

IMMINGHAM EASTERN RO-RO TERMINAL



Environmental Statement: Volume 1
Chapter 15: Cultural Heritage and Marine Archaeology
Document Reference: 8.2.15

APFP Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5(2)(a) and 5(2)(e)
PINS Reference – TR030007

December 2022

Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal

Environmental Statement: Volume 1

Chapter 15: Cultural Heritage and Marine Archaeology

December 2022



Document Information

Document Information	
Project	Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal
Document title	Environmental Statement: Volume 1 Chapter 15: Cultural Heritage and Marine Archaeology
Commissioned by	Associated British Ports
Document ref	8.2.15
APFP Reg 2009	Regulation 5(2)(a) and 5(2)(e)
Prepared by	Wessex Archaeology

Date	Version	Revision Details
12/12/2022	1	

Contents

15	Cultural Heritage and Marine Archaeology	15.1
15.1	Introduction	15.1
15.2	Definition of the study area	15.2
15.3	Assessment methodology	15.2
15.4	Consultation	15.10
15.5	Implications of policy legislation and guidance	15.16
15.6	Description of the existing environment	15.20
15.7	Future baseline environment	15.26
15.8	Consideration of likely impacts and effects	15.26
15.9	Mitigation measures	15.31
15.10	Limitations and assumptions	15.34
15.11	Residual effects and conclusions	15.34
15.12	References	15.38
15.13	Abbreviations/Acronyms	15.40
15.14	Glossary	15.42

Tables

Table 15.1.	Criteria discriminating relevance of identified features to proposed scheme	15.4
Table 15.2.	Criteria to assess the archaeological value of marine receptors.....	15.8
Table 15.3.	Classification of magnitude of impact	15.9
Table 15.4.	Significance matrix.....	15.9
Table 15.5.	Summary of consultation	15.11
Table 15.6.	Value of seabed prehistory heritage receptors	15.21
Table 15.7.	Maritime recorded losses, summary by date	15.23
Table 15.8.	Summary of potential impact, mitigation measures and residual impacts	15.36

15 Cultural Heritage and Marine Archaeology

15.1 Introduction

- 15.1.1 This chapter provides an assessment of the potential significant effects of the proposed Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal (IERRT) on cultural heritage and marine archaeology. This chapter has been prepared by Wessex Archaeology.
- 15.1.2 During the First World War, the Port of Immingham was a submarine base for British D class submarines and in the Second World War functioned as a naval base and headquarters for the Royal Navy. The Port was considerably expanded during the second half of the 20th century, with east and west jetties and the addition of several deep-water jetties for the handling of various bulk cargoes. Further extensions have been undertaken during the 21st century, improving the port infrastructure and facilities to cater for the export of bulk cargoes and goods.
- 15.1.3 The following receptors have been taken forward as part of the assessment:
- Seabed prehistory (for example, palaeochannels and other features that contain prehistoric sediment, and derived Palaeolithic artefacts e.g. hand axes);
 - Seabed features, including maritime receptors (such as shipwrecks and associated material including cargo, obstructions, and fishermen's fasteners) and aviation receptors (aircraft crash sites and associated debris);
 - Intertidal heritage receptors; and
 - The historic setting of the Port of Immingham, including the wider designated terrestrial heritage receptors.
- 15.1.4 Potential direct impacts to terrestrial heritage receptors from the IERRT project were scoped out as no receptors are located within the footprint of the proposed development. This was agreed in the scoping responses from the archaeological curators (see Table 15.5). The lack of receptors is shown on Figure 1 of Appendix 15.2 (Historic Environment Setting Assessment) in Volume 3 of this Environmental Statement (ES) (Application Document Reference number 8.4). Impacts from the disposal of dredged material have also been scoped out as should this activity be required it will take place at already licensed marine disposal sites that have been characterised for this purpose.
- 15.1.5 This chapter is supported by Appendix 15.1 (Marine Archaeology Technical Report), Appendix 15.2 (Historic Environment Setting Assessment) and Appendix 15.3 (Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation) to this ES.

- 15.1.6 A series of figures support the description of the existing environment (baseline) and are provided in Volume 2 of this ES (Application Document Reference number 8.3). These consist of:
- Figure 15.1 Site Location and Study Area;
 - Figure 15.2 Palaeogeographic features of archaeological potential;
 - Figure 15.3 Palaeogeographic feature data example 1;
 - Figure 15.4 Palaeogeographic feature data example 2;
 - Figure 15.5 Palaeogeographic feature data example 3;
 - Figure 15.6 Seabed features of archaeological potential;
 - Figure 15.7 Data examples of seabed features; and
 - Figure 15.8 Photographs of intertidal heritage receptors.
- 15.1.7 Potential effects on marine heritage receptors have been assessed with reference to the assessment provided in the Physical Processes chapter (Chapter 7) of this ES.

15.2 Definition of the study area

- 15.2.1 The marine study area for this assessment is the area over which potential direct and indirect effects of the IERRT project are predicted to occur on marine heritage receptors during construction and operation.
- 15.2.2 Direct effects could occur to known and potential archaeology receptors during the construction phase as a result of the piling and capital dredge.
- 15.2.3 Indirect effects could occur to known and potential archaeology receptors due to changes in physical processes as a result of the piling and capital dredge.
- 15.2.4 The marine study area (Figure 15.1 to this ES) therefore comprises the proposed development area of the IERRT project below Mean High Water Springs (MHWS). This encompasses all direct impacts from construction and dredging. A further 500 m buffer zone beyond the area of the proposed development has been included in order to capture relevant proximate heritage receptors in the assessment that could be affected indirectly.
- 15.2.5 The assessment of Setting (see Section 15.6), including designated terrestrial heritage receptors, considers a wider area, comprising a 5 km buffer zone beyond the area of the proposed development (illustrated and detailed in Appendix 15.2).

15.3 Assessment methodology

Data and information sources

- 15.3.1 Current baseline conditions have been determined by a desk-based review of available information. A project-specific geophysical survey was also undertaken in January 2022 that has been used to characterise features of archaeological potential, supported by sediment logs from vibrocores

acquired during sediment sampling in 2021 (see Appendix 7.2 to this ES). An intertidal walkover survey was undertaken in order to characterise the intertidal heritage receptors, along with a setting assessment which involved site visits to selected heritage receptors within 5 km of the IERRT project site.

15.3.2 The main desk-based sources of information that have been reviewed to inform the baseline description within the vicinity of the proposed development include:

- United Kingdom Hydrographic Office (UKHO) wreck database (acquired 28 July 2021);
- Historic England's National Record of the Historic Environment (NRHE), (acquired 21 October 2021);
- North East Lincolnshire Historic Environment Records (NELHER) (now no longer in existence) (acquired 09 April 2020);
- Various online resources including the British Geological Survey (BGS) Geology of Britain Viewer;
- Historical maps and Ordnance Survey maps;
- Admiralty Charts; and
- Relevant primary and secondary sources in Wessex Archaeology's own library and those available through the Archaeology Data Service and other websites. Both published and unpublished archaeological reports relating to excavations and observations in the area around the study area were reviewed.

15.3.3 The site-specific surveys that have been undertaken to underpin the assessments include:

- A geophysical survey, which was conducted in January 2022;
- Marine vibrocore logs, acquired in October 2021;
- An intertidal walkover survey, which was conducted on 23 February 2022; and
- A setting assessment, which was conducted on 24 February 2022.

Geophysical assessment methodology

15.3.4 A full methodology for the geophysical data assessment is provided in Appendix 15.1 (Marine Archaeology Technical Report) to this ES.

15.3.5 The baseline relating to both seabed prehistory and seabed features such as maritime and aviation receptors, has been developed through archaeological analysis of geophysical survey data comprising sub-bottom profiler (SBP), sidescan sonar (SSS), magnetometer (Mag.) and multibeam echosounder (MBES) data sets (Appendix 7.2 to this ES).

15.3.6 In summary, geophysical and geotechnical datasets consulted during this assessment include:

- Geophysical survey datasets and survey report produced by ABPmer (2022) (Appendix 7.2 to this ES);
 - Marine vibrocore logs acquired by Coastline Marine Services in 2021 on behalf of ABPmer and provided to Wessex Archaeology (Appendix 7.2 to this ES); and
 - Relevant background mapping from the area (British Geological Survey (BGS) 1989, admiralty charts received from UKHO).
- 15.3.7 All available geophysical datasets were conducted independently of one another. This inevitably leads to the possibility of any one object being the cause of numerous anomalies in different datasets and potentially overstating the number of archaeological features in the exploration area.
- 15.3.8 To address this, the anomalies were grouped together; allowing one ID number to be assigned to a single object for which there may be, for example, a UKHO record, a MBES anomaly and multiple SSS anomalies (ID numbers beginning with 7, Figure 15.2 – 15.6).
- 15.3.9 Once all the geophysical anomalies and desk-based information were grouped, they were classified based on their archaeological potential. For anomalies located on the seabed, these are classified and discriminated as per the criteria in Table 15.1. The discrimination codes are included in the legends of Figures 15.2 – 15.6 of this ES).

Table 15.1. Criteria discriminating relevance of identified features to proposed scheme

Overview Classification	Discrimination	Criteria
Archaeological	P1	Feature of probable archaeological interest, either because of its palaeogeography or likelihood for producing palaeoenvironmental material.
Archaeological	P2	Feature of possible archaeological interest.
Archaeological	A2_h	Anomaly of likely anthropogenic origin but of unknown date; may be of archaeological interest or a modern feature.
Archaeological	A2_l	Anomaly of possible anthropogenic origin but interpretation is uncertain; may be anthropogenic or a natural feature.
Archaeological	A3	Historic record of possible archaeological interest with no corresponding geophysical anomaly.

- 15.3.10 The geophysical data were assessed to identify anomalies of archaeological potential relating to maritime and aviation activity. Due to the proximity of the area to the modern port workings, many of the receptors identified are likely to represent modern features and as such would not be of interest from an archaeological perspective (Figure 15.6 of this ES).

15.3.11 A number of records from the UKHO, NRHE and HER sources are located outside the area of geophysical survey but within the wider Study Area of the Baseline Technical Report (Appendix 15.1), so both are retained in the baseline (ID numbers beginning with 2, Figure 15.6 of this ES).

Determining significance of effects

15.3.12 For the impact assessment process and to ensure consistency in the terminology used, a standard assessment methodology has been applied. This methodology has been developed from a range of sources, including:

- Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (English Heritage, 2008, 21 (English Heritage became Historic England in April 2015));
- Ships and Boats: Prehistory to Present – Designation Selection Guide (English Heritage, 2012); and
- The Setting of Heritage Assets - Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Historic England, 2017).

Assessment of setting

15.3.13 Currently, there is no specific guidance regarding the assessment of the setting of marine archaeological and cultural heritage receptors. However, Historic England's *The Setting of Heritage Assets - Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3* (2017) provides general guidance, though this has largely been applied to terrestrial sites, noting that the importance of a setting “*lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset*” (Historic England, 2015, 4). Regarding significance for heritage policy, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2021) states that the interest of a heritage asset “*may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic*” (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government 2021).

15.3.14 Marine heritage receptors are generally only experienced by divers, Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV), or by geophysical survey, and the views to the receptor are often very limited due to reduced visibility in the water column. In addition, unlike many terrestrial sites, the position of the receptor on the seabed has not been deliberately chosen, and although some sites may have reached their position through military action or have been lost due to a particular navigational hazard (e.g. hitting a harbour wall or being stranded on a particular hazard), many positions are entirely arbitrary, and even with military sinking events, an attack on the surface could lead to a wreck being deposited on the seabed miles from where the event took place. Non-visual factors may include associations with specific battles, wars, minefields, and other historic events, as well as how the wreck can be appreciated in its wider context, for example through well-known trade routes, collisions, or local industry. Association between the receptor and the local social history is another important aspect of the receptor's non-visual importance, including rescue attempts or losses occurring within modern memory.

- 15.3.15 It is not possible to ascertain the setting of any currently unidentified marine heritage receptors, where limited information is known, for example wrecks that have not been identified or characterised to determine their period of build, use or loss. Similarly, setting cannot be assessed for geophysical anomalies of archaeological potential or potential sites that have not yet been discovered.
- 15.3.16 A historic environment setting assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 15.2 to this ES, primarily focused on terrestrial receptors. The aim of the study was to assess the potential for the proposed development to cause harm to the significance of any designated heritage assets through a change in their setting. Following a process of refinement, two assets out of the 28 total designated assets within the 5 km buffer zone were identified as being potentially susceptible to harm. Further details are provided in Section 15.6 of this Chapter.

Receptor sensitivity

- 15.3.17 In order to assess the potential impacts of a development upon marine cultural heritage, the conceptual approach known as the 'source-pathway-receptor' model has been adopted. This approach is based on the identification of the source (i.e., the origin of a potential impact), the pathway (i.e., the means by which the effect of the activity could impact a receptor) and the receptor that may be impacted (e.g., known/potential heritage receptors). For the significance of any given impact to be fully understood and for appropriate mitigation to be proposed as necessary, the sensitivity of any marine and cultural heritage receptors that may be impacted need to be considered. This section outlines how the sensitivity of marine heritage receptors has been ascertained.
- 15.3.18 The capability of a receptor to accommodate change and its ability to recover if affected is a function of its sensitivity. Receptor sensitivity is typically assessed via the following factors:
- Adaptability - the degree to which a receptor can avoid or adapt to an effect;
 - Tolerance - the ability of a receptor to accommodate temporary or permanent change without significant adverse impact;
 - Recoverability - the temporal scale over, and extent to which, a receptor will recover following an effect; and
 - Value - a measure of the receptor's importance, rarity and worth.
- 15.3.19 Cultural heritage and marine archaeology receptors cannot typically adapt, tolerate, or recover from physical impacts resulting in material damage or loss caused by development. Consequently, the sensitivity of each receptor is predominantly quantified only by its value.

Value of a receptor

- 15.3.20 Based on Historic England's *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment* (English Heritage, 2008, 21), the significance of a historic receptor “*embraces all the diverse cultural and natural heritage values that people associate with it, or which prompt them to respond to it*”.
- 15.3.21 Within this document, value is weighed by consideration of the potential for the receptor to demonstrate the following value criteria:
- Evidential value – deriving from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity;
 - Historical value – deriving from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. It tends to be illustrative or associative;
 - Aesthetic value – deriving from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place; and
 - Communal value – deriving from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory. Communal values are closely bound up with historical (particularly associative) and aesthetic values but tend to have additional and specific aspects.
- 15.3.22 With regards to assessing the value of shipwrecks, the following criteria listed in English Heritage's *Ships and Boats: Prehistory to Present – Designation Selection Guide* (English Heritage, 2012) can be used to assess a receptor in terms of its value:
- Period;
 - Rarity;
 - Documentation;
 - Group value;
 - Survival/condition; and
 - Potential.
- 15.3.23 These aspects help to characterise each receptor whilst also comparing them to other similar receptors. The criteria also assess the potential of each receptor to contribute to wider knowledge and understanding.
- 15.3.24 Having regard to the above, the value of known archaeological and cultural heritage receptors have been assessed on a four-point scale using professional judgement informed by criteria provided in Table 15.2.

Table 15.2. Criteria to assess the archaeological value of marine receptors

Value	Definition
High	<p>Best known, only example or above average example and / or significant or high potential to contribute to knowledge and understanding and / or outreach. Receptors with a demonstrable international or national dimension to their importance are likely to fall within this category;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wrecked ships and aircraft that are protected under the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973, Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 or Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 with an international dimension to their importance, plus as-yet undesignated sites that are demonstrably of equivalent archaeological value; and ▪ Known submerged prehistoric sites and landscapes with the confirmed presence of largely <i>in situ</i> artefactual material or palaeogeographic features with demonstrable potential to include artefactual and/or palaeoenvironmental material, possibly as part of a prehistoric site or landscape.
Medium	<p>Average example and / or moderate potential to contribute to knowledge and understanding and / or community engagement;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Includes wrecks of ships and aircraft that do not have statutory protection or equivalent significance, but have moderate potential based on a formal assessment of their importance in terms of build, use, loss, survival, and investigation; and ▪ Prehistoric deposits with moderate potential to contribute to an understanding of the palaeoenvironment.
Low	<p>Below average example and / or low potential to contribute to knowledge and understanding and / or community engagement;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Includes wrecks of ships and aircraft that do not have statutory protection or equivalent significance, but have low potential based on a formal assessment of their importance in terms of build, use, loss, survival, and investigation; and ▪ Prehistoric deposits with low potential to contribute to an understanding of the palaeoenvironment.
Negligible	<p>Poor example and / or little or no potential to contribute to knowledge and understanding and / or community engagement. Receptor with little or no surviving archaeological interest.</p>

Impact magnitude

15.3.25 The magnitude of an impact or scale of change is defined by a series of factors including the spatial extent of any interaction, the likelihood, duration, frequency, and reversibility of a potential impact. The definitions of the levels of magnitude used in this assessment are described in Table 15.3 and are based on professional judgement, founded on experience and the application of relevant guidance and legislation.

Table 15.3. Classification of magnitude of impact

Magnitude	Definition
High	Complete or comprehensive physical damage or changes to the character of the receptor.
Medium	Considerable changes that affect the character of the receptor, resulting in considerable physical damage.
Low	Minor change that partially affects the character of the receptor, resulting in some physical damage.
Negligible	Very minor or negligible change to the character of the receptor, with no or negligible physical damage leading to an imperceptible change to the baseline.

Significance criteria

15.3.26 The significance of effect has been assessed by comparing the value or sensitivity of the receptor against the magnitude of impact. Residual effects (i.e. those remaining after mitigation measures) have been taken into consideration and have been assessed. The overall significance has been assessed using the significance matrix shown in Table 15.4. Effects of Major or Moderate adverse significance are considered 'significant' in this assessment.

Table 15.4. Significance matrix

Magnitude / Scale of Change	Value / Sensitivity			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	Major	Major to Moderate	Moderate	Negligible
Medium	Major to Moderate	Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Negligible
Low	Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

15.4 Consultation

- 15.4.1 Consultation as to whether there are likely to be any effects on cultural heritage as a result of the construction and operation of the IERRT project has been undertaken with Historic England (HE), North East Lincolnshire Council (NELC) and North Lincolnshire Council (NLC). These stakeholders were consulted during the formal scoping process, with responses from them received in October / November 2021 and during the statutory consultation, with responses from them received in January - August 2022. The outcomes of the formal scoping process, as well as any feedback received in response to the statutory consultation and the publication of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and supplementary statutory consultation and the publication of the Supplementary Consultation Report, have also been taken into account to inform the assessment. Further consultation was undertaken with regards to the setting assessment methodology and a meeting was held with HE to discuss the draft ES chapter in May 2022.
- 15.4.2 The outcome of the consultation that has been undertaken, along with how it has influenced the cultural heritage and marine archaeology assessment, is presented in Table 15.5.

Table 15.5. Summary of consultation

Consultee	Reference, Date	Summary of Response	How Comments have been Addressed in this Chapter
Planning Inspectorate (PINS) Historic England	Scoping Opinion, October 2021. Table ID 4.10.1 Appendix 2 Historic England response	The ES should include an assessment of the contribution of setting to the overall significance of heritage receptors, including those which are buried or submerged, or information demonstrating agreement with the relevant consultation bodies and the absence of a likely significant effect.	Setting cannot be assessed for unidentified marine heritage receptors and geophysical anomalies of archaeological potential, as detailed in paragraph 15.3.14 of this chapter. A historic environment setting assessment was undertaken and is detailed in Section 15.6.22 of this chapter, resulting in two sites being considered for further assessment.
PINS	Scoping Opinion, October 2021. Table ID 4.10.2	The ES should explain how the final study area reflects the full zone of influence of the proposed development.	A wider 5 km buffer zone has been considered in order to undertake a heritage setting assessment, covering the full zone of influence of the proposed development. This considered designated terrestrial heritage receptors within a 5 km buffer, as discussed in Section 15.6 of this chapter.
PINS Historic England	Scoping Opinion, October 2021. Appendix 2 Historic England response	Impacts on terrestrial archaeological features should also be considered, in order to properly understand the marine archaeological environment. The study area in the ES must be defined in a way which allows the Examining Authority to fully understand the nature and significance of the archaeological	Study area consists of the area directly/indirectly impacted by proposed development and a 500 m buffer including terrestrial, intertidal, and marine datasets in order to allow the Examining Authority to fully understand the nature and significance of the archaeological features affected.

Consultee	Reference, Date	Summary of Response	How Comments have been Addressed in this Chapter
		features affected by the proposed development.	Further details are provided in Section 15.2 of this chapter.
PINS	Scoping Opinion, October 2021. Table ID 4.10.3	Paragraph 6.11.8 of the Scoping Report refers to marine archaeological and cultural heritage <i>receptors</i> which are located within the marine works; however, Table 17 refers to marine heritage <i>features</i> . The Applicant should ensure that consistent terminology is used throughout the marine archaeology ES chapter.	Noted. Reference made to marine cultural heritage receptors throughout. "Receptor" has been used for cultural heritage assets taken forward in this ES to ensure that consistent terminology is used throughout.
PINS	Scoping Opinion, October 2021. Table ID 4.10.4	The Applicant should seek to agree the baseline data required for the assessment with relevant stakeholders (including the requirement for site-specific survey data).	This was developed following PEIR stage and subsequent discussion with key stakeholders (Historic England, and relevant local authority archaeology advisors (27 May 2022 meeting discussed below). Site-specific survey data was acquired to inform the baseline. No further requirements for baseline surveys or data collection were required / requested at this point.
Historic England	Scoping Opinion, October 2021. Appendix 2 Historic England response	'Our Seas - A shared resource: High level marine objectives' is a policy document relevant to marine planning in general and therefore should be considered for inclusion elsewhere rather than in the desk-based assessment.	Noted. This policy document has been included in Section 15.5 of this chapter.

Consultee	Reference, Date	Summary of Response	How Comments have been Addressed in this Chapter
Historic England	Scoping Opinion, October 2021. Appendix 2 Historic England response	It is not clear if a marine survey campaign will be conducted to acquire data for analysis and interpretation in any ES produced for this proposed project.	A marine geophysical survey campaign was undertaken in January 2022, as well as vibrocore sediment sampling in October 2021, and formed the basis of the marine archaeological baseline assessment and EIA for the proposed project. Further details provided in Section 15.6 of this chapter.
North East Lincolnshire Council	Scoping Opinion, 23 November 2021	In addition to the underground remains we would expect a report on the potential impact on the historic landscape. North East Lincolnshire has had historic landscape character (HLC) undertaken and this should be consulted.	These elements have been developed in conjunction with baseline technical assessments for this ES chapter and presented in Appendix 15.2 to this ES.
North East Lincolnshire Council	Scoping Opinion, 23 November 2021	Regarding setting issues, potential impacts on the settings and significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets which would experience visual change should be evidenced using accurate visual representations. Viewpoints, including views of, from, and across heritage asset receptors as well as general intervisibility, all have historic context and need to be assessed properly to determine the contribution of the setting of the heritage asset and the potential impact upon it by development or proposed mitigation measures.	These elements have been developed in conjunction with baseline technical assessments for this ES chapter. Viewpoints, including accurate visual representations of, from, and across heritage asset receptors are provided in Appendix 15.2 to this ES.

Consultee	Reference, Date	Summary of Response	How Comments have been Addressed in this Chapter
Historic England (PI42)	Statutory Consultation – 19 Jan – 23 Feb 2022 Ref: PL00756423	The approach set out in the PEIR appears to be a sound starting point for investigation of terrestrial and marine effects (both direct and setting) but since this is an iterative process we will need to see and discuss with you the results of initial investigations and assessments in order to advise on what further work may be necessary in advance of and subsequent to determination.	Noted. List of selected assets for the historic setting assessment was passed on to HE for review and comment on 07/03/2022. See discussion of HE response dated 25 March 2022 in later table entry.
North Lincolnshire Council (PI38)	Statutory Consultation – 19 Jan – 23 Feb 2022	NLC Historic Environment Officer has confirmed that the proposal does not affect any heritage assets or their settings with North Lincolnshire.	Noted.
North East Lincolnshire	Correspondence following the Statutory Consultation	NELC confirm that they do not have any comments in respect of this matter.	Noted.
Historic England	Setting Assessment Methodology Response dated 25 March 2022 provided in respect of information provided to HE on 7 March 2022	We are content with the asset selection in the draft heritage assessment. As set out in our GPA3 Setting of Heritage Assets setting is not a bounded space, so I might have gone a little wider in some cases to include the experience of assets on approach / kinetically through the historic landscape / seascape, but in this specific instance I do not believe that would produce substantively different	Noted. Proceeded with Setting Assessment based on the asset selection which was presented in the draft heritage setting assessment. Further details are found in Appendix 15.2 to this ES.

Consultee	Reference, Date	Summary of Response	How Comments have been Addressed in this Chapter
		<p>assessment results from those you set out.</p> <p>In this case a focus on SOUTH FARMHOUSE 1083467 Grade II for further consideration in the ES is the right result.</p>	
Historic England	Meeting 27 May 2022	<p>HE will look at setting text that comes through.</p> <p>Flagged up the East Midlands Historic Environment Research Framework, to consult when underpinning the WSI objectives.</p>	Draft WSI (Appendix 15.3 to this ES) updated with East Midlands Historic Environment Research Framework objectives.
Historic England (PI 23)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	<p>The construction ‘mitigation in the form of offsetting’ is unhelpful in an historic environment context since the resource is specific, finite and irreplaceable, ‘geoarchaeological assessment of geotechnical surveys, and implementation of a Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (PAD), secured through a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)’ could be better simply categorised as ‘archaeological mitigation’ or if it is also to inform refinements in design to reduce loss / damage to remains one could refer to it as ‘archaeological mitigation and adaptive design’.</p>	Noted. The archaeological mitigation is addressed in Section 15.9 of this ES chapter.

15.5 Implications of policy legislation and guidance

15.5.1 This section of the chapter sets out key aspects and implications of applicable legislation, policy and guidance that are relevant to the assessment of likely impacts on cultural heritage and marine archaeology. It builds upon the overarching chapter covering the Legislative, Policy and Consenting Framework (Chapter 5 of this ES).

Legislation

15.5.2 In England and within its territorial waters (up to 12 nautical miles (nm)) the following legislation applies (full information within WSI- Appendix 15.3):

- ***The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (as amended) (MCAA) / Planning Act 2008:***
 - This legislation is relevant to marine development within English territorial waters. Whilst the MCAA regulates marine licensing for works at sea, Section 149A of the Planning Act 2008 enables an applicant for a Development Consent Order (DCO) to include within the Order a Marine Licence which is deemed to be granted under the provisions of the MCAA;
- ***Protection of Wrecks Act 1973: Sections 1 and 2:***
 - It is an offence to carry out certain activities in a defined area surrounding a wreck that has been designated, unless a licence for those activities has been obtained from the Government. There are no protected wrecks within the footprint of the proposed development;
- ***Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended):***
 - It is a criminal offence to carry out any works on, or near to, a Scheduled Monument without Scheduled Monument Consent. Both terrestrial and maritime sites, including wrecks, may be designated under this Act. There are no scheduled ancient monuments within the footprint of the proposed development;
- ***Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (as amended):***
 - This Act provides protection for the wreckage of military aircraft and designated military vessels. The Act provides for two types of protection: 'protected places' and 'controlled sites'. Military aircraft are automatically protected, although vessels have to be specifically designated. The primary reason for designation is to protect as a 'war grave' the last resting place of servicemen; however, the Act does not require the loss of the vessel to have occurred during the war. There are no protected places or controlled sites within the footprint of the proposed development;

- **Treasure Act 1996 (as amended):**
 - All information required by the Treasure Act (i.e., finder, location, material, date, associated items etc.) will be reported to the coroner within 14 days. Items falling under the Treasure Act will be removed from the site by the Retained Archaeologist and stored in a secure location, pending a decision by the coroner;
- **Merchant Shipping Act 1995 (as amended):**
 - All wreck material recovered from UK waters must be declared to the Receiver of Wreck who acts to settle questions of ownership and salvage. 'Wreck' refers to all items of flotsam, jetsam, derelict, and lagan found in or on the shores of the sea or any tidal water; and
- **Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended):**
 - Works affecting Listed Buildings are subject to additional planning controls; and
 - The Act requires authorities to have regard to the fact that there is a Conservation Area when exercising any of their functions under the Planning Acts and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

National Policy

National Policy Statement for Ports (NPSfP)

15.5.3 The NPSfP recognises the importance of the historic environment and that the construction, operation and decommissioning of port infrastructure has the potential to result in adverse impacts on it (Department for Transport 2012, Section 5.12). Therefore, the significance of heritage assets and the extent of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of any heritage assets has to be understood (Department for Transport 2012, Section 5.12.9). Both designated heritage assets and undesignated heritage assets have to be considered, and the setting of a heritage asset also has to be taken into account.

15.5.4 The NPSfP advises that the ES should include:

- A description of the significance of the heritage assets affected by the proposed development and the contribution of their setting to that significance;
- Appropriate desk-based assessment and, where such desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field evaluation;
- Consideration of the possibility of damage to buried features from underwater disposal of dredged material; and
- An assessment of the extent of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of any heritage assets affected (Department for Transport 2012, Section 5.12).

- 15.5.5 The NPSfP also advises that the assessment should take account of other relevant UK policies and plans, including the Marine Policy Statement (MPS) and any existing marine plans provided for by the MCAA 2009 (Department for Transport 2012, Section 4.1.1).

UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS)

- 15.5.6 UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS) was adopted by all UK Administrations in March 2011 as part of a new system of marine planning then being introduced across UK seas (HM Government, 2011). The statement was intended to facilitate and support the formulation of Marine Plans, ensuring that marine resources are used in a sustainable way in line with high level marine objectives.
- 15.5.7 Under the MCAA, England was divided into marine planning regions, with an associated authority responsible for preparing a Marine Plan for that area. The MPS sets out the framework for preparing Marine Plans and making decisions affecting the marine environment. The MPS also states that Marine Plans must ensure a sustainable marine environment that will protect heritage receptors. Marine plans must also be in accordance with other UK national policy, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2021).
- 15.5.8 As part of the NPPF, a core planning principle is to conserve heritage receptors in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2021). Section 16 of the NPPF, entitled 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment', sets out the principal national guidance on the importance, management and safeguarding of heritage assets within the planning process.

East Inshore Marine Plan

- 15.5.9 The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) have divided the inshore and offshore waters around England into 11 plan areas for which marine plans are to be produced. The proposed development is within the East Inshore Marine Plan Area which has been adopted as of April 2014 (Defra, 2014).
- 15.5.10 The East Inshore Marine Plan Policy SOC2 states that proposals that may affect heritage receptors should demonstrate, in order of preference:
- (a) That they will not compromise or harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage asset;
 - (b) How, if there is compromise or harm to a heritage asset, this will be minimised;
 - (c) How, where compromise or harm to a heritage asset cannot be minimised, it will be mitigated against; or
 - (d) The public benefits for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate or compromise the harm to the heritage asset.

Local Policy

North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 to 2032

- 15.5.11 The North East Lincolnshire Local Plan (North East Lincolnshire District Council, 2018), adopted in 2018, recognises the significant role the historic environment plays in providing a *“sense of community identity and local distinctiveness, and enhance the aesthetic, social and cultural quality of life available to residents”* (p. 218).
- 15.5.12 Policy 39 ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ states that *“Proposal for development will be permitted where they would sustain the cultural distinctiveness and significance of North East Lincolnshire’s historic urban, rural and coastal environment by protecting, preserving and, where appropriate, enhancing the character, appearance, significance and historic value of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings”* (p.220).
- 15.5.13 Furthermore, *“Where a development proposal would affect the significance of a heritage assets (whether designated or non-designated), including any contribution made to its setting, it should be informed by proportionate historic environment assessment and evaluations”*. This is undertaken by:
- *“Identifying all heritage assets likely to be affected by the proposal;*
 - *Explain the nature and degree of any effect on elements that contribute to their significance and demonstrating how, in order of preference, any harm will be avoided, minimised, or mitigated;*
 - *Provide a clear explanation and justification for the proposal in order for the harm to be weighed against public benefits; and,*
 - *Demonstrate that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; and whether the works proposed are the minimum required to secure the long-term use of the asset.”*

Guidance

- 15.5.14 This assessment has been carried out in a manner consistent with available guidance as described below in chronological order of issue:
- Identifying and Protecting Palaeolithic Remains: Archaeological Guidance for Planning Authorities and Developers (English Heritage, 1998);
 - Managing Lithic Scatters: Archaeological Guidance for planning authorities and developers (English Heritage, 2000);
 - Military Aircraft Crash Sites: Guidance on their significance and future management (English Heritage, 2002);
 - The Code of Practice for Seabed Developers (Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee and The Crown Estate, 2006);
 - Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (English Heritage, 2008);
 - Our Seas – A shared resource: High level marine objectives (Defra, 2009);

- Environmental Archaeology: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods, from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation (second edition) (English Heritage, 2011);
- Offshore Geotechnical Investigations and Historic Environment Analysis: Guidance for the Renewable Energy Sector (Gribble & Leather, 2011);
- Ships and Boats: Prehistory to Present: Designation Selection Guide (English Heritage, 2012);
- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2014, updated 2017);
- Marine Geophysics Data Acquisition, Processing and Interpretation Guidance Notes (English Heritage, 2013);
- Dredging and Port Construction: Interaction with Features of Archaeological or Heritage Interest (PIANC, 2014);
- Geoarchaeology: Using Earth Sciences to Understand the Archaeological Record (Historic England, 2015); and
- The Assessment and Management of Marine Archaeology in Port and Harbour Development (Historic England, 2016).

15.6 Description of the existing environment

Baseline resource

- 15.6.1 The baseline resource of cultural heritage and marine archaeology, which includes known wrecks and obstructions, identified geophysical receptors, the potential for further maritime and aviation archaeological receptors, potential seabed prehistory, intertidal heritage receptors and setting assessment is presented in Appendix 15.1 and Appendix 15.2 to this ES. The full baseline of anomalies is presented in Annexes 3 to 7 of Appendix 15.1 and illustrated in Figure 15.2 to Figure 15.8 to this ES. The section below presents a summary of the baseline.

Seabed prehistory

- 15.6.2 Twenty-five palaeogeographic features of archaeological potential have been identified within the study area (full details found in Appendix 15.1 to this ES). These are illustrated in Figures 15.2 – 15.5 to this ES.
- 15.6.3 From the assessment of SBP data the oldest shallow geological unit within the marine study area is glacial till, identified within a number of the vibrocores as stiff gravelly and sandy clay and visible in the SBP data as an acoustically unstructured unit. The SBP data indicates the presence of a channel system, aligned generally west-northwest to east-southeast, with the southern edge cutting into interpreted till and reworked till. This southern edge falls across the central extents of the dredge area. The channel fill is visible as predominantly uniformly parallel reflectors which may suggest laminated deposits of probable sands, silts, and clays, although none of the vibrocores penetrated into this unit. This channel is overlain by a more chaotic silty sand sediment unit.

- 15.6.4 Due to the presence of a high amplitude seabed reflector (generally identified as areas of sediment with a high organic content such as peat which reflect most of the energy from the SBP) across much of the study area, much of the data has been ‘blanked out’ which means the full extent of the identified units are not visible; although it is possible a far edge of the channel has been identified in the northwest of the survey data.
- 15.6.5 The entire marine study area appears to have several high amplitude reflectors at the seabed, indicating that the entire site is covered by organic deposits such as peat or sediments containing a relatively high organic content (e.g. organic silt and/or clay). An area of irregular seabed has been identified within the MBES and SSS data sets, which has been assessed as consisting of predominantly alluvium containing organic sediment, based on vibrocores VC04, VC07 and VC10 which align with this possible outcrop. The remaining vibrocores indicate the high amplitude seabed reflectors to be muddy silts, potentially with a high organic content.
- 15.6.6 These alluvium-containing organic sediments are present above what is interpreted to be Devensian till which would suggest they are potentially Holocene in age. As such, these deposits are of high archaeological and palaeoenvironmental potential.
- 15.6.7 Table 15.6 summarises the potential for seabed prehistory receptors and their respective value based on the criteria described in Table 15.2.

Table 15.6. Value of seabed prehistory heritage receptors

Receptor Type	Description	Value
<i>In situ</i> Prehistoric sites	Primary context features and associated artefacts and their physical setting (if found).	High
	Known submerged prehistoric sites and landscape features with the demonstrable potential to include artefactual material.	
Submerged landscape features (without associated archaeological material)	Other known submerged palaeolandscape features and deposits likely to date to periods of prehistoric archaeological interest with the potential to contain <i>in situ</i> material.	Medium
Isolated Prehistoric finds	Isolated discoveries of prehistoric archaeological material discovered within secondary contexts.	Medium
Palaeoenvironmental evidence	Isolated examples of palaeoenvironmental material	Low
	Palaeoenvironmental material associated with specific palaeo-landscape features or archaeological material	

Seabed features: Maritime

- 15.6.8 There are no sites within the study area that are subject to statutory protection from the Protection of Wrecks Act 1973, the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 or the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979; the three principal statutes that could be used to protect marine archaeological sites.
- 15.6.9 There are two known wreck sites within the study area (including the 500 m buffer zone), illustrated in Figure 15.6 to this ES. Wreck 2003 was listed as dead in 2004, i.e. it has not been detected by repeated surveys, although wreck material still may exist at this location. This consists of the possible remains of a craft recorded between 1991 and 1999. Wreck 2006 is an unknown wreck, shown on Humber 8, April 2009 edition.
- 15.6.10 A number of sites relate to port infrastructure and include the jetties and dolphins associated with the 20th century port (2008, 2009, and 2012).
- 15.6.11 There are also a number of unidentified anomalies in the area. Anomaly 2010 was observed in bathymetry in 2013 and measures 2 x 1 m with a height of 0.5 m. Anomaly 2011 consists of a submerged obstruction that was struck by a vessel in 1957. This measured 17.5 x 10.7 m with 1 m in height, but was amended to dead in 2013, although archaeological material still may exist at this location. Five anomalies (2001, 2002, 2004, 2005 and 2007) are seen on aerial photography possibly consisting of the remains of further jetty and dolphin structures (Figure 15.6 to this ES).
- 15.6.12 A total of 102 features have been identified from the SSS data as being of possible archaeological potential within the study area, defined as follows:
- 26 A2_h anomalies (anomaly of likely anthropogenic origin but of unknown date; may be of archaeological interest or a modern feature); and
 - 76 A2_l anomalies (anomaly of possible anthropogenic origin but interpretation is uncertain; may be anthropogenic or a natural feature).
- 15.6.13 Full details can be found in Section 5 of Appendix 15.1 to this ES and illustrated in Figure 15.6 and Figure 15.7 to this ES.
- 15.6.14 These are likely to represent modern debris that has been disposed of within the area when demolition of the mooring dolphins at the Immingham Oil Terminal was undertaken (see paragraph 15.6.20 of this chapter to the ES).

Marine recorded losses

- 15.6.15 Recorded Losses can be considered as an indication of the potential for archaeological maritime remains to exist within the study area and the type and number of wrecks that could be present. These records relate to vessels reportedly lost or for which no physical wreck remains have ever

been identified. Table 15.7 shows the distribution of these documented losses according to date of loss for those records whose position fall within the study area. Details regarding these losses are presented in Appendix 15.1 to this ES.

Table 15.7. Maritime recorded losses, summary by date

Date	Number of Records of Ships
Post-medieval	0
19th Century	4
Modern	1
Unknown	0
Total	5

Seabed features: Aviation

- 15.6.16 There are no known aircraft crash sites within the Study Area (Appendix 15.1). Nonetheless, there is the potential for aircraft or aircraft-related debris to exist on the seafloor. Given the identified potential of the area for military aircraft crashes (Wessex Archaeology 2008), particularly relating to the Second World War, the likelihood would be for any aircraft crash to be of military origin, which would be protected under Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 and therefore would be of high value. This would include both Allied and Axis aircraft and would relate to both complete aircraft wrecks and debris scatters.
- 15.6.17 The only recorded loss relating to an aircraft is a Halifax MK III, that ditched off Immingham in October 1944. As this is a recorded loss the positional data is unreliable and serves only to provide an indication of the types of aircraft that flew over this coastline.

Intertidal archaeological receptors

- 15.6.18 Seven records (2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007) are located within the intertidal zone. Some of these records relate to coastal infrastructure, such as dolphins associated with the 20th century Port (full details found in Appendix 15.1 to this ES).
- 15.6.19 A walkover survey was attempted on 23 February 2022, within the intertidal zone of the study area. From the above seven sites, only four were observed: two octagonal obstructions (2002 and 2005) and two obstructions (2004 and 2007). Access to these receptors was not possible due to the condition of the terrain consisting of mudflats, and from a health and safety perspective it was decided not to go beyond the revetment along the shoreline.
- 15.6.20 The observed obstructions, which appear to be made of concrete, are likely to be remnants of 20th century reinforced concrete mooring Dolphins (Figure 15.8 to this ES). These are a fixed structure dug into the seabed.

Through documentation received from ABP, a notice to mariners issued in 1983 draws attention to the debris deposited on the foreshore '*Mariners are advised that debris recovered from the demolished mooring dolphins at the Immingham Oil Terminal has been deposited on the foreshore above Low Water mark between the Fison's effluent outfall (situated approximately 800 metres downstream of the Immingham Tower 'A') and the root of the Immingham Oil Terminal jetty*' (H.108/1983).

- 15.6.21 A set of rock-cut stairs (1008) were observed during the walkover survey (Figure 15.8 to this ES). These are likely to have been built during the construction of the dock in the early 20th century and are built into the sea wall, providing access to/from the shoreline.

Historic setting of the Port of Immingham

- 15.6.22 The Port of Immingham, also known in the past as Immingham Dock, is today a major port on the east coast of England, located on the south bank of the Humber Estuary west of Grimsby. The port was established by the Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Company in association with the Great Central Railway, and the works to do so were permitted by the Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Act of 1904 (subsequently modified in 1908, 1909 and 1913). Construction began in 1906 and by 1912 the dock was completed, acting as a port for the export of coal from the Derbyshire and Yorkshire coalfields. The port facilities linked with the railways which were present at Grimsby, run by the Great Central Railway (Grace's Guide, 2020).
- 15.6.23 During the First World War, the Port of Immingham was a submarine base for British D class submarines and was later used for cruise ships in the 1930s, accommodating vessels of the Orient Steam Navigation Company, White Star Line and Blue Star Line calling at the port. The Second World War saw the port used as a naval base and headquarters for the Royal Navy. In addition, a number of anti-aircraft batteries (heavy anti-aircraft battery Humber H21 & H22) were located around the dock during the war.
- 15.6.24 The dock was considerably expanded during the second half of the 20th century, with east and west jetties and the addition of several deep-water jetties for bulk cargoes. The latter half of the century saw the construction of the Immingham Oil Terminal jetty on the banks of the Humber east of the dock entrance in 1969, and the Immingham Bulk Terminal commissioned in 1970 for the export of coal and import of steel constructed to the west of the dock entrance. In 1985 the Immingham Gas Jetty was opened, handling Liquid Petroleum Gas. Several extensions, terminals and roll-on/roll-off berths have been added during the 21st century, improving the port infrastructure and facilities to cater for the export of bulk cargoes and goods.
- 15.6.25 The IERRT project is located within the existing 21st century industrial setting of the Port described above. Therefore, the proposed development will not have an impact on the historic setting of the Port, as this has already been expanded and modified to cater for larger quantities of exports.

Historic environment setting assessment

- 15.6.26 A site visit was undertaken on 24 February 2022 in order to undertake a setting assessment. The site visit allowed for the proposed development and heritage assets to be understood in their immediate and wider contexts. This was undertaken in accordance with guidance set out in *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3* (Historic England 2017). The assessment is based on professional judgement, founded on experience and the application of relevant guidance and legislation. The full baseline of selected designated heritage receptors and detailed assessment is found in Appendix 15.2 to this ES.
- 15.6.27 From the 28 Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings that were identified in the study area, two sites were taken forward for more detailed assessment:
- South Farm (1083467) a Grade II Listed Building; and
 - Stone Creek Heavy Anti-aircraft gun site (1020187) a Scheduled Monument.
- 15.6.28 The above selection was undertaken through a refinement exercise which was guided by the staged approach set out in *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3* (Historic England 2017). The selection was also discussed and agreed with Historic England (see Table 15.5 of this chapter of the ES). These two heritage assets were chosen as they had the potential to have their significance and setting harmed by the proposed development. The remaining 26 heritage assets were not taken forward as their significance and setting was not deemed to be harmed by change brought about by the proposed development.
- 15.6.29 South Farm consists of a large farmhouse dating to the mid-19th century which was built for the Crown Estate. The farmhouse is located across the Humber Estuary from the Port of Immingham on the north bank within low-lying terrain, with clear vistas all around and a strong link to the wider landscape.
- 15.6.30 The second receptor comprises the remains of a Second World War Anti-Aircraft gun site located at Stone Creek, Sunk Island, again on the north bank of the Humber Estuary. The remains comprise of standing buildings and concrete structures, earthwork remains and the potential for associated buried archaeological remains. The gun site was established in late 1939 and was known as Station J. This was later referred to as Station H9 from 1941 onwards. The site was located at a strategic position, providing protection to Hull and Immingham Port and Dock from enemy aircraft. The anti-aircraft gun site would have had clear, unobstructive views out to sea and across the landscape.

15.7 Future baseline environment

- 15.7.1 In the absence of the IERRT project there would be no change to known and potential archaeological marine and terrestrial heritage receptors beyond those caused by natural physical processes and natural deterioration. Physical effects to marine receptors are considered below in terms of likely impacts and effects.

15.8 Consideration of likely impacts and effects

- 15.8.1 This section identifies the potential likely effects on the cultural heritage and marine historic environment receptors as a result of the construction and subsequent operation of the IERRT project which have been identified.
- 15.8.2 The Physical Processes assessment (Chapter 7 of this ES) was consulted to assess the damage to known and unknown receptors from indirect impacts.
- 15.8.3 Cumulative impacts on marine cultural heritage that could arise as a result of other developments and activities in the Humber Estuary have been considered as necessary as part of the cumulative impacts and in-combination effects assessment (see Chapter 20 Cumulative and In-combination Effects of this ES).

Construction phase

- 15.8.4 This section contains an assessment of the potential impacts to marine archaeology and cultural heritage as a result of the construction phase of the IERRT project. The following impact pathways have been assessed:
- Direct impacts on known and potential marine heritage receptors from construction activities;
 - Direct impacts on known and potential marine heritage receptors from dredging; and
 - Indirect impacts to marine heritage receptors due to altered sediment or hydrological processes.
- 15.8.5 The construction of the IERRT project may be completed in a single stage, or it may be sequenced such that construction of the southernmost pier takes place at the same time as operation of the northernmost pier (see Chapter 3 of this ES). In the case of a sequenced construction, the duration of construction activity will be extended but it will not increase the scale of construction activity. All capital dredging (and associated disposal activity) will be undertaken together at one time, before operation of the northernmost pier commences. As a consequence, the impact pathway assessment below is considered to be the worst case and will not be altered by a sequenced construction period.

Direct impacts on known and potential marine heritage receptors from construction activities

- 15.8.6 Any direct impacts to marine archaeological receptors are likely to occur during the construction stage of the proposed development. Impacts resulting in adverse effects upon archaeological receptors from construction works are those involving contact with the seabed. Marine archaeological receptors with height, such as shipwrecks, may also be impacted by activities that occur within the water column.
- 15.8.7 Construction activities that could have direct impacts will primarily consist of piling which could lead to physical damage of the archaeological resource and deformation of the surrounding deposits. The use of floating/jack up barge will be used to undertake piling on the finger piers.
- 15.8.8 Any adverse effects upon marine archaeological receptors from direct impacts associated with construction activities would be permanent and irreversible. As such, the magnitude of direct impacts on known maritime and aviation receptors, and potential seabed prehistory receptors as a result of construction activities, if they were to occur, would be high. As a result, if appropriate mitigation is not applied, both the high sensitivity and the high magnitude of direct impacts on such resources would result in **major adverse** effects considered to be significant.

Direct impacts on known and potential marine heritage receptors from dredging

- 15.8.9 Any direct impacts to marine archaeological receptors are likely to occur during dredging activities. Impacts resulting in negative effects upon archaeological receptors as part of dredging works are those involving contact with the seabed and/or the removal of seabed sediments.
- 15.8.10 It is anticipated that the dredging will be conducted using a tug assisted backhoe dredger and possibly a trailer suction hopper dredger (TSHD). Dredged material will be transported to disposal sites by bottom dumping split barges if an alternative beneficial use for the material has not been identified.
- 15.8.11 Any adverse effects upon marine archaeological receptors from direct impacts associated with dredging would be permanent and irreversible. As such, the magnitude of direct impacts on known maritime and aviation receptors, and potential seabed prehistory features as part of dredging activities, if they were to occur, would be high. As a result, if appropriate mitigation is not applied, both the high sensitivity and the high magnitude of direct impacts on such resources would result in **major adverse** effects considered to be significant.

Indirect impacts to marine heritage receptors due to altered sediment or hydrological processes

- 15.8.12 The indirect effects upon the known and potential marine archaeological receptors are those which occur as a result of changes to hydrodynamic and sediment transport regimes, where these changes have occurred as a consequence of activities and structures associated with the construction and dredging activities. These impacts may occur through sediment dispersal / deposition from dredging activities or scour associated with the disturbance from construction activities and structures.
- 15.8.13 Indirect impacts may affect marine archaeological baseline conditions where they result in the increased exposure or burial of marine archaeological receptors. The increased exposure of marine archaeological receptors has the potential to cause erosion and deterioration to the receptors. Conversely, should receptors be subject to increased sedimentation and burial, they may, in turn, benefit from conditions which afford higher levels of preservation.
- 15.8.14 The magnitude of indirect impacts to marine archaeology and cultural heritage during the construction phase is expected to be low/negligible. Results provided in Chapter 7 Physical Processes of this ES, which characterised the local hydrodynamic and wave regime and the sediment composition within, and around the proposed dredged berth pocket, show that the magnitude of change is assessed as small, resulting in an overall low exposure to change. It is considered that the increase in Suspended Sediment Concentrations (SSC) and potential sedimentation in the marine environment is likely to be the same as that which already occurs from the existing maintenance dredging in the area. Similarly, impacts from construction vessel movements are considered to be localised and temporary, and the magnitude of change is assessed as small, resulting in a low/negligible exposure to change.
- 15.8.15 Therefore, the high sensitivity and low/negligible magnitude of indirect impacts on such resources will result in **negligible adverse** effects, considered not significant.

Operational phase

- 15.8.16 This section contains an assessment of the potential impacts to cultural heritage and marine archaeology receptors as a result of the operational phase of the IERRT project. The following impact pathways have been assessed:
- Direct impacts on known and potential marine heritage receptors from maintenance dredging;
 - Indirect effects such as changes in local scouring and sedimentation patterns; and
 - Impacts to setting of cultural heritage receptors.

Direct impacts on known and potential marine heritage receptors from maintenance dredging

- 15.8.17 Any adverse effects upon marine archaeological receptors from direct impacts associated with maintenance dredging will be permanent and irreversible. As such, the magnitude of direct impacts on known maritime and aviation receptors, and potential seabed prehistory features as part of dredging activities, if they were to occur, would be high.
- 15.8.18 However, as maintenance dredging takes place in areas where the impact has already occurred for the capital dredge during the construction phase, there is unlikely to be further impact. Therefore, the magnitude of indirect impacts on such resource would result in **negligible adverse** effects, considered not significant.

Indirect effects such as changes in local scouring and sedimentation patterns

- 15.8.19 The effects upon the known and potential marine archaeology are those which occur as a result of changes to hydrodynamic and sediment transport, where these changes have occurred as a result of the presence of structures associated with the proposed development.
- 15.8.20 The magnitude of effect of indirect impacts to marine archaeology and cultural heritage during the operational phase is expected to be low/negligible. Results provided in Chapter 7 Physical Processes of this ES, which characterised the local hydrodynamic and wave regime and the sediment composition within, and around the proposed dredged berth pocket, show that the magnitude of change is assessed as small, resulting in an overall low exposure to change.
- 15.8.21 The assessment also looked at impacts from maintenance dredging on Suspended Sediment Concentrations (SSC) and sedimentation. The less intensive maintenance dredging programme will result in smaller changes in SSC and sedimentation compared with the capital dredge. It is also predicted that impacts from future maintenance dredging on the marine environment is likely to be the same as that which already occurs from the existing maintenance dredging in the area.
- 15.8.22 Therefore, the high sensitivity and low/negligible magnitude of indirect impacts on such resources would result in **negligible adverse** effects, considered not significant.

Setting changes

- 15.8.23 The following section details the assessment carried out on each of the two receptors identified as requiring further detailed assessment.

South Farmhouse (1083467)

- 15.8.24 A Grade II Listed Building consisting of a large farmhouse constructed in the mid-19th century for the Crown Estate. Its significance is derived from its

historic and architectural interest. The building retains much of its original architectural detailing both internally and externally. The farmhouse is situated at the end of a long lane, close to the foreshore of the Humber Estuary.

- 15.8.25 The low-lying nature of the surrounding land means there is clear visibility all around and there is a strong link from the farmhouse to the wider landscape, including the industrial Port at Immingham across the Humber Estuary, although immediate rural setting of the receptor is the most important component in understanding its purpose and appreciating its significance.
- 15.8.26 The IERRT project would be visible from this receptor and it will lie within its setting. However, there will be no impact on the setting as the proposed development will make no material change to that setting. The presence of the existing large docks at Immingham does not alter in any way the setting of the receptor while the proposed development will be neither novel nor noticeable within the existing vista across the Humber Estuary.
- 15.8.27 It is considered that the effect of the IERRT development upon the setting of this receptor will be of negligible magnitude leading to a **negligible** effect and therefore not significant for the purpose of this assessment.

Stone Creek Heavy Anti-aircraft gun site (1020187)

- 15.8.28 This receptor is a Scheduled Monument comprising the standing, buried and earthwork remains of a Second World War heavy anti-aircraft site located on the eastern bank of the Humber Estuary. Its significance is bound in its archaeological and historical interest as a rare, complete, and well-preserved example of this type of installation. Its setting is defined by its location as deliberate, tactical decisions were made in the selection of the site to host these defences which were to protect the ports and industrial infrastructure in the area from attack. The setting must, as well, be thought of in three dimensions for this receptor where clear skies and visibility in all directions was a key characteristic and one which remains in place.
- 15.8.29 The setting of the receptor is defined by its location which was deliberately chosen for its strategic benefit. German Aircraft would use the natural feature of the Humber Estuary to assist in navigating to a target, in this case Hull, Immingham and their docks. The position of the anti-aircraft gun site allowed for clear, unobtrusive views out to sea and across the landscape. Unlike many other receptors, this setting also includes the skies above as those unobtrusive views were critical to identifying and attacking incoming aircraft. In this respect, the existing makeup of the landscape around the receptor makes little difference as this unobstructed view has remained unaltered.
- 15.8.30 The receptor's historic interest is arguably the key element of its significance. While its archaeological interest is undeniable, it is the combination of the remains as a whole, preserved together in their original location, which makes this receptor so significant. In particular, the rare surviving elements like the remains of the domestic camp add greatly to that

significance. Its setting also makes a contribution to its significance as its location was deliberately selected while the unobstructed views around the landscape, particularly towards the skies, are critical to understanding, appreciating and experiencing the receptor. The IERRT project, while in its setting, does not make any direct contribution to the receptor's significance.

- 15.8.31 While the IERRT project lies within the setting of the receptor, there will be no impact to its significance as the proposed development will make no material change to that setting. As the anti-aircraft emplacement was specifically located to provide defence for the Port at Hull, this location and its wide, open views across the landscape and towards the sky is critical to understanding its function. The presence of the large docks at Immingham does not alter in any way the setting of the receptor while the proposed development will be neither novel nor noticeable within the existing vista across the Humber Estuary.
- 15.8.32 It is considered that the impact upon setting will be of negligible magnitude leading to a **negligible** effect and therefore not significant for the purpose of this assessment.

15.9 Mitigation measures

Introduction

- 15.9.1 Mitigation measures are to be secured through a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI). A draft WSI is included as Appendix 15.3 to this ES. The final WSI will need to take account of any relevant matters emerging through the ongoing detailed design process and any relevant matters emerging through the examination of the IERRT DCO application. The intention is to have a final WSI in place at the end of the examination stage of the IERRT DCO application.
- 15.9.2 The following measures – which will be included in the WSI - are designed to mitigate any predicted adverse effects upon seabed receptors from direct impacts. The mitigation measures are designed to either avoid, reduce or offset any damage/disturbance occurring as a result of the proposed development upon known receptors, and to establish the presence of unknown sites.

Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs)

- 15.9.3 As no A1 anomalies have been identified for this assessment, no Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs) are currently recommended for the IERRT project. Should any A1 anomalies be discovered during the works (e.g. through the Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries- see paragraph 15.9.15 of this chapter) then this mitigation may be used.
- 15.9.4 The primary mitigation for the protection of known archaeological receptors is avoidance. This is commonly achieved through the implementation and

monitoring of AEZs, which are proposed for identified high value seabed receptors of anthropogenic origin (i.e. A1 classified geophysical anomalies).

- 15.9.5 Historic Environment guidance for Port and Harbour development (Historic England 2016) sets out the context for initiating AEZs, and establishing a buffer around the known extents of sites for which the available evidence suggest that there could be archaeological material present on the seabed. The mitigation will establish appropriately sized AEZs around receptors which have been considered to be of high archaeological potential, in consultation with the Archaeological Curators (HE). These areas would be out of bounds to construction activities and to anchoring or jacking-up. Monitoring of any AEZs to ensure there is no disturbance to them would be part of this mitigation.

A2 anomalies

- 15.9.6 For anomalies assigned an A2 archaeological classification (Table 15.1), no AEZs are recommended. However, avoidance of these anomalies by micro-siting will be carried out, if possible, if they are directly impacted by the proposed development. If micro-siting is not possible, then further appraisal and investigation to ascertain the nature of the anomalies would take place.
- 15.9.7 Further investigations would mean that anomalies can either have their archaeological value removed, if they prove to be of non-anthropogenic nature or modern, or their value as archaeological receptors confirmed. If their value is confirmed, mitigation in the form of either avoidance (which may be enacted by the implementation of an AEZ) or through remedying or offsetting measures as identified through a Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (PAD) (see paragraph 15.9.15 of this chapter).
- 15.9.8 The WSI will detail the agreed mitigation that will be in place during the construction of the proposed development. The implementation of a WSI is the mitigation, rather than the document itself. The WSI has been and will continue to be developed in line with Historic Environment guidance for Port and Harbour development (Historic England 2016). The WSI is based on the measures recommended in this chapter and will be subject to approval by the Archaeological Curator (Historic England) through the application examination process.
- 15.9.9 In cases where avoidance is either inappropriate or impossible, the damage to archaeological receptors would be offset, generally by more extensive study, excavation or survey of the receptor. Any mitigation strategy will be identified within the WSI and any recommended methods will be covered by a specific Method Statement, approved by the Archaeological Curator (Historic England), should they be implemented.
- 15.9.10 Where suitable for archaeological assessment, further geophysical surveys undertaken in advance of the development commencing, for example for the purposes of detailed design, that require magnetometer data (e.g., unexploded ordnance (UXO) survey) will also be assessed by a suitably

qualified archaeological contractor. This will allow for the identification of any additional ferrous features of archaeological potential within the proposed development, as well as to confirm the presence of ferrous material at the location of features identified during this assessment.

Palaeogeography

15.9.11 The appraisal of geophysical data resulted in the identification of a total of 25 features of palaeogeographic interest within the study area, intersecting within the dredging pocket and locations of piling activities. Mitigation measures to offset physical effects to palaeogeographic receptors are discussed below. These features are summarised as follows:

- A total of 11 features, comprising channel features and deposits of organic material were assigned a P1 archaeological classification (feature of probable archaeological interest, either because of its palaeogeography or likelihood for producing palaeoenvironmental material); and
- A total of 14 features comprising simple cuts and fills, and other deposits were assigned an P2 archaeological classification (Feature of possible archaeological interest).

15.9.12 As terrestrial features interpreted as being deposited during periods of likely human occupation, those features given a P1 archaeological classification are considered of high archaeological potential. Those features with a P2 classification are considered of medium archaeological potential.

15.9.13 For the purposes of the detailed design of the marine elements of the project, further ground investigation work is programmed to take place. Appropriate archaeological advice has been provided on how that investigation can provide samples of benefit to ongoing archaeological considerations in synergy with the draft WSI (Appendix 15.3).

15.9.14 A geoarchaeological assessment of any future marine borehole logs obtained as part of this detailed design ground investigation will be undertaken, especially in respect of any logs that contain organic deposits for dating purposes. This will aid in refining the interpretation and therefore help determine the archaeological potential of the area.

Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (PAD)

15.9.15 If previously unknown sites or material are encountered during the different phases of the proposed development, measures will be taken to reduce the level of impact. In order to provide for these unexpected discoveries a Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (PAD) will be adopted. The PAD is a system for reporting and investigating unexpected archaeological discoveries encountered during construction activities, with a Retained Archaeologist providing guidance and advising on the implementation of the PAD. The PAD also makes provision for the implementation of temporary exclusion zones around areas of possible archaeological interest, for prompt archaeological advice, and, if necessary, for archaeological inspection of important features prior to further activities in the vicinity. The PAD provides

a mechanism to comply with the Merchant Shipping Act 1995, including notification of the Receiver of Wreck, and accords with the Code of Practice for Seabed Developers (Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee (JNAPC), 2006) and relevant Guidance (Historic England 2016).

15.10 Limitations and assumptions

15.10.1 The assessment has been undertaken based on the following assumptions:

- Data used to compile this report includes secondary information derived from a variety of sources as detailed in Section 15.3 of this Chapter, only some of which have been directly examined for the purposes of this assessment. The assumption is made that the secondary data, as well as that derived from other secondary sources, are reasonably accurate; and
- The records held by the UKHO, NRHE, local HERs and the other sources used in this assessment are not a record of all surviving cultural heritage receptors, rather a record of the discovery of a wide range of archaeological and historical components of the marine historic environment. The information held within these is assumed to be incomplete and does not preclude the subsequent discovery of further elements of the historic environment that are, at present, unknown. In particular, this relates to currently unknown buried archaeological receptors.

15.11 Residual effects and conclusions

15.11.1 A summary of the impact pathways that have been assessed, the identified residual impacts and level of confidence is presented in Table 15.8 of this Chapter.

15.11.2 The assessment considered three impact pathways from the construction phase in detail. These addressed the potential for direct impacts on known and potential heritage receptors from construction activities and from dredging, and the potential for indirect impacts to heritage receptors due to altered sediment or hydrological processes.

15.11.3 With regards potential maritime and aviation receptors (i.e. A2 anomalies), avoidance through micro-siting, where possible, is typically proposed. Following the application of the appropriate mitigation (Table 15.8), any effects resulting from the proposed development would be **negligible** and considered not significant.

15.11.4 Without any mitigation, impacts on known potential seabed history receptors, could result in moderate negative effects. However, mitigation applied through further investigation could result in a **significant positive effect** through contributing to the knowledge base of seabed prehistory receptors.

-
- 15.11.5 Any maintenance dredging works to be carried out during the operational phase will have a relatively small and defined footprint, and significant impacts would have already likely occurred during the construction phase. With the implementation of the appropriate mitigation measures set out above the significance of any direct or indirect effects on marine archaeology will be reduced significantly and the effect predicted to be **negligible** and not significant.
- 15.11.6 Accordingly, as presented in Table 15.8 below, residual effects on marine heritage receptors from direct impacts during the construction and operation of the proposed development are anticipated to be **not significant**.
- 15.11.7 With regards to indirect impacts, as presented in Table 15.8, residual effects on marine heritage receptors and the setting of the two heritage receptors are anticipated to be **not significant**.

Table 15.8. Summary of potential impact, mitigation measures and residual impacts

Receptor	Impact Pathway	Impact Significance	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact	Confidence
Construction Phase					
Known and potential seabed prehistory receptors.	Direct impacts on known and potential marine heritage receptors from construction activities.	Major adverse	Offsetting by means of geoarchaeological assessment of geotechnical surveys.	Major positive (as long as geotechnical data are retained, analysed, and reported on by a qualified geoarchaeologist)	High
Potential maritime and aviation receptors (i.e. A2 anomalies), Currently unknown archaeological sites and artefacts	Direct impacts on known and potential marine heritage receptors from dredging.	Major adverse	Avoidance via implementation of AEZs were deemed appropriate; WSI (and any supporting activity-specific Method Statements) and reduction via a PAD.	Negligible	High
Known and potential seabed prehistory receptors; maritime receptors; and aviation receptors.	Indirect impacts to marine heritage receptors due to altered sediment or hydrological processes.	Negligible adverse	No mitigation is necessary as a result of negligible adverse significance of impact.	Negligible	High

Receptor	Impact Pathway	Impact Significance	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact	Confidence
Operation Phase					
Known and potential seabed prehistory receptors; maritime receptors; and aviation receptors.	Direct impacts on known and potential marine heritage receptors from maintenance dredging.	Negligible adverse	No mitigation is necessary as a result of negligible adverse significance of impact.	Negligible	High
Known and potential seabed prehistory receptors; maritime receptors; and aviation receptors	Indirect effects such as changes in local scouring and sedimentation patterns.	Negligible adverse	No mitigation is necessary as a result of negligible adverse significance of impact.	Negligible	High
Known designated heritage receptors.	Impacts to setting of cultural heritage receptors.	Negligible	No mitigation is necessary as a result of negligible adverse significance of impact.	Negligible	High

15.12 References

ABPmer 2022 Immingham Eastern RoRo Terminal: Geophysical Survey Report. ABPmer Report No. R.3878

British Geological Survey: GeolIndex - British Geological Survey [Online] Available at: [REDACTED] (accessed November 2022).

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (2014). Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment. Reading, CIfA (updated 2020)

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. (2009). Our Seas- a shared resource. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/182486/ourseas-2009update.pdf (accessed 26 November 2021)

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. (2014). East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans. London.

Department for Transport. (2012). National Policy Statement for Ports. [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-ports> (accessed November 2021).

English Heritage (1998). Identifying and Protecting Palaeolithic Remains: Archaeological Guidance for Planning Authorities and Developers. London, English Heritage¹.

English Heritage (2000). Managing Lithic Scatters: Archaeological Guidance for planning authorities and developers. London, English Heritage.

English Heritage (2002). Military Aircraft Crash Sites: archaeological guidance on their significance and future management. London, English Heritage.

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

English Heritage (2011). Environmental Archaeology: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods, from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation (second edition).

English Heritage (2012). Ships and Boats: Prehistory to Present: Designation Selection Guide. London, English Heritage.

English Heritage (2013). Marine Geophysics Data Acquisition, Processing and Interpretation Guidance Notes.

¹ English Heritage became Historic England in April 2015.

Grace's Guide (2020). Immingham Dock. Grace's Guide to British Industrial History [Online] Available at: [REDACTED] (accessed November 2022).

Gribble, J. and Leather, S. for EMU Ltd. (2011). Offshore Geotechnical Investigations and Historic Environment Analysis: Guidance for the Renewable Energy Sector. Commissioned by COWRIE Ltd (project reference GEOARCH-09).

Historic England (2015). Geoarchaeology – Using earth sciences to understand the archaeological record.

Historic England (2016). The Assessment and Management of Marine Archaeology in Port and Harbour Development.

Historic England (2017). The Setting of Heritage Assets – Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (second edition).

HM Government. (2011). UK Marine Policy Statement. [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-marine-policy-statement> (accessed November 2022).

JNAPC (2006). JNAPC Code of Practice for Seabed Development. York, Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee.

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. (2021). National Planning Policy Framework.

North East Lincolnshire District Council. (2018). Local Plan 2013 to 2032.

PIANC (2014). Dredging and Port Construction: Interaction with Features of Archaeological or Heritage Interest, Guidance Document No 124-2014 .

Wessex Archaeology (2008). Aircraft Crash Sites at Sea: A Scoping Study. London. English Heritage.

15.13 Abbreviations/Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
AEZ	Archaeological Exclusion Zone
BGS	British Geological Survey
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
HE	Historic England
HER	Historic Environment Record
HLC	Historic Landscape Character
HM	Her/His Majesty
ID	Identification
IERT	Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal
JNAPC	Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee
Mag.	Magnetometer
MBES	Multibeam Echosounder
MCAA	Marine and Coastal Access Act
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MPS	Marine Policy Statement
NELC	North East Lincolnshire Council
NLC	North Lincolnshire Council
NELHER	North East Lincolnshire Historic Environment Records
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPSfP	National Policy Statement for Ports
NRHE	National Record of the Historic Environment
PAD	Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PIANC	Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses, now known as World Association for Waterborne Transport Infrastructure
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
ROV	Remotely Operated Vehicle
SBP	Sub-bottom Profiler
SSC	Suspended Sediment Concentrations
SSS	Side Scan Sonar
TSHD	Trailer Suction Hopper Dredger
UK	United Kingdom

UKHO	United Kingdom Hydrographic Office
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigations

Cardinal points/directions are used unless otherwise stated.

SI units are used unless otherwise stated.

15.14 Glossary

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

Contact Us

ABPmer

Quayside Suite,

Medina Chambers

Town Quay, Southampton

SO14 2AQ

T +44 (0) 23 8071 1840

F +44 (0) 23 8071 1841

E enquiries@abpmer.co.uk

