



Immingham Green Energy Terminal

TR030008

Volume 6

6.2 Environmental Statement

Chapter 14: Historical Environment (Terrestrial)

Planning Act 2008

Regulation 5(2)(a)

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as
amended)

September 2023

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended)

Immingham Green Energy Terminal Development Consent Order 2023

6.2 Environmental Statement

Chapter 14: Historic Environment (Terrestrial)

Regulation Reference	APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Case Reference	TR030008
Application Document Reference	TR030008/APP/6.2
Author	Associated British Ports Air Products BR

Version	Date	Status of Version
Revision 1	21 September 2023	DCO Application

Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
Table of contents	3
14 Historic Environment (Terrestrial)	14-1
14.1 Introduction	14-1
14.2 Consultation and Engagement	14-3
14.3 Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance	14-15
14.4 Assessment Methodology	14-18
14.5 Study Area	14-24
14.6 Baseline Conditions.....	14-26
14.7 Development Design and Impact Avoidance.....	14-41
14.8 Assessment of Likely Impact and Effects	14-42
14.9 Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	14-64
14.10 Assessment of Residual Effects.....	14-65
14.11 Summary of Assessment	14-66
14.12 Conclusions.....	14-71
14.13 References.....	14-73
Tables	
Table 14-1: Stakeholder Consultation.....	14-4
Table 14-2: Relevant legislation, policy and guidance regarding historic environment (terrestrial)	14-15
Table 14-3: Criteria for assessing the value of heritage assets	14-21
Table 14-4: Factors influencing the assessment of magnitude of impacts.....	14-22
Table 14-5: Classification of effects	14-23
Table 14-6: Summary of Assessment – Likely Effects.....	14-60
Table 14-7: Summary of Residual Effects.....	14-67

14 Historic Environment (Terrestrial)

14.1 Introduction

- 14.1.1 This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of the likely significant effects of the Project on the historic environment (terrestrial). For more details about the Project, including construction methodology, layout and lifespan and defined Site areas, refer to **Chapter 1: Introduction** and **Chapter 2: The Project [TR030008/APP/6.2]**.
- 14.1.2 References to ‘the Project’ within this chapter relate to the landside (terrestrial) infrastructure components as detailed in **Section 2.4 of Chapter 2: The Project**.
- 14.1.3 References to ‘the Site’ within this chapter relate to the areas of land encompassed by all terrestrial elements of the Project (the entire terrestrial Site Boundary of the Project). The Site location is shown on **Figure 1.1 [TR030008/APP/6.3]**, whilst **Figure 2.3 [TR030008/APP/6.3]** shows the Site plan for the Project, outlining the location of the West Site, Pipeline Corridor, East Site, Temporary Construction Areas (including a concrete batching plant on the East Site (Work No. 5a) and Jetty sites).
- 14.1.4 The Historic Environment (Marine) has been assessed and is reported separately in **Chapter 15: Historic Environment (Marine)** of this Environmental Statement (“ES”) **[TR030008/APP/6.2]**.
- 14.1.5 As interrelationships exist between the potential effects on the historic environment (terrestrial) and certain other assessments, reference should be made to the following chapters of the ES **[TR030008/APP/6.2]**:
- Chapter 15: Historic Environment (Marine).**
 - Chapter 21: Ground Conditions and Land Quality.**
- 14.1.6 This chapter is based on research and evaluation works including a Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (“DBA”, **Appendix 14.C [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) and a programme of archaeological evaluation undertaken across areas of the Site. The findings of these works have guided the baseline and impact assessment presented, helping to inform the understanding of the significance and setting of the heritage assets within the study area, and the impacts and effects that the Project may have upon them.
- 14.1.7 The chapter considers the future baseline, whereby changes to the status of heritage assets over time are identified in a scenario where the Project does not proceed.
- 14.1.8 Cultural heritage comprises all aspects of the historic environment resulting from the interaction and relationships between people and places through time. The above aspects are referred to as heritage assets: buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance due to their heritage interest that merit consideration in planning decisions. Cultural heritage influences how people relate to places and cultures and can provide a sense of place and stability to a community.

- 14.1.9 Heritage assets are defined within the National Policy Statement for Ports (“NPSfP”, Ref 14-8) as *“Those elements of the historic environment that hold value to this and future generations because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest”* and that *“A Heritage Asset may be any building, monument, site, place, area or landscape or any combination of these”*.
- 14.1.10 Heritage assets include those that are designated under legislation (such as listed buildings and scheduled monuments) as well as those that are non-designated. Non-designated heritage assets are assets that are considered to have a degree of local interest or significance usually recognised by local planning authorities (“LPAs”), either by their inclusion within the local Historic Environment Record (“HER”) or by local listing.
- 14.1.11 This chapter:
- a. Details the requirements of key legislative and policy requirements and describes how the Project and this assessment has considered them.
 - b. Explains how information on the existing and future historic environment has been collected (through desk-based studies, survey work and stakeholder consultation).
 - c. Describes the understanding of the existing and future historic environment, utilising the baseline information.
 - d. Explains any further information to be obtained through further consultation, desk-based studies or surveys.
 - e. Describes the likely significant effects of the Project on cultural heritage within the historic environment (terrestrial).
 - f. Describes the proposed mitigation measures.
 - g. Presents an assessment of residual effects, once the proposed mitigation measures have been taken into account.
- 14.1.12 This chapter is supported by the following figures [TR030008/APP/6.3]:
- a. **Figure 14.1:** Location of designated heritage assets.
 - b. **Figure 14.2:** Location of non-designated heritage assets.
 - c. **Figure 14.3:** Historic Landscape Characterisation.
- 14.1.13 This chapter is also supported by the following appendices [TR030008/APP/6.4]:
- a. **Appendix 14.A:** Historic Environment Events Register.
 - b. **Appendix 14.B:** Heritage Assets Register.
 - c. **Appendix 14.C:** Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Desk-based Assessment.
 - d. **Appendix 14.D:** Heritage Standards and Guidance.
 - e. **Appendix 14.E:** Written Scheme of Investigation for GI Watching Brief, Geoarchaeological Boreholes, Geophysical Survey and Archaeological Trial Trenching.

- f. **Appendix 14.F:** Report on Trial Trench Evaluation.
- g. **Appendix 14.G:** Report on Geoarchaeological Survey and monitoring of Geotechnical Investigations.
- h. **Appendix 14.H:** Report on Geophysical Survey.

14.2 Consultation and Engagement

- 14.2.1 A scoping exercise was undertaken in August 2022 to establish the form and nature of the historic environment (terrestrial) assessment, and the approach and methods to be followed. The Scoping Report (**Appendix 1.A [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) records the findings of the scoping exercise and details the technical guidance, standards, best practice and criteria being applied in the assessment to identify and evaluate the likely significant effects of the Project on the historic environment (terrestrial). A Scoping Opinion was adopted by the Secretary of State on 10 October 2022 **[TR030008/APP/6.4]**.
- 14.2.2 Statutory Consultation took place between 9 January and 20 February 2023 in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 (“the 2008 Act”). The Applicant (Associated British Ports) prepared a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (“PEI Report”), which was publicised at the consultation stage.
- 14.2.3 As a result of consideration of the responses to the first Statutory Consultation, the developing environmental assessments and ongoing design-development and assessment, a series of changes to the Project were identified. A second Statutory Consultation took place between 24 May and 20 July in accordance with the 2008 Act and a PEI Report Addendum was publicised to support the consultation.
- 14.2.4 The consultations undertaken with statutory consultees to inform this chapter, including a summary of comments raised via the formal scoping opinion (**Appendix 1.A [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) and in response to the first and second Statutory Consultations and other pre-application engagement are summarised in **Table 14-1** The full responses to consultation comments are included within the Summary of Consultation Responses document **[TR030008/APP/5.1]**.

Table 14-1: Stakeholder Consultation

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
Scoping Report August 2022	Planning Inspectorate	The Scoping Report seeks to scope out this matter [<i>impacts on below ground archaeological remains during operation and decommissioning of the Project</i>] on the grounds that project operation and decommissioning would not result in additional impacts to buried archaeological remains to those experienced during construction. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the assessment.	Noted. No further comment needed.
		The Scoping Report seeks to limit the scope of the assessment of built heritage to the impacts on the setting of two non-designated rows of terraced housing on Queens Road, as other assets within the study area are sufficiently distant from the site and shielded by other development. In light of the evidence provided in Appendix D -Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment, the Inspectorate agrees with the proposed scope of the built heritage assessment.	Noted. No further comment needed.
		The Scoping Report seeks to limit the scope of the assessment of impacts to historic landscape character to the western fringe of the Proposed Development area. In light of the evidence provided in Appendix D -Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment, the Inspectorate agrees with the proposed scope of the built heritage assessment.	Noted. No further comment needed.
		The Scoping Report does not refer to decommissioning within its proposals for scoping in/out with respect to impacts on built heritage and historic landscape. Subject to the provision of the Outline Decommissioning Plan secured within the DCO to detail measures to avoid or reduce impacts on built	Noted. No further comment needed. Information from this Chapter regarding decommissioning (Paragraphs 14.8.9 - 14.8.11) is included within

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
		heritage and historic landscape, the Inspectorate agrees to scope out this matter from the ES.	the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (“Outline DEMP”) [TR030008/APP/6.6]).
		The Scoping Report proposes a staged programme of archaeological evaluation, stating only that geophysical survey or evaluation trenching may be required. However, Appendix D paragraph 4.58 states that archaeological potential of the site is high for some features, and paragraph 6.6 recommends that archaeological evaluation is undertaken including geoarchaeological investigation and targeted trial trenching. The extent of survey activity should be agreed as part of a Written Scheme of Investigation with NELC, where possible. Where necessary intrusive investigations should be completed prior to submission of the DCO application.	A Written Scheme of Investigation (“WSI”) was produced that sets out the scope of archaeological investigation to be completed prior to the submission of the application (Appendix 14.E [TR030008/APP/6.4]). This scope of works included Ground Investigation (“GI”) watching brief, geoarchaeological borehole survey, trial trench evaluation and geophysical survey. This scope of works was agreed with the County Archaeologist and has been undertaken (reports on these works are attached as Appendices 14.F - 14.H [TR030008/APP/6.4]).
		The Proposed Development has potential to alter drainage patterns and this could indirectly affect below ground heritage assets. The ES should provide commentary on the likelihood of indirect impacts on heritage assets to arise and outline any necessary mitigation measures to address significant effects where they are likely to occur.	A greater understanding of the ground make up and any archaeological features present has been obtained through the archaeological evaluation work undertaken. The results of this in relation to the potential impact upon below ground archaeological

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
			remains have been considered as part of the assessment.
		The Applicant's attention is drawn to the consultation response from Immingham Town Council regarding the historical value of 31 Queen's Road.	The PEI Report initially considered and reported on the historic value of assets at Queens Road including No 31 and the impact upon them. The properties have been reconsidered as part of this assessment (and in light of changes to the Project and its Site Boundary). This re-assessment has confirmed that the impact on the properties remains assessed as low.
Scoping Report August 2022	Historic England	We are in general agreement regarding the content of the Scoping Report (AECOM: August 2022) and the areas of the Historic Environment which are to be scoped in and out of the assessment. It is important to make sure that the area of the terrestrial and maritime heritage assessments abut or overlap so that no assets are missed and the setting of assets can be assessed as a whole.	Noted. An intertidal walkover survey was undertaken on 25 October 2022 in order to ensure baseline coverage of the intertidal zone has been considered for terrestrial and marine heritage aspects. There is an overlap between the terrestrial and marine areas. Information on how the terrestrial and marine assessments overlap is provided in Paragraphs 14.6.71 - 14.6.74.
		This development could, potentially, have an impact upon a number of designated and un-designated terrestrial and maritime heritage assets and their settings in the area around	The visibility of the Project has been taken into account when assessing impacts upon assets

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
		<p>the site. In line with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), we would expect the Environmental Statement to contain a thorough assessment of the likely effects which the proposed development might have upon those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets. Given the heights of the structures associated with the proposed development and the surrounding landscape character, this development is likely to be visible across a very large area and could, as a result, affect the significance of heritage assets at some distance from this site itself. We would expect the assessment to clearly demonstrate that the extent of the proposed study area is of the appropriate size to ensure that all heritage assets likely to be affected by this development have been included and can be properly assessed.</p>	<p>within this chapter. This has assumed a worse case scenario i.e. maximum proposed heights where options have been presented and maximum visibility (i.e. screening from proposed other elements of the Project or other proposed development has not been taken into account) when determining which assets may be effected by the Project and when assessing what that impact may look like.</p>
		<p>It is important that the assessment is designed to ensure that all impacts are fully understood including associated activities (such as construction, servicing and maintenance, and associated traffic) might have upon perceptions, understanding and appreciation of the heritage assets in the area. Section drawings and techniques such as photomontages are a useful part of this. The likelihood of alterations to drainage patterns should also be considered as this may lead to in situ decomposition or destruction of below ground archaeological remains and deposits, and the subsidence of buildings and monuments. We would strongly recommend that you involve the Historic Environment Officers at North and North East Lincolnshire Councils in the development of this assessment. They are best placed to advise on: local historic environment issues and priorities; how the proposal can be tailored to avoid and minimise</p>	<p>The assessment has considered physical impacts upon assets and impacts on the setting of assets.</p> <p>The results of the archaeological evaluation work have informed the assessment of the potential for below ground remains (incorporated into the baseline assessment and assessment of effects) and the sensitivity of such remains.</p> <p>The Historic Environment Officer has been consulted at all stages of work, as appropriate.</p>

Immingham Green Energy Terminal
Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Historic Environment (Terrestrial)

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
		potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of heritage assets.	
Scoping Report August 2022	Immingham Town Council	One of the properties, 31 Queens Road, appeared to have some historical value to the area, as it is unique and was built for the Pastor of Seaman's Mission. This should be protected.	This ES chapter has considered these properties including No 31. The value of the assets remains assessed as low. The impact of the construction of the Project within the setting of the asset remains assessed as of medium magnitude, resulting in a minor adverse effect which is not significant.
August 2022	North East Lincolnshire Council ("NELC")	NELC is happy with the details set out in the scoping document.	Noted.
July 2022	Heritage Officer for NELC	Approval of DBA – via email.	Approved, minor comments addressed.
August 2022	Heritage Officer for NELC	Outline meeting for scope of fieldwork – via Teams meeting.	Scope approved in principle and actions (production of WSI etc.) agreed.
14 September 2022	Heritage Officer for NELC	Approval of Written Scheme of Investigation for monitoring of Geotechnical investigation, Geophysical survey, Geo-archaeological investigation and trial trench evaluation - via email.	Approved, minor comments addressed.

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
17 January 2023	Heritage Officer for NELC	Approval of Method Statements for Geophysical survey, Geo-archaeological investigation and trial trench evaluation – via email.	Approved, minor comments addressed.
21 November 2022 – 10 February 2023	Heritage Officer for NELC	Monitoring of field works and sign off of trial trench evaluation. Communication ongoing through this period (via phone calls and email). Comments resulted in minor trench relocation during works. Comments made via a combination of in person on site meetings, virtual meetings and emails over this period.	All field work approved and signed off (by the Heritage Officer for NELC) as complete
Statutory Consultation (PEIR) December 2022 – February 2023	Historic England	We note the proposed terrestrial and marine investigations. We consider it premature to conclude environmental impacts in respect of marine and/or terrestrial archaeology. Remains /wrecks can [be] classed as less than significant post-mitigation when sufficient survey and deposit modelling work [has not yet] been carried out/shared.	A programme of archaeological evaluation works was designed for the Site and has now been undertaken. The results of this work are incorporated into this document. As a result of this work, where applicable, new assets have been added, and the significance of assets re-evaluated.
		We note the submitted Written Scheme of Investigation for terrestrial works but would respectfully point out that this does not present the investigations proposed within a coherent staged strategy that would allow investigations and survey to effectively inform deposit modelling and mitigation through further intrusive investigations, supervision and recording etc.	The work to date has consisted of a number of stages, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The production of the DBA (which incorporates the results of previous archaeological surveys conducted at the Site).

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
			<p>b. A programme of archaeological field work which has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Geoarchaeological evaluation (with the aim of creating a deposit model). ii. Archaeological Trial Trench evaluation. iii. Geophysical Survey. iv. Monitoring of GI works. <p>The results of these stages of work are incorporated into this chapter and inform the necessity and scope of any further archaeological mitigation/evaluation or other works required post consent.</p>
		<p>The strategy presented appears to unduly compress this [fieldwork] process thereby potentially undermining the management of archaeological and project risks.</p>	<p>The programme of works has been thorough in its design, implementation and aims (and has been approved by the Heritage Officer for NELC). The results of all of the works have been considered in this assessment including the assessment of impacts and the</p>

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
		<p>We note also that whilst the methods submitted are presented as a Written Scheme of Investigation this document is not produced by the actual contractors who would undertake the work and as such should be regarded as a consultant's archaeological strategy with the actual WSI's remaining for preparation and approval with reference to the expertise of the Local Authority archaeological curator.</p> <p>As noted in our scoping advice it is important to regard the divide between marine and terrestrial as only the present day boundary and for investigations across this to be well integrated reflecting the shifting relationship through past</p>	<p>need for/nature of any further mitigation works.</p> <p>a. The WSI was an overarching document which was designed to provide a high-level strategy for the works.</p> <p>b. This WSI was supported by individual method statements (prepared by the specialist sub contractors) for each piece of work. These provided the specific detail of the method and aims for each piece of work.</p> <p>c. The WSI and each method statement were approved by the Heritage Officer for NELC prior to the start of works on site.</p> <p>d. All works were undertaken as detailed within the WSI and Method Statements and signed off by the Heritage Officer for NELC.</p> <p>The Marine Archaeological Assessment work is being undertaken by the same company which undertook the terrestrial</p>

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
		<p>centuries and millennia in which deposits were formed. As regards marine survey we look forwards to seeing the results of geophysical survey and deposit modelling to provide a more informed understanding both of ancient deposits and remains and the location, significance and importance of wrecks. Again it appears premature to cap the potential impact of capital dredging before this work is done since only with a sound understanding of the resource potential can mitigation through exclusion areas, depth limits and excavation be modelled.</p>	<p>archaeological evaluation fieldwork - Wessex Archaeology. This aids with integration of the results and assessment and presentation of the data collected. AECOM are working closely and collaboratively with Wessex Archaeology to ensure an integrated approach has been taken for the ES, particularly with reference to the transitions between marine and terrestrial archaeology, which, as Historic England rightly point out, can be viewed only as the present-day boundary rather than being fixed throughout prehistoric and historic periods. Again, this is presented within the ES (Chapter 15 [TR030008/APP/6.2]).</p>
<p>Statutory Consultation (PEIR) January – February 2023</p>	<p>Heritage Officer for NELC</p>	<p>Currently archaeological investigation work is ongoing on this site, and will be for the next few weeks in order to gather the evidence base to further inform any heritage mitigation on this site. Until this work is complete I am not able to add anything further to my original comments.</p>	<p>Site works are now complete. Reports on this work, have been provided to the Heritage Officer for NELC. The recommendations for further work contained within this assessment are based on the evidence contained within these reports and have been agreed in liaison with the Heritage Officer for NELC.</p>

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
		The scope of works and proposed Heritage Assessment appears to be acceptable and I look forward to working with the applicants throughout the project.	Noted. Evaluation work now complete (July 2023).
Second Statutory Consultation May – July 2023	Historic England	We note the additional information that has been provided. This provides a greater degree of certainty with regards to potentially sensitive peat deposits (and similar) will be handled further down the line. With the GI investigations in the marine environment we are still uncertain about the impact on any unknown wrecks &c. However, if the applicant is confident that—based on the data they have gathered through marine geophysical surveys—they can undertake this work whilst avoiding impacts on aforementioned historic environment assets, then we have no objection to the approach set out (suitably secured by requirements).	Further investigation on the samples taken will be undertaken as set out in the mitigation section of this assessment and agreed with NELC.
	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	In Section 6.4.4, the Applicant quotes the PEIR which states that, ‘In order to mitigate for tree loss from the Long Strip and elsewhere, the following approach is proposed: Tree planting within some peripheral areas around the operational sites of the hydrogen facility, although these opportunities will be very limited; and Opportunities to be explored for potential off-site tree-planting within areas to be agreed with local bodies/organisations’ LWT would like to point out that the Applicant has provided two examples of non-localised compensation, rather than mitigation. Therefore, further due diligence towards the mitigation hierarchy is recommended, and the above examples should be considered last resorts, according to best practice. Simply put, this particular woodland is considered	In relation to the Heritage aspect of the woodland, it has been determined that the planned ecological surveys will also provide an adequate historic record. See Appendix 8F: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [TR030008/APP/6.4] and the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (“Outline CEMP” [TR030008/APP/6.5] for details on proposed surveys.

Reference/ Date	Consultee	Comment	How comments have been addressed in this chapter
		irreplaceable and invaluable to local biodiversity and heritage, thus avoidance and mitigation should be emphasised, and the suggested compensation is likely to be unequal to the negative consequences of the projected habitat loss.	

14.3 Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance

14.3.1 **Table 14-2** presents the legislation, policy and guidance relevant to the historic environment (terrestrial) assessment and details how their requirements have been addressed in this assessment.

Table 14-2: Relevant legislation, policy and guidance regarding historic environment (terrestrial)

Legislation/Policy/Guidance	Consideration within the Environmental Statement
Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended) (Ref 14-3)	
Imposes a requirement for Scheduled Monument Consent for any works of demolition, repair and alteration that might affect a Scheduled Monument.	There are no Scheduled Monuments in the study area, so none are capable of being affected by the Project.
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Ref 14-24)	
Sets out the principal statutory provisions that must be considered in the determination of any application affecting listed buildings and conservation areas. Section 66 and 72 are specifically applicable (see the Cultural Heritage DBA for further details, Appendix 14.C [TR030008/APP/6.4]).	Listed buildings and conservation areas in the study area have been identified. Section 14.6 indicates that there is a single Grade II listed building located within the 2km study area. There are no conservation areas in the study area.
NPSfP (Ref 14-8)	
Section 5.12 of the NPSfP recognizes that the construction, operation and decommissioning of port infrastructure has the potential to result in adverse impacts on the historic environment. It sets out the expectations for assessment if a development site includes or has potential to include heritage assets with an archaeological interest.	The requirements of the NPSfP have been taken into account in the historic environment assessment for the Project.
National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) (Ref 14-21)	
<p>The NPPF sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these should be applied to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>Section 16 specifically deals with the historic environment. The NPPF sets out a clear framework to ensure that heritage assets are conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner that is consistent with their significance. Significance is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF.</p>	The requirements of the NPPF have been taken into account in the historic environment assessment for the Project.

Legislation/Policy/Guidance	Consideration within the Environmental Statement
National Planning Practice Guidance (“PPG”) (Ref 14-22)	
<p>The PPG provides further advice and expands on the guidance and policy outlines in the NPPF. Paragraph 009 states that heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change to their setting. Paragraph 013 recognises the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public right or the ability to experience that setting.</p> <p>The PPG discusses how to assess if there is substantial harm and the importance of assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm that is the impact of significance of the heritage asset.</p>	<p>The guidance provided in the PPG has been taken into account in the historic environment assessment for the Project.</p>
Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 (Ref 14-19)	
<p>Section 3 refers to listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments.</p> <p>3(1) When deciding an application which affects a listed building, or its setting, the decision-maker must have regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.</p> <p>3(2) When deciding an application relating to a conservation area, the decision-maker must have regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.</p> <p>3(3) When deciding an application for development consent which affects or is likely to affect a scheduled monument or its setting, the decision-maker must have regard to the desirability of preserving the scheduled monument or its setting.</p>	<p>The assessment has provided evidence to support consultees’ consideration of listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments.</p>
East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans (Ref 14-10)	
<p>The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans provide guidance for sustainable development for the coastal area between Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. They provide a clear approach to managing the East Inshore and Offshore areas, its resources and activities and interactions that occur in this area. Plan policy SOC2 is specific to heritage assets and</p>	<p>The requirements of the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans have been taken into account by the historic environment assessment for the Project.</p>

Legislation/Policy/Guidance	Consideration within the Environmental Statement
applies to both the Inshore and Offshore Marine Plans.	
North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 to 2032 (2018) (Ref 14-23)	
<p>Policy 39 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment sets out a clear approach providing guidance to developers on how to safeguard and respond to the historic environment, recognizing designated and non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>The Plan's Strategic Objectives provide a framework for the Plan policies to facilitate the form and pattern of development to ensure that the vision is fully realized by 2023. SO6 refers to the built, historic and natural environment, to ensure that the development needs are met in a way that safeguards and enhances the quality of the built, historic and natural environment.</p>	<p>The requirements of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan policies have been taken into account by the historic environment assessment for the Project.</p>
Historic England Guidance (Ref 14-12, Ref 14-13, Ref 14-15, Ref 14-16 and Ref 14-17)	
<p>The most relevant Historic England guidance for this report are the following:</p> <p>GPA1 provides advice for local authorities, planning offices and other consultants and stakeholders on the correct implementation of the historic environment policies detailed in the NPPF and PPG (Ref 14-12)</p> <p>GPA2 emphasizes the importance of having a knowledge and understanding of the significance of heritage assets likely to be affected by development (Ref 14-13).</p> <p>GPA3 provides guidance on the setting of heritage assets (Ref 14-15).</p> <p>Historic England Advice Note 12 outlines a recommended approach to assessing the significance of heritage assets in line with requirements of the NPPF (Ref 14-16).</p> <p>Historic England Advice Note 15 covers commercial and renewable energy development and the historic environment (Ref 14-17).</p>	<p>The historic environment assessment methodology takes into account Historic England guidance.</p>
Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (Ref 14-18)	
<p>Provides guidance on understanding cultural heritage assets and evaluating the consequences of change.</p>	<p>The historic environment assessment methodology takes into account Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment ("IEMA") guidance.</p>

Legislation/Policy/Guidance	Consideration within the Environmental Statement
Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (“CIfA”) Code of Conduct and Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment. (Ref 14-6 and Ref 14-7)	
Provides a code of conduct and standards and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment for archaeologists in order to appropriately investigate the historic environment and the impacts of proposed developments.	These codes, standards and guidance have been taken into account by the historic environment assessment.
Lincolnshire County Council Archaeology Handbook (2019) (Ref 14-20)	
Archaeology handbook that sets out guidelines for planners, developers, consultants and archaeological contractors. It contains principles of modern historic environment resource management that historic environment professional practitioners need to consider when working in Lincolnshire.	The historic environment assessment methodology takes into account the Lincolnshire County Council Archaeology Handbook guidance. The requirements of these policies have been considered when undertaking the assessment at this stage of the Project.

14.4 Assessment Methodology

Sources of Information

- 14.4.1 The basis of the cultural heritage baseline presented in this chapter is the information collected and presented in the DBA (**Appendix 14.C [TR030008/APP/6.4]**). This was developed through consultation of the following information sources:
- a. HER data from –
 - i. NELC
 - ii. Lincolnshire County Council (“LCC”)
 - b. The North East Lincolnshire Historic Landscape Characterisation (“NLHLC”) data, 2014.
 - c. Lincolnshire Historic Landscape Characterisation data, 2017.
 - d. Historic England’s National Heritage List for England (“NHLE”) – data including listed buildings, world heritage sites, scheduled monuments, registered battlefields and registered parks and gardens.
 - e. Databases of known archaeological sites, find spots, historic buildings and previous archaeological works, including Archaeology Data Service.
 - f. Aerial photographs obtained from the HER and through Google Earth.
 - g. Lincolnshire Council’s online land, planning and development website and the planning and advice documents contained within.
 - h. NELC’s online land, planning and development website and the planning and advice documents contained within.

- i. Historic Ordnance Survey and pre-Ordnance Survey mapping from online archives and the National Library of Scotland (“NLS”) for historic maps.
- j. Various documentary and internet sources, including British History Online.
- k. Consultation with the Heritage Officer for NELC.
- l. Local authority conservation area appraisal and management documents and their mapping.
- m. National Record of the Historic Environment (“NRHE”) held by Historic England.
- n. Heritage Gateway for former National Monuments Record and excavation index data.
- o. Vertical aerial photography and LiDAR imagery of the study area available from the National Collection of Aerial Photographs.
- p. British Geological Survey (“BGS”) Geology of Britain Viewer.
- q. Soilscales online for geological information.
- r. LiDAR data viewed online via The Environment Agency online database.
- s. Relevant records available from the Portable Antiquities Scheme.
- t. The results of a geophysical survey undertaken in 2013 (ECUS Ltd, 2013) within the west part of the Project.
- u. A site inspection visit was undertaken on 18 May 2022 to record the survival, extent, condition, setting and significance of cultural heritage assets within the 2km defined study area. The setting of heritage assets was also identified and potential Project impacts considered. Such works were undertaken as part of the Historic Environment DBA and the results incorporated into that document.

14.4.2 This chapter additionally incorporates information from the following sources:

- a. The results of geophysical survey investigations, monitoring of geotechnical work, geo-archaeological borehole evaluation and trial trench evaluation carried out within the Site Boundary of the Project during November 2022 – February 2023 (**Appendices 14.F – H [TR030008/APP/6.4]**); and
- b. Comments on the Scoping Report and PEI Report provided by the local planning authority (including the Heritage Officer for NELC), Historic England and other stakeholders provided in August 2022 (Scoping Report) and February 2023 (PEI Report), refer to **Table 14-1**.

Impact Assessment Methodology

14.4.3 This section sets out the approach to the assessment of the potential impacts and effects of the Project on designated and non-designated heritage assets. It is in line with the wider methodology set out in **Chapter 5: EIA Process [TR030008/APP/6.2]**. The objective of this assessment is to identify the potential for likely significant effects associated with the Project (which can be beneficial or adverse). The significance of potential effects has been determined by

considering the value of the cultural heritage resource with the predicted magnitude of impact upon it due to the Project.

- 14.4.4 The cultural heritage assessment includes an assessment of the heritage significance of potentially affected assets, in line with NPSfP (Ref 14-8). This requires the provision of information sufficient to enable adequate understanding of the potential impacts on the significance of any heritage asset. This is consistent with the requirements of NPSfP (Ref 14-8) and in line with the NPPF (Ref 14-21). Both documents also require this assessment to take account of changes to both the physical asset and its setting.
- 14.4.5 The NPSfP and the NPPF set out criteria which should be considered when assessing the significance of cultural heritage assets, which includes the archaeological, architectural, artistic and historic interest of the assets. These criteria have been used in the assessment of significance for each potentially affected asset and this information, in conjunction with professional judgement, has been used to assess the value of heritage assets.
- 14.4.6 Both documents relate to impacts affecting the value of heritage assets with negative, or adverse, impacts being equated to ‘harm’. There is a requirement for the decision maker to determine whether the level of harm amounts to ‘substantial harm’ or ‘less than substantial harm’. NPSfP and NPPF make it clear that substantial harm to, or loss of, a Grade II designated asset should be exceptional and that to a Grade II* or I asset, or Scheduled Monument, should be ‘wholly exceptional’. There is no direct correlation between the significance of effects identified through the EIA process and the level of harm caused to heritage significance.
- 14.4.7 The heritage baseline conditions relevant to this assessment are detailed in the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage DBA which is presented at **Appendix 14.C [TR030008/APP/6.4]**. The DBA was undertaken in accordance with guidance and regulations published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Ref 14-27), specifically the Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment and guidance and advice notes published by Historic England. This has been supplemented by a review of this baseline in light of subsequent changes to the Site Boundary.
- 14.4.8 Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (Ref 14-18) is a guide to good practice in cultural heritage impact assessment published jointly by the IEMA, the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (“IHBC”) and the Cifa. The document provides guidance on understanding cultural heritage assets and evaluating the consequences of change and has been considered when undertaking the assessment.

Significance criteria

- 14.4.9 The value of a heritage asset (its heritage significance) is guided by its designated status but is derived also from its heritage interest which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic (NPPF Annex 2, Glossary). Each identified heritage asset can be assigned a value in accordance with the criteria set out in **Table 14-3**, these criteria have been developed using available guidance, experience on comparable development schemes and professional

judgement. Using professional judgement and the results of consultation, heritage assets are also assessed on an individual basis taking into account any regional variations and individual qualities where applicable.

Table 14-3: Criteria for assessing the value of heritage assets

Asset Value	Description
High	<p>World Heritage Sites</p> <p>Scheduled Monuments</p> <p>Grade I and II* listed buildings</p> <p>Registered battlefields</p> <p>Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens</p> <p>Conservation areas of demonstrable high value</p> <p>Non-designated heritage assets (archaeological sites, historic buildings, monuments, parks, gardens, or landscapes) that can be shown to have demonstrable national or international importance.</p> <p>Well preserved historic landscape character areas, exhibiting considerable coherence, time-depth, or other critical factor(s).</p>
Medium	<p>Grade II listed buildings</p> <p>Grade II registered parks and gardens</p> <p>Conservation areas</p> <p>Non-designated heritage assets (archaeological sites, historic buildings, monuments, parks, gardens, or landscapes) that can be shown to have demonstrable regional importance.</p> <p>Averagely preserved historic landscape character areas, exhibiting reasonable coherence, time-depth, or other critical factor(s).</p> <p>Historic townscapes with historic integrity in that the assets that constitute their make-up are clearly legible.</p>
Low	<p>Locally listed buildings</p> <p>Non-designated heritage assets (archaeological sites, historic buildings, monuments, parks, gardens, or landscapes) that can be shown to have demonstrable local importance.</p> <p>Assets whose values are compromised by poor preservation or survival of contextual associations to justify inclusion into a higher grade.</p> <p>Historic landscape character areas whose value is limited by poor preservation and/ or poor survival of contextual associations.</p>
Very Low	<p>Assets identified on national or regional databases, but which have no archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic value.</p> <p>Assets whose values are compromised by poor preservation or survival of contextual associations to justify inclusion into a higher grade.</p> <p>Landscapes with no or little historical merit.</p>

- 14.4.10 Having identified the value of the heritage asset, the next stage in the assessment is to identify the level and degree of impact to an asset arising from the Project. The impacts of a development upon heritage assets can be positive or negative; direct or indirect; long term or temporary; and cumulative. Impacts may arise during construction, operation and decommissioning. Impacts can occur to the physical fabric of the asset or affect its setting. Direct physical impacts are considered permanent and could result in the total, or partial, loss of a heritage asset. These impacts are not reversible. Impacts as a result of changes to setting are split between those resulting from construction activities which are short-term, and those considered to last for the duration of the development operation. These operational impacts are considered to be long-term, but can be reversed upon development decommissioning.
- 14.4.11 The level and degree of impact (impact rating) has been assigned with reference to a four-point scale as set out in **Table 14-4** which have been developed using available guidance, past experience on comparable development schemes and professional judgement. The assessment of the level and degree of impact has been made taking into account any defined mitigation measures, including those embedded in the scheme design. If no impact is identified, no impact rating has been given, and no resulting effect reported.

Table 14-4: Factors influencing the assessment of magnitude of impacts

Magnitude of Impact	Description of Impact
High	Changes such that the significance of the asset is totally altered or destroyed. For example, the permanent and complete removal of a heritage asset and total loss of heritage value. Comprehensive change to, or total loss of, elements of setting that would result in change to the significance of the asset and our ability to understand and appreciate its significance.
Medium	Change such that the significance of the asset is affected, for example, a significant proportion of a heritage asset is removed permanently, resulting in a loss of heritage value which affects the ability to understand the asset's character and function. Noticeably different change to setting affecting significance, resulting in erosion in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.
Low	Change such that the significance of the asset is slightly affected. For example, a small proportion of a heritage asset is removed permanently resulting in a small loss of heritage value; however, this does not affect the ability to understand and/or characterise the resource. Slight change to setting affecting significance resulting in a change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.
Very Low	Changes to the asset that hardly affect significance. For example, a very small proportion of a heritage asset is damaged or removed permanently resulting in a very small loss of heritage value; however, this does not affect the ability to understand and/ or characterise the resource.

Magnitude of Impact	Description of Impact
	Minimal change to the setting of an asset that have little effect on significance resulting in no real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.

14.4.12 Effects have been classified (taking into consideration any embedded / designed mitigation) using the matrix at **Table 14-5**, which takes account of the value of the heritage asset (**Table 14-3**) and the predicted magnitude of impact due to the Project (**Table 14-4**). Effects can be neutral, adverse or beneficial. Neutral effects, by their nature do not have a magnitude of impact.

Table 14-5: Classification of effects

Asset Value	Magnitude of Impact			
	Very Low	Low	Medium	High
High	Minor (not significant)	Moderate (significant)	Major (significant)	Major (significant)
Medium	Minor (not significant)	Minor (not significant)	Moderate (significant)	Major (significant)
Low	Negligible (not significant)	Minor (not significant)	Minor (not significant)	Moderate (significant)
Very Low	Negligible (not significant)	Negligible (not significant)	Minor (not significant)	Minor (not significant)

14.4.13 If appropriate, additional mitigation may be proposed where significant effects have been identified. An assessment of the significance of effect following the implementation of additional mitigation allows the residual effect to be recorded. Mitigation does not automatically reduce an effect but may be used to offset or compensate for an adverse effect.

Cumulative Effects

14.4.14 The cumulative effects of the Project in conjunction with other proposed developments in the vicinity of the Project have been assessed. This has been done qualitatively through consideration of any proposed developments with planning consent secured or those identified that could have an impact on archaeology and cultural heritage, including impacts from changes to an asset's setting.

14.4.15 The cumulative assessment has considered the presence of the Project in combination with the cumulative schemes (consented and application schemes) where there is a potential for significant cumulative cultural heritage effects. This part of the assessment is reported in **Chapter 25: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects [TR030008/APP/6.2]**.

Limitations and Assumptions

- 14.4.16 The information presented in this ES reflects that obtained and evaluated at the time of reporting and is based on the design for the Project and the maximum extents of land required for its construction and operation, based on the application of the Rochdale Envelope.
- 14.4.17 The baseline presented in this document is based upon the Cultural Heritage DBA (**Appendix 14.C [TR030008/APP/6.4]**). This work was assumed to be a correct starting point for assessment of the baseline in this document but was not based on the latest Site boundary. This document updates the baseline and assessment information to reflect subsequent changes in the Site Boundary of the Project and the results of the archaeological evaluations.
- 14.4.18 A wide range of data sources (see **Paragraph 14.4.1**) have been used to define baseline historic environment conditions in the study area. It is assumed that any data provided by third parties is accurate.
- 14.4.19 Those undertaking the archaeological evaluation fieldworks did not encounter any issues which limited their ability to undertake the works as programmed or to yield results capable of addressing the planned aims and objectives of the works.
- 14.4.20 The assessment of potential impacts and effects has assumed that all individual finds (findspots) recorded on the HER within the study area were removed when found and are therefore no longer present in situ. The location of find spots has been considered when assessing the significance of archaeological sites in their vicinity.
- 14.4.21 Unless otherwise stated, it has been assumed that 100% of the area within the Site would be physically affected by the proposed works and the impact on applicable heritage assets listed below have been assessed accordingly. Any refinement to the Project design may reduce the currently defined impacts.

14.5 Study Area

- 14.5.1 The study areas for the historic environment (terrestrial) assessment were defined to include heritage assets that have the potential to be at risk from possible direct and indirect impacts that might arise from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the landside infrastructure elements of the Project.
- 14.5.2 The proposed Site Boundary presented and assessed in this ES differs to that presented in the PEI Report, which differs from those presented in both the DBA (**Appendix 14.C [TR030008/APP/6.4]**), and the WSI (**Appendix 14.E [TR030008/APP/6.4]**). These alterations have come about as the design of the Project has evolved to take account of the needs of the Project, its impact upon the landscape and various design requirements and constraints. The baseline presented in this chapter, and the assessment which follows, are based upon the current Site Boundary of the Project.

- 14.5.3 A study area of 1.6km from the approximate centre of the Site was defined to capture all cultural heritage assets with the potential to be affected by the Project. For designated heritage assets, the study area was extended to 2km to capture heritage assets whose significance may be impacted by the Project through changes to their setting (refer to **Figure 14.1** for designated heritage assets and **Figure 14.2** for non-designated heritage assets [TR030008/APP/6.3]). However, neither of these boundaries were treated as inflexible and where high value (designated or non-designated) assets were present beyond these boundaries they were also considered as part of this work. Which assets were considered beyond the limits of the study areas, was determined by professional judgement, taking into account such things as the value/sensitivity of the asset and the likelihood of significant impact.
- 14.5.4 The study areas have been established based upon the current environment of the Site and theoretical views across it, taking account of the maximum heights of the Project as set out in the parameters section of **Chapter 2: The Project [TR030008/APP/6.2]**, and therefore the visibility of it. The Project sits within a highly industrialised environment, elements of which act as visual screening barriers to the Project. The majority of these screening elements (Immingham town and Immingham Dock) sit to the north-west of the Project, with the Humber to the north and north-east, whilst the area to the south and south-east of the Project is generally more open. For this reason it was decided to skew the centre of the study area slightly in order to capture more assets in the open area to the south / south-west of the Site – where effects on setting are more likely, whilst reducing the number of assets captured which sit within or to the west of Immingham town and Immingham Dock, whose settings are incapable of being significantly affected by the Project due to the screening effect of the town and the Dock.
- 14.5.5 The extents of both the 1.6km and 2km study areas lie within the Humber Estuary to the north-east and east of the Site, and so in this direction all terrestrial assets capable of having their setting potentially affected by the Project have been assessed.
- 14.5.6 To the north and north-west, the study areas include parts of the Immingham Dock and its associated infrastructure and parts of the modern town of Immingham itself. Thus, assets up to and within these locations are included in the study areas. Assets beyond the Dock and the town are not within the study areas, but these are deemed to be sufficiently screened from any significant impact to setting by the structures of the Dock and the town.
- 14.5.7 To the south, south-west and south-east the land is more open. However, a number of large industrial developments on the periphery of the study areas provide screening to assets beyond the study areas, as does the A180 which acts as a significant 'break' in flow of the landscape.
- 14.5.8 For these reasons, the assessed study areas include all heritage assets whose settings are capable of being significantly impacted by the Project.
- 14.5.9 More information on visibility to the Project from the surrounding landscape is presented in **Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual [TR030008/APP/6.2]**.

14.6 Baseline Conditions

14.6.1 This section describes the baseline environmental characteristics for the Site and defined study areas with specific reference to cultural heritage. The heritage assets discussed within this section, including designated and non-designated heritage assets, are identified by their unique identification number assigned by the NHLE for designated assets and by the HER for non-designated heritage assets. The HER numbers are prefixed MNL for North East Lincolnshire. All assets are identified within the text using their unique identifier and can be cross-referenced to the Gazetteers (**Appendix 14.A** and **14.B [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) and **Figures 14.1** and **14.2 [TR030008/APP/6.3]**.

Geology and Soils

- 14.6.2 The BGS web-based Geology of Britain Viewer (Ref 14-4) indicates that the local geology within the Site is characterised by superficial deposits of river and estuarine Alluvium (clay, silt and sand) that formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary Period and tidal flat deposits (clay and silt). The underlying bedrock is Sedimentary Chalk Bedrock. The alluvium formed in an environment dominated by rivers with fine silt and clay deposited from overbank floods and some bogs depositing peat. The Soil Survey of England and Wales soil association mapping, 1:250,000 scale, (Ref 14-26) describes the soils as loamy and clayey soils of coastal flats with naturally high groundwater, characteristic of wet brackish coastal flood meadows. Historic boreholes from the BGS viewer that were drilled in 1937/1938 along the southern side of the West Site indicate topsoil and clay to a depth of over five feet and sealing a peat (four feet thick) over a sequence of silt, boulder clay and chalk (borehole references TA21SW91, TA21SW278).
- 14.6.3 The Humber Estuary is one of the largest river estuaries in Britain and high flood banks contain the estuary as it opens out as it enters the North Sea. On the south bank there are ports and extensive industrial complexes of oil and chemical tanks, towers, chimneys, warehouses and storage areas, with some agricultural land. Long views across the landscape are a dominant focus within much of the area. Along the Humber Estuary the landscape is always changing due to the tidal movements, which expose extensive mudflats at low tide, and the effects of the changing weather. Large ships, including ferries, container ships and cargo ships, are constantly moving in and out of the estuary.
- 14.6.4 The farmed landscape has been altered by relatively recent industrial and commercial development but originally was more open and expansive with large regular fields and few visible field boundaries. Along the estuary much of the land has been formed from reclaimed saltmarshes of the estuary using the drainage of the wet alluvial soils, and from a process known as 'warping' (seasonal tidal impoundment of farmland with water rich in silt). This has created a fertile land that is drained by a network of ditches which supports arable farming with areas of saltmarsh and reedbeds along tidal channels that cross the drained marshes. Immingham Dock with its port, warehouses, storage and production areas, chimneys and lighting columns is a major and distinctive feature of this part of the estuary. Mudflats are exposed along the estuary at low water.

- 14.6.5 Recent geoarchaeological works have allowed a detailed deposit model to be prepared for the Site, which is detailed in **Paragraph 14.6.52**.

Site Conditions

- 14.6.6 The Site is situated to the east of the Port of Immingham (“the Port”) and largely outside of the operational area of the Port. The Port comprises several operational areas, with bulk commodities such as liquid fuels, solid fuels, and ores, as well as freight, being handled from in-river jetties. The area surrounding the Port is industrial in nature, being dominated by chemical manufacturing, oil processing and power generation facilities. Residential and commercial properties are present to the south of the Port on Queens Road (A1173) and lie within, and adjacent to, the Site Boundary. Beyond the industrial facilities, the wider area is largely agricultural. The nearest residential area is the town of Immingham approximately 1km from the western edge of the West Site. The Site is generally flat and is situated below the 2m contour.
- 14.6.7 The Project components of the landscape infrastructure (associated development) are set out in **Section 2.4 of Chapter 2: The Project [TR030008/APP/6.2]**.

Historic Landscape Characterisation

- 14.6.8 The NLHLC data from 2014 (**Figure 14.3a**) identifies the West Site and Temporary Construction Areas as areas of **Modern Fields**, although part of the rectilinear field pattern that is recorded on the 1837 tithe map and historic OS maps is still visible (**Private Planned Enclosure**). The East Site and Bridleway Along the Western edge of the Temporary Construction Area are identified as part of a larger chemical works at Immingham Dock (**Other Industrial**) and has not retained any time depth linked to the character of the historic landscape. The Pipeline Corridor is identified as a mixture of recently developed warehouses, distribution, industrial works and former abandoned works areas which also has no time depth to its historic character (**Other Industrial** and **Warehouses and Distribution**) which overlies areas of former private planned enclosure and modern fields. A narrow belt of **Plantation Woodland** known as ‘Long Strip’ is also present in this area (and encompasses the site of the proposed Jetty Access Road and Piperack Corridor). This plantation is shown on historic Ordnance Survey (“OS”) maps dating to the second half of the 19th century and partially survives either side of Laporte Road. The Kings Road area is a mix of **Modern Fields, Recreation Ground, Terraced housing** and **Other industrial works** and chiefly relates to the 20th century development of the Dock and associated industries.
- 14.6.9 In addition to the above data, the region of and around the Project was also part of the Lincolnshire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project, which commenced in 2008 and completed in September 2011. It used Geographic Information System (“GIS”) mapping to categorise and characterise the landscape of the county over time. The process involved the definition of landscape types which were used to categorise all portions of the landscape. These were then grouped into ‘character zones’ of coherent landscape blocks

which were, in turn, grouped into larger ‘character areas’, the largest landscape components of the study.

- 14.6.10 The Site (**Figure 14.3b**), as well as the area surrounding it, falls into **NOM2: The Northern Marshes (Immingham Coastal Marshes)**. This is broadly defined as a zone dominated by industrial activity (comprising 36% of the character zone) and which, prior to enclosure in the 18th century, was mainly comprised of saltmarsh grazing land. The zone is largely modern in character although historic elements can still be identified in the landscape.

Designated Heritage Assets

- 14.6.11 There are no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I or II* listed buildings, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within the 2km study area for designated heritage assets.
- 14.6.12 Within the 2km study area there is a single Grade II listed building, comprising of the Immingham War Memorial (NHLE 1455139). Unveiled in 1925 the memorial was originally dedicated to the fallen of WWI. Subsequently, the names of local people who lost lives in WWII were added, with the name of a local man who fell in the Afghan war added in 2010. The asset is located at the junction of Humberville Road and Pelham Road, approximately 1.57km to the north-west of the Site, within Immingham, on the eastern edge of the town.
- 14.6.13 Beyond the 2km study area, there are a number of designated assets (listed buildings), which are considered below due to the significance of the asset and the potential for their setting to be impacted by intervisibility to the Project.
- 14.6.14 Churchfield Manor (NHLE 1161630) is a Grade II listed 17th - 18th centuries vernacular farmhouse located 2.7km to the north-west of the centre of the Site off Church Lane on the northern edge of Immingham, bordered to the north by agricultural fields, to the east by Immingham Golf Course and by Immingham to the south.
- 14.6.15 The Grade I listed Church of St Andrew (NHLE 1310011) dates to the 11th – 12th centuries with additions and alterations made to it throughout the 13th – 17th and 20th centuries, significant as an early medieval parish Church.
- 14.6.16 The Iron Bungalow (NHLE 1391349) is a Grade II Listed Building located at 359 Pelham Road, approximately 2.7km west of the centre of the Site, within Immingham itself (just to the south-west of the centre of the town). The asset is a corrugated iron bungalow dating to 1907 constructed by Price, Wills and Reeve, the contractors employed to build Immingham Dock. It is an example of rapidly constructed temporary housing – designed for employees involved in building the Dock, and is possibly a surviving element of “Tin Town” (**Paragraph 14.6.40**).
- 14.6.17 The Church of St Peter and St Paul (NHLE 1346978) is a Grade II* listed building dated to 1779-1781 (restored in the 20th century), which replaced an earlier church on the site, whose nave and tower collapsed in 1746. Within the churchyard are the remains of a free standing, Grade II listed, stone cross (NHLE 1020023, also recorded as NHLE 1161697) dated to 1725. The church and its churchyard (which includes the cross) are located on the north-west edge of the village of Stallingborough c.3.3km to the south-west of the centre of the Site.

- 14.6.18 Stallingborough scheduled medieval settlement (NHLE 1020423) is located in the north-east of the village of Stallingborough c. 3.3km to the south-west of the centre of the Site. The monument includes earthwork and associated buried remains of part of the settlement of Stallingborough, together with the earthworks of a post-medieval manor house and associated formal gardens. These all lie to the west of the modern settlement, extending around and to the south of the 18th century church of St Peter and St Paul. At the time of the Domesday survey in 1086, Stallingborough, with a recorded population of 47, was the third largest settlement in northern Lincolnshire, only smaller than Barton and Grimsby. Henry III (1216-72) granted the right to hold a weekly market and annual fair to the manor that was confirmed to Sir William Ayscough by Henry VIII in 1529. Surviving tax records in the early 14th century imply a population of 50-60 households, but it is thought that this was severely reduced in the middle of the century by the Black Death and other factors, because Stallingborough was granted 70% tax relief in 1352. Records indicate that there must have been at least 10 households by 1428, but the settlement was still receiving around 20% tax relief in 1448 and 1463. By 1563, possibly as a result of the re-establishment of the regular market and fair, the settlement had expanded to 150 households. In the 17th century there is some evidence of depopulation, but it appears to have been mainly in the 18th century that the settlement rapidly contracted once more, this time through the action of the Boucherett family enclosing land and reducing the number of tenants. In the 1720s there were around 120 families in the parish, but following the enclosure of the medieval open fields in 1736-37, this had dropped to 67 households by 1758. The settlement is believed to have steadily contracted still further, starting to rise again towards the end of the century. By the time of the first national census in 1801, Stallingborough had a population of 274 people in 59 houses.
- 14.6.19 The monument was surveyed by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England in 1978 which identified two main groups of earthworks. The first is an extensive area of village earthworks, standing up to 1m high, representing streets, building platforms and closes laid out in the medieval period and at least in part occupied up to the early 18th century. The second area lies around the northern side of the churchyard and represents the remains of a post-medieval manor house and the earthworks of the associated formal gardens. In addition, the survey sketch plotted further village earthworks to the west using aerial photographs taken before the area was levelled in the spring of 1978. Also noted were the crop marks of formal garden features to the north of the railway line.
- 14.6.20 The medieval village of Stallingborough was originally located on the edge of the saltmarsh that has since been almost totally reclaimed. A low hill formed an early settlement focus and this elevated position was used for the church and the principal manor house of the village. To the south of this was a main street running east-west, forming a routeway connecting the other saltmarsh side villages. Part of this street remains in use as Pinfold Lane and is continued across the southern part of the monument as a hollow way. All of these hollow ways are flanked by the remains of medieval and post-medieval properties defined by banks and/or ditches with raised platforms marking the sites of

buildings. All of these earthworks are at most 1m high, typically lower. The survey identified four platforms where the remains of brick buildings could be identified.

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 14.6.21 NELC maintains local lists of historic assets of special interest. The local list for 'Immingham and the Villages' includes two assets, a high-status Roman settlement and industrial site (MNL4490) (refer to section below on Roman assets) and the Immingham Police Station (MNL4726) located approximately 1.57km north-west of the centre of the Project (refer to section below on Roman assets).

Prehistoric (up to AD 43)

- 14.6.22 There are no assets of this date within the Site Boundary. There is one asset of prehistoric date recorded within the 1.6km study area. The earliest evidence is a pair of prehistoric ditches (MNL4182), identified approximately 1.1km south-east of the Site centre. These ditches may have been dug to flank a trackway. They contained flintwork of Neolithic (4,000BC-2,500BC) or Bronze Age (2,500BC-700BC) date. The flintwork suggests prehistoric occupation in the area.

Roman (AD 43 to AD 410)

- 14.6.23 There are no assets of this date within the Site Boundary. Archaeological investigation within the 1.6km study area has found evidence for a high-status Roman settlement and industrial site (MNL4490), located approximately 1.4km south-west of the Site at Mauxhall Farm at Stallingborough Interchange. An undated possible oval enclosure (MNL4618) to the west of the West Site could be related to the Roman settlement.
- 14.6.24 Undated cropmarks of rectangular ditched enclosures (MNL4607) located approximately 1.1km to the south-east of the Site centre, could form part of the Roman landscape.

Early Medieval (AD 410-1066)

- 14.6.25 There are no assets of early medieval date (AD 410-1066) within the Site Boundary or either study area.

Medieval (1066-1540)

- 14.6.26 Immingham is mentioned in Domesday, the Lindsey Survey (c.1115) and the Early Yorkshire Charters (1090-6) and historically within the wapentake and deanery of Yarborough (Ekwall, 1960; Cameron, 1991). The parish also contains the hamlet of Roxton. The form of the settlement appears to have been a chain of farmsteads or hamlets laid out along a pair of parallel roads, with a denser core around the parish church. Aerial photographs show some possible burgage plots to the south-west of the church, suggestive of at least some planning to the village. Roxton has no obvious topographic influence upon settlement form. The former earthworks of the hamlet have the appearance of a small, nucleated core around a moated manorial site, possibly with a tight grid like pattern of roads.

14.6.27 There are no assets of this date within the Site Boundary. There is some evidence for medieval (AD 1066-1540) settlement activity within the wider study area. A possible deserted medieval settlement (MNL326) near Mauxhall Farm is visible on aerial photography, including ridge and furrow cultivation features, trackways, and possible building platforms. Ridge and furrow (MNL2235) are also recorded at Stallingborough.

Post Medieval (1540-1900)

14.6.28 Local abbeys began to promote drainage schemes in the area from the 12th century. However, from the 17th century, coastal reclamation, drainage and enclosure had a significant impact on the rural landscape on the north side of the estuary. On the south side, flood defences were built to protect the developing towns and industrial areas. Warping (the process by which water was deliberately flooded over the land to enrich the soil with riverine sediments) was introduced by the Dutch in the 18th century. Later, Parliamentary enclosures produced the landscape of regular, geometric fields, mostly enclosed by dykes, with associated large brick-built isolated farmsteads and excavation of brick pits for the extraction of Pleistocene clays (for example at Barton). By 1870 the parish of Immingham had a population of only 237.

14.6.29 Within the Site Boundary of the Project there are five non-designated assets of this date. This includes a medieval plantation (MNL1797 – ‘Long Strip’) noted on the OS map of 1887-1889 which lies within the boundary of the East Site and the Pipe Rack and Jetty Access Road. MNL2085 is the site of a possible former sea defence bank which sits within the Pipeline Corridor. MNL4263 and MNL4426 are the sites of possible Beacons located near to the sea defence bank, within the Temporary Construction Area. Asset MNL3523 relates to the historic route of Kings Road, also seen on the OS maps of 1887 – 1889. The section of modern Kings Road from where it becomes Queens Road near Knauf (UK) Immingham up to the junction with Pelham Road, forms part of this historic route. Sections of this sit within the Site Boundary of the Kings Road Overhead Lines areas.

14.6.30 Within the wider study area there are a number of non-designated assets of this period. This includes another woodland feature (MNL1799 – Fox Covert) seen on historic OS maps and of low value. Other landscape features recorded include an osier at Reeds Meer (MNL2684), a mere at Stallingborough (MNL2685), and a spring also at Stallingborough (MNL4299).

14.6.31 Aerial photography has also recorded the remains of post-medieval field boundaries and narrow ridge and furrow cultivation features at Harborough Marsh (MNL4648, MNL4653, MNL4658, MNL4659, MNL4660), as well as the presence of either singular or a series of drainage ditches. These include North Moss Lane, Kiln Lane and Laporte Road, amongst others (MNL1793, MNL4603, MNL4604, MNL4606, MNL4620).

14.6.32 A series of historic roads and trackways (MNL3507, MNL3508, MNL3509, MNL3510, MNL3512, MNL3522, MNL3524) of post-medieval date are recorded on the early OS maps which may have origins in the medieval period.

Modern (1901-present)

- 14.6.33 Within the study area, the first half of the 20th Century was dominated by the construction of Immingham Dock, and its associated rail infrastructure, and fortifications associated with the World Wars, World War II (WWII) in particular. The second half of the 20th Century was associated with the continued use and expansion of the Dock and industry around it, bucking the general trend of much of the industrial north-east which saw widespread economic decline during this period.
- 14.6.34 The population of Immingham grew steadily but remained relatively small throughout much of this period, Immingham itself being eclipsed by the Port. However, the population expanded in the 1930s as new housing developments were created and with the development of new industries in the 1950s – 1960s. This meant that Immingham had a population of 11,506 by 1981.
- 14.6.35 Within the Site Boundary there are 10 non-designated assets of this date. This includes a number of WWII features; MNL4640 (an anti-landing obstacle within the West Site), MNL4643 (a possible WWII bomb crater in the Temporary Construction Area) MNL4651 (the possible site of a WWII barrage balloon mooring site within the East Site) and MNL4644 (the site of a possible military installation which partially extends into the boundary of the Bridleway Along the Western edge of the Temporary Construction Area).
- 14.6.36 Immingham Dock itself was built by the Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Company in association with the Great Central Railway and opened in 1912. The Dock was served by the Immingham Dock Branch – a large complex of railway lines and sidings which branched off the main line. Elements of this complex are still in operation today (as part of Network Rail) and elements of the line are still in use today and present within the Pipeline Corridor (MNL3039).
- 14.6.37 The Grimsby and Immingham Electric Light Railway (G&IER) was also opened in 1912 and connected Grimsby with Immingham Dock. This tramway was effectively a commuter line, transporting Dock workers from Grimsby to Immingham Dock and back. The route of this tramway runs around much of the area but sections of it pass through the boundary of the Pipeline Corridor (MNL3078 and MNL2087). The line closed in 1961 and whilst much of the track has now been removed, sections of it are still visible as marks on the ground. A tram shelter on Queens Road (within the Pipeline Corridor) associated with the line (dated to c. 1914, MNL4715), was dilapidated but extant until its demolition in 2021, to make way for a new border control post.
- 14.6.38 There are two rows of non-designated terraced properties on the Queens Road (ACM1) of some historic and architectural interest that have the potential to be impacted by the Project. These date to the early 20th Century (seen on the 1932 Ordnance Survey map) and are thought to relate to accommodation for Dock workers as Immingham Dock expanded and became busier. These properties lie within the Site (but not within the construction area) and so may have their setting impacted by the Project. In addition to the above, the northern extent of the Immingham H.C.C. landfill site (MNL1063) extends just into the southern edge of the West Site.

- 14.6.39 Within the wider study area, aerial photographs and historic OS maps record historic flood defences across the study area, including at Immingham, Kiln Lane Trading Estate, and at Harborough Marsh (MNL4682, MNL2086, MNL4608, MNL4650). Historic OS maps also record the presence of several features associated with coastal navigation and transportation, including Stallingborough Ferry (MNL3131) and the site of a coastguard station (MNL1790).
- 14.6.40 As noted, Immingham Dock was opened in 1912, with construction of the Dock starting in 1906. This Dock is recorded as MNL272. The development of the Dock went hand in hand with the construction of rail and other infrastructure to support its industrial development with an associated increase in population seen in the surrounding area. This includes a temporary settlement to house the Dock construction workers, which was established at Immingham and comprised a series of corrugated tin huts and other temporary buildings, known as “Tin Town” (MNL1077).
- 14.6.41 Other features associated with the historic development and operation of the Dock within the wider study area, include a coaling stage (MNL3097) and a former grain store (MNL4429). In addition, there are several records relating to the use and expansion of the transportation infrastructure associated with the Dock and Port. This includes: MNL2819, the site of the original Immingham East signal box (demolished 2010), MNL3040, the site of an engine shed opened in 1912, in use until 2015 and then demolished in 2019, and MNL4656, the site of a possible, disused, railway embankment.
- 14.6.42 A series of small rectilinear enclosure earthworks, of uncertain function are visible in aerial photographs dated to 1942, between the area of the Pipeline Corridor and East Site (MNL4652)
- 14.6.43 The Police Station (MNL4726, c.1.57km to the north-west of the Project, **Paragraph 14.6.21**) also dates to this period (1912). The Police Station, cells and houses were built to serve the developing town and are now currently used as private offices. The Police House is considered to have low heritage value associated with its historic and architectural interest as an early 20th century civic building.
- 14.6.44 During World War I (WWI) the Dock was a submarine base for British D-class submarines. It was later used for cruise ships in the 1930s, including vessels of the Orient Steam Navigation Company, White Star Line and Blue Star Line. Following the end of World War I (“WWI”) trade declined, as it did elsewhere along the east coast, including demand for shipping services and new ships.
- 14.6.45 However, World War II (“WWII”) revived the dock’s prospects, but, together with other ports along the east coast such as Hull, it became the target of bombing raids. It became a naval base and headquarters for the Royal Navy and anti-aircraft batteries were located around the Dock during the war. There remain numerous features relating to WWII activity recorded within the wider study area, including gun emplacements, anti-landing obstacles, barrage balloon sites and other buildings and installations (MNL1501, MNL1534, MNL4630, MNL4631, MNL4632, MNL4633, MNL4634, MNL4641, MNL4655, MNL4679, MNL4684, MNL4675, MNL4689, MNL4630, MNL4640, MNL4675). Evidence of German

bombing raids is also represented by two small circular hollows on aerial photographs (MNL4623, MNL4645).

- 14.6.46 In the second half of the 20th century the Dock expanded with the construction of east and west jetties and the addition of several deep-water jetties for bulk cargo. Within the wider study area, Immingham Oil Terminal jetty was constructed in 1969 on the banks of the Humber, east of the Dock entrance, whilst Immingham Bulk Terminal was commissioned in 1970 for the export of coal and the import of iron ore. In 1985 the Immingham Gas Jetty was opened.

Undated

- 14.6.47 Within the Site Boundary, MNL4674 is located just within the northern edge of the West Site. It is an undated curvilinear ditched enclosure visible as crop marks seen in aerial photographs taken in 1942.
- 14.6.48 Within the wider study areas, there are several assets of an unknown date located within the 1.6km study area, including several undated cropmark sites recorded on the HER. These include an area of enclosures or natural features (MNL4106), a sub-circular feature, possible prehistoric ring ditch or another natural feature (MNL4622), and linear features (MNL4400) to the south of Kiln Lane Industrial Site. These features are undated and could belong to any period between the prehistoric to post-medieval and modern period.
- 14.6.49 Geophysical survey undertaken within the West Site in 2013 did not positively identify any significant archaeological features. However, various anomalies were detected which may have related to buried paleoenvironmental features (former tidal channels and pools), as well as possible medieval salt production sites. Recent archaeological works (see below) would suggest that these are in fact not present at the West Site and the signals in fact relate to geological anomalies.
- 14.6.50 Recent former land boundaries, land drains, services and ground disturbance were also identified.

Deposit Model

- 14.6.51 Recent archaeological work undertaken at the Site has allowed the development of a detailed deposit model for the Site (see **Paragraph 14.6.64**). This model was constructed using geotechnical logs from previous works in the area as well as the works undertaken as part of this Project.
- 14.6.52 The deposit model developed by this work is presented in detail in **Appendix 14.G [TR030008/APP/6.4]**. In outline the deposition sequence across the Site is:
- a. Modern soil profile/made ground (modern). Made ground is located predominately in the Pipeline Corridor and East Site and was up to 1.2m thick. The modern soil (seen across the rest of the Site) is a firm dark greyish brown clay silt, generally 0.6m thick.

- b. Alluvium (Holocene) and Organic alluvium (Holocene). A firm to soft black/dark grey laminated silts with frequent organic material broadly distributed across the area of the Site. Found at depth of 0m – 4m. These deposits likely represent sediment accumulation in low energy environments, potentially including slow-moving or deactivated channels and within freshwater backswamp or more vegetated saltmarsh environments.
- c. Minerogenic Alluvium (Holocene). Deposits of variously sandy or slightly gravelly silty clay were recorded as pockets widely across the Project at depths varying from 1m to 10m. This deposit represents sediment accumulating under the influence of rising post-glacial sea-levels, deposited within a range of settings from early Holocene channel systems through to mud flats and saltmarsh environments within the succeeding extensive intertidal floodplains of the Humber Estuary.
- d. Peat (Holocene). Peat is present at depths of 3 – 5 m across the West Site and is generally less than 1 m thick. Peat is generally absent within the Pipeline Corridor and East Site. Peat is indicative of transitions to semi-terrestrial conditions on the floodplain supporting the growth of wetland vegetation such as that found growing in reed swamp, sedge fen or Fen Carr, likely as a response to a reduction in rates of relative sea level rise. The distribution of the peat deposits indicates that they were likely growing either in floodplain hollows or within a network of narrow dendritic channels, typical of those found in mudflats.
- e. Glacial till (Late Pleistocene). This consists of deposits of variable composition, but generally comprising firm sandy silt, silty clays or clays with frequent gravel clasts, including small to large, subrounded and rounded, chalk and possible flint/quartz pebbles and stones. The deposit is typically over 10m thick and is present at a depth of 4m – 8m, overlying the bedrock. This material is likely to have been deposited by the advancing Late Devensian ice sheet that reached its maximum extent in this area during the Late Glacial Maximum (“LGM”) at c. 23,000 – 17,000 years ago.
- f. Bedrock (Cretaceous). A white, silty chalk gravel deposit, transitioning into high density fractured yellowish white chalk with marls (the Burnham Formation). The surface of the bedrock is generally encountered at depths of 18m – 22m.

14.6.53 The deposit model did not find any conclusive evidence for the paleochannel suspected to be present at the site based on earlier geophysical survey work (Ref 14-5), see **Paragraph 14.6.67**.

Archaeological Investigations

14.6.54 Prior to the work undertaken in relation to this Project, the only archaeological investigation carried out within the Site Boundary was a geophysical survey undertaken within the bounds of what is now the West Site in 2013. This work (Ref 14-5) identified various anomalies which likely relate to buried paleoenvironmental features (former tidal channels, pools and saltmarsh). Some of the features identified were believed to possibly relate to medieval salt production sites (salterns) located on the edge or close to the former tidal

channels. Recent former land boundaries, land drains, services and ground disturbance were also identified near to the Project. A geophysical survey was undertaken in 2011 at land next to Queens Road to the east of the West Site (Ref 14-25). This survey recorded variations reflecting the presence of modern features including boundary fencing, a gas pipeline and miscellaneous ferrous rich objects.

- 14.6.55 Recent archaeological investigations associated with the Project (undertaken in 2023, **Appendices 14.F – H [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) have included monitoring of geotechnical investigations, geo-archaeological evaluation, geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation. The results of these are detailed below.

Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation 2023

- 14.6.56 An archaeological trial trench evaluation was undertaken within the area of the West Site from January – February 2023. This work involved the excavation of 107 trial trenches (each measuring 30m long x 2m wide, excavated onto the archaeological horizon – typically a depth of c.0.30m) which equated to a c. 3% sample of the area of the West Site. Of these trenches four (Nos 1-4) were targeted on suspected archaeological features, including a possible paleochannel and possible salterns. The works were governed by a WSI (**Appendix 14.E [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) which had been approved by the Heritage Officer for NELC. A full report on the works is presented as **Appendix 14.F [TR030008/APP/6.4]**.
- 14.6.57 In summary, the trial trench evaluation did not uncover any significant archaeological features, finds or deposits. Of the 107 trenches excavated archaeological evidence was uncovered in three of them. A linear feature (ditch) was uncovered in trench 3, the stratigraphy of this feature demonstrated that it was likely modern in origin and had a drainage function. A further linear feature (ditch) was also noted to run across trenches 41 and 67. Ceramic material recovered from the fill was derived from a modern land drain, indicating that this ditch was also modern in date and had a drainage function.
- 14.6.58 No evidence for the salterns and paleochannel were found within trenches 1-4 (or any other trial trenches).

Archaeological Geophysical Survey 2023

- 14.6.59 A detailed gradiometer survey was undertaken across the site of the Temporary Construction Area in January 2023. The work was governed by a WSI (**Appendix 14.E [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) which had been approved by the Heritage Officer for NELC. A full report on this work is presented as **Appendix 14.H [TR030008/APP/6.4]**.
- 14.6.60 The survey identified several possible archaeological anomalies (**Appendix 14.H, fig 3 [TR030008/APP/6.4]**). These includes several long, large linear features and one large rectangular feature. Given the known history of the area, it is possible that these relate to WWII defensive features. However, other origins such as being derived from much earlier activity (e.g. Roman or Medieval), or more modern activity (drainage / agricultural features), cannot be ruled out.

- 14.6.61 Two small curvilinear ditch features were identified to the west of the Temporary Construction Area. These features may also, potentially, be archaeological in nature. However, the weak nature of the signal also means that a natural origin (variation in geology) for the anomalies cannot be ruled out.
- 14.6.62 Two large, ferrous, responses were also identified. These may relate to modern activity, or possibly a bomb crater recorded in the area by the HER.
- 14.6.63 Numerous linear trends were noted across the north of the Temporary Construction Area, which may relate to past drainage or agricultural activity. To the south of the Temporary Construction Area, strong geological responses appear to reflect the intertidal environmental and alluvial processes which have taken place across the Site.

Geoarchaeological Evaluations 2023

- 14.6.64 A programme of geoarchaeological works, consisting of the archaeological monitoring of 40 geotechnical boreholes and the excavation of 14 geoarchaeological boreholes (across three transects) was undertaken in February – March 2023. The archaeological monitoring work spanned the West Site, the Pipeline Corridor and the East Site. The geoarchaeological work was focused on the West Site but also encompassed the Pipeline Corridor. The work was designed to provide information on the geoarchaeological and archaeological resource likely to be impacted by the Project and facilitate an informed decision with regard to any further archaeological and geoarchaeological work that may be required. In addition, borehole transects in the West Site targeted a possible paleochannel feature identified in a previous geophysical survey (Ref 14-5).
- 14.6.65 The works were governed by a WSI (**Appendix 14.E [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) which had been approved by the Heritage Officer for NELC. A full report on the works is presented as **Appendix 14.G [TR030008/APP/6.4]**.
- 14.6.66 This work has allowed the deposit model presented at **Paragraph 14.6.52** above to be developed.
- 14.6.67 The work did not reveal any archaeological features or finds, including in relation to the possible paleochannel feature referred to at **Paragraph 14.6.54** above. There was no clear evidence in the surface of the till for an early Holocene paleochannel cut into these deposits or for a distinct alluvial sequence infilling a paleochannel. The distribution and extent of peat and organic alluvium within the Holocene alluvial sequence was noted to be relatively evenly distributed across the area, rather than being focussed within this possible paleochannel feature.
- 14.6.68 However, the absence of evidence for an early Holocene channel here does not discount the possibility of a later channel cutting through the alluvial sequence, perhaps related to a dendritic channel typical of tidal mudflats, or a tributary channel draining east towards the Humber. The absence of peat and organic alluvium within the alluvial sequence in boreholes W-BH24 and W-BH28 (**Figure 3, Appendix 14.G [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) provides tentative evidence for subsequent fluvial erosion of such deposits. However, such channels are typically hard to identify in the sedimentary data available in borehole logs.

- 14.6.69 Peat deposits were noted at a depth of 3m – 5m across the West Site. These deposits contained a range of botanical remains (e.g. pollen and plant macrofossils) preserved in the waterlogged anoxic (oxygen-free) conditions, representing important archives of information on past climate and paleoenvironmental change and the impact of human communities on the landscape.
- 14.6.70 Organic-rich alluvium was recorded more widely across the Site, generally present at a depth of 0m – 4m. The geoarchaeological potential of organic-rich alluvium is similar to that of peat deposits, though in selected sequences the organic component is largely detrital and so deemed to be of limited geoarchaeological potential.

Offshore (Marine) Geoarchaeological and Geotechnical Evaluations 2023

- 14.6.71 A programme of geoarchaeological and geotechnical works was undertaken by Fugro in 2023 and geoarchaeologically assessed by Wessex Archaeology in order to identify, characterise and record potential geoarchaeological/paleoenvironmental assets offshore – the detail of this work and its findings is presented in Chapter 15 (**Appendix 15.A Marine Archaeology Technical Report [TR030008/APP/6.4]**). The results of this work are summarised here in order to synthesise the heritage potential of the Site as a whole – both its onshore and offshore components, as a number of the aims and findings of the offshore work link to the aims and findings of the onshore work.
- 14.6.72 One of the aims of the marine work was to locate and characterise ancient rivers (paleochannels) which once fed into the Humber. This links directly to a similar aim of the onshore geoarchaeological work. The marine work sought to locate the point where the paleochannel linked with the Humber. The onshore work was not successful in locating the suspected paleochannel, finding no clear evidence for it. The marine works had slightly more success. Whilst not highly visible, certain deposits identified by the marine work do hint at the presence of a paleochannel (**see Appendix 15.A - features 7502 and 7500 [TR030008/APP/6.4]**). At this stage it is not clear if the possible channel identified by the marine work aligns with the suspected (but unidentified) onshore channel.
- 14.6.73 The marine work also sought to identify the presence of organic rich deposits – such as peat, another aim which aligned with the aims of the onshore geoarchaeological work. The results of the marine work are comparable to those of the onshore works in that it successfully identified shallow, outcropping peat deposits scattered throughout the area of survey (**see Appendix 15.A - features 7501 and 7503 [TR030008/APP/6.4]**), with a few small clusters or ‘hotspots’ present. In many ways, these results are unsurprising and simply confirm that at one time marsh land extended out beyond the current coastline.
- 14.6.74 In terms of other assets, the marine work did not identify any receptors which link directly to, or form part of the background or setting of, any terrestrial heritage asset identified as part of this work (and vice versa).

Archaeological Potential

- 14.6.75 This section assesses the potential for unknown buried archaeological remains and surface artefacts to be present within the Site Boundary. The assessment of archaeological potential is based on the data available at the time of assessment, which includes the results of the programme of archaeological evaluation works undertaken in early 2023 and described above. As a result of these investigations, the potential to uncover new, unknown archaeological remains is concluded to be generally low.
- a. **Paleoenvironmental:** A generally moderate potential for encountering remains of this type, which if encountered would be of **local** and **regional archaeological interest** and of **medium value** based on their potential capacity to inform on past environments and land use.
 - b. **Early Prehistoric:** A low potential for encountering remains of this type, which if encountered would likely be of **local archaeological interest** and of **low value** based on their potential capacity to inform on material culture (in the case of tools) as well as the economy and subsistence/agricultural practices of the time.
 - c. **Later Prehistoric:** A low potential for encountering remains of this type, which if encountered would likely be of **local archaeological interest** and of **low value** based on their potential capacity to inform on material culture as well as the economic, and subsistence/agricultural practices of the time.
 - d. **Roman:** A low potential for encountering remains of this type, which if encountered would likely be of **local archaeological** and potentially **historic interest** and of **low value** based on their potential capacity to inform on material culture as well as the economic, trade, industrial and subsistence/agricultural practices of the time.
 - e. **Early Medieval:** A low potential for encountering remains of this type, which if encountered would likely be of **local archaeological interest** and of **low value** based on their potential capacity to inform on material culture as well as the economic, trade, industrial and subsistence/agricultural practices of the time.
 - f. **Medieval:** A low potential for encountering remains of this type, which if encountered would likely be of **local archaeological** and potentially **historic interest** and of **low value** based on their potential capacity to inform on material culture as well as economy, trade and industry (with particular reference to salt making), as well as the subsistence/agricultural practices of the time.
 - g. **Post Medieval:** A low potential for encountering remains of this type, which if encountered would likely be of **local archaeological** and potentially **historic interest** and of **low value** based on their potential capacity to inform on material culture as well as economy, trade and industry (with particular reference to salt making), as well as the subsistence/agricultural practices of the time.

- h. **Late Post Medieval – Modern:** A moderate potential for encountering remains of this type, which if encountered would likely be of **local archaeological** and **historic interest** and of **low value** based on their potential capacity to inform on material culture, economic, and subsistence/agricultural practices – with particular reference to land division and drainage – and the industrial development of the location.

Future Baseline

- 14.6.76 The future baseline is a prediction of baseline conditions in the future, assuming that the Project is not constructed. A review has been undertaken to determine how or whether the existing baseline conditions might change if the Project did not take place and thus considers other planned developments within the bounds of the Project.
- 14.6.77 Consideration was given to the following development-related changes that could potentially alter the historic environment in the future:
- The partial or total loss of known or potential (unknown) buried archaeological resources within the Site Boundary or known above-ground assets within the study areas as a consequence of land being disturbed or developed.
 - Changes to the sensitivity (value) and significance of assets within the study area through the introduction of new development in their setting.
- 14.6.78 The review involved:
- The identification of any permitted (i.e. consented) or other planned projects within the assessment study area that have yet to be implemented.
 - Analysis of the likely environmental effects and planned timescales for each identified project.
 - An assessment of the potential for each identified project to change the existing baseline conditions in the Construction Years (2025 – 2036) and the subsequent operational periods of the Proposed Developments (2028 – 2053), in the manner described.
- 14.6.79 Although a small number of other development projects are expected to form part of, and influence, the future conditions of the study areas, the review concluded that there would be no significant change to the form, character and appearance of the historic environment in this area. Fundamentally, in the absence of any other Project, parts of the Site will simply continue to be utilised for port activity within an already heavily industrialised landscape. As such, it is considered there will be no change to the future baseline for cultural heritage and that the baseline details as presented above are not anticipated to change in the absence of the Project.
- 14.6.80 Accordingly, the assessment presented in **Section 14.8** assesses the impacts of the Project against existing baseline conditions.

14.7 Development Design and Impact Avoidance

Embedded Mitigation Measures

- 14.7.1 The Project has been designed, as far as is possible given the constraints of the Project, to avoid and minimise environmental impacts and effects through the process of design development, and mitigation measures embedded into the design. This includes:
- Construction methods which will “do no harm” specifically deep Horizontal Directional Drilling (“HDD”) associated with the Pipeline Corridor and “no impact” methodologies within the Temporary Construction Area as outlined within the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**.
 - The Site Boundary has been refined to optimise land take, (given the constraints of the Project requirements) in order to have as small a physical impact upon the assets in and around it, as possible.

Standard Mitigation Measures

- 14.7.2 A programme of archaeological evaluation has been undertaken in order to better understand the archaeological potential of the Site.
- 14.7.3 It is considered that the Project’s impacts upon the buried archaeological resource at the Site have been further understood and clarified through a staged programme of archaeological works (see **Paragraph 14.7.4**), the purpose of was to ensure that any remains within the Site Boundary were identified, understood and recorded prior to construction activities commencing.
- 14.7.4 The first stage of these works has been completed and comprised a comprehensive programme of archaeological evaluation of the Site, as defined in the WSI (**Appendix 14.E [TR030008/APP/6.4]**). These works were developed in consultation with the Heritage Officer for NELC and comprised:
- An archaeological trial trench evaluation, consisting of 107 trial trenches.
 - Archaeological monitoring (watching brief) of geotechnical investigations conducted across the Site.
 - A geoarchaeological borehole survey.
 - A geophysical survey of the temporary construction area at the eastern end of the Project.
- 14.7.5 A summary of the results of these works is presented within this chapter (**Paragraphs 14.6.56 – 14.6.70**) and the full reports are presented as **Appendices 14.F – 14.H [TR030008/APP/6.4]**.
- 14.7.6 The information gathered by these evaluation works, along with the data presented in the baseline, has been used to determine if any further archaeological mitigation works (such as further evaluation, monitoring and/or archaeological excavation and recording) are required. The need for, and nature of, these mitigation works has been determined, and agreed, in liaison with the Heritage Officer for NELC. These mitigation measures are presented in **Section 14.9** and are also detailed in the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**.

14.7.7 Further, if remains which are deemed to be significant in nature are encountered during the works, the relevant part of the works will be halted and NELC Heritage officer consulted in order to understand if further works are required in relation to the asset in order to characterise, record and understand it (**Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**).

14.8 Assessment of Likely Impact and Effects

Potential Impacts and Effects

14.8.1 This section presents an assessment of how construction, operation and decommissioning of the Project may result in impacts to terrestrial heritage assets.

14.8.2 Impacts to terrestrial heritage assets fall into two categories:

- a. Direct impacts upon the asset. Typically impacts upon the physical remains of the asset, such as the total or partial truncation of the asset during construction activity.
- b. Indirect impacts upon the asset. Impacts which may not directly affect the physical remains of the asset but rather have the potential to affect our understanding, appreciation and experience of the asset by altering its setting, for example the introduction of a new and visually intrusive element into the view scape of an asset. Such changes may occur during the construction phase but may also continue through the operational life of the Project. Additional, similar, impacts may also arise during the decommissioning of the Project.

14.8.3 The sections below provide details of the potential impacts associated with the Project during these phases.

Construction Phase Impacts (Years 1 – 11 (phased))

14.8.4 Temporary and short-term construction impacts lasting for all or part of the Project construction phase potentially include the following:

- a. The presence and movement of construction plant and equipment, which may impact on the setting of heritage assets.
- b. The siting of construction compounds and activities within working areas, including associated construction noise and lighting, which may impact on the setting of heritage assets.
- c. The use of traffic management and increased volumes of traffic travelling on the local road network, which may impact on the setting of heritage assets.

14.8.5 Permanent construction impacts lasting beyond the Project construction phase potentially include the following:

- a. Partial or total removal or truncation of known and/or unknown heritage assets by such activities as:
 - i The construction of piles, pile caps, ground beams and floor slabs.
 - ii Ground remediation.

- iii Levelling of surfaces for formation of the temporary site facilities and the temporary construction areas.
- iv Installation of any below ground surface water attenuation tanks/drains.
- v The burial of pipes, cables and any other services or utilities.
- b. Compaction of archaeological remains by construction traffic and structures.
- c. Changes to local hydrology that could result in the drying out of underlying peat deposits and affect preservation levels of heritage assets.
- d. Vibration effects during construction of the Project arising from increased traffic and construction activities.
- e. Adverse effects on the setting of heritage assets arising from the presence of the Project in the landscape, for example visual intrusion, noise pollution, light pollution, severance, reduced access and reduced amenity.

Operational Phase Impacts (Year 3 or 4 onwards until decommissioning)

- 14.8.6 Project operation impacts lasting for all or part of the operational phase potentially include the following:
- a. Permanent increase in such things as traffic movements, vibration, noise pollution and light pollution on and around the Site (maintenance traffic) which could affect the setting of heritage assets.
 - b. Long term impacts on hydrology and geology as a result of the permanent presence and operation of the Project (such as the raising or lowering of ground water levels and the diversion of underground aquifers).
- 14.8.7 The operation of the Project will not result in any additional land take or construction activities or other development, nor generate any other effects (such as light, noise and vibration) which are not present during construction or which are present at a worse level than as generated by the construction of the Project. As a result, it is not expected that the operation of the Project will result in any additional impacts, direct or indirect, to terrestrial heritage assets, other than those already identified during the construction phase, and that such impacts will not be worsened during operation. Assessment of the Project's impacts during construction therefore represents an assessment of the worst case for the assets affected by the Project.
- 14.8.8 There will not be any significant impact upon ground water levels or "through flow" across the Site following the construction of the Project (see **Chapter 18: Water Use, Water Quality, Coastal Protection, Flood Risk and Drainage [TR030008/APP/6.2]**). As a result, those peat and organic alluvium deposits present at the Site, which are not directly impacted by the construction of the Project, will not be impacted by changes to hydrology.

Decommissioning Phase Impacts (excludes marine elements)

- 14.8.9 Project decommissioning impacts are likely to be similar to those temporary impacts experienced during the Project construction phase. Impacts lasting for all or part of the decommissioning phase of the Project potentially include the following:
- a. The presence and movement of plant and equipment, which may impact on the setting of heritage assets.
 - b. The siting of compound and activities within working areas, including associated noise and lighting, which may impact on the setting of heritage assets.
 - c. The use of traffic management and increased volumes of traffic travelling on the local road network, which may impact on the setting of heritage assets.
- 14.8.10 Decommissioning of the Project is unlikely to result in additional temporary or permanent impacts on any terrestrial heritage asset, as decommissioning of the landside elements would likely involve only leaving underground pipelines and other underground elements of the Project *in situ* (see **ODEMP [TR030008/APP/6.6]**). All above ground infrastructure associated with the Project is anticipated to be dismantled and all material removed.
- 14.8.11 It is not expected that there would be any permanent impacts during Project decommissioning as it is not anticipated that there will be impacts beyond the already-disturbed footprint of the Project; therefore, it is not anticipated that decommissioning activities would have a direct physical impact upon archaeological remains nor any additional adverse impacts upon setting.

Assessment of Effects for the Historic Environment (Terrestrial) – Construction Phase

- 14.8.12 This section provides an assessment of the likely significant effects on the historic environment associated with the construction of the Project. As noted above the operation and decommissioning of the Project will not result in any additional impacts nor worsening of already identified impacts.
- 14.8.13 Only those heritage assets which are considered to experience an adverse or beneficial effect from the Project, as informed by the desk-based research and professional judgement, are discussed herein – whether the effect is significant or not. Those assets which will not experience an impact (adverse or beneficial) either physically or through changes to their setting, are omitted. Details of assets within the study areas, but not subject to adverse impacts by the Project, are presented in the Cultural Heritage DBA (**Appendix 14.A [TR030008/APP/6.4]**).
- 14.8.14 As noted earlier (**Paragraphs 14.4.20 and 14.4.21**) the assessment of potential impacts and effects has assumed that, for all assets recorded in the HER and that are within the Site Boundary, unless otherwise stated, 100% of the area within the Site will be physically affected by the Project. The impacts on applicable heritage assets listed below have been assessed accordingly. Any refinement to the Project design may reduce the currently defined impacts.

Designated Assets

- 14.8.15 No designated heritage assets have been identified as having the potential to experience significant effects (either direct or indirect) during any Project stage (refer to **Paragraphs 14.6.11 – 14.6.20**).
- 14.8.16 There are no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I or II* listed buildings, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within the 2km study area for designated heritage assets.
- 14.8.17 There is a single Grade II listed building, located within the 2km study area, comprising of the Immingham War Memorial (**NHLE 1455139**, described at **Paragraph 14.6.12**). The asset is located at the junction of Humberville Road and Pelham Road, approximately 1.57km to the north-west of the Site, within Immingham, on the eastern edge of the town. The primary setting of the asset includes the small green area it is located within, with modern Immingham (consisting of residential houses and commercial properties) surrounding this on all sides, with Humberville Road and Pelham Road to the immediate north. It is set within the community it references. The asset is considered to have **medium heritage value**, derived from its **architectural** merit and **historic** interest associated with the World Wars. There will be very limited change to the setting of this designated asset as a result of the Project. It is sufficiently distant from the Project that the Project cannot be seen to form part of its primary setting. In addition, the combination of distance from the Project, topography and the buildings of intervening modern Immingham, mean that there is very limited change arising from the Project to the wider view scape of the asset (the views to the asset from its setting and from the asset across its setting). In any event, the wider setting of the asset has always been industrial Immingham with its ports and heavy industry. This was the case when it was unveiled and has remained the case as names have been added to the memorial over the decades; it has formed part of the evolving landscape. The addition of new areas of industrial development to the backdrop of this asset are simply a continuation of this evolution and do not detract from the significance of this asset. As a result, the Project will have a **very low** impact upon the view scape of the asset and / or its immediate or wider setting and our ability to appreciate, understand and experience the asset within its setting. This is assessed as a **negligible adverse effect**, which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.18 Beyond the 2km study area, there are a number of designated assets (listed buildings), as described at **Paragraphs 14.6.14 – 14.6.20** above.
- 14.8.19 Churchfield Manor (NHLE 1161630) is a Grade II listed building located on Church Lane on the northern edge of Immingham, bordered to the north by agricultural fields, to the east by Immingham Golf Course and by Immingham to the south. It is located approximately 2.7km north-west of the centre of the Site. The asset is considered to have **medium** heritage value stemming from **architectural** merit and **historic** interest as a 17th century vernacular farmhouse. There will be very limited change to the setting of this asset due to a combination of distance from the Project and interrupted views between the Project and the asset (the view between the Project and the asset would be largely obscured by topography, modern Immingham and Immingham Dock). The asset's primary

setting comprises the semi-rural area north of Immingham. This will not be directly impacted by the Project. Other than the introduction of additional industrial units within an already heavily industrialised landscape, wider views to and from the asset will remain largely unchanged by the Project. For these reasons, the Project is deemed to have a **very low** impact upon the asset's setting and our ability to appreciate, understand and experience the asset within its setting. This is assessed as a **negligible adverse effect**, which is **not significant**.

- 14.8.20 The Grade I Church of St Andrew (NHLE 1310011) is located 2.9km to the west of the centre of the Site on the north-west edge of Immingham. It is considered to have **high** heritage value, derived from **architectural, historic** and **archaeological** interest as a medieval parish church and is therefore deemed to be sensitive to change. The immediate setting of the church comprises the churchyard which is enclosed by mature trees and foliage, with its wider setting including open rural land to the north (including a golf course) and Immingham to the south. The setting of the asset will not be affected by the Project. It is located at a sufficient distance from the Project for it not to form part of the primary setting of the asset. This distance combined with topography, and obscuring factors such as intervening foliage and elements of Immingham itself also means that the Project will not impact upon the wider setting (or view scape) of the asset. As a result of these factors there will be no impact upon our ability to appreciate, understand and experience the asset within its setting. Therefore, the Project is assessed as having a **neutral effect** upon this asset, which is not considered further in this assessment.
- 14.8.21 The Iron Bungalow (NHLE 1391349) is a Grade II Listed Building located on Pelham Road, approximately 2.7km west of the centre of the Site, within Immingham itself (just to the south-west of the centre of the town). The asset is considered to have **medium** heritage value, stemming from its **architectural** and **historic** interest, utilising an unusual construction form and having an association with the construction of Immingham Dock. The asset's primary setting would have been the Dock with which it was associated, the other structures of emerging Immingham (including "Tin Town") and the largely open, rural landscape in which it was set (prior to the construction of the Dock and the growth of Immingham). However, the subsequent growth and development of Immingham has all but divorced the asset from this setting, there being no substantial, direct, views left between the asset and the Dock or industry with which the Dock is associated. Today the primary setting of the asset consists of urban Immingham. Neither the asset nor views from / to its setting will be affected by the Project due to a combination of distance from the Project and an already interrupted view scape. Therefore, the Project is assessed as having a **neutral effect** upon this asset, which is not considered further in this assessment.
- 14.8.22 The Church of St Peter and St Paul (NHLE 1346978) is a Grade II* listed building, which contains within its churchyard the remains of a Grade II listed stone standing cross (NHLE 1020023, also recorded as NHLE 1161697). The church and its churchyard (which includes the cross) are located on the north-west edge of the village of Stallingborough c.3.3km to the south-west of the centre of the Site. The assets are considered to have **high** heritage value,

derived from **architectural, historic and archaeological** interest as a post medieval church and churchyard cross, with some reuse of medieval masonry, and so are deemed sensitive to change. The primary setting of both assets comprises the churchyard, with their wider setting encompassing the parish of Stallingborough. Specifically this includes the rural landscape which surrounds the churchyard and within which post medieval elements can be seen, the extant village of Stallingborough to the immediate south (which also contains post medieval elements) and the earthwork remains of the medieval extent of Stallingborough which sits to the immediate west of the churchyard. The Project is at a sufficient distance from the assets that it is not considered to fall within the assets' primary or wider setting. The views of the Project from the assets and their immediate setting are shielded by trees and mature hedges which enclose the churchyard, this in combination with distance from the Project, the topography of the landscape and intervening developments, including the railway and A180 road means that there will only be very limited visibility, if any, of the Project from either asset and very limited change to the wider setting of the asset. As a result, the Project will not have an impact on our ability to appreciate, understand or experience either asset. Therefore, the Project is assessed as having a **neutral effect** upon these assets, which are not considered further in this assessment.

- 14.8.23 Stallingborough scheduled medieval settlement (NHLE 1020423) is located on the north-east of the village of Stallingborough c. 3.3km to the south-west of the centre of the Site. The asset is considered to have **high** heritage value, derived from **archaeological** and **historic** interest associated with a deserted section of the village and earthworks of a post medieval manor and formal gardens. The setting of the asset comprises of the parish of Stallingborough which includes the surrounding rural landscape, the above mentioned church and stone cross and the modern village of Stallingborough which has post medieval elements to it. As with the Church, the Project is at a sufficient distance from this asset that it is not considered to fall within the assets' wider setting. Additionally, view scape of the asset will not be affected by the Project as the Project is obscured from it by a combination of distance, topography and intervening hedgerows and developments, including the railway and A180. This means that the Project will only be very minimally visible, if at all, from the asset and will only minimally impact the view scape of it or its setting. As a result, the Project will not impact on our ability to appreciate, understand or experience the asset. Therefore, the Project is assessed as having a **neutral effect** upon this asset, which is not considered further in this assessment.

Non – Designated Assets

- 14.8.24 There are 17 non-designated heritage assets recorded in the 1.6km study area that have the potential to be subject to physical impacts or impacts arising from a change to their setting as a result of the construction of the Project (for details of the assets refer to **Paragraphs 14.6.21 – 14.6.50**). Effects upon these non-designated assets are summarised below.
- 14.8.25 **Kings Road (MNL3523)** relates to the historic route of Kings Road, also seen on the OS maps of 1887 – 1889 a section of which survives today as part of the

route of modern Kings Road. It can be considered to be of **local** interest, derived from its **archaeological** and **historic** interest as part of the landscape, prior to the industrialisation of the area with the construction of the port in the early 20th century, It is assessed as of **low value** based on its capacity to inform on historic communication routes.

- 14.8.26 The original setting of this asset would have been the rural, post medieval landscape through which it ran. Very little of this remains today having been replaced by the Dock, heavy industry and the residential and commercial buildings associated with modern Immingham. An open area adjacent to the south-west of the road may contain traces of this post medieval landscape and forms part of the immediate setting of the historic route of the road. The wider setting of the historic route would also have included the nearby contemporary asset of 'Long Strip'. However, modern industrial, residential and commercial developments as well as a reduction in the size of the woodland, from its post medieval extent, mean that the road and the woodland have effectively become disconnected. There is no longer any visibility between the assets.
- 14.8.27 The works associated with the Project at this location are simply the temporary removal of street furniture and alterations to overhead cables to allow the passage of abnormal loads along Kings Road to the Site. This will have no direct or indirect impact upon the historic route of the road. The construction of the Project as a whole will add a number of new industrial buildings and structures into the current setting of the historic route and its wider view scape (setting). However, the current setting of the asset is not, largely, its original setting – it has evolved over time with the construction of the Dock and associated areas of industry. This Project is a continuation of this evolution and will merge into the existing industrial view scape and not be overly intrusive. Accordingly, the impact upon this asset is deemed to be **very low** resulting in a **negligible adverse effect**, which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.28 **Sea Defence Bank (MNL2085)** is known from OS maps dated 1887-1889, and consists of a series of linked, large, bank earthworks, which are still visible today around the area to the south and west of Immingham Dock. It is of **local** importance, derived from its **archaeological** and **historic** interest as part of the landscape, prior to the industrialisation of the area with the construction of the Port in the early 20th century. It is assessed as of **low value** based on its capacity to inform on past land use, and the protection of that land from inundation from the sea.
- 14.8.29 With reference to this Project, the stretch of the Sea Defence Bank which once did exist within the Site Boundary of the Project (within the Pipeline Corridor), has been entirely removed by the construction of the new Border Control Post. Thus, the Project will have no direct physical impact upon this asset. However, the asset covers a larger area than just within the Site Boundary, extending southwards through, and beyond, the study areas. Within the 1.6km study area, the setting of this asset includes intervisibility to other sections of the asset as well as to the surviving elements of the post medieval landscape it would once have formed a significant part of. Today this includes the surviving element of 'Long Strip', an area of open land to the immediate south of Queens Road

(through which a surviving stretch of the bank runs) and the North Beck Drain (c.420m to the south of Queens Road). The Project may have a significant impact upon 'Long Strip' (see below) but will not directly impact the area to the south of Queens Road nor North Beck Drain. Much of the rest of the rural landscape which would have formed the setting of this asset has now been replaced by Immingham Dock and areas of heavy industry. These now act as the primary backdrop to what remains of the original setting of the historic Sea Defence Bank and the Project will cause little change to the existing industrial landscape of this area. Accordingly, there will be little impact upon the extant setting of the stretches of this asset which survive within the study area, but beyond the Site Boundary. The impact of the Project upon this asset is assessed as **very low** resulting in a **negligible adverse effect**, which is **not significant**.

- 14.8.30 **Long Strip (MNL1797)** is a post medieval plantation marked on the OS 1887 – 1889 25 inch to 1 mile maps. It is of **local** interest, derived from its **archaeological** and **historic** interest as part of the landscape, prior to the industrialisation of the area with the construction of the port in the early 20th century. It is assessed as of **low value** based on the potential to inform on past land use and how this has changed over time. The southern part of Long Strip, south of Laporte Road, sits within the Site Boundary but will not be subject to any direct physical impacts by the Project. It is included in order to allow the Applicant to temporarily remove informal access during the construction phase of the Project. The section of Long Strip to the north of Laporte Road is within the area of the Site where the Pipe Rack and Jetty Access Road are proposed. This section of the woodland will be subject to direct physical impacts associated with the construction of the jetty access road and the above ground pipe rack, which will permanently remove a portion of the woodland. This is assessed as having a **high** magnitude of impact upon the asset resulting in a **moderate adverse effect** which is **significant**.
- 14.8.31 **Post medieval/modern beacons in Stallingborough (MNL4263 and MNL4426)** are recorded on the 1887 – 1889 OS map on the edge of the Sea Defence Bank. It is unclear from the records whether this is the site of two separate beacons, or the same beacon, whose location has been inaccurately recorded across a series of maps. Regardless, both assets have no extant above ground remains, and the extent of the survival of any below ground remains is unknown, although the geophysical survey of this area has identified a linear anomaly which may be associated with MNL4426 (**Appendix 14.H [TR030008/APP/6.4]**). The heritage value of such an asset type is derived from its **archaeological** and **historic** interest and its contribution to the maritime heritage of the area. They are both of **local** interest and the value of these assets are assessed as **low**. The assets sit within the proposed location of the Temporary Construction Area. The nature of the works in this area will be such that they will “do no harm” to any below ground archaeological assets, as outlined within the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]** (see **Paragraph 14.9.3, bullet point 5**). Specifically, there will be:
- No buildings other than containers and/or storage sheds.
 - No foundation or excavation work.

- c. No topsoil removal.
 - d. Ground protection via matting or similar.
 - e. Issues of ground compaction to be mitigated again by use of suitable ground matting and other protection measures.
- 14.8.32 As a result, there will be no direct physical impact upon any surviving below ground remains of the assets.
- 14.8.33 The setting of the assets includes their relationship with each other (if there are two assets), the coastline, which they would have been associated with, and the open rural landscape in which they would have been located. The latter partially survives as the field in which the assets sit, Long Strip to the north, and areas of open ground to the immediate south-west. The Project will alter this setting. The buildings and stored materials within the Temporary Construction Area itself will affect visibility between the two beacon assets and will also reduce visibility between them, Long Strip and potentially the coast, as well as altering the immediate rural setting of the assets. These alterations will, however, only be temporary during the construction of the Project. A more permanent alteration to setting will be the partial loss of Long Strip and the introduction of new industrial buildings into the general view scape (setting) of the assets. Given the already heavily industrialised context and setting for the assets, this factor carries little weight when assessing the impact. Overall, the Project will have a **low** magnitude of impact on both of the assets through changes to their setting and our ability to understand appreciate and experience the assets, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.34 Sections of the **Immingham Dock Branch Railway (MNL3039)** also lie within the Site Boundary. This branch line opened in 1912 along with the Dock and is still in use today (albeit with some alterations to the route having been made over the intervening century). The line can be seen as having **local** interest and **very low** heritage value. Its interest primarily lies in its **historic** contribution to the understanding of the development and use of the Dock and their impact upon the surrounding landscape. Whilst the rail line crosses through the proposed Pipeline Corridor, it is an active line which will not be subject to any direct physical impacts as a result of the construction or operation of the Project. The setting of the rail line, within the Site Boundary, is the industrial landscape. Whilst the Project may alter this slightly, adding new elements to the views from and to the rail line, it will not fundamentally alter the setting and will have no impact upon our ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset. Accordingly, the Project will have a **very low** impact upon the setting of the asset resulting in a **negligible adverse effect** which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.35 Elements of **The Grimsby and Immingham Electric Light Railway (“G&IER”) (MNL2087 and 3078)**, which was in operation between 1912 – 1961 traverse through the Site. Much of this track has been removed, indeed there is no extant track relating to this tramway present within the Site Boundary. However, the route of the track is known from mapping and from its cuttings still being visible in the landscape. Within the Pipeline Corridor the proposed route of the pipe intersects with the known route of the tramway as it crosses Queens Road. Whilst no extant track is present, it is possible that below ground archaeological

remains associated with the tramway may still survive. Such remains are assessed as of **local** interest and **very low** heritage value, with interest lying in their **archaeological** and **historic** contribution to the understanding of the industrialisation of the landscape and the development of transportation networks (construction, use and closure), including its use in WWII and the immediate post-war period. The main pipelines will be installed via deep Horizontal Direction Drilling, and as such this work will have no impact upon the archaeological horizon. However, there is a possibility that a utility pipeline may need to be installed, and this will be installed as a c.1m wide trench cut along the length of the Pipeline Corridor (see **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**). The installation of this would directly impact the archaeological horizon, and any surviving archaeological remains associated with the G&IER.

- 14.8.36 As with the Immingham Dock Branch Railway, the setting of this Electric Light railway, within the Site Boundary, is the industrial landscape through which it traverses. Again, whilst the Project may alter this slightly, adding new elements to the views from and to the rail line, it will not fundamentally alter the setting and will have no impact upon our ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset. However, the direct physical impact from the utility pipeline does have the potential to permanently truncate, or completely remove, part or all of the remains associated with this asset. Accordingly, the Project has the potential for a **medium** impact upon the asset, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.37 The site of a **Tram Shelter on Queens Road (MNL4715)** is located (just) within the Pipeline Corridor. It is the site of what was once a single storey building, with a rectangular footprint, that dated to c.1914 and which formed part of the G&IER. The building was demolished in 2021 with the construction of the new border control post and the associated upgrading of Queens Road. It is possible that below ground elements of the building survive. Such remains are assessed as of **local** interest and **very low** heritage value, with its interest lying in their **archaeological** and **historic** contribution to an understanding of the use of the transportation network. Again, there is the potential for these remains to be directly physically impacted by the placing of the utility pipeline (see **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]** for related construction methods), resulting in the permanent truncation, or complete removal of part or all of the remains associated with this asset.
- 14.8.38 The primary setting of any remains of the asset would be the remnants of the electric light railway and industrial Immingham, which the tram shelter served when it was active, the Project will alter this very little. As with G&IER remains, the Project has the potential to have a **medium** impact upon this asset – via direct physical impact, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.

- 14.8.39 It must be noted that the construction of the Border Control post in this area (Pipeline Corridor) in 2021 did not involve any archaeological assessment and has likely removed / heavily truncated any archaeological remains associated with the G&IER and Tram Shelter. A small, apparently undisturbed area of land on the south-east edge of the control post may have potential for archaeological survival of any below ground remains of the G&IER, but given the generally very disturbed area of land at this location this must be seen as a very low potential.
- 14.8.40 **Two rows of terraced properties (ACM1) located on the Queens Road** fall within the Site Boundary, adjacent to the West Site. The terraces date back to the early 20th century, likely built as accommodation for Dockworkers and their families contemporary to the construction of Immingham Dock. The assets are assessed as of **local** interest and to have **low** heritage value, their **historic** and **architectural** interest relating to the industrial development of the Dock and workers housing around the Dock. Whilst the properties do fall within the Site Boundary, they would not be demolished as part of the Project.
- 14.8.41 The properties are still, at least partially, in use today for a mix of residential and commercial purposes. Their setting is then the current modern aspect of the area, within which traces of the early 20th century landscape, contemporary with their construction, can be seen. This includes elements of Kings Road to the north-west, surviving open areas (such as the West Site, but also land to south, south-east and further to the west) and of course the Port itself to the immediate north. The construction of the Project will have an impact upon the setting of these assets. Whilst the primary aspect of the front of the buildings (view across to the Port) will remain unaltered, to their rear the open area which is currently the West Site will be transformed through industrial development. In addition to this change in character, the new buildings and structures and their use will create (both during its construction and operation) new visual, noise, vibration and light impacts on the assets and will affect views to/from Kings Road and the remaining open areas of land to the west and south. However, it must be remembered that the properties are part of a living, industrial landscape which has seen numerous other changes since the construction of these dwellings. Accordingly, these changes are seen as having a **medium** impact upon the setting of the assets and our ability to understand, appreciate and experience them, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.42 The site of **World War II anti-landing obstacles (MNL4640)** is recorded in the HER as present within the West Site. In aerial photographs taken in 1940 the asset was visible as multiple lines of obstacles placed on a north-east to south-west orientation. Today there are no above ground remains of this asset, additionally both the geophysical survey undertaken at the Site in 2013 and the more recent (2023) trial trench evaluation (**Paragraph 14.6.56**) did not identify any anomalies which were thought to be associated with this asset. The asset is assessed as having **local** interest, deriving from its **archaeological** and **historic** contribution towards our understanding of the defence of the Port of Immingham during WWII. The value of this asset is assessed as **low**. Being located within the West Site, the asset would be subject to total or partial, permanent, truncation/ removal during the construction of the Project if present. However, work to date

strongly indicates that no below ground remains associated with this asset exist, and therefore it is incapable of being affected by the Project. This asset is not considered any further in this chapter.

- 14.8.43 The **probable site of a World War II bomb crater (MNL4643)** is located in the Temporary Construction Area. It was visible as an earthwork, c.8m in diameter, on aerial photographs taken in 1941 but has no visible remains today. However, recent geophysical survey work has identified an anomaly which may relate to this asset (**Appendix 14.H [TR030008/APP/6.4]**). The asset is assessed as being of **local** importance and of **very low** heritage value, derived from its **archaeological** and **historic** interest, contributing to our understanding of the impact of WWII on the landscape around the Port.
- 14.8.44 As noted above (**Paragraph 14.8.31**), the Project will not directly physically impact assets at this location. The setting of MNL4643 (possible WWII bomb crater) includes its relationship with other local assets relating to WWII and the fortification of the east coast, including MNL4651 (WWII Barrage balloon mooring site), the site of MNL4640 (anti landing obstacle) and MNL4644 (possible military installation). Whilst knowledge of these assets contributes to the experience and wider understanding of MNL4643, there is currently no intervisibility between any of these assets due to a combination of distance, topography and intervening features (such as buildings and woodland). The setting of MNL4643 includes the coastline as well as the open rural landscape in which it was located. It also includes the wider landscape of the Dock and industry which were the primary targets of the attack from which the asset was derived. Today the immediate setting of the asset comprises the field in which it sits, “Long Strip” woodland which is visible to the north, and areas of open ground to the immediate south-west. The wider landscape of the Dock and industry remain and whilst details have changed and evolved over time, the general use remains the same.
- 14.8.45 The Project will alter the asset’s setting. The buildings and stored materials within the Temporary Construction Area itself will affect visibility between the asset and Long Strip, and potentially the coast, as well as altering the immediate rural setting of the asset. These alterations to setting will, however, only be temporary during the construction of the Project. More permanent alterations to setting will arise from the partial loss of Long Strip, and the introduction of new industrial buildings into the general view scape of the asset. Given the already heavily industrialised context and setting for the asset, this factor carries little weight when assessing the impact. Overall, the Project is assessed as having a **low** magnitude of impact on the asset, in relation to its setting and our ability to understand appreciate and experience it, resulting in a **negligible adverse effect** which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.46 The **possible site of a World War II barrage balloon mooring (MNL4651)** is located within the East Site. It was visible as a military installation on aerial photographs taken in the 1940s where it consisted of a roadway leading to a circular structure with a second circular earthwork to the north-west. Nothing survives above ground today. The asset is considered to be of **local** importance and **low** heritage value – derived from its **archaeological** and **historic** interest, contributing towards our understanding of the defence of the Port of Immingham

during WWII. However all available data suggests that no below ground remains associated with this asset survive, having been removed by earlier construction works. As a result the asset is deemed incapable of being affected by the Project and is not considered any further in this chapter.

- 14.8.47 The **possible site of a World War II military installation (MNL4644)** is located at the end of the sea wall near the existing Immingham Oil Terminal Jetty. It was visible as a series of structures and earth features in aerial photographs until the 1950s. Nothing survives above ground today and the extent of any surviving below ground remains is unknown. The asset is of **local** importance and **low** heritage value – derived from its **archaeological** and **historic** interest, contributing towards our understanding of the defence of the Port of Immingham during WWII. There are no ground intrusive works planned within this area of the Site, which is included within the Site Boundary to enable informal access along the top section of the sea wall to be removed permanently, as it would be incompatible with the construction and operation of the jetty. As a result, the asset will not be subject to any direct physical impacts.
- 14.8.48 The setting of MNL4644 includes its relationship with other local assets relating to WWII and the fortification of the east coast, including MNL4643 (possible bomb crater), MNL4651 (site of a former WWII Barrage balloon mooring site) and MNL4640 (anti landing obstacle). Whilst knowledge of these assets contributes to the experience of MNL4644, there is currently no intervisibility between any of these assets due to a combination of distance, topography and intervening features (such as buildings and woodland) and lack of preservation above (and below) ground. The contemporary, immediate, setting of MNL4644 would have been that of an open, rural landscape to the south and east, the coastline it was defending to the immediate north, and with the Dock and areas of heavy industry (which it was built to defend) to the north and west. Whilst the Dock, areas of heavy industry and coastline remain, the areas of open land to the south and east have largely been replaced with further industrial development. Only Long Strip survives as a visible part of this once rural setting.
- 14.8.49 The Project will alter this setting, introducing new industrial buildings into the general view scape of the asset. However, given the already heavily industrialised back drop of the area this change will be minimal. Overall, the Project is assessed as having a **low** magnitude of impact on the asset, in relation to its setting and our ability to understand appreciate and experience the asset, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.50 A **small rectilinear enclosure (MNL4652)** is visible as earthworks on aerial photographs, taken in 1941, in a field to the west of Queens Road, just outside of the Site Boundary. It is of uncertain function but has been dated to the 20th century. It is possible that this feature has been removed by modern development and the construction of hardstanding. Should it survive it would be of **local** interest and of **low** heritage value, its interest derived from its **archaeological** and **historic** contribution to the understanding of land use and change around the port in the 20th century. The asset does not sit within the Site Boundary and so only the setting of the asset may be impacted.

- 14.8.51 The mid- 20th century setting of this asset would have included open, agricultural land to the west, south and east (including Long Strip) and the Dock and industrial areas to the north. Industrial developments in the latter part of the 20th century, including industrial development of the land the asset is potentially located under, has significantly altered this landscape and little of the asset's contemporary rural setting survives. Long Strip remains, and is visible from the location of the asset, and open areas remain to the south of Queen Road, which are also at least partially visible from the location of the asset. Construction of the Project will have minimal impact on this setting. The eastern section of Long Strip, visible to the asset, is not being removed and views between the asset and the open areas to the south and Long Strip will only be minimally altered by the Project. New industrial buildings will be introduced into the general view scape of the asset. However, given the already heavily industrialised nature and back drop this change is assessed as minimal. As a result of this it is assessed that there will be a **low** magnitude of impact on the asset, in relation to its setting and our ability to understand appreciate and experience the asset, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.52 A mid- 20th century landfill site **Immingham H.C.C Landfill (MNL1063)** is recorded on the southern edge of the West Site, the very northern extent of this asset overlapping with the southern boundary of West Site. The extent of the landfill is visible today as a series of earthworks and "scars". The location is now the site of Immingham Household Recycling Centre. Whilst the landfill is partially located within the Site Boundary, the proposal is to use the landfill access road, from Queens Road, for access to the Site. The asset itself would be physically unaffected by the Project. The asset can be seen as having **local** interest and being of **very low** heritage value, its interest derived from its **historic** contribution to the understanding of land use and change around the port in the 20th century. The immediate setting of the asset is the modern aspect present today, including Queens Road (from which the landfill site is accessed), the open agricultural land to the immediate north and west, industry to the immediate south and former industrial land to the east. Its wider setting includes the Dock and industrial areas to the north, south and east and Immingham, which it served to the west. Indeed, the site of the landfill itself – both with its former and current use – is a functional part of the 'industrial' landscape. Whilst the Project will alter the immediate setting of the asset, bringing industrial development more proximal to it, this does not fundamentally change the setting of the asset or have any impact upon our ability to understand, appreciate or experience the asset. The Project is assessed as having a **low** magnitude of impact on the asset, in relation to its setting and our ability to understand appreciate and experience the asset, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.53 An **undated curvilinear enclosure (MNL4674)** is known from aerial photographs of 1942 and is located on the very northern edge of the West Site, extending into the Site but also beyond it to the north. No visible remains survive and it is unclear if any below ground archaeological remains extend into the bounds of the West Site. Should any survive, they would be of **local** interest and of **low** heritage value, interest being derived from their contribution to our understanding of the **archaeological** record of the area and likely the agricultural

use of the landscape of the period they relate to. Given the uncertain date of the feature it is not possible to understand what its contemporary setting would have been, what elements of this survive in the modern landscape and how these would contribute to an understanding and appreciation of the asset. Given its location, at least partially within the West Site, any surviving remains associated with this asset would be subject to permanent, partial, removal/truncation during the construction of the Project. This is assessed as a **medium** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.

Unrecorded Heritage Assets

- 14.8.54 Recent archaeological evaluation undertaken within the Site has uncovered a number of previously unknown archaeological assets. This section assesses the potential impact of the Project upon these, as they are currently understood.
- 14.8.55 Recent geoarchaeological work (**Appendix 14.G [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) has identified a number of **peat and organic rich alluvium deposits** scattered as pockets around the West Site. Depending upon how well preserved these deposits are, and the information they contain, they can be seen as having **regional** interest and as being of **medium** heritage value, their interest being derived from their potential to contribute to our understanding of the **archaeological** record of the area, our understanding of past environments and climate and how these evolved, and human communities use of, and influence over, the landscape. Given the location of these assets within the West Site they would be subject to at least partial removal/truncation by the construction of the Project. This is assessed as a **high** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **major adverse effect** which is **significant**.
- 14.8.56 Recent geophysical survey work (**Appendix 14.H [TR030008/APP/6.4]**) has identified a number of previously unknown **potential archaeological anomalies** within the Temporary Construction Area. This includes:
- a. Several long, large linear features and one large rectangular feature. Given the known history of the area it is possible that these relate to WWII defensive features or earlier Beacons (e.g. MNL4426). However, other origins such as being derived from much earlier activity (e.g. Roman or medieval), or more modern activity (modern drainage/agriculture), cannot be ruled out.
 - b. Two small curvilinear ditch features were identified to the west of the Temporary Construction Area. These features may also, potentially, be archaeological in nature. However, the weak nature of the signal also means that a natural origin (variation in geology) for the anomalies cannot be ruled out.
 - c. Two large, ferrous, responses were also identified. These may relate to modern activity, or possibly a bomb crater recorded in the area by the HER (MNL4643).

- d. Numerous linear trends were noted across the north of the Site, which may relate to past drainage or agricultural activity. To the south of the Site, strong geological responses appear to reflect the intertidal environmental and alluvial processes which have taken place across the Site.
- 14.8.57 Given the somewhat unknown nature of these assets, placing a value on them is difficult. They are likely to be of **local – regional** interest and as being of **low – medium** heritage value, their interest being derived from their potential to contribute to our understanding of the **archaeological** record of the area and the use of the landscape by human communities over time.
- 14.8.58 As previously noted (**Paragraph 14.8.31**) this area of the Site will not be subject to any intrusive ground works or anything which would create a direct physical impact upon below ground archaeological assets. Again, the uncertain nature of the features means relating them to their contemporary setting within the modern landscape is difficult; however, their setting is likely to be similar to that as described for **Beacons MNL4263 / MNL4426** and **Bomb Crater MNL4643** and to be affected in similar ways. Overall, the Project is likely to have a **low** magnitude of impact upon these assets in relation to their setting and our ability to understand appreciate and experience the assets, resulting in an overall **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.

Historic Landscape Character

- 14.8.59 The Historic Landscape Character of the Site is described in **Paragraphs 14.6.8 – 14.6.10**. The landscape of the Project is largely described as Other Industrial and Warehouse and Industrial, although areas of Modern Fields and Plantation Woodland are also present. The area is characterised as being dominated by industrial activity. As a whole, the historic landscape is considered to not be particularly sensitive to change and to be of **negligible – medium** value, with modern industrial areas within the Site being at one end of this spectrum and areas of preserved post medieval landscape, e.g. Long Strip being at the other. As a whole, the Project will have little impact upon the character of the historic landscape. It will change one area of modern field to industrial use and reduce the area of a post medieval plantation woodland. Some areas of the Project will have a **medium** impact upon the landscape – for instance the partial removal of Long Strip, whilst other areas will have a **low** (construction in the West Site within a modern field) or **very low** (Temporary Construction Area and development of already industrial area e.g. the East Site) impact. Overall, the Project is deemed to have a **low** magnitude of impact upon the historic landscape character, resulting in an overall **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.

Previously Unknown Heritage Assets

- 14.8.60 There is potential for previously unknown (unrecorded and unmapped) heritage assets to be present within areas of the Site which have not been subject to significant prior ground disturbance. Note that this is distinct from those assets which are *unrecorded*, but which are now known about via the archaeological evaluation explained in this Chapter.

- 14.8.61 The archaeological evaluation work undertaken to date ensures that there is only potential for unknown heritage assets to be encountered within the Pipeline Corridor, the Bridleway Along The Western Edge of the Temporary Construction Area, the East Site and the Pipe Rack and Jetty Access Road. However, given what we know of the Site from the evaluation works explained in this Chapter, and the DBA, the potential to encounter such unknown remains at all of these locations is assessed as **very low to low**.
- 14.8.62 Neither the sea wall nor the Kings Road Overhead Cables areas have been subject to any form of archaeological evaluation. However, as no construction or other ground intrusive works are planned for either of these areas there is **no** potential for unknown heritage assets to be encountered or impacted at these locations.
- 14.8.63 The working methodology to be employed within the Temporary Construction Area (see **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**) will also ensure that no unknown below ground heritage assets are encountered within this area of the Site.
- 14.8.64 The working methodology to be employed within Pipeline Corridor (see **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**) will reduce the potential to physically encounter unknown below ground heritage assets. Deep HDD for the main pipelines will mean that the archaeological horizon is not impacted by these works. There is the possibility that a utility pipeline may be placed in a trench cut from the surface, which therefore has the potential to physically impact unknown remains. However, this will have as small a footprint as possible (c.1m wide) and is running through an area of **very low to low** potential to contain unknown remains (see **Paragraph 14.8.61**).
- 14.8.65 As a result, there is **very low to low potential** that unknown remains associated with the medieval and post medieval agricultural use of the land may be present within the Site. Such assets would be of **local archaeological** and **historic** interest due to their potential to inform on the economy and land use of this pre-industrialised period and would be of **low** heritage value. The nature of the Project at these locations would mean that they would likely be subject to partial to complete truncation/removal resulting in a (near) total loss of heritage value. Whilst such an impact would seem to be high, the measures to be employed, should significant assets of this nature be uncovered, (as detailed at **Paragraph 14.7.7**) will reduce the impact to a **medium to low** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.
- 14.8.66 There is also **very low to low potential** that that unknown heritage assets relating to post medieval/modern industrial activity and infrastructure may also be present in the Site. Again, such assets would be of **local archaeological** and **historic** interest due to their potential to inform on the industrial use and development of the landscape, the development of infrastructure in the area as well as the local economy of the period(s) and how these aspects had changed from earlier periods. These assets would likely be of **low** heritage value. The nature of the Project at these locations would mean that they would likely be subject to partial to complete truncation/removal resulting in a (near) total loss of heritage value. Whilst such an impact would seem to be high, the measures to be employed, should significant assets of this nature be uncovered, (as detailed at

Paragraph 14.7.7) will reduce the impact to a **medium to low** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.

- 14.8.67 Unknown heritage assets associated with WWII and the fortification of England's East coast may also be present within the Site. The potential to encounter such remains is assessed as **very low to low**, and such assets would be of **local** importance and **low** heritage value – derived from their **archaeological** and **historic** interest and their contribution towards our understanding of the defence of the Port of Immingham. The nature of the Project at these locations would mean that they would likely be subject to partial to complete truncation / removal resulting in a (near) total loss of heritage value. Whilst such an impact would seem to be high, the measures to be employed, should significant assets of this nature be uncovered, (as detailed at **Paragraph 14.7.7)** will reduce the impact to a **medium to low** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **minor adverse effect** which is **not significant**.

Summary of Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects

- 14.8.68 **Table 14-6** provides a summary of the significant effects of the Project upon historic environment (terrestrial) assets, taking into account the embedded mitigation measures detailed in **Section 14.7**. Significant effects are defined as moderate or major. The below indicates that there are two assets which will be subject to significant effects (**Major or Moderate adverse effects**) due to the impacts of the Project.

Table 14-6: Summary of Assessment – Likely Effects

Receptor Name	Receptor Location	Receptor Value	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect
Peat deposits and organic alluvial deposits identified by geoarchaeological evaluation	Within West Site	Medium	Partial or complete, permanent truncation/removal of below ground remains	High	Major adverse (significant)
Long Strip (MNL1797)	Within East Site and Jetty Access Road and Pipeline Corridor	Low	Partial or complete, permanent truncation/removal of below ground remains	High	Moderate adverse (significant)
Terraced properties on Queens Road (ACM1)	West Site	Low	Effect on setting	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Curvilinear enclosure (MNL4674)	West Site	Low	Effect on setting but also potential for direct physical impact leading to the partial or complete, permanent truncation/removal of below ground remains	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Remains of Grimsby and Immingham Electric Light Railway (MNL2087 and MNL3078)	Pipeline Corridor	Very low	Effect on setting but also potential for direct physical impact leading to the partial or complete, permanent truncation/removal of below ground remains	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Site of Tram Shelter (MNL4715)	Pipeline Corridor	Very low	Effect on setting but also potential for direct physical impact leading to the partial or complete, permanent truncation/removal of below ground remains	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)

Receptor Name	Receptor Location	Receptor Value	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect
Unknown Heritage Assets relating to the Medieval – Post Medieval agricultural use of the landscape	All land within Site Boundary	Low (likely estimate)	Potential for direct physical impact leading to the partial or complete, permanent truncation/ removal of below ground remains. If present would be flagged with Heritage officer for NELC and need for/nature of any mitigation measures discussed	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Unknown Heritage Assets relating to the Post Medieval - Modern industrial use of the landscape	All land within Site Boundary	Low (likely estimate)	Potential for direct physical impact leading to the partial or complete, permanent truncation/ removal of below ground remains. If present would be flagged with Heritage officer for NELC and need for/nature of any mitigation measures discussed	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Unknown Heritage Assets relating WWII activity in landscape	All land within Site Boundary	Low (likely estimate)	Potential for direct physical impact leading to the partial or complete, permanent truncation/ removal of below ground remains. If present would be flagged with Heritage officer for NELC and need for/nature of any mitigation measures discussed	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Archaeological features present within TCA as demonstrated by geophysical survey	TCA	Medium	Effect on setting (physical impacts mitigated by no-harm approach to construction)	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Historic Landscape Character of Site and area around Site	Study Area	Medium	Alterations to character of landscape by the Project	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)

Immingham Green Energy Terminal
Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Historic Environment (Terrestrial)

Receptor Name	Receptor Location	Receptor Value	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect
Beacon at Stallingborough (MNL4263)	Temporary Construction Area	Low	Effect on setting (physical impacts mitigated by no-harm approach to construction)	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Beacon at Stallingborough (MNL4426)	Temporary Construction Area	Low	Effect on setting (physical impacts mitigated by no-harm approach to construction)	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Site of WWII military installation (MNL4644)	PROW along Jetty west of the TCA	Low	Effect on setting	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Rectilinear enclosure (MNKL4652)	1km study area	Low	Effect on setting	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Mid 20 th Century landfill Site – Immingham H.C.C. landfill (MNL1063)	West Site	Very Low	Effect on setting, no works planned in area of the asset which would physically impact it	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Site of WWII bomb Crater (MNL4643)	TCA	Very Low	Effect on setting (physical impacts mitigated by no-harm approach to construction)	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Churchfield Manor (NHLE 1161630)	2km Study Area	Medium	Effect on setting	Very low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)
Immingham War Memorial (NHLE1455139)	2km Study Area	Medium	Effect on setting	Very low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)
Sea Defense Bank (MNL2085)	1 km Study Area	Low	Effect on setting	Very low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)

Immingham Green Energy Terminal
Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Historic Environment (Terrestrial)

Receptor Name	Receptor Location	Receptor Value	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect
Kings Road (MNK3523)	Kings Road	Low	Effect on setting	Very low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)
Immingham Dock Branch Railway (MNKL3039)	Pipeline Corridor	Very low	Effect on setting – will not be directly physical impacted by the Project	Very Low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)
Stallingborough Medieval Settlement (NHLE1020423)	2km Study Area	High	Effect on setting	None	Neutral
Church of St Andrew (NHLE 1310011)	2km Study Area	High	Effect on setting	None	Neutral
Church of St Peter and St Paul (NHLE1346978)	2km Study Area	High	Effect on setting	None	Neutral
The Iron Bungalow (NHLE1391349)	2km Study Area	Medium	Effect on setting	None	Neutral
Site of WWII anti landing obstacle (4640)	West Site	Low	None as evidence indicates asset no longer exists	None	None
Site of WWII barrage balloon mooring point (MNL4651)	East Site	Low	None as evidence indicates asset no longer exists	None	None

14.9 Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

- 14.9.1 A programme of archaeological evaluation works has been undertaken across the Site during January to February 2023 (as detailed in **Paragraphs 14.6.55 – 14.6.70**). The scope of these archaeological works was set out in a WSI approved by the Heritage Officer for NELC (**Appendix 14.E**) and the individual reports on the works are presented as **Appendices 14.E – G [TR030008/APP/6.4]**. The purpose of these works was to enhance the baseline presented in this document and to further understand the potential for the presence of archaeological and paleoenvironmental remains across the Site, in order that suitable further works could be devised (where necessary) to mitigate impact from the Project upon them and/or enhancement opportunities be recognised and taken.
- 14.9.2 The trial trench evaluation did not demonstrate the presence of any significant archaeological remains within the West Site. The Geophysical Survey demonstrated the potential for previously unknown archaeological anomalies to be present within the Temporary Construction Area. The Geoarchaeological Evaluation resulted in a deposit model across the Project area, this (along with the monitoring of geotechnical works) demonstrated that, whilst the suspected paleochannel was not present, a number of peat and organic alluvial deposits were present. These have the potential to contain important information on past climate and paleoenvironmental change and the impact of human communities on the landscape.
- 14.9.3 Following the completion of this work, the reports detailing the results of the work were disseminated to the Applicant and the Heritage Officer for NELC. Subsequently, a meeting was held on 28 July 2023 involving the Applicant, AECOM and the Heritage Officer for NELC to discuss the results of these recent works and to determine appropriate next steps/mitigation measures. This meeting resulted in the following decisions regarding further archaeological in relation to the Project:
- a. **West Site – Archaeology.** The evaluation work done to date suggests that this area has no/very low potential for buried archaeological remains. Accordingly, it was agreed that no further archaeological work is required at this location.
 - b. **West Site – Geoarchaeology.** The evaluation work to date suggests that the retained borehole samples of peat and organic alluvium have paleoenvironmental potential. It was agreed (following the recommendation from the specialist) that rather than conducting additional fieldwork, the samples retained from the evaluation be subject to further analytical work, and a report detailing the results of this work be prepared and submitted to AECOM who will review and then disseminate to the Applicant and the Heritage Officer for NELC for their review and approval (as included within the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**). No further field work is required.

- c. **Pipeline Corridor.** The low potential for the survivability of below ground remains at this location, combined with the proposed working methodology (deep horizontal directional drilling - see **Paragraph 14.8.35**) means, despite the possibility of the construction of a cut utility pipe trench, it is considered unlikely that remains will be impacted even if present and it was agreed that no further archaeological work is required in this area.
- d. **East Site.** The low potential for survivability of below ground archaeological remains, combined with the likely low value of such possible remains (WWII defence infrastructure) along with the difficulty of work in the area – given the current land use - means that it was agreed that fieldwork in this area would be disproportionately onerous on the Project taking account of the likely benefits. Accordingly, it was agreed that no further archaeological work is required in this area.
- e. **Temporary Construction Area.** The recent geophysical survey indicated that there is the potential for unknown below ground archaeological remains at this location. However, the working methodologies for construction and construction associated activities at this Site will be designed so as to “do no harm” (see **Paragraph 14.8.31**) as outlined within the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**. With this commitment in place, it is agreed that no further archaeological works will be required as the potential remains will be preserved *in situ*.
- f. **Piperack and Jetty Access Route.** Will be impacted by the work. Whilst a survey of the woodland, focusing on preserving the historic information of the woodland, could be undertaken, the potential usefulness of this was discussed at this meeting, and it was not certain how such a survey would differ from the work being undertaken as part of the ecological/environmental mitigation works (see **Appendix 8.F: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [TR030008/APP/6.4]** and **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**). Following a further meeting between the Heritage Officer for NELC and the Tree Officer for NELC on the 7 August 2023 (*Pers Comm*) it was concluded that a separate historic survey would not add to those works, which would provide sufficient historical data in respect of the woodland, and that this work would be made available to the HER.

14.10 Assessment of Residual Effects

- 14.10.1 A summary of the residual effects of the Project, following implementation of the mitigation measures detailed above (**Section 14.9**) is presented in **Table 14-7** below.
- 14.10.2 Further analysis of the peat/organic alluvium deposits retained by the evaluation work (as included within the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**) will aid in our understanding of these deposits. This analytical work, on samples which were difficult to gain and would not have been sought if it were not for the Project, will be beneficial to our understanding of past climates, environments, and human use of the land across the Humber region. This is a benefit of the Project and when combined with the adverse effect on the peat deposits from the Project results in an overall **minor adverse** residual effect on this asset.

14.10.3 In terms of the residual effect on the Long Strip woodland, account is taken of the mitigation work (see **Appendix 8G: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [TR030008/APP/6.4]** and **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**) in relation to the ecological and environmental impacts upon the woodland in concluding that the residual effect is **minor adverse** in nature (**Paragraph 14.9.3, bullet point 6**).

14.11 Summary of Assessment

14.11.1 This section summarises the residual effects of the Project upon the assets impacted by the Project, once the additional mitigation measures such as those detailed above have been taken into account in relation to Significant effects. Additional mitigation measures are not considered to be required for non-significant effects. Residual **Significant** effects are defined as **Major** or **Moderate**. The data is presented in **Table 14-7**.

Table 14-7: Summary of Residual Effects

Asset	Value	Magnitude of impact	Significance of impact	Additional mitigation measures	Residual Effect
Long Strip (MNL1797)	Low	High	Moderate adverse (significant)	The work already being undertaken by the ecological/environmental teams (see Appendix 8.F: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [TR030008/APP/6.4] and Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]) will provide mitigation for the impact upon the historical nature of the woodland. Accordingly, no additional work is required in relation to this impact	Minor adverse (not significant)
Peat deposits and organic alluvial deposits identified by Geoarchaeological evaluation	Medium	High	Major adverse (significant)	Further analysis of the peat and organic alluvium samples obtained by the evaluation and report produced detailing the results of this work (as included within the Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]). Such work will provide useful information that would otherwise never been gained.	Minor adverse (not significant)
Terraced properties on Queens Road (ACM1)	Low	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Curvilinear enclosure (MNL4674)	Low	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)

Immingham Green Energy Terminal
Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Historic Environment (Terrestrial)

Asset	Value	Magnitude of impact	Significance of impact	Additional mitigation measures	Residual Effect
Remains of Grimsby and Immingham Electric Light Railway (MNL2087 and MNL3078)	Very low	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Site of Tram Shelter (MNL4715)	Very low	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Unknown Heritage Assets relating to the Medieval – Post Medieval agricultural use of the landscape	Low (likely estimate)	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Unknown Heritage Assets relating to the Post Medieval - Modern industrial use of the landscape	Low (likely estimate)	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Unknown Heritage Assets relating WWII activity in landscape	Low (likely estimate)	Medium	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Archaeological features present within TCA as demonstrated by geophysical survey	Medium	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Historic Landscape Character of Site and area around Site	Medium	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)

Immingham Green Energy Terminal
Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Historic Environment (Terrestrial)

Asset	Value	Magnitude of impact	Significance of impact	Additional mitigation measures	Residual Effect
Beacon at Stallingborough (MNL4263)	Low	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Beacon at Stallingborough (MNL4426)	Low	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Site of WWII military installation (MNL4644)	Low	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Rectilinear enclosure (MNKL4652)	Low	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Mid 20 th century landfill Site – Immingham H.C.C. landfill (MNL1063)	Very Low	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Site of WWII bomb Crater (MNL4643)	Very Low	Low	Minor Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Minor Adverse (not significant)
Churchfield Manor (NHLE 1161630)	Medium	Very low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Negligible Adverse (not significant)
Immingham War Memorial (NHLE1455139)	Medium	Very low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Negligible Adverse (not significant)
Sea Defense Bank (MNL2085)	Low	Very low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Negligible Adverse (not significant)

Immingham Green Energy Terminal
Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Historic Environment (Terrestrial)

Asset	Value	Magnitude of impact	Significance of impact	Additional mitigation measures	Residual Effect
Kings Road (MNK3523)	Low	Very low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Negligible Adverse (not significant)
Immingham Dock Branch Railway (MNKL3039)	Very low	Very Low	Negligible Adverse (not significant)	N/A	Negligible Adverse (not significant)
Stallingborough Medieval Settlement (NHLE1020423)	High	None	Neutral	N/A	Neutral
Church of St Andrew (NHLE 1310011)	High	None	Neutral	N/A	Neutral
Church of St Peter and St Paul (NHLE1346978)	High	None	Neutral	N/A	Neutral
The Iron Bungalow (NHLE1391349)	Medium	None	Neutral	N/A	Neutral
Site of WWII anti landing obstacle (4640)	Low	None	None	N/A	None
Site of WWII barrage balloon mooring point (MNL4651)	Low	None	None	N/A	None

14.12 Conclusions

- 14.12.1 The Project occupies an area of relatively low archaeological significance. The HER records a number of assets within and around the Site which are largely of Post Medieval/Modern date, which relate to the industrial development of the Dock and the WWII defence of the east coast of Britain. On the whole, these assets are deemed to be of typically low value and local interest. On top of this the area is very active and has been subject to various construction or other ground penetrative works over the years – most recently the construction of the Border Control Post. This means that the potential for below ground archaeological remains to survive is thought to be generally low (**low to very low**).
- 14.12.2 A recent programme of archaeological works appears to at least partially confirm this lack of archaeological presence. It has been established that suspected salterns, paleochannels and WWII remains within the West Site are not present. However, the same programme of works was successful in identifying both known (a possible bomb crater) and unknown remains (a series of enclosures) via geophysical survey of the Temporary Construction Area, indicating that where the ground intrusive activities have not taken place and so the ground has remained undisturbed over the years, some potential for unknown remains survives. The work also demonstrated geoarchaeological potential in the deep deposits of the West Site – identifying peat and organic alluvial layers.
- 14.12.3 Across much of the Site the potential for archaeological remains to actually be physically present is considered to be very low to low. Taking this into account, and following the recent programme of archaeological evaluation and a subsequent meeting with the relevant authorities and stakeholders, further archaeological field work to offset the impacts of the Project upon archaeological remains is not considered necessary. Where cultural assets may be present the potential impact of the Project on these will be mitigated via a combination of engineering and analytical means (“do no harm” methods of work as outlined within the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**).
- 14.12.4 Within the Temporary Construction Areas, a method of work which will “do no harm” to the buried archaeology present will be employed (as outlined within the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**) – either directly (via excavation) or indirectly (e.g. compaction). Alternate “do no harm” methods of work will also be employed within the Pipeline Corridor, i.e. deep HDD for the main pipelines.
- 14.12.5 Whilst no further archaeological fieldwork is required, further (laboratory) analysis of the peat and organic alluvium collected by the recent geoarchaeological evaluation will mitigate against direct impact of the Project on these underlying deposits (as outlined within the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]**).

- 14.12.6 A historic Post Medieval plantation woodland (Long Strip) exists within the footprint of the Site and will be impacted by the Project - sections of the woodland are proposed to be cut down. As described in **Appendix 8F: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [TR030008/APP/6.4]** and the **Outline CEMP [TR030008/APP/6.5]** a survey of the woodland will be undertaken which will aim to preserve a record of the woodland and so mitigate the impact of the Project upon it.

14.13 References

- Ref 14-1 AECOM (2022a) Immingham Green Energy Terminal, Heritage Desk-Based Assessment.
- Ref 14-2 AECOM (2022b) Immingham Green Energy Terminal: Written Scheme of Investigation for GI Watching Brief, Geoarchaeological boreholes, Geophysical Survey and Archaeological Trial Trenching.
- Ref 14-3 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended).
- Ref 14-4 British Geological Survey Geology of Britain viewer - British Geological Survey (bgs.ac.uk)
- Ref 14-5 Bunn, D. 2013 Archaeological Geophysical Survey. Land at Immingham, North East Lincolnshire. Report prepared for Pre-Construct Archaeological Services Ltd by Pre-Construct Geophysics Ltd.
- Ref 14-6 CIFA 2022 Code of Conduct.
- Ref 14-7 ClfA (2020) Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, June 2020.
- Ref 14-8 Department for Transport, 2012. National Policy Statement for Ports (NPSfP).
- Ref 14-9 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Draft) 2021 National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS – EN1).
- Ref 14-10 East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans 2014, updated 2022.
- Ref 14-11 ECUS Ltd (2013) Kings Road Immingham: Desk Based Assessment.
- Ref 14-12 Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 1, The Historic Environment in Local Plans.
- Ref 14-13 Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2, Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment
- Ref 14-14 Historic England (2016) Preserving Archaeological Remains. Decision-taking for Sites under Development.
- Ref 14-15 Historic England (2017) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3, The Setting of Heritage Assets, 2nd edition.
- Ref 14-16 Historic England (2019) Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets. Historic England Advice Note 12.
- Ref 14-17 Historic England (2021) Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment. Historic England Advice Note 15.
- Ref 14-18 IEMA (2021) Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK.

- Ref 14-19 Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010.
- Ref 14-20 Lincolnshire County Council Archaeology Handbook 2019.
- Ref 14-21 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2021). National Planning Policy Framework.
- Ref 14-22 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2021). Planning Practice Guidance.
- Ref 14-23 North East Lincolnshire District Council (2018) Local Plan 2013 to 2032.
- Ref 14-24 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- Ref 14-25 Pre-Construct Geophysics 2011 Geophysical Survey: Land off Queen's Road, Immingham, North East Lincolnshire. Unpublished Report
- Ref 14-26 The Soil Survey of England and Wales soil association mapping Mapping and understanding soil types across England and Wales (cranfield.ac.uk).
- Ref 14-27 ClfA (2020). Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020.