



HELIOS RENEWABLE
ENERGY
PROJECT

PINS Document Number:
EN010140/APP/6.1.6

Pursuant to:
APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Environmental Statement Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage

June 2024

6. Cultural Heritage

6.1. Introduction

6.1.1. This chapter of the Environmental Statement reports on the assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development with respect to cultural heritage.

6.1.2. This chapter is supported by **Figure 6.1 Heritage Assets Considered within the ES [EN010140/APP/REF/6.2.6.1]**.

6.1.3. This chapter is supported by the following Appendices:

- **Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Technical Appendix [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.1];**
- **Appendix 6.2 Archaeological Mitigation Strategy ('AMS') [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.2];**
- **Appendix 6.3 Archaeological Services West Yorkshire Archaeological Service (ASWYAS) Geophysical Survey [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.3];**
- **Appendix 6.4 Consultation Correspondence from the North Yorkshire Council Conservation Officer (19th May 2023) [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.4];**
- **Appendix 6.5 Consultation Correspondence from the North Yorkshire Council Principal Archaeologist (18th July 2022) [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.5];**
- **Appendix 6.6 Consultation Correspondence from the North Yorkshire Council Principal Archaeologist (31st March 2023) [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.6]; and**
- **Appendix 6.7 Consultation Correspondence from the North Yorkshire Council Principal Archaeologist (31st May 2023) [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.7].**

6.2. Planning Policy Context

Legislation

6.2.1. Legislation relating to cultural heritage assets and of relevance to this assessment

comprises:

- Planning Act 2008;
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; and
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.

National Planning Policy

6.2.2. National planning policy that has been considered comprises the following National Policy Statement's (NPS) designated in 17 January 2024 and the NPPF:

- NPS EN-1 Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (November 2023)¹;
- 'NPS EN-3 Renewable Energy Infrastructure (November 2023)²;
- NPS EN-5 Electricity Networks Infrastructure (November 2023)³; and
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2023)⁴.

6.2.3. The relevant text from each NPS and the NPPF is presented below.

NPS EN-1

6.2.4. NPS EN-1 discusses heritage at section 5.9. Relevant sections of this NPS EN-1 comprise:

'5.9.27 When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should give great weight to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss, or less than substantial harm to its significance.

5.9.28 The Secretary of State should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving all heritage assets. Any harm or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or

¹Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65bbfdbc709fe1000f637052/overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf> Accessed February 2024

² Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a7889996a5ec000d731aba/nps-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en3.pdf> Accessed February 2024

³ Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a78a5496a5ec000d731abb/nps-electricity-networks-infrastructure-en5.pdf> Accessed February 2024

⁴ MHCLG, 2023. *National Planning Policy Framework*.

destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.

5.9.29 Substantial harm to or loss of significance of a grade II Listed Building or a grade II Registered Park or Garden should be exceptional.

5.9.30 Substantial harm to or loss of significance of assets of the highest significance, including 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, should be wholly exceptional.*

...

5.9.32 Where the proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.

5.9.33 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.

...

5.9.36 When considering applications for development affecting the setting of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should give appropriate weight to the desirability of preserving the setting such assets and treat favourably applications that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to, or better reveal the significance of, the asset. When considering applications that do not do this, the Secretary of State should give great weight to any negative effects, when weighing them against the wider benefits of the application. The greater the negative impact on the significance of the designated heritage asset, the greater the benefits that will be needed to justify approval'.

6.2.5. An important addition to the NPS EN-1 version of November 2023 was the discussion

of the Government commitment to fully decarbonizing the power system by 2035 to underpin net zero ambitions. As part of this and to help achieve these targets, the Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority ('CNP') for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure⁵. The implications of this CNP are set out in the paragraphs below:

4.2.15 Where residual non-HRA or non-MCZ impacts remain after the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, these residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure. Therefore, in all but the most exceptional circumstances, it is unlikely that consent will be refused on the basis of these residual impacts. The exception to this presumption of consent are residual impacts onshore and offshore which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference with, human health and public safety, defence, irreplaceable habitats or unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero. Further, the same exception applies to this presumption for residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference offshore to navigation, or onshore to flood and coastal erosion risk.

4.2.16 As a result, the Secretary of State will take as the starting point for decision-making that such infrastructure is to be treated as if it has met any tests which are set out within the NPSs, or any other planning policy, which requires a clear outweighing of harm, exceptionality or very special circumstances.

4.2.17 This means that the Secretary of State will take as a starting point that CNP Infrastructure will meet the following, non-exhaustive, list of tests:

- where development within a Green Belt requires very special circumstances to justify development;*
- where development within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) requires the benefits (including need) of the development in the location proposed to clearly outweigh both the likely impact on features of the site that make it a SSSI, and any broader impacts on the national network*

⁵ Para. 4.2.4 Overarching NPS for Energy EN-1 <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65bbfbc709fe1000f637052/overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf> Accessed February 2024

of SSSIs.

- *where development in nationally designated landscapes requires exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated; and*
- *where substantial harm to or loss of significance to heritage assets should be exceptional or wholly exceptional. “ (Authors emphasis)*

6.2.6. Therefore, when considering any residual harm (or adverse effects) identified within this ES chapter, by virtue of the fact the Proposed Development is a CNP, the starting point for decision-making shall be that these harms (or adverse effects) are outweighed and the Proposed Development has met the tests of NPS EN-3 and any other policy requiring a clear outweighing of harm.

NPS EN-3

6.2.7. The NPS EN-3 includes a provision for the consideration of solar schemes which propose a generating capacity above a threshold of more than 50MW. Of relevance to the Proposed Development, and its temporary nature, the NPS EN-3 sets out at a series of technical considerations for the Secretary of State ('SoS') to take into account in the decision-making process. Paragraphs 2.10.147 – 2.10.151 are of relevance along with paragraph 2.10.160:

2.10.147 Where the consent for a solar farm is to be time-limited, the DCO should impose a requirement setting that time-limit from the date the solar farm starts to generate electricity.

...

2.10.149 An upper limit of 40 years is typical, although applicants may seek consent without a time period or for differing time-periods for operation.

2.10.150 The time limited nature of the solar farm, where a time limit is sought as a condition of consent, is likely to be an important consideration for the Secretary of State.

2.10.151 The Secretary of State should consider the period of time the applicant is seeking to operate the generating station as well as the extent to which the site will return to its original state when assessing impacts such

as landscape and visual effects and potential effects on the settings of heritage assets and nationally designated landscapes.'

2.10.160 Solar farms are generally consented on the basis that they will be time-limited in operation. The Secretary of State should therefore consider the length of time for which consent is sought when considering the impacts of any indirect effect on the historic environment, such as effects on the setting of designated heritage assets.'

6.2.8. Specific considerations relating to heritage are set out at paragraphs 2.10.107 onwards which state:

'2.10.107 The impacts of solar PV developments on the historic environment will require expert assessment in most cases and may have effect both above and below ground.

2.10.108 Above ground impacts may include the effects on the setting of Listed Buildings and other designated heritage assets as well as on Historic Landscape Character.

2.10.109 Below ground impacts, although generally limited, may include direct impacts on archaeological deposits through ground disturbance associated with trenching, cabling, foundations, fencing, temporary haul routes etc.

2.10.110 Equally solar PV developments may have a positive effect, for example archaeological assets may be protected by a solar PV farm as the site is removed from regular ploughing and shoes or low-level piling is stipulated.

2.10.111 Generic historic environment impacts are covered in Section 5.9 of EN-1.

2.10.112 Applicant assessments should be informed by information from Historic Environment Records (HERs)⁸⁷ or the local authority.

2.10.113 Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to, include heritage assets with archaeological interest, the applicant should submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where

necessary, a field evaluation. These should be carried out, using expertise where necessary and in consultation with the local planning authority, and should identify archaeological study areas and propose appropriate schemes of investigation, and design measures, to ensure the protection of relevant heritage assets.

2.10.114 In some instances, field studies may include investigative work (and may include trial trenching beyond the boundary of the proposed site) to assess the impacts of any ground disturbance, such as proposed cabling, substation foundations or mounting supports for solar panels on archaeological assets.

2.10.115 The extent of investigative work should be proportionate to the sensitivity of, and extent of proposed ground disturbance in, the associated study area.

2.10.116 Applicants should take account of the results of historic environment assessments in their design proposal.

2.10.117 Applicants should consider what steps can be taken to ensure heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including the impact of proposals on views important to their setting.

2.10.118 As the significance of a heritage asset derives not only from its physical presence but also from its setting, careful consideration should be given to the impact of large-scale solar farms which depending on their scale, design and prominence, may cause substantial harm to the significance of the asset.

2.10.119 Applicants may need to include visualisations to demonstrate the effects of a proposed solar farm on the setting of heritage assets.

...

2.10.137 The ability of the applicants to microsite specific elements of the proposed development during the construction phase should be an important consideration by the Secretary of State when assessing the risk of damage to archaeology.

2.10.138 Where requested by the applicant, the Secretary of State should consider granting consents which allow for the micrositing within a specified tolerance of elements of the permitted infrastructure, so that precise locations can be amended during the construction phase if unforeseen circumstances, such as the discovery of previously unknown archaeology, arise.”

NPS EN-5

- 6.2.9. There is no specific discussion of heritage within NPS EN-5. There are references to heritage assets within the document in relation to the consideration of the siting of substations where the NPS states at footnote 21:

‘Care should be taken in relation to all historic sites with statutory protection eg Scheduled Monuments, Battlefields and Listed Buildings.’

NPPF

- 6.2.10. Heritage Assets are defined in 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).’

- 6.2.11. The NPPF goes on to define a Designated Heritage Asset as:

‘World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under relevant legislation.’

- 6.2.12. Significance is defined as:

‘The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.’

6.2.13. Section 16 of the NPPF relates to ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ and states at paragraph 201 that:

‘Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.’

6.2.14. Paragraph 203 goes on to state that:

‘In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

a. the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

b. the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

c. the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.’

6.2.15. With regard to the impact of proposals on the significance of a heritage asset, paragraphs 205 and 206 are relevant and read as follows:

‘When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.’

‘Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

a. grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;

b. assets of the highest significance, notably 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, should be wholly exceptional.'*

6.2.16. Section b) of paragraph 206, which describes assets of the highest significance, also includes footnote 72 of the NPPF, which states that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

6.2.17. In the context of the above, it should be noted that paragraph 207 states:

'Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

a. the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and

b. no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and

c. conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and

d. the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.'

6.2.18. Paragraph 208 goes on to state:

'Where a development proposal 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

6.2.19. Paragraph 213 goes on to recognise that *'not all elements of a World Heritage Site*

or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance’ and with regard to the potential harm from a proposed development states:

‘Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 200 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 201, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.’

6.2.20. With regards to non-designated heritage assets, paragraph 208 of the NPPF states that:

‘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.’

Local Planning Policy

6.2.21. In April 2023, North Yorkshire Council (‘NYC’) became the administrative authority in which the Site is located, following its creation as a unitary authority by combining several district councils, including Selby District Council (‘SDC’), the administrative area within which the Site had previously been located. The planning policy of SDC is still relevant to the Proposed Development.

6.2.22. The planning policy for SDC is contained within the Selby District Core Strategy (2013)⁶ and the saved policies of the Selby District Local Plan (2005)⁷.

6.2.23. The only saved policy of the Selby District Local Plan of relevance to the Proposed Development is Policy ENV27, which states:

‘Where scheduled monuments or other nationally important archaeological sites or their settings are affected by proposed development, there will be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. In exceptional

⁶ Available at: https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/planning_migrated/planning_policy/CS_Adoption_Ver_OCT_2013_REDUCED.pdf. Accessed June 2023

⁷ Available at: <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/planning-and-conservation/planning-policy/planning-policy-your-local-area/selby-planning-policy/selby-development-plan> Accessed June 2023

circumstances where the need for the development is clearly demonstrated, development will only be permitted where archaeological remains are preserved in situ through sympathetic layout or design of the development.'

6.2.24. The relevant policy in the Selby District Core Strategy (2013) is contained within Policy SP18 – Protecting and Enhancing the Environment, which states:

'The high quality and local distinctiveness of the natural and manmade environment will be sustained by:

1. Safeguarding and, where possible, enhancing the historic and natural environment including the landscape character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance.

2. Conserving those historic assets which contribute most to the distinct character of the District and realising the potential contribution that they can make towards economic regeneration, tourism, education and quality of life.

...'

6.2.25. Prior to the merging of the district councils to form NYC, Selby District Council were in the process of updating their Local Plan (the Selby Local Plan Publication Version 2024)⁸. Relevant policies from this emerging Plan are included below for completeness:

'Policy SG10 – Low Carbon and Renewable Energy (Strategic Policy)

A. Proposals for low carbon and renewable energy storage and generation (including hydrogen transportation networks) will be supported where:

1. Planning impacts of the development and associated infrastructure, both individually and cumulatively, are, or can be made, acceptable;

2. Appropriate weight, consideration and mitigation has been given to the following where applicable:

i.. Landscape character and sensitivity;

⁸ Available at:
<https://edemocracy.northyorks.gov.uk/documents/s28009/Appendix%201%20Revised%20Publication%20Local%20Plan%20Consultation%20Document.pdf> Accessed May 2024

ii. Designated nature conservation sites, features, functionally linked land, protected habitats and species;

iii. Designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings; ...'

6.2.26. Specifically related to heritage are policies SG12 and SG13:

'Policy SG12 – Valuing the Historic Environment (Strategic Policy)

The former Selby district area's heritage assets will be preserved and where appropriate enhanced in a manner commensurate to their significance. Developments which will help in the management, conservation, understanding and enjoyment of the District's historic environment, especially for those assets which are at risk, will be encouraged. Particular attention will be paid to the conservation of those elements which contribute most to the former Selby district area's distinctive character and sense of place. These include:

- *The archaeology and historic landscapes of the Magnesian Limestone Ridge and the Humberhead levels;*
- *The significant ritual and funerary sites and archaeological remains associated with Newton Kyme henge and Skipwith Common;*
- *The Roman heritage of the Tadcaster area;*
- *Medieval sites – particularly moated and manorial sites;*
- *The registered Battlefield at Towton and its setting;*
- *The Historic Parks and Gardens of the former Selby district area*
- *The former Selby district area's significant ecclesiastical history, as exemplified by Selby Abbey, Cawood Castle and the Bishop's Canal;*
- *The former Selby district area's strong industrial heritage, relating principally to mining and shipbuilding, in contrast with its largely rural character;*
- *The 19th Century farming heritage of the area;*

- *20th Century military remains, most notably the airfields of former RAF Riccall and RAF Church Fenton; and*
- *The designated heritage assets of the former Selby district area.*

Policy SG13: Planning Applications and the Historic Environment (Strategic Policy)

In order to preserve and/or enhance the historic environment, a development scheme will be supported which meets the following;

A. Development affecting a heritage asset should preserve, and where appropriate, enhance those elements which contribute to its significance.

B. Harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a designated heritage asset (or an archaeological site of national importance) will only be supported where this is clearly justified and outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a designated heritage asset (or an archaeological site of national importance) will be permitted only in those circumstances set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

C. Development affecting a Conservation Area should preserve and where appropriate enhance those elements which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area, including its setting, and should be in accordance with the guidance set out in adopted Conservation Area Appraisals.

D. Development which would remove, harm, or undermine the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will only be permitted where the benefits are considered sufficient to outweigh the harm, having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the asset.

E. Proposals for the sympathetic re-use of vacant and “at risk” buildings will be supported where they prevent further deterioration of the buildings condition, maintain, or enhance their significance, and support their long-term conservation.

F. Any applications which impact the historic environment must be accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment undertaken by suitably qualified expertise and a Heritage Statement which demonstrates how the scheme has incorporated any recommended mitigation measures.

G. Where there is potential for archaeological remains, applicants will be required to undertake an archaeological field evaluation commensurate to the likelihood and/or significance of the archaeology and use the results to inform the design of the scheme accordingly.'

6.3. Assessment Methodology

Study Area

- 6.3.1. The study area utilised for this assessment is consistent with the methodology set out within the EIA Scoping Report submitted to the Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') (**Appendix 2.1 of the ES [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.2.1]**) and PINS' adopted EIA Scoping Opinion (**Appendix 2.2 of the ES [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.2.2]**). The study area for designated heritage assets (comprising listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, world heritage sites) utilised a 3km area from the Site boundary. For searches of the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record ('NYHER') and the National Record of the Historic Environment ('NRHE') to identify heritage assets, non-designated heritage assets and other records, a search area of 1km from the Site boundary was utilised.
- 6.3.2. A Zone of Theoretical Visibility ('ZTV') has been prepared for the Proposed Development (further details are provided in **Chapter 7 Landscape and Views of the ES [EN010140/APP/REF/6.1.7]**); given the extent of the study area which has potential visibility of the Proposed Development, only a very limited number of assets are located outside of the ZTV. Therefore, no assets have been excluded from the assessment using the ZTV and all have been given some level of consideration in the assessment process.

Terminology

- 6.3.3. Within this ES chapter, the terms '*heritage asset*', '*designated heritage asset*' and '*setting*' are utilised. These are defined in the glossary of the NPPF (with these

definitions carried across for the purposes of the NPSs) in Annex 2⁹ as the following:

- *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. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing);*
- *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; and*
- *Setting - 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.*

6.3.4. The Planning Practice Guidance provides a description of ‘*non-designated heritage assets*’ at paragraph 039¹⁰. This sets out that:

“Non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified by plan-making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets.”

6.3.5. Further to this, non-designated assets are described in NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.9.7 as also being capable of identification through ‘*the application, examination and decision making process...on the basis of clear evidence that such heritage assets have a significance that merits consideration in that process, even though those assets are of a lesser significance than designated assets.*’

6.3.6. The term ‘*non-designated heritage asset*’ is utilised in this chapter and the Archaeological Baseline to reference those assets identified as having a degree of heritage significance that merits consideration in this assessment process. Any assets which have been identified through the baseline survey work carried out to support this Proposed Development are referred to as ‘*heritage assets*’.

Sources

⁹ MCHLG December 2023 – Annex 2: Glossary

¹⁰ Paragraph: 039 Reference ID: 18a-039-20190723 Available at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment#non-designated> Accessed February 2024

6.3.7. Data has been gathered from a number of sources to inform the baseline conditions at the Site and surrounding area. Sources comprise the following, and are referenced throughout the chapter, where required:

- National Heritage List for England;
- NYHER;
- NRHE;
- National Mapping Programme data;
- North Yorkshire Archives, Northallerton, for documentary, aerial photograph and cartographic resources;
- Selby Library local studies collection;
- Historic England Archive, Swindon, for aerial photographs;
- LiDAR¹¹ (where available); and
- Grey literature reports¹².

6.3.8. The data collection has been supplemented by Site visits, comprising a walkover across the Site and visits to selected heritage assets to visually assess their surroundings and the visual elements of their setting.

Assessment Methodology

6.3.9. The assessment has been carried out in line with Historic England guidance and advice notes, comprising *Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysis Significance in Heritage Assets*¹³, *Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment*¹⁴, *The Setting of Heritage Assets*¹⁵ and *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment*¹⁶.

6.3.10. The methodology utilised for this assessment has been informed by guidance documents and professional judgement, as there is no specific guidance or prescribed methodology for undertaking an assessment of the likely significant

¹¹ Light Detection and Ranging: a remote sensing method which uses light to measure distances to the earth from an aerial source. This can highlight earthworks and subtle changes in ground level, identifying potential archaeological anomalies.

¹² Unpublished archaeological fieldwork reports submitted to the NYHER describing the results of the work.

¹³ Historic England, 2019, Historic England Advice Note 12: *Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysis Significance in Heritage Assets*

¹⁴ Historic England, 2021, Historic England Advice Note 15: *Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment*

¹⁵ Historic England, 2017, Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning - 3: *The Setting of Heritage Assets 2nd Ed*

¹⁶ Historic England, 2015, Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning – 2: *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment*

effects of a proposed development on cultural heritage.

- 6.3.11. The assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage has been informed by **Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Technical Appendix [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.1]** which contains the detailed heritage baseline information, and the initial assessment, in accordance with Step 1 and Step 2 of the Historic England guidance, of the identification of which assets have the potential to have their settings affected by the Proposed Development. As part of this, those assets which do not have the potential to have their settings affected have been scoped out from further consideration. This process is set out within the gazetteer at Appendix 1 of the Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline (refer to **Appendix 6.1 EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.1**). Mitigation measures have also been committed to, where relevant, to reduce the significance of the identified adverse effects.
- 6.3.12. When discussing heritage assets, the term 'significance' is used in the NPS EN-1 to describe the sum of the heritage interests that a heritage asset holds and also that significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting and that some assets have a level of significance that justifies official designation. The term 'significance' has a specific meaning within Environmental Impact Assessment ('EIA') and therefore to avoid confusion, when discussing heritage significance, this has been made clear and distinct from the discussion of significance in EIA terms throughout the chapter.
- 6.3.13. In order to assess the effects of the Proposed Development upon heritage assets, these have first been assigned a value. This is not merely a reflection of any designated status but also accounts for the heritage interests of the asset. This has been expressed as the value/ sensitivity of the asset to change. Following this, the magnitude of impact or change to the significance of the asset has been assessed, including impacts to its significance through changes within its setting. The value of the asset has been considered against the magnitude of impact and the resultant effect has been assessed.
- 6.3.14. To establish the value/ sensitivity of a heritage asset, professional judgement guided by statutory and non-statutory designations, and national and local policy has been utilised. Table 6.1 below sets out the levels of value/ sensitivity and the criteria that have been applied.

Table 6.1: Criteria for Establishing Value/ Sensitivity

Value/Sensitivity	Criteria
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Remains of inscribed international importance, such as World Heritage Sites; ▪ Grade I and II* Listed Buildings; ▪ Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens; ▪ Scheduled Monuments; ▪ Registered Battlefields; ▪ Non-designated archaeological assets of demonstrable equivalence to a scheduled monument quality; and ▪ Non-designated buildings, monuments, sites or landscape that can be shown to have a very important quality in their fabric or historical association.
Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grade II Listed Buildings; ▪ Conservation Areas; ▪ Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens; and ▪ Assets of high archaeological resource value identified through consultation.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-designated buildings, monuments or sites or landscapes of local importance and of modest quality; ▪ Heritage assets identified through baseline studies which are considered to have a value commensurate with a non-designated heritage asset; ▪ Locally important historic or archaeological assets, assets with a local value for education or cultural appreciation and of medium archaeological value; ▪ Locally Listed buildings identified on a local list; ▪ Non-designated buildings, monuments, sites or landscape that can be shown to have important qualities in their fabric or historical association; ▪ Historic townscapes with historic integrity; and ▪ Parks and gardens of local interest.
No heritage significance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assets identified as being of no historic, artistic, archaeological or architectural value; ▪ Assets that are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade; and ▪ Assets whose values are compromised by poor preservation or survival to justify inclusion in a higher category.

6.3.15. The magnitude of impact resulting from the Proposed Development has also been established. Impacts have been considered in terms of being either direct, indirect, occurring during construction, operation or decommissioning and short-term or long-term temporary, and permanent. The assessment has included the consideration of an asset's setting in terms of its contribution to the asset's significance.

6.3.16. The magnitude of an impact has been judged using the criteria in Table 6.2 below. The judgement of the magnitude of impact has been made without accounting for the

value/sensitivity of the asset and the impact has been assessed without taking into account any secondary mitigation (until section 6.7 ‘Residual Effects’ and section 6.8 ‘Cumulative Effects’ of this chapter). It has, however, taken into account embedded mitigation for the Proposed Development.

Table 6.2: Criteria for Establishing Level of Impact/Change

Magnitude of Impact	Description of Change
High	Change such that the significance of the asset is totally altered or destroyed. Comprehensive change to setting affecting significance, resulting in substantial changes in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical setting.
Medium	Change such that the significance of the asset is affected. Changes such that the setting is noticeably different, affecting significance resulting in moderate changes to significance and in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource.
Low	Change such that the significance of the asset is slightly affected. Changes to the setting that have a slight impact on significance resulting in changes in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource.
Negligible	Changes to the asset that hardly affect significance. Changes to the setting of an asset that have little effect on significance and no real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource.
No change	The Proposed Development results in no change or such a negligible level of change that it does not affect the significance of the asset. Changes to the setting do not affect the significance of the asset or our appreciation of it.

6.3.17. The assessment of the residual effects of the Proposed Development has been undertaken accounting for secondary mitigation measures. This assessment has derived the residual effect of the Proposed Development on the significance of the heritage assets. Effects can be neutral, beneficial, or adverse. Table 6.3 sets out the matrix which has been used to identify the significance of effect.

Table 6.3: Significance of Effect (* professional judgement to be used to assign a level of effect)

Value / sensitivity of Heritage Asset	Magnitude of Impact				
	No Change	Negligible	Low	Medium	High
No Heritage significance	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Value / sensitivity of Heritage Asset	Magnitude of Impact				
	No Change	Negligible	Low	Medium	High
Low	Neutral	Neutral	Minor	Minor / Moderate*	Moderate
Moderate	Neutral	Minor	Minor / Moderate*	Moderate	Major
High	Neutral	Minor	Moderate	Major	Major

- 6.3.18. This assessment has also assessed any likely significant cumulative effects upon the heritage resource resulting from the Proposed Development in combination with other schemes, as appropriate.
- 6.3.19. A significant effect is considered to be ‘major’. A ‘moderate’ effect could also be considered to be significant, however, this has been subject to professional judgement. All other effects are considered to be not significant.
- 6.3.20. In accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations, this assessment has assessed the significance of effects resulting from the Proposed Development’s impacts; however, NPS EN-1 considers impacts in terms of levels of harm or loss to the significance of an asset from a proposed development. A significant effect identified in this assessment would not necessarily equate to a finding of substantial harm, as defined in the NPS EN-1. Equally, a less significant effect identified in this assessment may result in a higher level of harm according to the NPS EN-1. Professional judgement has been used throughout this assessment to ensure that where a matrix-based system has been employed (as set out in Table 6.3), a robust assessment of the potential significance of the effect (in EIA terms) to the heritage asset has been reported within this assessment.
- 6.3.21. This chapter will provide an assessment of harm and a judgement of whether the Proposed Development results in no harm, less than substantial harm or substantial harm. Therefore, where appropriate, a narrative conclusion has been set out which discusses the level of harm (if any) that the Proposed Development will have upon the significance of the heritage assets.

Consultation

- 6.3.22. Table 6.4 below provides a summary of the consultation undertaken to date in

support of the preparation of this assessment.

Table 6.4: Consultation Summary

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
<i>EIA Scoping Opinion</i>			
PINS	EIA Scoping Opinion (14 th July 2022)	ID 3.2.1 – PINS stated that the ES should assess both direct and indirect impacts to archaeology during all phases of the development where significant effects are likely to occur. This should be supported by a robustly characterised baseline and effort should be made to agree the approach to assessment with the County Archaeologist.	The assessment within this chapter has considered both direct, physical impacts to heritage assets and indirect impact on setting on sensitive archaeological receptors (refer to section 6.5 ‘Likely Significant Effects’ of this chapter). The baseline data informing the assessment is provided at Appendix 6.1. Correspondence with the NYC Archaeologist [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.1] is as listed below in this table.
		ID 3.2.2 - PINS agreed that direct physical impacts to designated heritage assets could be scoped out.	No further action required.
		ID 3.2.3 - PINS agreed to the scoping out of impacts to registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields or World Heritage Sites on the basis that none of these designated assets are present within the cultural heritage study area.	No further action required.
		ID 3.2.4 - PINS stated that the ES should assess both direct and indirect impacts to listed buildings where significant effects are likely to occur.	The assessment in this chapter has considered both direct and indirect impacts to listed buildings where significant effects are likely to occur (refer to section 6.5 ‘Likely Significant Effects’ of this chapter).

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		ID 3.2.5 – PINS advised that the ES should assess impacts on the setting of heritage assets during construction and decommissioning where significant effects are likely to occur.	The assessment in this chapter considers impacts on the setting of heritage assets during construction and decommissioning where significant effects are likely to occur (refer to section 6.5 ‘Likely Significant Effects’ of this chapter).
		ID 3.2.6 – PINS stated that the ES should provide an assessment of impacts on Conservation Areas within the 3km study area during all phases of the Proposed Development where significant effects are likely to occur.	The assessment in Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Technical Appendix [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.1] supporting this chapter considers impacts to Conservation Areas at Appendix 1 of the report.
		ID 3.2.8 – PINS advised that given the potential effects during decommissioning are likely to be similar to those experienced during construction, this matter cannot be scoped out at this stage.	This assessment considered potential effects arising during the decommissioning phase (refer to section 6.5 ‘Likely Significant Effects’ of this chapter).
		ID 3.2.9 – PINS advised that the Applicant should ensure that the information used to inform the assessment is robust and allows for suitable characterisation of the archaeological baseline. The Applicant should make effort to agree the methodology for any intrusive investigations with relevant consultation bodies.	The methodology for fieldwork has been agreed with the relevant consultation bodies.
		ID 3.2.10 – PINS advised that any screened ZTV should take into account the influence of seasonality on the degree	This assessment has not utilised ZTVs as part of the assessment due to reasons set out at paragraph 6.3.2

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		of vegetative screening.	above.
Northern Powergrid	EIA Scoping response (4 th July 2022)	Suggested the EIA should consider the impacts (and subsequent mitigation requirements) borne from any additional potential land take required to accommodate relocated electricity assets and its impact upon existing habitats and heritage assets.	The Applicant has confirmed that the relocation of electricity assets is not required.
North Yorkshire County Council and SDC (now NYC)	EIA Scoping response (5 th July 2022)	<p>NYCC and SDC agreed with the proposed study areas for designated and undesignated heritage assets. Suggested neighbouring authorities may also need to be consulted with regards to designated assets. Noted the use of the term 'non-designated' asset to describe assets which are not designated but stated that 'Government has a particular definition of 'Non-designated Heritage Asset' that means an asset specifically identified by a plan-making body i.e. in a neighbourhood plan, Conservation Area appraisal or local List. They then request that a different term should be used for these assets which are not designated to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Stated that they did not agree with the statement in the Scoping Report which set</p>	<p>Areas beyond the former Selby authority/North Yorkshire authority area within the 3km designated study area were consulted for Conservation Area information.</p> <p>A section on terminology has been included in the ES at section 6.3.3 – 6.3.5 setting out the glossary of terms used.</p> <p>As part of the research for the ES and further work on the baseline, the North Yorkshire Archives were visited to view their aerial photograph collection.</p> <p>This assessment has considered effects upon non-designated archaeological assets (refer to section 6.5 'Likely Significant Effects' of this chapter).</p>

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		<p>out that the Proposed Development would not result in a significant effect upon non-designated archaeological assets.</p> <p>Stated that they considered the list of sources was comprehensive but considered the aerial photographs held by North Yorkshire Archives should also be checked.</p> <p>Supported the proposal for geophysical survey and requested this be sufficient to allow sensitive impacts to be designed out from direct impact. Stated they were happy to keep requirements for evaluation under review.</p>	
NYC Principal Archaeologist	Email (18 th July 2022)	Responding to an email from Pegasus informing the Principal Archaeologist of the forthcoming start of the geophysical survey at the Site and informing them that the programme would be protracted due to cropping requirements. The Principal Archaeologist confirmed this was an appropriate approach.	The NYC Principal Archaeologist was kept informed of the geophysical survey progress (See Appendix 6.6 [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.6]).
NYC Principal Archaeologist	Email – (31 st March 2023)	Responding to an email from Pegasus informing the NYC Principal Archaeologist of the near completion of the geophysical survey at the Site and the opportunity to be for an initial review of the results. The NYC Principal Archaeologist confirmed this and welcomed the opportunity to	The NYC Principal Archaeologist was provided the geophysical survey report to inform an initial consideration of mitigation strategies and/ or further works, where required.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		discuss the strategy for any further works.	
NYC Principal Archaeologist	Virtual meeting (19 th April 2023)	<p>Virtual meeting with the Applicant and project team members to discuss the geophysical survey results and for Pegasus to put forward the proposed strategy. Several mitigation areas were proposed, where solar photovoltaic ('PV') panels, access tracks and cable runs would be raised up to prevent below-ground disturbance. Also discussed potential for no further works in other locations due to the very low/ no archaeological potential within these areas as shown within the geophysical survey, coupled with the relatively low physical impact that solar PV panels cause.</p> <p>Also discussed the area of the Site not subject to geophysical survey (the underground cable route). It was agreed during the virtual meeting that this could be subject to an Archaeological Watching Brief during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, given the relatively low level of impact.</p>	A plan showing areas of proposed archaeological mitigation for agreement was provided to the NYC Principal Archaeologist in a subsequent email of 16 th May 2023.
NYC Principal Archaeologist	Email (31 st May 2023)	Email responding to the proposed mitigation areas plans. Confirmed agreement to the mitigation areas plans, and had no recommendations for other	An AMS (refer to Appendix 6.2 [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.2]) has been prepared for agreement with the NYC Principal Archaeologist which

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		mitigation areas or further archaeological works within the Site.	sets out the requirements of the mitigation.
SDC Conservation Officer (now NYC)	Email – (19 th May 2023)	Confirmed SDC considered the approach to the assessment to be correct and requested that the assessment terminology related to the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') in terms of harm/ less than substantial harm.	Email response to the SDC Conservation Officer (refer to Appendix 6.4 [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.4]) confirming that as an application for development consent is to be submitted for the Proposed Development, terminology from the NPPs, rather than the NPPF, would be applicable to the assessment. No further action required.
<i>Statutory Consultation</i>			
North Yorkshire Council - Archaeology	Statutory Consultation response 15 December 2023	NYC notes that <i>“the applicant has continued to use the term ‘non-designated heritage asset’ in it’s plain English meaning throughout the documents rather than following the Government definition, i.e. meaning an asset specifically identified by a plan making body as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions This is contrary to my advice on the EIA Scoping response”</i> .	Addressed within Appendix 6.1 [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.1] and this ES chapter at 6.3.3 – 6.3.5 where a terminology and glossary section has been added to address this point.
		NYC state at 6.3: <i>“The consultant has also chosen not to follow the advice regarding checking aerial photographs held by North Yorkshire Archives. Although the Historic</i>	North Yorkshire Archives were visited to view the aerial photograph collection to address this point, and

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		<p><i>England Archives have been consulted and the area is covered by the National Mapping Programme this is not a justification for discounting locally held collections.”</i></p>	<p>are considered in this chapter and in Appendix 6.1 [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.1].</p>
		<p>NYC agreed that the information submitted with the application is thorough.</p> <p>NYC are pleased that the entire area of the proposed arrays has been subject to field evaluation in the form of a geophysical survey.</p> <p>NYC state: <i>“This survey along with the desk-based work forms a suitable basis from which to assess the impact of the proposal on heritage assets of archaeological interest. The geophysical survey results were largely clear and the morphology of the anomalies present allowed reasonable interpretations to be made of the types of sites represented.”</i></p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
		<p>NYC state at 6.5: <i>“The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy sets out a number of areas based around the more complex areas of geophysical survey anomalies where a ‘no-dig’ solution to construction is proposed. I support this aspect of the strategy.”</i></p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		NYC state at 6.6: <i>“The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy also proposes archaeological monitoring during installation of underground cabling. Again, I support this strategy which is proportionate to the expected significance of the remains.”</i>	No further action required.
North Yorkshire Council - Conservation	Statutory Consultation response 15 December 2023	Underneath a heading of Heritage Assets scoped within this scheme and referring to the heritage assets set out earlier in the consultation response at 7.9 – 7.15 of Camblesforth Hall, Dovecote, Carlton Towers and Manor Farmhouse, NYC Conservation stated at para. 7.35 <i>“Having looked at the information provided, the above heritage assets identified appear to be correct and therefore the search is considered satisfactory. There were a number of heritage assets which can be ruled out of an assessment because they are deemed to be too far from the sites submitted.”</i>	No further action required.
		NYC Conservation state at 7.42: <i>“It is considered that the contributing elements of harm between the recognised significance and setting afforded to Camblesforth Hall when comparing the proposed site for the use of solar would amount to the lower end of less than substantial harm.”</i>	The conclusions of this assessment are set out below and in Table 6.5. This assessment departs slightly from the conclusions of the North Yorkshire Council Conservation team, however this departure is justified within the text.

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		<p>NYC Conservation state at 7.44 “...<i>the introduction of further structures within the views of Carlton Towers is considered to result in less than substantial harm to the setting and therefore the significance of the Carlton Towers Estate.</i>”</p>	<p>The conclusions of this assessment are set out below and in Table 6.5. This assessment agrees with this conclusion.</p>
		<p>NYC state at 7.46 “<i>However the resultant development proposal would upset the balance of a farmhouse setting therefore it is considered that the location of the solar panels would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the (Manor Farm Grade II Listed) farm house and therefore its significance.</i>”</p>	<p>The conclusions of this assessment are set out below and in Table 6.5. This assessment departs slightly from the conclusions of the North Yorkshire Council Conservation team, however this departure is justified within the text.</p>
		<p>NYC state at 7.48 “<i>The significance of the heritage assets has been described above (paragraphs 7.42-7.46), along with the analysis of the positioning and siting of the solar panels. Given there is a proposal to introduce solar panels on mass coupled with their closeness to acknowledged heritage assets it is considered that the proposal would amount to less than substantial harm to the setting and therefore significance of the listed buildings.</i>”</p>	<p>The conclusions of this assessment are set out below and in Table 6.5. Justification to conclusions made are set out within the text.</p>

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		<p>NYC state at 7.49 <i>“As harm has been acknowledged this harm needs to be outweighed by the public benefit of the proposal as recognised within paragraph 5.8.14, 5.8.15 and 5.8.18 of the National Policy Statement EN-1. Although there may be a public benefit to renewable energy to have solar panels so close to listed buildings which harms their setting and ultimately their significance should be taken into consideration.”</i></p>	<p>Residual effects or harm to heritage assets needs to be considered by the decision-maker within the context of the Proposed Development being considered CNP and paragraphs 4.2.15 – 4.2.17 of NPS EN-1.</p>
<p>Historic England</p>	<p>Formal S42 Preapplication Statutory Consultation Response 13 November 2023</p>	<p>Historic England is supportive of installation of PV array in this location. The response welcomed the geophysical survey undertaken across the Site and had no concerns regarding archaeology.</p>	<p>No further action</p>
		<p>Historic England highlighted the potential for changes to setting Grade I listed Camblesforth Hall and Carlton Towers, and requested that the effects be fully assessed as part of the application and opportunities to minimise the harm to assets be identified.</p>	<p>Camblesforth Hall and Carlton Towers are assessed in detail in this chapter at sections 6.5.15-6.5.26 and 6.5.27 – 6.5.37.</p>
		<p>Historic England assessed potential for a very small degree of harm to the significance of Camblesforth Hall through a change in setting.</p>	<p>The conclusions of this assessment are set out below and in Table 6.5. This assessment departs slightly from the conclusions of Historic England here, however this departure is justified within the text.</p>

Consultee	Type and Date	Summary of Consultation Response	Response to Consultee: ES
		<p>Historic England assessed a very small degree of harm to the significance of Carlton Towers arising from the scheme.</p> <p>Historic England note that the harm identified by them to Camblesforth Hall and Carlton Towers is such a small degree of harm that it is likely to be outweighed by the clear public benefits of the scheme.</p> <p>Historic England expect that the ES would be supported by a Heritage Impact Assessment which would assess the contribution that setting makes to the significance of Camblesforth Hall and Carlton Towers, identifying any resulting harm from change.</p>	<p>The conclusions of this assessment are set out below and in Table 6.5. This assessment concurs with the conclusions of Historic England</p> <p>Agreed. No further action.</p> <p>Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline [EN010140/APP/REF/6.3.6.1] provides this level of supporting evidence and assessment</p>

Limitations and Assumptions

- 6.3.25. The site visits carried out to support this assessment and to view identified heritage assets have been undertaken from publicly available areas and footpaths. No interior visits were made to any of the identified heritage assets. Notwithstanding the lack of internal access into identified heritage assets, it is considered that the conclusions of this assessment are robust.
- 6.3.26. No further limitations have been identified in the preparation of this chapter. There are no assumptions considered to date as part of the assessment.

6.4. Baseline Conditions

Overview

- 6.4.1. The 3km study area for designated heritage assets identified the following (refer to **Figures 6.1 [EN010140/APP/6.2.6.1]**):
- Four Scheduled Monuments;
 - Five Grade I Listed Buildings;
 - One Grade II* Listed Building;
 - 65 Grade II Listed Buildings; and
 - Two Conservation Areas.
- 6.4.2. No Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or World Heritage Sites were located within the 3km study area.
- 6.4.3. A geophysical survey (refer to **Appendix 6.3 [EN010140/APP/6.3.6.3]**) has been undertaken across the majority of the Site, excluding the proposed underground cable corridor within the central part of the Site and the underground cable corridor to the grid connection near the Drax Power Station (shown on **Figure 3.2 Parameter Plan of the ES [EN010140/APP/6.2.6.2]**) in the north-eastern part of the Site. This identified several discrete areas of archaeological potential, showing indications of possible enclosures within internal features. A number of these correspond to cropmarks on the aerial photographs of the Site.
- 6.4.4. The area of the underground cable corridor has been excluded from further

geophysical survey and a position agreed with the NYC Principal Archaeologist. This area will, instead, be subject to an Archaeological Watching Brief during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. This was agreed due to the focused and minimal below-ground impact occurring during the insertion of the cable, which requires only the excavation of a narrow trench which will not cause significant impacts to any below-ground archaeological assets. The methodology for this Archaeological Watching Brief is set out within the AMS (refer to **Appendix 6.2 [EN010140/APP/6.3.6.2]**).

Baseline

- 6.4.5. A summary of the heritage baseline is presented below. The reference numbers stated are either the NYER numbers (prefixed 'MNY') or the NRHE (prefixed 'NRHE' followed by six or seven digit numbers) or, for designated heritage assets, their National Heritage List for England ('NHLE') reference number. The assets are shown on the figures within **Appendix 6.1: Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline [EN010140/APP/6.3.6.1]**.
- 6.4.6. There is limited confirmed evidence of prehistoric activity within the Site and study area. There are records from the NYHER of findspots of flint cores recorded at Atkinson Wood in the centre of the Site (MNY10049, MNY10050) within the proposed cable route corridor and a retouched flint flake is recorded to the east of Brick Lands Lane in the southern part of the Site (MNY10051). These locations are approximate. There are further records of prehistoric findspots but these lie outside the Site boundary.
- 6.4.7. Various cropmarks have been recorded within the Site, taken from analysis of aerial photography. These are recorded within the Site and study area and may be of later prehistoric or Iron Age origin or could be more modern in origin, comprising:
- A sub-square enclosure and associated field system to the south of Hagg Bush just outside the Site boundary (MNY10066);
 - Possible former field boundaries within the apex of Hardenshaw Lane and Claypit Lane just inside the eastern part of the Site (MNY10045) (also visible on aerial photographs viewed at the North Yorkshire Archives and identified by the geophysical survey);
 - Three ring ditches and a linear ditch to the south of Bales Wood in the northern

part of the Site (MNY10059, MNY10060, MNY10061, MNY10062, 1308907) (also visible on aerial photographs from the North Yorkshire Archives and identified within the geophysical survey);

- Short sections of ditch of a possible former field system to the north-west of Barlow Common, approximately 780m north-east of the Site (MNY10058);
- A possible enclosure at Sandwith Lane, approximately 330m west of the south-eastern part of the Site (MNY9879, 1304192); and
- Other cropmarks are considered more likely to be of geological or modern origin, for example to the south of Burn Lane crossing over 1km west of the Site (MNY10067), and at Ings Lane over 1km west of the south-western corner of the Site (MNY10035).

- 6.4.8. As stated previously, a geophysical survey was carried out within the Site (**Appendix 6.3 [EN010140/APP/6.3.6.3]**). Within this, the survey identified a number of archaeological anomalies which correspond with cropmarks identified on the NYHER and National Mapping Programme (NMP) mapping and in aerial photographs viewed at the Historic England Archives and the North Yorkshire Archives. The anomalies identified include linear ditches and rectilinear enclosures with internal sub-circular features. The survey also identified several now removed former field boundaries, evidence of land drains and other remnants of the agricultural history and farming practices within the Site.
- 6.4.9. Beyond the Site boundary, several cropmarks have been identified, all of which correspond with the NMP map.
- 6.4.10. There is limited evidence of Roman activity within the Site and study area. Within the Site, the NRHE identified two areas of cropmarks, one area west of Bales Wood Plantation (1308879) includes a complete enclosure measuring 30m x 30m which corresponded to the NMP data and was identified within the geophysical survey. The other area is located south of Quosquo House and Rosehill Farm, within which aerial photographs recorded a possible Roman linear settlement overlaid by a possible medieval field system (1308995).
- 6.4.11. There is no evidence of early medieval activity recorded within the study area. According to the NYHER, Temple Hirst is first documented in 1030AD (MNY10034). Camblesforth (MNY10037), Barlow (1018403), Carlton (MNY9868), and Drax

(MNY10093) are all named in the Domesday Survey of 1086AD, indicating that these settlements were established within the early medieval period and of a size such as to be taxable by 1086 and thus recorded within the Domesday Survey.

- 6.4.12. There is evidence for medieval activity within the 1km study area, although nothing within the Site itself. At Barlow, approximately 1.6km north-east of the Site, are the scheduled remains of the medieval settlement, as well as an Elizabethan house and gardens (1018403) from a later date.
- 6.4.13. Evidence of medieval activity at Drax includes a scheduled Augustinian Priory founded in the 1130s on an island within marshland to the south of the River Ouse, approximately 1.5km north of the north-eastern part of the Site (1016857); the scheduled Talleville Castle, built sometime after 1139 by Philip de Colville, approximately 1km south-east of the Site (1017455); and the ditch of a possible former burgage plot division, approximately 840m south-east of the Site (MNY23510).
- 6.4.14. Medieval moats are recorded at Scurff Hall to the east of Drax, approximately 2km east of the north-eastern part of the Site (1017485 - scheduled), and to the east of Carlton Bridge, approximately 475m east of the site (MNY10106).
- 6.4.15. The NYHER records a former medieval deer park at Burn (MNY39998) located outside the Site boundary. This is indicated by the depiction and naming of Park Lane extending east from Burn village towards the former Hollins Hill Barn (located at the centre of the later airfield). The former course of Common Lane, arcing south towards Hagg Bush through the north-western part of the Site, and curving field boundaries to the south of Hagg Bush, might represent the eastern and southern boundaries of the park. However, the NYHER notes that this evidence is only anecdotal.
- 6.4.16. The geophysical survey undertaken within the majority of the Site area located several areas of medieval or post-medieval ridge and furrow cultivation. This confirms the NRHE records which comprise a large number of areas of ridge and furrow, identified from aerial photographs, the majority of which are no longer extant to the naked eye having been removed by modern ploughing. These records provide evidence that during the medieval period, that the majority of the Site, if not all of it was being utilised for agricultural purposes.
- 6.4.17. The NYHER identifies several sites of post-medieval extraction activity within the

study area: a brickyard in the field between the eastern part of the Site boundary and Camblesforth village (MNY10041), a clay pit and brick kiln at Brickyard Farm approximately 450m north of the Site (MNY10054, MNY10053), and a sand pit at Cat Bableton approximately 60m from the eastern part of the Site boundary (MNY10055). Further evidence of early industrial activity within the study area is found in the form of records of windmills. Three are recorded within the study area, none of which were recorded within the Site; none survive today.

- 6.4.18. The post-medieval and early period sees the construction of larger houses and estates, replacing the earlier moated manors which are located within the study area. Approximately 400m north-east of the south-eastern corner of the Site is the Grade I Listed Camblesforth Hall, believed to have been built in approximately 1700 but there appear to be few records of its origin and history (MNY10047). Surrounding the hall, a parkland is recorded on the NYHER (MNY31298) as being 17th century in date. This parkland has been significantly truncated and is not particularly legible. Modern housing is constructed to the south of Camblesforth Hall.
- 6.4.19. To the north of New Coates Farm, approximately 1km south of the Site, the NYHER locates the former site of Coates Hall, known from historic mapping to have been in existence in the mid-19th century but since demolished (MNY9876).
- 6.4.20. To the south of Carlton, approximately 1.4km south of the Site, is the 18th and 19th century-designed landscape of Carlton Towers which surrounds the grade I listed building (1295955). It encompasses a landscaped park, ornamental garden, walled garden, kitchen garden, Italian garden and parterre, and according to the NYHER was placed on English Heritage's Initial List of Non-Registered Historic Park or Garden Sites in North Yorkshire in 1996 (MNY31613) but not subsequently inscribed in the official register therefore the garden is not a designated asset. This parkland provides a sense of enclosure with very little experience of the landscape outside the parkland boundary from within the ground themselves.
- 6.4.21. The post-medieval and modern periods also see the establishment of long-distance trade and communication routes within the study area. Approximately 1.2km north-west of the Site is the Selby Canal, created via an Act of 1774 (MNY10475, 1340668). This canal remains open today.
- 6.4.22. The dismantled Selby-Goole railway line through Barlow, which opened in 1903, lies

approximately 444m north and north-east of the Site (MNY12378, 57936). The now dismantled Hull and Barnsley Railway (1374644) located approximately 487m south of the Site boundary – which was originally known as the Hull, Barnsley and West Riding Junction Railway and Dock was opened in 1885 and terminated at Alexandra Dock in Hull. It closed to passenger traffic in 1955 and goods traffic in 1967. Another now dismantled railway line ran to the south of the Site boundary. The Aire Junction (1374919) was a line which branched off the Hull and Barnsley Railway just south of the River Aire and ran to the Braithwaite Junction. It opened in 1916, before being closed in 1970 and was dismantled.

- 6.4.23. The only railway line still extant within the study area established in the late 19th century is the Great Northern Railway (1375238). This is located approximately 190m west of the Site boundary and runs north-south.
- 6.4.24. The earliest available mapping of the Site which shows the area in detail are the 1808 Enclosure and the 1838 tithe maps for the parishes of Camblesforth and Hirst Courtney. These cover the central, south-eastern and south-western parts of the main Site area plus the proposed cable route and grid connection areas. The Camblesforth map labels Chester Court Hall Farm as Chester Coates outside the redline boundary but surrounded by the Site to the north, west and south. The nearby plantations of Chester Court Wood and Jub Close Wood are shown, as well as others, to the north of Jub Close and between Jowland Winn Lane and Claypit Lane, which are no longer extant.
- 6.4.25. The next iteration of available mapping is the First Edition Ordnance Survey of 1853, which shows Chester Coates, now labelled as Chester Court and is a more elaborate complex comprising house, outbuildings, gardens, and parkland (as demarcated on the 1891 mapping and labelled as Chester Court Park MNY31617). The buildings of Chestercourt House Farm are visible on this mapping, though they are not labelled until later mapping editions (adjacent to Field 28). This farm complex is not within the Site boundary but is located surrounded by the Site.
- 6.4.26. The buildings of Quosquo Hall located east of Field 53 and outside the Site boundary cable corridor area, Quosquo House (no longer extant), and Rosehill Farm (directly north of Field 55 and outside the Site boundary) are also shown for the first time in detail, as this part of the Site was not covered by the tithe mapping, and an area to their south is illustrated as marshland with a curious feature that is either a channel

or a building.

- 6.4.27. The series of 20th century mapping and aerial photographs record a number of changes to the buildings mentioned above, all of which are outside of the Site boundary. These changes show that these buildings have been subject to significant change over the 20th century including the construction of extensions, demolition, construction of large, modern agricultural buildings which has removed original fabric and altered the immediate surroundings of these buildings.
- 6.4.28. Dating from the modern period, the NHRE and NYHER records demonstrate that the location of the First World War ('WWI') airfield at Carlton (1508122/MNY36248) was located approximately 77m south of the Site, south of Lee's Carr Wood and north of Sandwith Lane. This was a home defence landing ground established to defend the industrial areas at Leeds, Sheffield and Scunthorpe from German airship attack. There was no hardstanding or formally laid out runways at this time; the airfield would have simply been a cleared area of grassland, meaning that there would be very little to no trace of this surviving today.
- 6.4.29. On the west side of the North Eastern Railway line is the former Burn Airfield, located approximately 300m west of the Site boundary, in operation from 1942 to 1946 (MNY10063, 1309034). While Second World War ('WWII') airfields often had satellite sites for accommodation and bomb stores, there is no suggestion from available data sources that any such satellite sites were located within the Site. The airfield is still extant in partial use by the Burn Gliding Club and the perimeter track and runways are still largely intact.
- 6.4.30. The NRHE records the site of a WWII heavy anti-aircraft battery within the Site, off Claypit Lane south of Camblesforth (1473689). No trace of this remains today. In addition, a number of WWII aircraft crash sites are recorded within the study area. However, whilst their locations are not exact, there is no evidence, for example from the geophysical survey, that any aircraft sites are located within the Site.
- 6.4.31. A Royal Observer Corps monitoring post, built in 1961, was located at Camel Lane to the north of Camblesforth, approximately 755m north of the south-eastern part of the Site (MNY36127, 1415781).

Archaeological Potential

- 6.4.32. The geophysical survey (refer to **Appendix 6.3 [EN010140/APP/6.3.6.3]**) carried out across the majority of the Site, together with evidence gathered from the NYHER, the NRHE, NMP mapping and review of aerial photography, indicates that there are discrete areas of archaeological potential within the Site. These areas represent D-shaped enclosures with likely internal features and there is a similarity of form and plan across a number of these discrete areas. These enclosures may be prehistoric or Roman in date, and correspond with cropmarks, indicating these are archaeological in origin and not geological or formed from another natural process.
- 6.4.33. This archaeological potential is, therefore, contained within discrete areas and is not widespread across the entire Site. It is these areas of archaeological potential, which are sensitive to development, which have been identified and discussed with the NYC Principal Archaeologist. The areas of archaeological potential have been identified within the AMS (refer to **Appendix 6.2 [EN010140/APP/6.3.6.2]**) and it is these areas which will be subject to mitigation in the form of 'no dig' foundations. This will ensure that these areas will not experience any below ground disturbance from the Proposed Development.

Future Baseline Conditions

- 6.4.34. It is considered that there would be no change to the baseline conditions as presented above for the future baseline year of 2027.

6.5. Likely Significant Effects

Embedded Mitigation

- 6.5.1. The Solar Farm Zone (shown on **Figure 3.2 Parameter Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.2]**) has evolved throughout the preparation of the baseline to reduce potential effects upon listed heritage assets by moving the proposed Solar Farm Zone further away from sensitive heritage receptors and creating more substantial landscape buffer zones. In addition, the substation and BESS Compound has been placed in a central position in the Site, well-screened from surrounding assets and not within any views from any identified designated heritage assets.
- 6.5.2. Landscaping proposals also represent embedded mitigation, as these will provide

screening and will reinstate a number of historic field boundaries. In addition, there is no proposed removal of entire stretches of hedgerow.

Measures to be Adopted by the Project

- 6.5.3. Measures to be adopted by the project in the form of an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy ('AMS') have been established through consultation with the Principal Archaeologist for NYC. The scope of this AMS has been agreed with the Principal Archaeologist and will be submitted as part of the DCO application (refer to **Appendix 6.2 [EN010140/APP/6.3.6.2]**). This mitigation also includes provision of an Archaeological Watching Brief during the implementation of the underground cable corridor.
- 6.5.4. The AMS has been taken into account in the creation of the **Landscape Strategy [EN010140/APP/6.2.7.19]**. Major conflicts have been avoided.

Assets Discussed within the ES

- 6.5.5. This ES discusses those assets with the potential to experience effects from the Proposed Development. An initial assessment and sieving exercise¹⁷ have been undertaken within **Appendix 6.1: Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline in Appendix 1 [EN010140/APP/6.3.6.1]** as part of which, all relevant heritage assets were considered. This assessment has involved a combination of desk-based assessment, site visits, and application of professional judgment, to identify the significance of assets, their setting and determine whether the Site forms part of the setting that contributes to significance. Following this, it was assessed if the Proposed Development had the potential to cause harm or impact upon the significance of the identified heritage assets.
- 6.5.6. Assets were sieved out on the basis of:
- Distance from the Site;
 - Consideration of whether the Site formed part of the setting of assets which contributed to their significance;
 - Lack of visual connection, intervisibility or co-visibility; and

¹⁷ An exercise undertaken to remove heritage assets from the scope of assessment which will not experience effects.

- Lack of historic or functional association.

6.5.7. The current landscape surrounding the Site was also taken into account within this assessment when considering the current setting of identified heritage assets. The landscape in this area is dominated by the power station at Drax and the landmark cooling towers. The visibility of the towers in numerous views shapes the idea that this is a landscape of power generation, capable of absorbing schemes of the size and scale of Drax without unduly harming the significance of heritage assets in the vicinity.

6.5.8. As advised in the Scoping Report (Appendix 2.1 [EN010140/APP/6.3.2.1], there would be no effects arising from the Proposed Development to any Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or World Heritage Sites.

6.5.9. Following initial assessment, three designated heritage assets were identified as having the potential to experience adverse effects from the Proposed Development:

- Grade I – Carlton Towers (NHLE Ref: 1295955);
- Grade I – Camblesforth Hall (NHLE Ref: 1173983); and
- Grade II - Manor Farmhouse (NHLE Ref: 1148398).

Construction Phase

Direct Effects

6.5.10. As discussed in section 6.4 'Baseline Conditions' of this chapter, discussions have taken place with the Principal Archaeologist for NYC with regards to mitigation measures required to preserve areas of archaeological anomalies within the Site, as identified within the geophysical survey. These discrete areas of archaeological potential have been identified and will be subject to the requirements as set out within the AMS, including movement of construction traffic. Within these identified areas, mitigation measures will be implemented during the construction phase of the Proposed Development in order to preserve these areas in-situ and to avoid any below ground disturbance. An AMS has been prepared (Appendix 6.2 [EN010140/APP/6.3.6.2]) which sets out the proposed mitigation and the methodology for construction in these areas. The solar PV modules within these areas will be on ground mounted footings, with the cables raised up and clipped

beneath the solar PV panels to avoid any requirement for a cable trench in these locations. For the construction of access tracks, where these cross over the identified areas of archaeological potential, these will be raised above ground level, with maximum topsoil strip depth of less than 300mm (less than plough depth) for the formation of the access track and the placement of the concrete foundations (refer to **Figure 3.18 Access Road with Archaeological Mitigation [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.18]**). Also, within these areas, lighter weight construction vehicles which have low-impact tyres or tracks will be utilised and no construction will take place in these areas in wet weather or following heavy periods of rain to avoid the potential for rutting of the ground to take place. Where required, geotextile will be laid for the vehicles to track across.

- 6.5.11. As a result of the measures set out within the AMS, which has been agreed with the Principal Archaeological for NYC, the magnitude of impact to the identified areas of archaeological potential (assets of Moderate value) arising from the construction of the Proposed Development is considered to be no change. The significance of effect on the areas of archaeological potential will be neutral (**not significant**).
- 6.5.12. There is potential for the excavation of the underground cable corridor within the Site (indicated on ES **Figure 3.2 Parameter Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.2]**) to cause physical impacts to below-ground archaeological deposits of low value. This level of value is assigned as there are no indications that archaeological deposits of a higher value will be located within this area following review of aerial photographic and cartographic documents. The final underground cable corridor is yet to be determined at the time of preparation of this ES, but even when assuming a 'worst case' scenario for its routing based on **Figure 3.2 Parameter Plan [EN010140/APP/6.2.3.2]** of the ES, the appropriate mitigation for its routing has already been agreed with the Principal Archaeologist at NYC, whereby an Archaeological Watching Brief would be undertaken during the excavation works for this cable trench which would allow for the recording of any archaeological deposits which may be disturbed via the works. The cable trench would be relatively narrow and therefore the magnitude of impact arising from this to below-ground deposits would be low. The narrow width of the cable route would not allow for any archaeological deposit, which could be considered significant, to be removed in its entirety. It is therefore considered that with this mitigation embedded into the Proposed Development, via the provisions of the AMS, although the magnitude of impact will be medium to assets of low value,

implementation of the measures to be adopted by the project reduce the significance of effect to minor adverse (**not significant**). A level of minor adverse effect has been considered for these archaeological deposits as the level of impact they will experience is limited and unlikely to remove the entirety of the asset.

Indirect Effects

- 6.5.13. Whilst the construction phase of the Proposed Development would result in a short-term, temporary increase in construction traffic and movement and related construction activity within the Site and on roads within its vicinity, it is not considered that this increase would result in any impact to the heritage significance or value of any of the heritage assets and this would result in a neutral effect (**not significant**).
- 6.5.14. There would be no change in any identified effect under the future baseline conditions.

Operational Phase

- 6.5.15. Only indirect effects would result from the operational phase of the Proposed Development as there would be no below-ground activity within the Site during the operational phase.

Camblesforth Hall

- 6.5.16. During the operational phase of the Proposed Development, there is the potential for the significance of the Grade I Listed asset of Camblesforth Hall (1173983), a 17th century mansion with relatively limited modern alteration and an asset of **high value**, to experience an effect through changes within elements of the setting which contribute to significance. It is noted that the listing description of this asset from the NHLE, has not been updated since it was first listed in November 1966. As such, it is still recorded as being two dwellings, however the Hall was subject to a recent renovation in 2020/2021 after the building had fallen into disrepair. Camblesforth Hall now comprises a home and a wedding and filming venue, and not two dwellings as set out in the listing description. The Hall is the main building within this small complex which includes a number of barns and outbuildings located to the north of the building which form a courtyard. These are not listed, however the Dovecote to Camblesforth Hall Approximately 5m to East of House (1316356) is a Grade II listed building. The setting of the Dovecote is the grounds of Camblesforth Hall. It is this

setting which forms the surrounds in which the Dovecote can be experienced and it is the association between the Dovecote and Camblesforth Hall, as well as the interaction and understanding of the hierarchy of the other outbuildings of the hall which contributes to significance. There is no relationship between the Dovecote and the formal grounds to the front of the Hall; the Dovecote is a service building, constructed to provide a food source for the residents of Camblesforth Hall, it has no relationship with designed landscape elements of Camblesforth Hall. The primary element of the significance of the Dovecote is held within its physical fabric which displays its architectural and historic interest. The Site will not be visible from this asset, nor does the Site form part of the setting of the Dovecote, there are no historic associations which contribute to the understanding of the asset. Therefore, the Dovecote will not be adversely affected by the Proposed Development.

- 6.5.17. The significance of Camblesforth Hall is formed primarily by its architectural and historic interest, which is best demonstrated by its physical fabric, in particular, the relatively unaltered condition of the building as an example of William and Mary-style architecture together with the survival of a number of original features in the interior of the building (not inspected as part of this assessment but taken from the listing description). The historic interest is derived from the possible association with John Etty, the association with Sir Charles Blois and it possibly being a replacement for an earlier manor house.
- 6.5.18. The setting of this asset also contributes to the significance, but this contribution is much less than that made by the physical fabric. The setting of the asset is formed from a number of different elements. The element of the setting which makes the biggest contribution is the immediate surroundings to the north and south which consists of the outbuildings and barns, and listed Dovecote to the north and the formal gardens, tennis court and pool area to the south. The garden to the south allows an area to appreciate the attractive façade of the building, as well as being a place of ornamental planting and a clearly associated designed landscape. The outbuildings to the north contribute to the historic and architectural interest, being broadly on the same plan as 19th century mapping and contributing to the understanding of the hierarchy of the buildings and the former agricultural function.
- 6.5.19. The wider settlement of Camblesforth Hall makes a minor contribution to the significance of the asset, contributing to the historic interest.

- 6.5.20. The wider agricultural landscape makes a negligible contribution which diminishes as the distance increases. Whilst there is an historic association in terms of ownership with a small number of land parcels within the Site; ultimately, this association is no longer extant. In addition, modern development has been constructed in-between Camblesforth Hall and the Site which has severed any connection, both physically and associatively. Camblesforth Hall no longer has an agricultural function, with all the barns converted for leisure and non-agricultural business purposes.
- 6.5.21. Therefore, it can be said that the parcels of land which were once historically associated with the Hall contribute a negligible amount to the significance, however the remainder of the Site does not make any contribution to the significance of Camblesforth Hall.
- 6.5.22. Camblesforth Hall is not visible from the south, beyond the gardens. The views which contribute to significance are those views available from the gardens directly to the south. There are glimpsed views available of Camblesforth Hall when moving along the PRoW which runs from west to east to the northwest of Camblesforth Hall. It is noted that the views along this path when travelling towards Camblesforth are dominated by the cooling towers of Drax Power Station. The Proposed Development would not be visible in any of the views towards Camblesforth Hall on the journey along this PRoW.
- 6.5.23. There is the potential for there to be glimpsed views of the Proposed Development from the upper storeys of Camblesforth Hall. These views currently would contain the dense woodland planting and the modern built form of Camblesforth, but would have some agricultural land as a backdrop providing an understanding of the former rural surroundings of the asset.
- 6.5.24. The operational Proposed Development will not alter the primary contributing factors to the significance of Camblesforth Hall, nor will it change the ability to understand and appreciate views of the asset which form part of its setting and contribute to significance. The Proposed Development will not be co-visible with Camblesforth Hall in views, and the redline of the Proposed Development has been pulled back, southwards from the A1041 to create a buffer of land with an additional buffer of open space within the redline boundary before the panels within the Proposed Development are located. In addition, landscaping is proposed around the edge of

the Proposed Development in this location to further provide screening. The nearest built form within the Site is located over 425m south-west of the asset, with the modern dwellings along Beech Grove and Beech Tree Lane (two-storey dwellings), the modern A1041 and existing landscaping in-between.

- 6.5.25. Whilst it is the case that the Proposed Development represents a change in the character of the wider landscape within which it is located, from agricultural to one of energy generation, it is noted that the cooling towers of Drax are prominent in views and co-visible along with Camblesforth Hall in many views. Views of large-scale energy generation, therefore, are capable of being accommodated from Camblesforth Hall or of Camblesforth Hall without causing harm. It is also the case that a change in character is not intrinsically harmful if, as is the case here, it is established that the Site subject to the change in character does not contribute in its entirety to the significance of the asset. Whilst the Site lies in the wider surroundings of the asset, the asset cannot be experienced, understood, or appreciated from within the area and there is no longer any historic or functional link between the asset and the Site, and even when there was these were for a small number of fields, not the entirety of the Site. It is these fields only which hold a negligible contribution, however these links are no longer extant and the Hall now has no agricultural function at all.
- 6.5.26. It is therefore considered that the Proposed Development will result in an impact of no change to the value of this asset. The significance of effect would therefore be neutral (**not significant**).

Carlton Towers

- 6.5.27. The operational phase of the Proposed Development will be visible from the upper floors of the clock tower at the Grade I Listed Carlton Towers (1295955), an asset of **high value**. The asset dates in part to the 17th century and likely replaced an earlier building constructed for the Stapleton family. The house has been through many alterations with wings added in 1740 and 1770 with the clock tower likely added in 1777. The most significant change occurred in the late 19th century when the entire building was refaced by Pugin and a fantastical mix of architectural styles was created including Palladian, Neo-Classical, and Gothic Revival. Turrets, battlements, gargoyles, and coats of arms were created. The interior, created in 1875-90 is considered to be one of the best examples of the Gothic Revival style in Britain. The

building is still a family home to the Fitzalan-Howards and is also used as a wedding venue.

- 6.5.28. Carlton Towers sits within the non-designated asset MNY31613 of the wider estate and designed landscape which comprises entrance drives, lakes, formal gardens, woodland tree belts to screen buildings and views and, in more recent years, a vineyard. The parklands associated with the estate were originally not as extensive as exist today, and extended eastwards to New Bank in the 1870s.,
- 6.5.29. There are a number of other designated heritage assets within the grounds and non-designated parkland of Carlton Towers (MNY31613), comprising:
- Gatepiers and Railings Approximately 20 Metres to South-West of House, grade II – 1148394;
 - Folly Approximately 40 Metres To South Of Carlton Towers, grade II – 1174041; and
 - Gates, Railing and Piers Approximately 8 Metres To South Of House, grade II – 1148393.
- 6.5.30. These will not experience effects arising from the Proposed Development whereby there will be no visibility or awareness of the Proposed Development from any of these assets.
- 6.5.31. The significance of Carlton Towers is primarily derived from its architectural, artistic, and historic interest displayed within its physical fabric. There are several tall tower elements within the main building and the tall clock tower, likely added in 1777, is a prominent feature within views towards this asset within the surrounding landscape. The architectural and artistic interest of the building is clear to see with surviving 17th century fabric and the interior of the building widely recognized as being one of the finest Gothic Revival interiors in the country coupled with the extensive changes by Pugin to create the visually arresting building which exists today. The historic interest of this asset is derived from the association with famous architectural figures as well as with the Stapleton family and, more recently, the Fitzalan-Howards. Whilst the prominence and height of the tower elements, in particular the clock tower, does add to the significance of the asset, through visibility in long-range views towards the asset and the potential for views from the upper floors of the building and the towers towards the Site, this only contributes a small amount to the significance of the asset.

- 6.5.32. The setting is formed by the wider parkland estate (the non-designated asset MNY31613) which surrounds Carlton Towers, as well as the village of Carlton which makes a negligible contribution to significance of Carlton Towers, as part of the historic association and current continued association with the settlement. The parkland represents the immediate surroundings of the asset, and the approach southwards from the northern entrance gates along the drive offers the first glimpses of the asset and allows an appreciation and experience of the architectural and artistic interest of the asset. The asset is best appreciated from these immediate surroundings and, in particular, from the approach along the southern driveway. The wider parkland also contributes by forming the wider estate, evolving over time and increasing in size.
- 6.5.33. The views towards Carlton Towers from outside the parkland boundary contribute a negligible amount to the significance of this asset. The only elements of the asset visible from outside the parkland boundary are the upper stages of the clock tower. This is a partially visible feature within wider landscape views, and pinpoints the location of the asset and provides an indication that a building of status is located in this area.
- 6.5.34. Although not visited, and not currently publicly accessible, it is likely that there are panoramic views available from the clock tower. This is an assumption and forms the worst-case scenario in terms of assessment. These views form only a negligible part of the significance of Carlton Towers. It is also the case that given the relatively flat landscape of this general area and the height of the clock tower, any views would be long-distance and cover the entire 360-degree panorama, thus taking in an extensive range of landscapes, built form, modern development and not least, the cooling towers of the Drax Power Station.
- 6.5.35. The site visit to this parkland identified that there were no views at all towards the Site available from within the publicly accessible areas of the parkland and grounds, with views entirely blocked by the mature trees surrounding the northern boundary of the parkland. The site visit also demonstrated that the only views available of the entirety of Carlton Towers are from the south and from the immediate surrounding grounds when in close proximity. It is the case that the views from the upper floors of the towers projecting from the main building and roof of the clock tower, if accessible and available, would extend over a vast area and would include, and be

dominated by, the Drax Power Station's cooling towers, when looking northeast. The views northwest, towards the Site, would also include the polytunnels around West Bank and the infrastructure of the railway line which cuts across to the northwest. The nearest built form of the Proposed Development is approximately 1.5km north of Carlton Towers. Whilst there will be some visibility of the operational Proposed Development from the upper floors of the building and clock tower, this will only impact upon a one particular view in one particular direction and would be within a context of a view which is not over a pristine, untouched rural landscape, but rather one which contains the built form of Carlton, the extensive area of polytunnels at West Bank, and the infrastructure associated with Drax Power Station.

- 6.5.36. It is considered that it is the current use and character of the Site as a parcel of agricultural land, providing some understanding of the much wider landscape around the asset which makes a negligible contribution to the significance of the asset,
- 6.5.37. The Proposed Development would introduce a change in the character of the land within the Site from agricultural fields, mostly arable, to one of energy generation. It is noted that many of the fields within the Site contain a Rape crop which, when in full flower are visible and bright yellow in colour and visually prominent. This change in character would be visible in one particular aspect of a panoramic view from the tower with the built form of the Proposed Development over 1.5km to the north of Carlton Towers. It is important to note that there would be no views of the Proposed Development from the majority of Carlton Towers and from its curtilage and associated parkland. This change would introduce additional modern development within a portion of a view which already contains modern built form as described above. It is also noted that there are no historic associations with the Site and this asset, no functional association, and the only change would be in a glimpsed view from an area which is not publicly accessible. This would detract slightly from these views, although it is considered that given the wide scope of views available within the panorama, this change is considered to have a negligible impact upon the significance of the asset, and would result in a minor adverse effect, which is **not significant**.

Manor Farmhouse

- 6.5.38. The operational Proposed Development will be in proximity to the Grade II Listed Manor Farmhouse (1148398), an asset of **moderate value**, which is located

approximately 820m to the southwest of the Site boundary. This is a 17th century farmhouse with later additions and alterations which faces south, towards the River Aire. It is currently located within a working farmyard with several modern outbuildings and large agricultural sheds located to the north, in-between the asset and the Site.

- 6.5.39. The significance of this asset is primarily derived from its physical fabric which displays its architectural interest as a late 17th or early 18th century farmhouse, providing historic interest in the information it provides for the agrarian economy in this area and the growth of Temple Hirst. In particular, the surviving historic fabric of the interior (not inspected but taken from listing description) makes a large contribution to significance.
- 6.5.40. The setting of the asset is formed by its immediate surrounding landscape of the working farmyard, including several large modern agricultural buildings to the north. These buildings will block views of the Site from Manor Farmhouse. The modern agricultural buildings make a neutral contribution to the significance. The fields to the north of the asset also form part of the setting which contributes to significance as it is likely these are the fields farmed by the asset.
- 6.5.41. The Site does not contribute to the setting of Manor Farmhouse as it has no current functional or historic association with the asset. Given the number, scale and density of built form to the north of the asset, and the fact the principal views from Manor Farmhouse face south and the Site is approximately 800m to the north-east of the asset, views south are considered to be of greater importance to the asset and views north of much less significance. In any case, given the distance and built form north of Manor Farmhouse, there will be no views of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development does introduce a change of character into the wider surroundings of the asset from agricultural to energy generation, however it has been established that the Site does not form part of the setting of this asset which contributes to significance. In addition, the Site is approximately 800m from the asset and with no visual or historic functional connections. The agricultural land surrounding Manor House is not considered to contribute to the significance of Manor House, as it has no historic or functional association. Simply being agricultural land in the wider vicinity of the asset of Manor House, a farmhouse within a working farmyard with no other connection in terms of historic or functional association is

insufficient grounds to state that this contributes to the significance. To refer to the terminology set out above at 6.3.3 and 6.3.4, the setting of an asset is described as the *surroundings in which an asset is experienced*. The asset cannot be experienced from the Site, nor do elements of the Site contribute to the understanding of this asset. As such, change within the wider agricultural landscape will not cause harm to the significance of this asset. The ability to appreciate the survival of historic fabric in the interior will not be affected nor will the understanding of this asset as a farmhouse within a working farmyard.

- 6.5.42. Therefore, the change introduced by the operational Proposed Development will not cause any impact or change to the significance of this asset. The magnitude of impact will be no change and the effect will be neutral (**not significant**).
- 6.5.43. None of the other identified heritage assets within the study areas are identified as experiencing any effects from the operational phase of the Proposed Development.
- 6.5.44. The identified effects above would not be different under the future baseline conditions.

Decommissioning Phase

- 6.5.45. The decommissioning of the Proposed Development would not result in any physical effects to heritage assets. The areas of archaeological potential will not require any intrusive works to remove the infrastructure of the Proposed Development, given the above-ground nature of all of the elements within. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated during this phase and the effect is neutral (**not significant**).
- 6.5.46. Should the below-ground cabling within the Site be removed as part of the decommissioning, this would also not result in any physical impacts to below-ground archaeology given the archaeological deposits disturbed by the insertion of the cable would have been removed and recorded via an Archaeological Watching Brief during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.
- 6.5.47. There is likely to be a beneficial effect upon the significance of the Grade I Listed Carlton Towers due to the removal of the Proposed Development infrastructure which has been assessed as causing a minor adverse effect during its operational lifetime. This beneficial effect arises from the removal of the Proposed Development and the restoration of the Site to agricultural use. The level of impact will be negligible and

the level of effect will be minor beneficial (**not significant**).

- 6.5.48. The identified effects above would not be different under the future baseline conditions.

6.6. Mitigation Measures

Construction Phase

- 6.6.1. With regards to impacts to below-ground archaeology, the mitigation measures to reduce the level of effect to these elements has been agreed within the AMS and are therefore considered to be measures to be adopted by the project. No further mitigation measures are proposed.

Operational Phase

- 6.6.2. During the operational phase of the Proposed Development, a scheme of interpretation, facilitated through the erection of information boards, established by DCO requirement, will be instigated. This will provide information on the heritage of the area along with other aspects of the surrounding natural and built environment to the general public. This will help to provide further information on the heritage assets within the area, including information on the anomalies identified during the geophysical survey. The information boards will be implemented to help better reveal the historic environment of the area and to help disseminate information gained during the preparation of the DCO to the public.

Decommissioning Phase

- 6.6.3. It is not considered that any heritage mitigation measures would be required for the decommissioning phase. Measures to protect the archaeological resource within the areas of preservation are set out within the AMS and are therefore considered to be measures to be adopted by the project.
- 6.6.4. Under the future baseline conditions, no additional mitigation measures would be required for the construction, operational and decommissioning phases beyond those identified above.

6.7. Residual Effects

Construction Phase

- 6.7.1. No additional mitigation is required with regards to the identified construction phase effects. Therefore, the significance of effects remain unchanged as set out in section 6.5 'Likely Significant Effects' of the chapter.
- 6.7.2. The significance of effects on identified areas of archaeological potential arising from the Proposed Development is considered to be neutral (**not significant**).
- 6.7.3. The significance of effects on below-ground archaeological deposits within the route of the underground cable corridor considered to be of low value would be minor adverse (**not significant**).
- 6.7.4. The identified effects are not considered to be significant.

Operational Phase

- 6.7.5. No additional mitigation is required with regards to the identified operational phase effects. Therefore, the residual effects of the operational phase of the Proposed Development remain as set out in section 6.5 'Likely Significant Effects' of this chapter:
- Camblesforth Hall (1173983), asset of high value: neutral (**not significant**);
 - Carlton Towers (1295955), asset of high value: minor adverse (**not significant**);
and
 - Manor Farmhouse (1148398), asset of moderate value: neutral (**not significant**).
- 6.7.6. The identified effects are not considered to be significant.

Decommissioning Phase

- 6.7.7. No additional mitigation is required with regards to the identified effects during the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development. Therefore, the residual effects of the decommissioning phase remain as set out in section 6.5 'Likely Significant Effects' of this chapter. A minor beneficial effect is anticipated upon the Grade I Listed Carlton Towers, as an asset of high value. This effect is **not significant**.

- 6.7.8. The effects identified above would remain unchanged under the future baseline conditions.

6.8. Cumulative Effects

Construction Phase

- 6.8.1. It is not considered that there would be any significant cumulative effects to heritage assets resulting from the Proposed Development in combination with other schemes during the construction phase. This is because the construction effects identified are limited to assets within the Site boundary and therefore, as no other scheme is located within the Site boundary, there would be no cumulative effect.

Operational Phase

- 6.8.2. **Chapter 2 EIA Methodology [EN010140/APP/6.1.2]** of the ES sets out the schemes that have been considered for likely significant cumulative effects on cultural heritage with the Proposed Development. A number of these schemes have been assessed as not having the potential to result in any cumulative effects in combination with the Proposed Development. This is due to factors including the distance from the Proposed Development, and review of the heritage documentation submitted in support of the schemes. This review identified that either no heritage effects were identified at all, or no heritage effects or harm were identified to heritage assets identified as experiencing an effect from the Proposed Development.
- 6.8.3. The following schemes are considered to be relevant for consideration in the assessment of the Proposed Development's likely significant cumulative effects.
- 6.8.4. The Land North and South of Camela Lane, Camblesforth scheme (ref. 2021/0788/EIA) comprises a ground-mounted solar farm, including associated infrastructure. Within the planning application documents submitted for this scheme¹⁸, a level of harm was identified to the Grade I Listed Camblesforth Hall through changes to its setting, and the change in appearance of the land to its north. It was considered that this harm was outweighed by the benefit of the scheme. Whilst the Proposed Development will introduce solar PV panels to the west of the Grade I

¹⁸ Lanpro, 2021, *Heritage Statement. Land north and South of Camblesforth, Selby, North Yorkshire*. Available at: https://publicaccess1.selby.gov.uk/PublicAccess_LIVE/Document/ViewDocument?id=5D43C39ADA5C11EBA5C9005056B348EC Accessed June 2023.

Listed Camblesforth Hall, it is not considered there would be any visibility of the Proposed Development due to the embedded mitigation incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development in this area. Therefore, as no effect has been predicted upon this asset from the Proposed Development, there can be no cumulative effect arising from the Land North and South of Camela Lane, Camblesforth scheme and the Proposed Development.

- 6.8.5. The planning application documents¹⁹ for the Land to the East New Road, Drax scheme (ref. 2022/0711/EIA) for a new converter station at Drax Power Station, granted permission in August 2023 but not yet under construction, identified harm to the Grade I Listed Church of St Peter and St. Paul at Drax. As this chapter has not identified any effects arising from the Proposed Development upon this heritage asset, there will therefore be no cumulative effect on this heritage asset resulting from the Proposed Development in cumulation with the Land to the East New Road, Drax scheme.

Decommissioning Phase

- 6.8.6. It is not considered that there would be any cumulative effects arising from the Proposed Development in cumulation with the other identified schemes during the decommissioning phase. None of the cumulative schemes identified any harm or effects to the one asset, the Grade I Listed Carlton Towers, which is identified as experiencing an effect during the decommissioning phase. Therefore, there can be no cumulative effect.

6.9. Summary

- 6.9.1. The methodology used to undertake this chapter is consistent with that set out within the EIA Scoping Report and PINS' adopted EIA Scoping Opinion. Desk-based research and data collection has been supplemented by site walkovers to visit identified heritage assets. To assist in the assessment of change to the setting of heritage assets, relevant guidance has been utilised.²⁰
- 6.9.2. There are no designated heritage assets located within the Site boundary. There are

¹⁹ AECOM, 2022, *Scotland England Green Link 2 – English Onshore Scheme. Environmental Statement Volume 2: Chapter 9: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage*. Available at: https://publicaccess1.selby.gov.uk/PublicAccess_LIVE/Document/ViewDocument?id=1A2435804758407AB2FEB60EA50CC96F Accessed June 2023

²⁰ Historic England, 2017, *The Setting of Heritage Assets. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 (2nd edition)*.

a limited number of records identified from the NYHER and NRHE within the Site and several areas of cropmarks that have been identified from aerial photographic analysis and NMP mapping. In addition to this, a geophysical survey has been carried out within the Site which has identified several areas of discrete archaeological anomalies, some of which correspond with previously recorded cropmarks.

- 6.9.3. The Proposed Development's construction, operational, and decommissioning phases are not anticipated to result in significant effects on cultural heritage.

Table 6.5: Table of Significance – Cultural Heritage

Potential Effect/Name of Receptor	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****	
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L		
Construction Phase (accounting for Embedded Mitigation and Measures to be Adopted by the Project)											
Effects on areas of archaeological potential identified through geophysical survey	Physical, permanent	Neutral	None required						X		Neutral (Not Significant)
Effects on below-ground archaeological deposits within underground cable route corridor due to excavation	Physical, permanent	Minor Adverse	None required							X	Minor Adverse (Not Significant)
Effects to the setting of above-ground heritage assets as a result of construction activity and transport movements	Temporary, short-term	Neutral	None required								Neutral (Not Significant)

Potential Effect/Name of Receptor	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
Operational Phase (accounting for Embedded Mitigation and Measures to be Adopted by the Project)										
Effects on the setting of Camblesforth Hall Grade I Listed Building (1173983)	Temporary, long term	Neutral	Interpretation boards will be established at the Site describing archaeological context of the area, secured by DCO requirement		X					Neutral (Not Significant)
Effects on the setting of Carlton Towers Grade I Listed Building (1295955)	Temporary, long-term	Minor Adverse			X					Minor Adverse (Not Significant)
Effects on the setting of Manor Farmhouse – Grade II Listed Building (1148398)	Temporary, long-term	Neutral			X					Neutral (Not Significant)
Decommissioning Phase (accounting for Embedded Mitigation and Measures to be Adopted by the Project)										
Effects on areas of archaeological potential identified through geophysical survey	Physical, permanent	Neutral	None required					X		Neutral (Not Significant)
Effects on Carlton Towers – Grade I listed building	Permanent	Minor Beneficial	None required		X					Minor Beneficial (Not Significant)

Potential Effect/Name of Receptor	Nature of Effect*	Significance **	Secondary Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance ***						Residual Effects ****
				I	UK	E	R	UA	L	
(1295955)										
Cumulative Effects										
Construction Phase										
<i>No effects identified</i>										
Operational Phase										
<i>No effects identified</i>										
Decommissioning Phase										
<i>No effects identified</i>										
Nature of Effect *	Permanent or Temporary Short-term, Medium-term, or Long-term									
Significance**	Major/ Moderate/ Minor/ Negligible/Neutral Beneficial/ Adverse									
Geographical Importance ***	I = International; UK = United Kingdom; E = England; R = Regional; UA = Unitary Authority; L = Local									
Residual Effects ****	Major / Moderate / Minor / Negligible/Neutral Beneficial / Adverse									