

Annex 18.4

Assessment of Setting Effects
on the Significance of Heritage
Assets

(AC Archaeology)

Able UK Limited Marine Energy Park: Assessment of setting effects on the significance of heritage assets

Prepared by:
Sarah Cottam and Peter Cox

On behalf of:
Able UK Limited

Document No: ACW283/4/0

Date: December 2011



archaeology

Able UK Limited Marine Energy Park: Assessment of setting effects on the significance of heritage assets

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 An assessment of the effects of the development of the proposed Able UK Ltd Marine Energy Park (AMEP), on the setting of heritage assets, has been undertaken with reference to the guidance set out in *The Setting of Heritage Assets* (English Heritage 2011). The assessment has concentrated on the long-term effects during the operational phase of the AMEP site; short-lived effects during construction of the facilities are considered in the main Environmental Statement (ES) chapters (Chapters 18 and 40).

1.2 The study has comprised the following:

Step 1: In order to identify the heritage assets affected, consideration has been given to a) the kinds of effects on setting that the AMEP development is capable of producing, b) the extent of those effects and c) the nature of the existing conditions at the AMEP site and Compensation Site.

Step 2: The assessment (shown on assessment table) comprised a) a description of the current setting and b) a consideration of whether, how and to what degree the current setting makes a contribution to the significance of each heritage asset selected in the study area.

Step 3: An assessment was made as to the effect the proposed development may have on the setting of heritage assets and the resultant effects on the significance of the asset.

Step 4: Consideration has been given to how the effects on significance can be reduced.

1.3 The assessment includes the AMEP site on the south bank of the Humber and the Compensation Site on the north bank (Cherry Cobb Sands and Old Little Humber Farm). The results of the assessment are set out in the assessment table.

2. DEFINITION OF SETTING

2.1 Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance, (English Heritage 2008)

Para 76

'Setting' is an established concept that relates to the surroundings in which a place is experienced, its local context, embracing present and past relationships to the adjacent landscape. Definition of the setting of a significant place will normally be guided by the extent to which material change within it could affect (enhance or diminish) the place's significance

Para 77

'Context' embraces any relationship between a place and other places. It can be, for example, cultural, intellectual spatial or functional, so any one place can have a multi-layered context. The range of contextual relationships of a place will normally emerge from an understanding of its origins and evolution. Understanding context is particularly relevant to assessing whether a place has greater value for being part of a larger entity, or sharing characteristics with other places.

2.2 Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment Annex 2

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.

2.3 The Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide

This document supports PPS5 and provides further guidance as follows (with the relevant paragraph numbers cited)

(113) Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. 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.

(114) The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration; by spatial associations; and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each. They would be considered to be within one another's setting.

(115) Setting will, therefore, generally be more extensive than curtilage, and its perceived extent may change as an asset and its surroundings evolve or as understanding of the asset improves.

(116) The setting of a heritage asset can enhance its significance whether or not it was designed to do so. The formal parkland around a country house and the fortuitously developed multi-period townscape around a Medieval church may both contribute to the significance.

(117) The contribution that setting makes to the significance does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance. Nevertheless, proper evaluation of the effect of change within the setting of a heritage asset will usually need to consider the implications, if any, for public appreciation of its significance.

3. DEFINITION OF SIGNIFICANCE

3.1 Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5) Annex 2

The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.

3.2 PPS5 provides no terminology for ranking the relative significance of heritage assets. In the absence of a nationally accepted means of ranking the significance (importance/value) of archaeological and cultural heritage assets (other than the Secretary of State's non-statutory criteria for the assessment of national importance – principally condition, period, rarity, group value and survival), a set of terms has been applied in order to provide a comparison of the relative importance of any cultural heritage features present on the site. Appropriate rankings are considered to be National importance, Regional/County importance, Local importance, No importance; these rankings are based primarily on an asset's evidential archaeological or historical value.

4. STEP 1: IDENTIFY ASSETS THAT MAY BE AFFECTED

4.1 Specific guidance is provided in the English Heritage guidance document (EH 2011) which states in Section 4.2 that

...if the development is capable of affecting the contribution of a heritage asset's setting to its significance or the appreciation of its significance, it can be considered as falling within the asset's setting.

The area of assessment for a large or prominent development, such as a tall building in an urban environment or a wind turbine in the countryside, can often extend for a distance of several kilometres. In these circumstances, while a proposed development may affect the setting of numerous heritage assets, it may not impact on them all equally, as some will be more sensitive to change affecting their setting than others.

4.2 The principal effects that the AMEP development may have on the setting of heritage assets arises from the proximity to the asset, the extent of the development, the prominence and scale of the development, changes to the skyline, lighting effects, and the duration of the operation of the site. These are all visual effects. Other factors that may be considered part of the setting of a site, such as changes in soil chemistry, compaction and hydrology are not dealt with here but considered in Chapter 18 of the ES.

4.3 It is apparent from the assessment of Landscape effects (ES Chapters 20 and 41) that the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) from the turbines on the quayside may extend for in excess of 30km to the north and east of the AMEP site, and generally up to 15km to the south and west (ES Figure 20.3a). The Compensation Site has a more restricted visual effect, but is also considered in the assessment table, where appropriate.

4.4 The existing landscape and land use in the vicinity of the AMEP site comprises major industrial activity, including oil refineries, power stations and port facilities. These are visible from many heritage assets in the area. The new sources of potential effects on setting will, therefore, be introduced into an area already dominated by a distinctive, modern, late twentieth century industrial landscape. The most prominent existing industrial features comprise derricks, flare stacks and cooling towers, up to c. 30 m in height, that have been constructed over the past c. 25 years. The visual backdrop to many heritage assets in the study area is, therefore, dynamic and able to accommodate change. Furthermore, while the AMEP site will be in use over a long period of time (>15 years) and the visual effects are considered permanent, the effects are reversible in the long term and of variable intensity, depending on the number of turbines on the quay (the highest point of the site) at any one time.

4.5 Given the existing conditions on the AMEP site it was considered reasonable that a zone of c. 10km is sufficient to assess setting effects on heritage assets. Beyond this zone visual effects are considered too minor to affect significance. All heritage assets within the zone have been identified (see ES Figure 18.2) and further analysed if they meet the following criteria.

- The asset is considered to be of national significance;
- There is intervisibility between the asset and the AMEP site
- The asset has a setting susceptible to visual intrusion

In addition an asset may be included if it;

- cover a large area;
- have relationships with other heritage assets, or
- incorporate formal design, openness, or acts as a prominence or focal point in the local landscape.

5. STEP 2: ASSESS THE CONTRIBUTION OF SETTING TO SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HERITAGE ASSET

5.1 For the purposes of this study the key attributes of each affected heritage asset was assessed and then consideration given to the following:

- the physical surroundings of the asset, including its relationship with other heritage assets;
- the way the asset is appreciated; and
- the asset's associations and patterns of use.

5.2 The analysis is presented in the attached table.

6. STEP 3: ASSESS THE EFFECT OF THE DEVELOPMENT ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HERITAGE ASSET

6.1 For the purposes of this study, the range of effects of the development on settings and the degree of harm or benefit to the significance of each asset has been evaluated. Using guidance provided in Section 4.2 of *The Setting of Heritage Assets*, the key attributes considered were:

- location and siting;
- form and appearance;
- additional effects; and
- permanence.

6.2 It is considered that the AMEP development will not have a beneficial effect on any heritage assets. Effects are likely to be either neutral or adverse. In general, it is considered that the ability to see the AMEP site, against an industrial skyline, does not in itself constitute an effect on significance. Most impacts are therefore considered to be minor due to their cumulative effect within an existing dynamic skyline.

6.3 The consideration of effects set out in the assessment table includes guidance on the effects of wind turbines provided in the English Heritage document **Wind Energy and the Historic Environment**.

Indirect Impacts: Turbine towers are now typically in excess of 60 metres in height and may have a visual influence of more than ten kilometres in radius. Because wind turbines work best in locations where conditions are frequently windy, their visibility is often increased by being situated on high ground or in exposed positions in order to maximise energy yields. Similarly, in order to distance development from population centres, many existing developments have been sited in upland locations: places which are valued for their wild and remote character and often for their exceptionally well-preserved historic remains.

The wider landscape: While all landscapes are the product of human intervention and are therefore historic to some degree, some have been far more dynamic over time or have altered more radically than others. These historically dynamic landscapes, particularly those where the prevailing character is industrial or agriculturally intensive, may be more suited to accommodating large-scale wind energy developments than less dynamic areas. The historic character of the landscape should therefore be considered alongside other aspects of character and visual and aesthetic issues when framing planning policies or determining individual applications and landscape capacity and sensitivity analyses should always include the historic dimension.

Reversibility: One important feature of wind energy developments is their general reversibility (in terms of landscape if not archaeological impacts). Planning authorities should therefore make provision, as part of any planning permission, for the long-term protection of the landscape by requiring legal agreements for the remediation and restoration of wind farm sites and their infrastructure when they are decommissioned.

8. STEP 4: ENHANCEMENT AND MITIGATION

8.1 The nature of the effects on setting and the scale of the development does not lend itself to tree screening or other landscaping techniques to minimise impacts. Only in the case of the Lighthouses at South Killingholme is any mitigation offered; by implementing a management plan.

9. RESULTS

9.1 The assessment table contains a review of those heritage assets within the study area, where the AMEP site may affect the settings and hence significance of the asset. It summarises the principal factors that contribute to their setting and comments on the contribution that views of the AMEP site may have on their significance.



10. REFERENCES



(English Heritage 2008) Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the sustainable management of the historic environment. London.



(English Heritage 2010) Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 5: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide.


(English Heritage 2011a) Seeing the History in the View: A method for assessing heritage significance within views.


(English Heritage 2011b) The Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance.


Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>LIGHTHOUSES, SOUTH KILLINGHOLME Listed Buildings Grade II Killingholme High LB No. 165871 Killingholme North Low LB No. 165872 Killingholme South Low LB No. 165873</p>	<p>This group lies at around 3m OD behind the sea wall on the south shore of the River Humber at South Killingholme. There is modern development to the south and west; open views to the north and east. Their position on the river bank preserves the principal element of the original setting which required open views onto the estuary. The three lighthouses were intended to mark safe passage past Grimsby towards Killingholme. Post war development surrounds two of the lighthouses (top photo), the third lies within the proposed development area (lower photo; Site 165871) and is currently occupied as a dwelling.</p>	<p>Views from the lighthouses across and along the Humber to other surviving lighthouses of the Humber Estuary Lights series are fundamental to the group's significance as they provide a historic link with earlier phases of maritime activity. Their visual prominence and functional relationship with each other was a crucial part of their original design. There are few prominent land positions, other than from the sea wall, from which to view them as a group or individually and no direct public access.</p>	<p>Despite there already being extensive modern industrial development to the south and west, it is considered that the addition of high structures, the new quay, cranes and temporary towers to the north and west will no longer allow clear visibility from the river; this is particularly the case with site 165871 where it will probably be undetectable from the AMEP backdrop. Intervisibility with lighthouses at Thorngumbald Clough will be prevented by the construction of the new quay. This is considered to be a high adverse impact on the significance of the group as a whole.</p>	<p>It will be necessary to ensure that the structure within the development area is protected during construction from damage. Vibration effects will also be monitored. A management plan will be agreed with NLC.</p>
	<p>BRICK AND TILE KILN INCLUDING CHIMNEY, EAST HALTON Listed Building Grade II LB No. 165900</p>	<p>Prominent chimney adjacent to sea wall NE of East Halton. Provides a reference point from local viewpoints marking the historic sea wall.</p>	<p>Views into the asset are largely restricted by the hedged boundaries that surround it, although the chimney is a prominent feature. The former quarry pits lie to the south, now infilled. The asset represents part of the early industrial development of the area</p>	<p>Views south from the asset already have a distant backdrop of industrial development. However, the proposed structures will lie in front of these. Given that the asset is itself an industrial structure and provides a visual historic link to later development to the north the cumulative effect on the setting is considered have a minor adverse effect on the significance of the asset. See Photomontage20.4a view 1</p>	<p>None proposed</p>



Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>MOATED SITE & EARTHWORKS AT BAYSGARTH FARM, EAST HALTON Scheduled Monument No. 21185</p>	<p>The asset lies at around c. 10m OD on generally level ground between the villages of East Halton and North Killingholme. Medieval field systems adjoin the asset on its north, west and east sides. Beyond these, modern housing lies to the north and post-war industrial development lies to the southeast, all clearly visible from the asset.</p> <p>The site is one of four similar sites which together record the historical development of the villages along an arterial road.</p>	<p>Views into and from within the asset are restricted by the hedged boundaries that surround it. There are no prominent positions from which to view it and no public access. The immediate setting of the asset includes visible, well-preserved earthwork remains. The surrounding Medieval field systems provide an important contribution to its setting through their historic associations with it. None of the four moated manor sites are inter-visible.</p>	<p>Views from the asset toward the river already have a backdrop of industrial development. There will be a small incremental cumulative impact due to the height of the proposed installations. This is considered to be a minor adverse impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
	<p>NORTH GARTH MOATED SITE, NORTH KILLINGHOLME Scheduled Monument No. 21186</p>	<p>The asset lies at around c. 10m OD on generally level farmland between the villages of East Halton and North Killingholme. Medieval field systems adjoin the asset on its south and east sides. Post-war industrial development lies to the east and is clearly visible from the asset.</p> <p>The site is one of four similar sites which together record the historical development of the villages along an arterial road.</p>	<p>Views from within, and into, the asset are restricted by the hedged boundaries that surround it. There are few prominent positions from which to view it, but there is public access into the site. The setting of the asset comprises well preserved and extensive Medieval field systems which provide a visual contribution and historic association to its setting. The industrial development to the east is clearly visible from the asset but from the east looking across the monument the view is uncluttered. None of the four moated manor sites are inter-visible.</p>	<p>Views from the asset toward the river already have a backdrop of industrial development. There will be a small incremental cumulative impact due to the height of the proposed installations. This is considered to be a minor adverse impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>



Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>MANOR FARM MOATED SITE, EAST HALTON Scheduled Monument No. 21187</p>	<p>The asset lies at around 10m OD on generally level ground at the north end of East Halton village. Medieval field systems adjoin the asset to the south and east and , more distantly, to the west. There is modern industrial development to the southeast. The asset is one of four similar sites which together record the historical development of the villages along an arterial road.</p>	<p>Views from within, and into, the asset are restricted by the hedged boundaries that surround it. There are few prominent positions from which to view it and no public access. The immediate setting of the asset includes visible, well-preserved earthwork remains. The surrounding Medieval field systems provide an important contribution to its setting through their historic associations with it. None of the four moated manor sites are inter-visible. Industrial development is distantly visible to the south east</p>	<p>Views from the asset toward the river already have a backdrop of industrial development. There will be a small incremental impact due to the height of the proposed installations. See Photomontage <i>Figure 20.4d</i>. This is considered to be a minor adverse impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
	<p>CHURCH OF ST DENYS, NORTH KILLINGHOLME Listed Building Grade I LB No. 165854</p>	<p>The asset lies on generally level ground within a small village. The village itself is a mix of post-Medieval and modern buildings. The church lies on the edge of the village green. There is a moated manor site to the north (21188) and this is inter-visible with the church. Medieval field systems are visible to the west.</p>	<p>The most prominent view of the church when approaching the village is from the East Halton road looking east with the oil refineries behind it. However, from Vicarage Lane, to the south of the church, the asset can be appreciated within a clear and unspoilt view with the church dominating its immediate village setting. The presence of agricultural fields to the west and a moated manor to the north comprise a historically significant group of assets that are visible from the churchyard. More distant views from the site do not add to its significance.</p>	<p>There will be views of cranes and the temporary towers to the east of the church but these will lie beyond the oil refineries already constructed. It is considered that, while the principal significance of the asset is its historical position within the village and its relationship to other assets, its visual setting is already affected by modern development and that the cumulative effect of the proposed new structures will have a minor adverse impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>



Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>MANOR FARM MOATED SITE, NORTH KILLINGHOLME Scheduled Monument No. 21188 Listed Building Grade II* LB No. 165856 Listed Buildings Grade II LB No. 165857</p>	<p>The assets lie at c.15m OD on level ground on the northern edge of the older part of the village. Post-war industrial developments lie to the east of these assets and are clearly visible from them. The assets comprise two moated sites, one within the other and the farmhouse and associated structures, which lie within the larger moated area. The church and ploughed-out field systems lie to the south and are inter-visible with the asset.</p>	<p>There are no prominent views of the assets which lie in an isolated position within farmland. There is no public accessibility. The farmhouse is most clearly visible from the churchyard to the south and from here the oil refineries to the east are also clearly visible. However, the immediate setting of the moated sites within a surviving field system and close to the church comprise a historically significant group of associated assets that are inter-visible. More distant views from the asset do not add to its significance</p>	<p>There will be views of cranes, temporary towers and possibly some structures from the assets but these will lie beyond the oil refineries already constructed. It is considered that, while the principal significance of the asset is its historical position within farmland on the edge of the village and its relationship to other assets, its visual setting is already affected by modern development. The cumulative effect of the proposed new structures will have a minor adverse impact on its significance.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>



Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>HULL DOCK DECOYS, PAULL Scheduled Monument No. 34704</p>	<p>The site lies just above high water level and is largely overgrown. The River Humber lies to the west and low lying farmland lies to the east, north and south. There are long distant views in all directions including across to the industrial areas on the south shore.</p>	<p>The only accessible view of the asset is from the sea wall adjacent to it. The site lies in an isolated location but does have public access via the sea wall. The asset was originally intended to be viewed from above by enemy planes targeting Hull rather than from the ground and as such its design can still only be fully appreciated from the air. Additionally, the asset was intended to be functional only when illuminated at night during blackout. Its position within a largely unpopulated area on the edge of the river was a significant factor in choice of location. This setting has remained largely unchanged. The asset lies close to an anti-aircraft battery, adding to its historic significance as part of the defence of Britain during WW2. Despite their historic associations the battery and dock decoy are not intervisible and they do not contribute to visual setting.</p>	<p>There will be distant views of the high structures, the new quay, cranes and temporary towers from the asset but these will be largely indistinguishable from the existing backdrop of industry on the south shore of the river. It is considered that the cumulative effect of the proposed new structures will have a minor adverse impact on the significance of this asset.</p> <p>The Compensation site to the southeast will create a modified alignment of the sea wall and introduce a new wet inlet behind the existing wall. This may have a minor adverse effect on aerial views of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>



Heritage Asset	Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
 <p>THORNTON ABBEY, THORNTON CURTIS Scheduled Monument No. 13377 Listed Buildings Grade I Abbey Gatehouse LB No. 165878 Church Ruins LB No. 165879 Listed Buildings Grade II Bridge LB No. 165880 Walls enclosing orchard LB No. 165881 Walls to custodians lodge LB No. 165882 Ruins of south precinct gateway LB No. 165891</p>	<p>The principal buildings comprise the abbey gatehouse and wing walls, the remains of the abbey church and cloisters. Associated with these remains are fishponds, moat and other features within the abbey precinct which provide the immediate setting. The gatehouse is an imposing feature in an otherwise open, flat, landscape and can be seen at distance. Views out of the site add to its remoteness and there are few modern structures nearby. Views to the southeast contain the modern industrial skyline of North Killingholme and Immingham which is only reduced by the presence of occasional trees at the southern end of the precinct. From the upper levels of the gatehouse the industrial skyline provides a stark contrast with the Medieval precinct.</p>	<p>The scale of the upstanding remains set against the stark, flat, open landscape means that its visual setting contributes greatly to an appreciation of the monument as a special historical place. The distant views of the industrial skyline detract from that appreciation, particularly as visitors view power station cooling towers framed in the distance as they approach the gatehouse from the car park.</p>	<p>The addition of tall buildings, towers and cranes may add significantly to the cluster of industrial structures currently visible. Overall, it is considered the cumulative effect of the proposed structures will have a minor adverse impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>



Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>PAULL POINT BATTERY, PAULL Scheduled Monument No. 34713 Listed Building Grade II LB No. 166651</p>	<p>The asset lies at c.10m OD on the north bank of the River Humber. It includes a WWII coastal battery and its perimeter is ringed by public footpaths. Salt marsh and agricultural lands lie to the south and east. There are distant views across the river to the industrial areas on the south shore and to the urban and industrial areas of Hull, which the fort was designed and located to protect.</p>	<p>There are prominent views of the asset from the river and from lands to the south. The site is open to the public. Views across and down the River Humber are a major part of its setting and contributes to its significance.</p>	<p>There will be distant views of the high structures, the new quay, cranes and temporary towers from the asset. See photomontage <i>Figure 19.4b</i> (night view only). The view of the site from the river approach will not be affected. It is considered that the cumulative effect of the proposed structures will have a minor adverse impact on the significance of this asset</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
	<p>CHURCH OF ST ANDREW, PAULL Listed Building Grade I LB No. 166656</p>	<p>The asset lies close to the high point of the ridge at Paull, at c. 12m OD. There are open fields to the north and east and salt marshes to the south. The church does not lie close to an existing settlement. Its slightly elevated position provides distant views to the industrial areas of the south shore of the Humber and to the Saltend chemical works to the north.</p>	<p>The prominence of the location provides good views from the asset in all directions. There is public access and the site is part of a local heritage trail which includes Paull Battery. The views of modern industrial developments, particularly to the north, detract from the broader setting. Its immediate setting within an agricultural and salt marsh landscape adjacent to the river is preserved. The cemetery contains bodies recovered from the Humber, forming a close association with both the River Humber and the working communities on it. This contributes to the historic significance of the asset.</p>	<p>There will be distant views of the high structures, the new quay, cranes and temporary towers from the asset but these will be largely indistinguishable from the existing backdrop of industry on the south shore of the river. It is considered that the cumulative effect of the proposed structures will have an imperceptible impact on the significance of this asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>


Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>PAULL HOLME MOATED SITE Scheduled Monument No. 21175</p> <p>PAULL HOLME TOWER Listed Building Grade I LB No. 166654</p>	<p>The assets lie at c.5m OD within generally level agricultural land close to the north shore of the Humber. The site lies in a secluded location surrounded by hedged or tree lined boundaries on a private lane and there is no public access. There appears to have been no encroachment by modern development.</p>	<p>The assets lie on a private road and there is no public access and no prominent views. The tower is not easily visible from outside the boundaries of its immediate plot. This implies restricted views from within also. There may be distant views across the Humber toward the industrial areas of the south shore. The Scheduled Monument within which the tower stands has largely protected its immediate setting and the lack of modern development suggests that the broader setting has also remained largely unchanged. This contributes greatly to the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>There are likely to be distant views of the high structures, the new quay, cranes and temporary towers from the assets but these will be largely indistinguishable from the existing backdrop of industry on the south shore of the river. It is considered that the cumulative impact of the proposed structures will have an imperceptible impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
	<p>STONE CREEK HEAVY ANTI-AIRCRAFT SITE, SUNK ISLAND Scheduled Monument No. 32706</p>	<p>The asset lies at c. 4-5m OD on the north shore of the River Humber. There are open fields to the east, southeast and north and foreshore to the southwest. 19th century coastguard cottages lie to the west. There are distant views across the river towards the industrial areas of the south shore. There appears to be no encroachment from modern development and the area is largely agricultural and salt marsh. The site is currently in a state of decay</p>	<p>There are no prominent views of the asset and no public access. The setting has remained largely unchanged. The asset lies close to the dock decoys, adding to its historic significance as part of the defence of Britain during WWII. Despite their historic associations the anti aircraft site and dock decoys are not intervisible.</p>	<p>There are likely to be distant views of the high structures, the new quay, cranes and temporary towers from the asset, above the sea wall, but these will be largely indistinguishable from the existing backdrop of industry on the south shore of the river. It is considered that the cumulative effect of the proposed structures will have an imperceptible impact on the setting of the asset</p> <p>The Compensation Site will not affect the setting.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>THORNGUMBALD CLOUGH LIGHTHOUSES, PAULL Listed Buildings Grade II LB No. 166657 LB No. 166658</p>	<p>The lighthouses are located on a narrow spit of land on the north shore of the River Humber. They are largely surrounded by agricultural lands, salt marsh and foreshore with Paull Fort to the north west. There is no encroachment from modern development. There are distant views across the river towards the industrial areas of the south shore</p>	<p>There are few prominent positions from which to view the assets and they are not publicly accessible. Both lighthouses are still in use. Views from the lighthouses across and along the Humber to other surviving lighthouses of the Humber Estuary Lights series remain intact and are fundamental to their significance as they provide a historic link with previous maritime activity.</p>	<p>There will be distant views of the high structures, the new quay, cranes and temporary towers from the assets but these will be largely indistinguishable from the existing backdrop of industry on the south shore of the river. Direct views to the Killingholme group of lighthouses will be obscured. It is considered that the cumulative effect of the proposed structures will have a minor adverse impact on the setting of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
	<p>MEDIEVAL SETTLEMENT, CROXTON Scheduled Monument No. 32629 CHURCH OF ST JOHN Listed Building Grade II* LB No. 165913</p>	<p>The church lies on a small knoll of high ground within the existing settlement with the former settlement on lower ground to the west and east. A ridge to the northeast of these assets rises to c. 40m OD and blocks low-level views across to the industrial areas on the south shore. The assets lie within agricultural lands which have been truncated by modern railway and road systems.</p>	<p>There are no prominent positions from which to view the assets as a whole. Publicly accessible roads and paths provide good views of the immediate environs of the site. The church and former settlement are intervisible. The church dominates both the former and existing settlements from its slightly higher position. The historic and visual associations between the former settlement, the church and traces of field systems beyond contributes to the historic significance of this group of assets. More distant views from the site do not add to their significance.</p>	<p>It is considered that the principal significance of the asset is its historical position within the village and its relationship to other assets. Its visual setting is already affected by modern roads and the railway. There may be distant views of the cranes and temporary towers but the cumulative effect of the proposed structures will have an imperceptible impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>ROMAN SETTLEMENT, KIRMINGTON Scheduled Monument No. NL217</p>	<p>The site lies on generally level ground at c. 20m OD. There is no visible trace of the asset above ground. Humberside International Airport lies to the south and the village of Kirmington to the east. To the north west there are views across agricultural land and a railway to a large modern quarry complex. To the northeast the land rises to c.30m OD which blocks low-level views toward the industrial areas on the south shore of the Humber.</p>	<p>There are no visible elements to this asset at ground level therefore a visual setting does not contribute to its significance. There are no known associated heritage assets within its immediate environs that contribute a wider context for the asset.</p>	<p>It is considered that the proposed structures will have no impact on the setting of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
	<p>MEDIEVAL SETTLEMENT, MANOR HOUSE AND FORMAL GARDENS, STALLINGBOROUGH Scheduled Monument No. 34711 CHURCHYARD CROSS Scheduled Monument No. 34706</p>	<p>These assets lie below 10m OD and comprise the earthwork remains of a medieval settlement, a post-medieval manor house, formal gardens and a churchyard cross. The assets lie on the west side of Stallingborough. The scheduled area is bounded by hedges to the west and property boundaries elsewhere. The church is adjacent to the assets. Ploughed outfield systems and further settlement remains lie to the west and southwest. There are open views to the north. A railway line runs adjacent to the northern boundary of the scheduled area and modern residential developments are encroaching to the south.</p>	<p>There are prominent views of the assets from the church and from the south west but they are not publicly accessible. Open fields to the west give some appreciation of the original landscape of the settlement. The former settlement lies close to surviving field systems and the church. All are intervisible. These visual and historic associations form a significant group of assets. More distant views from the site do not add to its significance.</p>	<p>It is considered that, while the principal significance of the assets are their historical position close to the church and as part of an extensive medieval settlement, their visual setting is already affected by the railway and other modern development. The proposed new structures will have an imperceptible impact on the significance of these assets.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

Heritage Asset	Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
  <p>BROCKLESBY PARK, BROCKLESBY Registered Park No. 1969 Listed Building Grade I LB No. 196557 LB No. 196579 LB No. 196580 LB No. 196583 Listed Building Grade II* LB No. 196562 LB No. 196564 LB No. 196567 LB No. 196558 LB No. 196584 Listed Building Grade II LB No. 196563 LB No. 196565 LB No. 196568 LB No. 196560 LB No. 196559 LB No. 196561 LB No. 196570 LB No. 196571 LB No. 196572 LB No. 196573 LB No. 196574 LB No. 196576 LB No. 196577 LB No. 196578 LB No. 196581 LB No. 196582</p>	<p>The park comprises an area of c.600ha and is composed of a large body of parkland with a sinuous woodland, cut through with rides. It is bounded by roads to the east, north-east and south-west, by Great Limber village to the south and by farmland to the north-west. Its highest point is c53m OD at the southern end and a broad ridge to the north lies at c.30m OD. The park contains a number of Listed buildings, including the main house, several of which have clear views between them. There is a long view across the lake towards the house. There are no views beyond the north-east boundaries of the park from the house. There are distant views toward the industrial areas of the south shore from the northern boundaries of the park.</p>	<p>The park was designed by Lancelot Brown and embellished by Thomas White and Humphrey Repton. The Listed buildings all lie within the park boundaries and have been designed to be largely intervisible with open views between them. The views from the house, assumed to be a principal factor in determining the significance of the park, have remained unaltered. Together the assets create an enclosed, ornamental landscape which appears to have changed little since the early 19th century. The unaltered visual and cultural associations greatly enhance the significance of this group of assets.</p>	<p>It is considered that the principal views within the park and the functional relationship between the heritage assets within it are unaffected. There may be distant views of the cranes and temporary towers from the northern boundaries of the asset but the cumulative effect of the proposed structures will have a minor adverse impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>WOOTON HALL, WOOTON Listed Building Grade II* LB No. 165936</p>	<p>This asset lies at around 35m OD on generally level ground. The village of Wooton lies to the south and there are agricultural lands to the north, east and west. The building lies within formal gardens that appear to be of some age and is likely to have once extended north into an area called 'The Park'. The asset is not visible from public roads.</p>	<p>The asset lies within private gardens. There is no public access. The asset is not visible from outside its immediate boundaries. This also implies restricted views out from the site. The asset once lay on the edge of designed parkland, which would have provided a broader vista than now exists, although the physical surroundings of the asset have otherwise remained largely unchanged. The historic core of the village lies to the southeast and is no longer visible from the asset. The seclusion provided by tree screens restricts appreciation of the asset and obscures distant views of it and the change in surrounding land-use has considerably altered the original setting</p>	<p>There may be distant views of the proposed new structures but the cumulative effect of the proposed structures will have a minor adverse to imperceptible impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
	<p>THORNTON HALL, THORNTON CURTIS Listed Building Grade II* LB No. 165887</p>	<p>The asset lies at c25m OD and is set almost entirely within agricultural land with a road to the south. The asset is visible from this road. The building now has a very restricted curtilage although it is likely to have been part of a designed landscape. There are open views to the south toward the industrial areas.</p>	<p>There is no public access to the asset. The reduction of the garden/park in the early 20th century has considerably altered the original setting. The asset was designed to be viewed from the road and across parkland. These views remain unimpeded by modern development. However, the significance of the asset is reduced by the changes of land-use as the original intention of the designer, that it be viewed as part of a designed landscape, has been reduced.</p>	<p>There may be distant views of the proposed new structures but the cumulative effect of the proposed structures will have a minor adverse to imperceptible impact on the significance of the asset.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

Heritage Asset		Step 2a: Description of modern setting	Step 2b: Contribution of setting to the significance of the asset	Step 3: The effect of the development on the significance of the asset	Step 4: Mitigation
	<p>SUNK ISLAND Conservation Area</p>	<p>The asset comprises a large area of flat agricultural land behind the sea wall on the north shore of the River Humber. Sunk Island is a product of 17th - 19th century embanking and reclamation that linked a small island to the bank of the Humber. It is sparsely populated with isolated houses and farms. There are open views into and out of the asset, including views of the industrial areas on the south shore.</p>	<p>The gradual post-17th century land reclamation has created a landscape and settlement pattern unique within the East Riding of Yorkshire. Some of the farmsteads within the asset were designed or enhanced during the mid 19th century by architect S.S. Teulon, under instruction from Prince Albert and the Crown Estate. Views between the farms and within the asset have remained largely unchanged since and there has been no encroachment from modern development. These visual, functional and cultural associations greatly enhance the significance of this asset.</p>	<p>There will be distant views of the proposed new structures but the cumulative effect of the proposed structures may have a minor adverse impact on the significance of the asset.</p> <p>The Compensation Site will not affect the setting of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>

Wiltshire Office

AC archaeology Ltd
Manor Farm Stables
Chicklade
Hindon
Nr Salisbury
Wiltshire
SP3 5SU

Telephone: 01747 820581
Fax: 01747 820440

Devon Office

AC archaeology Ltd
Unit 4, Halthaies Workshops
Bradninch
Nr Exeter
Devon
EX5 4LQ

Telephone/Fax: 01392 882410

www.acarchaeology.co.uk