

West Burton Solar Project

Draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic England

Prepared by: Lanpro Services
July 2023

PINS reference: EN010132
Document reference: EX1/WB8.3.3

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010



Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT	3
1.2	PARTIES TO THIS STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND	3
1.3	TERMINOLOGY	3
2	RECORD OF ENGAGEMENT	4
2.1	SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION	4
3	MATTERS AGREED	10
3.1	MATTERS AGREED	10
4	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION	11
4.1	MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION	11
5	MATTERS NOT AGREED	16
6	SIGNATORIES	17

Issue Sheet

Report Prepared for: West Burton Solar Project Ltd.
Pre-Examination

Statement of Common Ground Historic England

Prepared by:

Name: Alice James BA (hons) MSc MCifA and
Tristan Wilson BA (hons) MA

Title: Principle and Senior Historic Environment
Consultants

Approved by:

Signature: 

Name: Mitchell Pollington BA (hons) MA MCifA FS,

Title: Director (Historic Environment)

Revision	Date	Prepared by:	Approved by:
0	July 2023	AJ / TW	

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared as part of the proposed West Burton Solar Project Development Consent Order (the Application) made by West Burton Solar Project Ltd (The Applicant) to the Secretary of State for Energy Security & Net Zero (the Secretary of State) pursuant to the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008).
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties, and where agreement has not yet been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the DCO consenting process of allowing all parties to identify and focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) West Burton Solar Project Ltd. as the Applicant and (2) Historic England (HE).
- 1.2.2 Collectively, West Burton Solar Project Ltd and HE are referred to as ‘the parties’.

1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the tables in **Sections 3 - 5** of this SoCG:
- “Agreed” indicates where the issue has been resolved.
 - “Not Agreed” indicates a final position, and
 - “Under discussion” indicates where these points will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.

2 Record of Engagement

2.1 Summary of Consultation

2.1.1 The parties have been engaged in consultation since November 2021. A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between West Burton Solar Project and HE in relation to the Application is detailed in **6.2.13 Environmental Statement - Chapter 13_Cultural Heritage [APP-051]**. outlined in **Table 2.1**.

Table 2.1: Record of Engagement

Date	Form of Correspondence	Key Topics Discussed and Key Outcomes
29.11.2021	Online meeting with Historic England (HE) and the Applicant.	Initiation meeting to brief Historic England on the scope of the Scheme, assessment approach and potential archaeological survey, evaluation and mitigation strategies. Historic England highlighted need to avoid impacts to designated heritage assets.
25.02.2022	Historic England (HE) Scoping Opinion	No issues raised with the iterative approach proposed to assess the archaeological potential of land within the Scheme. HE looked forward to continued discussion regarding the setting effects on heritage assets and direct impacts on archaeological remains. <i>HE "Welcomed the early inclusion of a palette of mounting techniques to allow for the avoidance of some physical impacts upon buried remains."</i> HE noted that the Scheme involved significant cable infrastructure. HE stated <i>"the significance / character / importance of assets on these cable routes will need to be well understood from an early stage such that route options can effectively be weighed and risks managed."</i> HE noted that the Scheme should look to find opportunities to reduce harm. Appropriate timeframes should be given to field evaluation, and any areas of heightened risk (i.e. burials, wet deposits and former water courses) should be given early attention.

		<p>The following designated heritage sites and their setting were highlighted as being of particular interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broxholme medieval settlement and cultivation remains (1016797) • Deserted village of North Ingleby (1003570) • The medieval bishop's palace and deer park, Stow Park (1019229)
13.05.2022	Site Visit with Historic England (HE) and the Applicant	<p>Site visit to West Burton 1, 2 and 3 to initially assess the Stow Park, Ingleby, Broxholme Scheduled Monuments.</p> <p>HE confirmed that they would have no objection to the generality of proposals within West Burton 1 and 2. HE appreciated that design proposals were sympathetic to the setting of Ingleby DMV through the removal of panels in fields adjacent to the Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>In regards to West Burton 3, HE stated that it was minded to object to any development within the historical area of Stow Park, which they viewed had potential to change the setting of 'The medieval bishop's palace and deer park' (1019229)'. </p>
25.05.2022	Online meeting with Historic England's Science Advisor and the Applicant	<p>No objections were raised to the proposed methodology for evaluation works.</p> <p>Historic England's Science Advisor was happy with the baseline information that was being collated and being used to inform the location of evaluation trial trenches. They were pleased that palaeoarchaeology was being considered for the Scheme.</p> <p>HE advised that archaeological works should be considered as part of other ground investigations i.e. archaeological monitoring of boreholes.</p>
27.07.2022	Section 42 Consultation	<p>HE noted <i>"the necessity of geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching to inform a proportionate approach to the significance of below ground heritage assets and their individual sensitivity and importance"</i>. HE referred the Applicant to LHPT to agree the scope of works.</p>

		<p>HE stated that the landscape adjacent to the Trent is considered to contain a complex archaeological landscape. HE recommended that combined cable route option be explored that combines the Cottam, Gate Burton and West Burton Schemes.</p> <p>HE welcomed <i>“a dynamic approach to setting assessment which is not overly constrained fixed radii”</i> and highlighted the designated sites identified during in the scoping opinion (25.02.2022).</p> <p>With reference to the site visit with the Applicant on 13.05.2022, HE stated <i>“With regard to impacts upon those specific assets Historic England would have no objection to the proposals within West Burton 1 and 2 and noted that the design proposals at West Burton 2 had taken into account the setting of the Ingleby Scheduled Monument, by removing areas adjacent to the Scheduled Monument from any proposed development. On the basis of the indicative layout plans for panels with the pale of Stow Park we are as noted in the PEIR minded to object to installation of any part of the development within the former deer park (as defined by the lines of the scheduled Park Pale and its former course). Our concerns are focussed upon setting impacts upon the significance of the medieval bishop’s palace and deer park SM 1019229 and we consider that the proposed sections of solar array sited within the medieval deer park at Stow would constitute substantial harm to the significance of the scheduled monument. That part of the Scheme within the historic extent of Stow Park should we suggest be deleted prior to submission as it presents avoidable and unjustified harm to the significance of a nationally important designated heritage asset.”</i></p>
07.06.2023	Historic England (HE) West Burton Relevant Representations (Ref EN010133)	<p>HE stated that they are minded to oppose the grant of the DCO for the West Burton scheme on the basis of avoidable harm to the significance of Medieval bishop’s palace and deer park, Stow Park Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1019229). HE stated the <i>“impact of the proposed installation within the former deer park represents substantial harm (in NPS/SPPF terms) to the significance of the monument through loss of its character as a bounded architectural space. This represents a significant environmental impact (major harmful) in EIA terms.”</i></p>

		<p>HE stated <i>“the Medieval Bishop’s Palace site and deer park is set on the Roman road from Lincoln to Doncaster a key line of communication between the Episcopal sees of Lincoln and York. Deer parks and palace / lodges offered a place for retreat, rest and entertainment of social and political peers, clients and Royal guests and were hence key spaces for the performance of the elite status of Bishops in the medieval landscape. The deer park is an architectural space, a place cut out from the overlapping and complex the medieval landscape, a place where rights were monopolised - in this instance the Bishop. At the heart of the significance of a medieval deer park is not just the functional containment and protection of deer and other resources but also their articulation as a space apart – a space imparked. This central aspect of significance would be profoundly compromised by the loss both of its rural character through the installation of panels and by it being subsumed into a new landscape of solar generation. The railway and associate ex MOD petroleum storage facility represented significant change to the former deer park by bisecting the site, but they have not fundamentally compromised the ability to experience the park as a space defined in the landscape. As one walks from the moated site at the north to the raised ground occupied by the farm buildings at the south of the park and then crosses the railway past the fuel depot to the farmstead and the south western part of the park one can still gain a sense of this as a bounded space.”</i></p> <p>As previously identified during a site visit on the 13.05.2023, HE <i>“would have no objection to the proposals within West Burton 1 and 2 and noted that the design proposals at West Burton 2 had taken into account the setting of the Ingleby Scheduled Monument, by removing areas adjacent to the Scheduled Monument from any proposed development.”</i></p> <p>In regard to buried archaeological remains HE commented that <i>“it is important that risk of avoidable / unmitigated damage to sensitive remains is well managed in proportion to their importance. This can be achieved through layout, deployment of green space and construction options for cabling and panel mounting etc.”</i></p> <p>HE stated that <i>“archaeological risks can thus be well addressed, but only if there is a sound understanding of where archaeological sensitivity and importance lies across the</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>site</i>". HE believes a sufficient field evaluation is vital as some features considered to be of a high importance (i.e. early medieval burial ground or high-status Roman buildings), will have a high sensitivity to the insertion panel mounting piles.</p> <p>HE acknowledges <i>"discussion is continuing as regards the extent of archaeological evaluation and deployment of intrusive and non-intrusive techniques, the reliance upon / complimentary nature of such techniques, and the timing there-of; all in the context of concerns around the management of archaeological and project risk."</i></p> <p>HE defers the Applicant to local authority archaeological advisors (LHPT) to agree a sufficient level of evaluation work, written schemes of investigation and an overall archaeological strategy secured through DCO submission.</p> <p>HE welcomes a combined cable connection corridor with other local Solar NSIPs, as this has the potential to minimise cumulative impacts in archaeologically sensitive areas.</p>
17.08.2023	Phone call / Email exchange between Historic England (HE) and the Applicant.	<p>Conversation to ascertain the contents that would be itemised in the Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>HE confirmed that they don't certify the quality of work done in the ES Chapter, as this is for the applicant to demonstrate to The Planning Inspectorate. Consequently they are unable to agree to any items detailed within the SoCG that relate to scope or quality of works undertaken as part of the ES assessment.</p> <p>Historic England and the Applicant identified that there was one item currently under discussion: Medieval bishop's palace and deer park, Stow Park Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1019229).</p> <p>HE stated that any matters relating to evaluation trial trenching should be discussed with the County Archaeologists.</p>

29.08.2023	Email from Historic England (HE) to the Applicant.	Comments on the first draft of the Statement of Common Ground. HE requested more balance between the space afforded to HE's Position and that of the Applicant and provided revised statement for Topic HE-02 in Table 4.1
------------	--	--

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between (1) West Burton Solar Project Ltd. and (2) Historic England in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

3 Matters Agreed

Tables 3.1 below detail by topic the matters agreed with Historic England (HE).

3.1 Matters Agreed

Table 3.1

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Agreed
HE-01 Approach to safeguarding designated heritage assets	Assessment and mitigation of designated heritage assets	<p>The assessment of designated heritage assets within the Heritage Statement (6.3.13.5 Environmental Statement - Appendix 13.5 Heritage Statement [APP-117 to APP-119]), which was used to inform 6.2.13 Environmental Statement - Chapter 13_Cultural Heritage [APP-051] is considered proportionate.</p> <p>Setting issues are considered appropriately mitigated for all designated heritage assets, excluding the Medieval Bishop’s Palace and Deer Park, Stow Park Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1019229) – see matters under discussion (Table 3.2).</p>

4 Matters Under Discussion

Tables 4.1 below detail by topic the matters under discussion with Historic England (HE)

4.1 Matters Under Discussion

Table 4.1

Main Topic	Sub-topic	Details of Matters Under Discussion
HE-02 Approach to safeguarding designated heritage assets	Scheduled Monument: Medieval Bishop's Palace and Deer Park, Stow Park (NHLE 1019229)	<p>HE considers that the impact of the Scheme on land within the former deer park as defined by Medieval bishop's palace and deer park, Stow Park Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1019229) would cause substantial harm (in NPS/NPPF terms) / significant environmental impact (major harmful; in EIA terms) to the significance of the monument through loss of its character as a bounded architectural space. Consequently HE <i>"object to installation of any part of the development within the former deer park (as defined by the lines of the scheduled Park Pale and its former course)."</i></p> <p>Historic England stated in their relevant representation that <i>"the impact of the proposed installation within the former deer park represents substantial harm (in NPS/SPPF terms) to the significance of the monument through loss of its character as a bounded architectural space."</i> Historic England believes that <i>"this represents a significant environmental impact (major harmful) in EIA terms."</i> As detailed in their Relevant Representations <i>"The Medieval Bishop's Palace site and deer park is set on the Roman road from Lincoln to Doncaster a key line of communication between the Episcopal sees of Lincoln and York. Deer parks and palace / lodges offered a place for retreat, rest and entertainment of social and political peers, clients and Royal guests and were hence key spaces for the performance of the elite status of Bishops in the medieval landscape. The deer park is an architectural space, a place cut out from the overlapping and complex medieval landscape, a place where rights were monopolised - in this instance [by] the Bishop. At the heart of the significance of a medieval deer park is not just the functional containment and protection of deer and other resources but also their articulation as a space apart - a space imparked. This central aspect of significance would be profoundly compromised by the loss both of its rural character through the installation of panels and by it being subsumed into a new landscape of solar generation. The railway and associate ex MOD petroleum storage facility represented significant change to the former deer</i></p>

		<p><i>park by bisecting the site, but they have not fundamentally compromised the ability to experience the park as a space defined in the landscape. As one walks from the moated site at the north to the raised ground occupied by the farm buildings at the south of the park and then crosses the railway past the fuel depot to the farmstead and the south western part of the park one can still gain a sense of this as a bounded space.”</i></p> <p>HE added (email of 29/08/2023) that: <i>“The scheduled monument is experienced kinetically as one moves through and reconstructs the deer park, for instance from the moated palace site at the north on the Roman Tillbridge Lane to the slightly raised ground within the centre of the park at the present farmstead where the railway is bridged. Crossing the railway at the farmhouse to find the park pale and ‘west lawn’ one heads south and exits onto the Torksey – Brandsby Road turning east and encountering the pale again at the park’s south-east corner enclosing the ‘east lawn’. The ability to thereby reassemble the park would be substantially compromised by the insertion of panels filling up its interior space. The north – south striated topography suggests (by analogy with sites such as Ravensdale Medieval Deer Park – Derbs.) that the moated site was set in a structured landscape of deer coursing (with hounds set to a deer as a spectacle), the stagger in the western boundary may also be associated as at Ravensdale with deer herding. The Ordnance Survey 1” 1824 mapping, before the railway, marks the moated site as ‘Stow Park’ whilst the present farm is an unlabelled group of buildings set on a north-south track then running the length of the park (now surviving south of the present farmstead). A further building now lost is shown on the southern boundary, these sites within the park may have their origins in ancillary buildings such as a park keeper’s house or kennels. One can still experience the deer park as an enclosed historic space for acting out social status; bounded to protect the rights and dignity of its owner. At the same time one is forced to engage with those historic processes whereby bishops’ estates were dispersed and deer hunting abandoned as a forum for elite discourse. These post-medieval changes including arable cultivation and the railway are part of the significance of the monument, rather than something separate from an essential medieval identity. Significance therefore is [diachronic] concerned with the history and evolution of the monument as a landscape rather than [synchronic] confined to certain particular points in time. Infill with panels would inhibit the monument’s legibility and conceal its character.”</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p>The Medieval bishop’s palace and deer park, Stow Park Scheduled Monument (1019229) is composed of three physically separate elements. These are the former medieval deer park; the site of a moated Bishop’s Palace, the west section of park pale and the east section of park pale. Although the Applicant acknowledges HE’s view that the deer park forms an architectural space and that there is an associated historical spatial relationship between the three sections of the Scheduled Monument, the Applicant believes that the various Scheduled areas can only be experienced individually. Post-medieval and modern interventions have significantly altered the character of the former medieval park preventing it from being experienced as a continuous enclosed space. Additionally, the sense of a space imparked, is not clearly appreciable with the current land use within and without the space both being agricultural. Consequently the surviving vestiges of the deer park are not experienced collectively within the modern landscape, and it is difficult to reconstruct and get a sense of an imparked high status medieval space, without the aid of aerial imagery or historical documentation.</p> <p>As stated in Paragraph 3.3.34 of the Heritage Statement (6.3.13.5 Environmental Statement - Appendix 13.5 Heritage Statement [APP-117 to APP-119]), the Applicant acknowledges that the Scheme has the potential to physically and visually isolate the three Scheduled areas that make up the medieval bishop’s palace and deer park Scheduled Monument. However, as identified in Paragraph 3.3.35 of the Heritage Statement [APP-117 to APP-119], the Applicant believes that the relationship between the three surviving components of the deer park has already been adversely compromised. Modern activity including the ex MOD petroleum storage facility and a railway line completely bisect the deer park, resulting in there being no intervisibility between the west park pale, and the Bishop’s Palace and east park pale. While intervisibility exists between the Bishop’s Palace and the east park pale, their historical relationship can only be experienced through the fossilisation of the parkland boundary by later mature trees and hedgerow. Conversely although this intervisibility exists, the Applicant highlights that the overall legibility of the northern section of the deer park is problematic. Desk-based research has demonstrated that there are several possibilities for the locations of the pales in the north of the deer park, which would have each joined the east and west park pales to the Bishop’s Palace (Paragraphs 3.2.27-3.2.48 [APP-117 to APP-119]). Consequently, the Applicant believes that Scheme would cause less than substantial harm (at the upper end) to the designated heritage</p>
--	--	---

		<p>assets and that use of fixed shorter panels, as incorporated into the design of the Scheme, is sufficient mitigation (Paragraph 3.4.9 [APP-117 to APP-119]).</p> <p>The applicant does not feel that all of the post-medieval changes to the deer park identified contribute positively to the significance of the scheduled monument. Although, it is agreed that the MOD petroleum site and the railway form elements of the post-medieval narrative of the scheduled monument and therefore make a contribution to its significance, the asset derives the majority of its significance from its historic interest as an enclosed medieval space. As such, the MOD petroleum site and railway, which bisects the scheduled monument, have a detrimental effect on the ability to appreciate the asset's enclosed medieval character and consequently a detrimental effect on the significance the deer park derives from its historical interest as an enclosed medieval space.</p> <p>With regard to the land within the deer park that provides the setting to the three sections of Scheduled Monument, Paragraphs 3.3.35 and 3.3.36 of the Heritage Statement ([APP-117 to APP-119]) highlight the negative affect that has been caused by post-medieval and early modern agricultural activity. Land within the deer park has been transformed from a compartmentalised parkland containing areas of managed woodland and grassland to a landscape characterised by enclosed fields used for agricultural purposes. The character and appearance of the land within the historical boundaries of the deer park is indistinguishable from the agricultural land outside of its boundaries and does not contribute to the understanding or appreciation of its former medieval deer park function. The site of the Bishop's Palace presently contains the derelict remains of Moat Farm. Consequently, the general character of the landscape within the former deer park relates to a post-medieval or later landscape and fails to embody a sense of the earlier medieval deer park.</p> <p>The Applicant also highlights the temporary (and thus, reversible) nature of the scheme, and that existing landscape features will remain in situ. This means that following decommissioning, any impact to the setting (or ability to appreciate it) of the Scheduled Monument caused by the proposed Scheme will be reversed as the land is reverted back to its current, modern function.</p> <p>These matters remain under discussion.</p>
--	--	---

5 Matters Not Agreed

5.1.1 There are no matters “not agreed” with Historic England.

6 Signatories

6.1.1 The above SoCG is agreed between West Burton Solar Project Ltd. (the Applicant) and Historic England (HE) as specified below.

Duly authorised for and on behalf of **West Burton Solar Project Ltd.**

Name:	
Job Title:	
Date:	
Signature:	

Duly authorised for and on behalf of **Historic England (HE)**

Name:	
Job Title:	
Date:	
Signature:	