

West Burton ExA Qs1 Deadline 3 Historic England responses in *italics*.

1.7.1	Applicant/ Historic England/Local Authorities	<p><b>Study Area Selection</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant please explain with greater clarity the approach to and justification for the selection of study areas set out in the ES Chapter 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-051] , noting that 2km has been used for non-designated heritage assets and 5km for designated heritage assets. Have these study areas been agreed with Historic England and the Local Authorities?</p>
		<p><i>Historic England are content with our usual caveat as regards fixed radii; that professional judgement (and a degree of flexibility as regards selection) still needs to be applied to the consideration of specific impacts upon assets on the basis of an understanding of their particular significance, importance and sensitivity.</i></p>
1.7.5	Applicant/ Historic England	<p><b>Stow Park medieval bishops place and deer park</b></p> <p>The Heritage Statement at ES Appendix 13.5 [APP-117] sets out at 3.3.41 that a conclusion of less than substantial harm (at the upper end) is based on the use of shorter fixed panels and the reversibility to the current baseline (in 40 years). The ES Ch 13 [APP-051] para 13.7.39 refers to such panels being c.2m in height (noting that fixed panels of 3.5m in height are referred to elsewhere in the ES). Can the Applicant please provide greater clarity on the implications of this mitigation measure for the wider scheme. Is this a realistic prospect? Have any other mitigations measures been considered?</p>
		<p><i>Historic England notes c2m panels might be a little less prominent than those at c3.5m but do not see that as providing a tipping point from the substantial harm we identify in respect of the proposed scheme. At either height the scheme as set out would cause substantial harm through loss to its largely agrarian character as a former deer park and its legibility.</i></p>
1.7.7	Applicant	<p>Stow Park medieval bishops place and deer park Can the Applicant please clarify where a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis is undertaken of the Proposed Development in relation to the Stow Park medieval bishops place and deer park.</p>
		<p><i>The 'work' at Stow Park which the Secretary of State was able to designate under S1 of the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act comprised the park pale (bank and ditch) and the moated palace, these features comprise the scheduled monument. The open ground enclosed within the pale – the deer park - was not regarded as a work under the Act, hence only the moated palace and surviving sections of the park pale being designated as scheduled areas. The whole park, however, should be regarded as the primary heritage asset including the palace, pale and enclosed park as a private space cut out of the medieval landscape for the enjoyment of the Bishop and his guests. The enclosed space is intrinsic to the significance of the scheduled monument. Given that it is proposed to install solar array inside the park it will evidently be visible in a way which directly impacts upon the significance of the scheduled monument through loss to its largely agrarian character as a former deer park and its legibility. ZTV analysis would be useful to assess the effectiveness of a revised scheme which deleted panels from within the park.</i></p>

1.7.11	Applicant and Historic England	<p>Roman Villa at Scampton: Cumulative impacts The Potential for up to moderate adverse cumulative impacts with Cottam at Roman Villa west of Scampton (NHLE 1005041) are referred to in the Joint Report in Interrelationships [REP1-057], depending upon the effectiveness of the landscape mitigation. The Heritage Statement [APP-117] at 3.2.14 notes the ‘sweeping view west across the Trent Valley’ from this location, also the Cumulative Developments Augmented ZTV [APP-272] illustrates that all four solar developments would be visible from this location. The Heritage Statement notes a slight adverse effect on significance at 3.3.15, presumably based on the effect of the West Burton Proposed Development alone. However, at 3.3.16 reference is made to fact that as the development would prevent any further developments from occurring within the Order Limits (e.g., for residential development) during the operational period, there is the potential for the Scheme in the longer term to have a beneficial effect on the settings of heritage assets. The Applicant is therefore asked to please explain the implications of these differential assessments. Historic England is invited to comment on both the assessments undertaken and their outcomes.</p>
		<p><i>Setting impacts upon Scampton Roman Villa from the present scheme and cumulatively with other NSIP solar proposals currently under examination are suggested by the ZTV. These impacts would derive from change to the landscape character extending west to the Trent. Harm to the monument’s significance would derive from loss to the agrarian character and legibility of that landscape as historic landscape context to the Villa. The assessment in the Joint Report in Interrelationships [REP1-057] appears reasonable. The experience of this landscape as setting forms parts of the general large-scale cumulative landscape effects in the delivery of renewable energy generation with proportionate public benefits, a matter in which we defer to the ExA. We would not give weight to any potential effect of the present proposals in excluding as yet un-drawn developments which might otherwise be brought forwards (to be assessed on their own merits).</i></p>

Tim Allen MA FSA

Team Leader (Development Advice)

Midlands Region

Historic England

The Foundry, 82 Granville Street, Birmingham B1 2LH

<http://www.historicengland.org.uk/> | [REDACTED]