Direct	Permanent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	County or National (depending on below-ground remains)	Major adverse	Mitigation by design – exclusion zone ensuring no physical effects from installation of solar array	Negligible (no adverse effect)
Non-designated heritage asset: ring ditch (recorded in evaluation)	Direct	Permanent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	County	Major adverse	Mitigation by design – no-dig zone ensuring no physical effect	Negligible (no adverse effect)
Non-designated heritage asset: ring ditch (cropmark)	Direct	Permanent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	County	Major adverse	Mitigation by design – relocation of new access track to avoid the potential sensitive area	Negligible (no adverse effect)
Non-designated heritage asset: potential remains associated	Direct	Permanent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	County	Major adverse	Preservation by record of remains affected by groundworks within peripheries of the archaeological	Minor Adverse (no significant effect)

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

with Gokewell Priory							exclusion zone (pylon, cable trench, ecological enhancements, adjacent areas of Field 10 and swale excavation) – archaeological recording and monitoring	
Non-designated heritage assets: IA ditch area in Field 10	Direct	Permanent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Local	Major adverse	Preservation by record – archaeological monitoring and recording during groundworks (cable trench excavation)	Minor Adverse (no significant effect)
Non-designated heritage assets: undated enclosure in Field 7	Direct	Permanent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Local	Major adverse	Preservation by record – archaeological monitoring and recording during groundworks affecting the enclosure and its interior (cable trench, access track and transformer station base excavations)	Minor Adverse (no significant effect)
Non-designated	Direct	Permanent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Local	Major adverse	Preservation by record	Minor Adverse

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT  
MAIN STATEMENT**

**CULTURAL HERITAGE**

heritage assets: additional archaeological remains							(undertaken during archaeological investigations to date)	(no significant effect)
<b>Operation</b>								
Raventhorpe medieval settlement	In-direct	Temporary	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	National	None	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Listed Buildings within 2km	In-direct	Temporary	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	National	None	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Gokewell Priory	In-direct	Temporary	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	County or National (depending on below-ground remains)	Minor adverse	Promote site history in local area Provide interpretations boards/exhibitions	Negligible
<b>De-Commissioning</b>								
Not Applicable								
<b>Cumulative and In-combination</b>								
Not Applicable								

