

# Springwell Solar Farm

## Planning Statement Appendix 5: Heritage Harm Statement

EN010149/APP/7.2.3  
Deadline 4  
September 2025  
Springwell Energyfarm Ltd

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)  
Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning  
(Applications: Prescribed Forms  
and Procedure) Regulations 2009

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Legislative and Planning Policy Framework.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1. The Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 (as amended) .....	3
2.2. Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002) .....	3
2.3. Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1).....	3
2.4. National Planning Policy Framework.....	5
2.5. Planning Practice Guidance .....	6
2.6. Historic England Guidance.....	7
<b>3. Methodology .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1. Introduction .....	8
3.2. Statement of Significance.....	9
Brauncewell Medieval Village (Scheduled Monument; NHLE 1018397) .....	9
Harm Assessment .....	10
<b>4. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5. References .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6. Tables.....</b>	<b>13</b>

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This document has been updated at Deadline 4 to include further designated assets following further engagement with Lincolnshire County Council and Historic England. The document references have not been updated from the original submission. Please refer to the **Guide to the Application [EN010149/APP/1.2]** for the list of current versions of documents.
- 1.1.2. The Springwell Solar Farm (the ‘Proposed Development’) is a new solar energy farm proposal that would deliver electricity to the national electricity transmission network.
- 1.1.3. The Proposed Development is defined as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and will require a Development Consent Order (DCO) from the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, due to its generating capacity exceeding 50MW. Legislation and national planning policy considered relevant to the determination of the DCO application identifies the need to present an assessment of harm to designated heritage assets affected by the Proposed Development and consider this in the decision as to whether to grant a DCO. The purpose of this Heritage Harm Statement is to set out the assessment of harm that the Proposed Development may have upon designated heritage assets. This is then used in the planning balance relating to the heritage national planning policy tests in the **Planning Statement [EN010149/APP/7.2]** accompanying the DCO application. This Heritage Harm Statement therefore includes the following:
- The legislative and planning policy framework context for the assessment; and
  - A summary of the results of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) undertaken which is presented in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [EN010149/APP/6.1]** to establish those assets affected by the Proposed Development with resultant harm to their significance; and for those assets where there is the potential for that harm to be substantial, a statement of significance is provided to explain the potential scale of the harm.
- 1.1.4. The EIA relating to Cultural Heritage is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]**. This Heritage Harm Statement draws upon the information presented in the **ES [EN010149/APP/6.1]**. Where a significant impact/ effect has been identified in the EIA and there is less clarity on the potential extent of the harm this Heritage Harm Statement explores this further

## 2. Legislative and Planning Policy Framework

### 2.1. The Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 (as amended)

2.1.1. The Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 (as amended) apply to the determination of DCO applications under the Planning Act 2008. Regulation 3 requires the Secretary of State to have regard to the following when deciding an application:

- For an application which affects a listed building or its setting, the Secretary of State ‘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’;
- For an application relating to a conservation area, the Secretary of State ‘must have regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area’; and
- For an application for development consent which affects or is likely to affect a scheduled monument or its setting, the Secretary of State ‘must have regard to the desirability of preserving the scheduled monument or its setting’

### 2.2. Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002)

2.2.1. The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002) affords protection to any asset identified on the schedule of nationally important archaeological sites, known as Scheduled Monuments. Pursuant to section 33 of the Planning Act 2008, the notice and consent requirements under this Act do not apply to DCO development proposals.

### 2.3. Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)

2.3.1. The overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1) (**Ref. 1**) sets out the overall national energy policy for delivering major energy infrastructure.

2.3.2. Part 3.2 of the statement sets out how the Secretary of State should approach decision making, namely that substantial weight should be given to the need for these types of infrastructure. Part 5 of the statement sets out guidance on generic impacts for the Applicant’s assessment and decision-making on the application. These impacts concern, amongst other matters, the historic environment. Paragraph 5.9.5 details what non-designated heritage assets “have been demonstrated to be of equivalent significance to designated heritage assets of the highest significance”. The document sets out a phase progression to the heritage assessment,

emphasising the need to understand the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of their setting to that significance (paragraph 5.9.10) before assessing the extent to which that significance is impacted.

- 2.3.3. When assessing impact, NPS EN-1 identifies the potential for the significance of an asset to be harmed or lost through development
- 2.3.4. Paragraph 5.9.28 states that 'loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification'. This harm is described in terms of substantial harm or loss of significance. A distinction is given between substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden which should be exceptional and substantial harm to or loss of designated assets of the highest significance, including Scheduled Monuments; registered battlefields; grade I and II\* listed buildings; grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens; and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional (paragraphs 5.9.29 and 5.9.30).
- 2.3.5. Paragraph 5.9.32 provides guidance on how harm should be weighed within the planning balance and states '[less than substantial harm] should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. These paragraphs recognise that a scale needs to be employed so that the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset the greater the justification will be needed for any loss. The document is clear that consent should be refused for any Proposed Development which will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage 'unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm to or loss of significance is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that loss or harm' (paragraph 5.9.31).
- 2.3.6. NPS EN-1 makes allowance for those assets with archaeological interest not currently designated, but which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments (paragraph 5.8.4). Within this it includes those assets 'which have yet to be formally assessed for designation'. When such an asset is identified as being affected by a development, paragraph 5.8.5 makes it clear that the same policy considerations should be applied as those that apply to designated assets. This is applicable to the Proposed Development and should any non-designated assets of schedulable quality have been identified; these would have been included in **Table 1**. However, no such assets have been identified. The two WWII air plane crash sites identified within the Order Limits have been assessed as of high importance but are not considered to be of schedulable quality due to the fragmentary nature of any potential surviving remains.
- 2.3.7. The NPS for Renewable Energy (NPS EN-3) (**Ref. 2**) sets out specific policies for solar energy developments. Paragraph 2.10.117 notes that "applicants should consider what steps can be taken to ensure heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance,

including the impact of proposals on views important to their setting". The Proposed Development has embedded mitigation measures to reduce the impacts on views important to the setting of heritage assets.

## 2.4. National Planning Policy Framework

- 2.4.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ref. 3) was originally published in 2012 and most recently updated in December 2024. The NPPF provides more detail regarding the assessment of harm to heritage assets and is supported by the Planning Practice Guidance (**Ref.4**). This document has been produced following S55 advice received from the planning inspector post-submission and therefore references the latest version of NPPF which was published post-submission.
- 2.4.2. The NPPF sets out the importance of being able to assess the significance of heritage assets that may be affected by a development. Paragraph 207 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, decision makers should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. Similarly, there is a requirement on decision makers, having assessed the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal; to take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset (paragraph 208). Significance is defined in Annex 2 as being the, "value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic". Significance is not only derived from an asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. The setting of a heritage asset is defined in Annex 2 as, "the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve".
- 2.4.3. Paragraphs 213 to 216 of the NPPF introduce the concept that heritage assets can be harmed or lost through alteration, destruction or development within their setting. This harm ranges from less than substantial through to substantial. In instances where development would cause substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated asset consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that it is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss (paragraph 214). In instances where development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal to provide a balanced judgement (paragraph 215).
- 2.4.4. With regard to non-designated assets, there is a requirement to take a balanced judgement in determining planning applications given the scale

of any harm or loss against the significance of the asset (paragraph 216). Where the asset is demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, it should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets (footnote 75).

## 2.5. Planning Practice Guidance

- 2.5.1. Further clarity on the interpretation of harm is provided within the Planning Practice Guidance (**Ref. 4**). Although relating to the policy outlined within the NPPF, it is transferable to the policy contained within the National Policy Statement for Energy.
- 2.5.2. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) expands on terms such as ‘significance’ and its importance in decision making. Paragraph 018 states “What matters in assessing whether a proposal might cause harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the NPPF makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. Proposed development affecting a heritage asset may have no impact on its significance or may enhance its significance and therefore cause no harm to the heritage asset. Where potential harm to designated heritage assets is identified, it needs to be categorised as either less than substantial harm or substantial harm (which includes total loss) in order to identify which policies in the NPPF (paragraphs 200-202) apply. Within each category of harm (which category applies should be explicitly identified), the extent of the harm may vary and should be clearly articulated”.
- 2.5.3. Paragraph 018 emphasises that substantial harm is a high test and it is important to consider whether an adverse impact “seriously affects a key element” of an asset’s significance. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed.
- 2.5.4. The PPG states that in relation to setting, a thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it (paragraph 013).
- 2.5.5. The NPPF indicates that the degree of harm should be considered alongside any public benefits that can be delivered by development. The PPG states that these benefits should flow from the Proposed Development and should be of a nature and scale to be of benefit to the public and not just a private benefit and would include securing the optimum viable use of an asset in support of its long-term conservation (paragraph 020).

## 2.6. Historic England Guidance

- 2.6.1. Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Note 2 (**Ref. 5**) contains Historic England's guidance on implementing historic environment policy contained within the NPPF and PPG. GPA2 emphasises the importance of having a knowledge and understanding of the significance of heritage assets likely to be affected by the development and that the 'first step for all applicants is to understand the significance of any affected heritage asset and, if relevant the contribution of its setting to its significance (paragraph 4). With regard to harm, the document clarifies that change to heritage assets is inevitable, but that the change is only harmful when significance is damaged and that 'the nature and importance of the significance that is affected will dictate the proportionate response to assessing that change' (paragraph 29). The document reiterates that substantial harm is a high test (paragraph 27).



## 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Introduction

- 3.1.1. All designated assets which have been identified as experiencing an adverse effect in the Environmental Statement have been considered within this document and are identified in **Table 1** of this report. Adverse effects can be experienced as a direct physical impact on historic fabric, or an effect as a result of changes to an asset's setting. Effects can also be experienced during the construction of the Proposed Development as short-term, or long-term impacts, or as a result of the operation of the Proposed Development.
- 3.1.2. For the majority of assets, the effect presented in the Environmental Statement has been assessed as being not significant. No impacts of major or moderate magnitude have been identified to any designated heritage assets and as such, it is concluded that the harm caused to these assets falls within the less than substantial category. The reader is directed to **Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage** of the **ES [EN010149/APP/6.1]** and **Appendix 9.1: Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]** for a full consideration of the impacts to these assets and Annex A of this Statement for the categorisation of harm.
- 3.1.3. While there is no direct correlation between the significance of effect in EIA terms and the degree of harm referenced in national planning policy, it is acknowledged that those assets which are identified as experiencing a significant adverse effect are more likely to experience substantial harm. This note, therefore, provides further assessment of those heritage assets where significant effects have been identified in order to understand where on the harm spectrum this impact falls. The emphasis is placed on the level of impact for the purposes of this Heritage Harm Statement. This is consistent with the NPS and the NPPF. 'Effect' is a purely EIA term which balances the impact of a development on the heritage significance of an asset. Harm is associated with the impact on the asset and is not influenced by an asset's heritage value. It is recognised that for designated heritage assets any harm requires justification and therefore **Table 2** of this report details those designated assets for which non-significant effects were identified in the EIA but where some level of adverse impact, and therefore harm has been identified. This harm is also assessed to fall within the less than substantial category. No physical harm will occur to any of these designated assets, only harm resulting from changes in their setting which will be reversed following decommissioning. In addition, this note only discusses harm in relation to designated assets.

- 3.1.4. Although non-designated assets could be identified as being of sufficient significance to meet the criteria for designation, i.e. are of 'schedulable quality', no such assets have been identified within the Proposed Development (see **ES Volume 3, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Stage 1 Setting Assessment [EN010149/APP/6.3]**). Harm can be caused to non-designated heritage assets; however, there is no policy requirement to distinguish between substantial and less than substantial harm (unless demonstrably of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument). Therefore, impacts to non-designated assets are not explored within this statement. These impacts are outlined in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010149/APP/6.1]**.
- 3.1.5. This note considers the significance of the assets to enable an understanding of how the impact is experienced. In particular, it establishes the degree to which the setting of an asset makes a contribution to significance, in recognition of the fact that no designated asset will be physically impacted by the Proposed Development. There follows a discussion of the impact of the Proposed Development on the identified significance, or on the ability to perceive that significance, and the resultant level of harm. This takes into consideration embedded mitigation within the Proposed Development.
- 3.1.6. The conclusion outlines the level of harm and the significance of the designated heritage assets affected by the Proposed Development, in accordance with national planning policy and guidance.

## 3.2. Statement of Significance

- 3.2.1. As reported within Chapter 9 of the **Environmental Statement [EN010149/APP/6.1]**, one designated asset has been identified as experiencing significant adverse effects on its heritage value.

### Brauncewell Medieval Village (Scheduled Monument; NHLE 1018397)

- 3.2.2. Brauncewell Medieval Village (Scheduled Monument; NHLE 1018397) is located partly within the Order Limits on the south side of Springwell West. The monument derives significance from its archaeological interest as the earthwork remains of a medieval village. The physical and historic association with the surviving church within the monument (separately designated as a Grade II Listed Building, NHLE 1254135) and with the non-designated farm buildings outside the scheduled monument contribute to this archaeological and historic interest. The immediate rural surroundings, including fields containing earthwork ridge and furrow to the north of the monument also contribute to the significance of the asset by providing appropriate context to the former rural settlement.

## Harm Assessment

- 3.2.3. Brauncewell Medieval Village (Scheduled Monument; NHLE 1018397) will experience both adverse and beneficial effects as a result of the Proposed Development. The adverse impact arises from changes within the setting of the monument through siting of solar arrays in the wider agricultural surroundings that contribute to its significance. This impact has been minimised through embedded mitigation comprising converting the field closest to the monument to grassland habitat to preserve the remains of ridge and furrow associated with the medieval village and the proposed vegetation planting to screen the panels from views from the monument (identified by the **Works Plans [EN010149/APP/2.3]**). The earthworks of the medieval village will continue to be experienced in an immediate agricultural setting, and the relationship with the surviving church and farm buildings will be retained.
- 3.2.4. Despite the carefully designed mitigation, there remains an impact on the medieval village due to the introduction of modern infrastructure within a formerly agricultural landscape. The landscape will continue to be read as open fields; however, the modern infrastructure is in conflict with the historic setting of the asset. In addition, while the development will be screened from the monument, the fields remain part of the setting of the asset as a whole. The character of the setting as individual fields will be maintained through the retention of existing boundaries, with development remaining low level. The development is also reversible, and, upon decommissioning the landscape can revert back to its current form.
- 3.2.5. As noted above, beneficial impacts will also occur to Brauncewell medieval village as a result of the Proposed Development. The beneficial effects arise from the creation of a permissive path to allow more people to appreciate the asset. Installation of interpretation boards on or close to this permissive path would provide further benefits.
- 3.2.6. Paragraph 018 of the PPG recognises that substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, which includes total loss, is a high test which may not arise in many circumstances. While there will be some loss of significance to Brauncewell medieval village during the lifetime of the Proposed Development, the loss will be negligible ("very minor changes to setting that hardly affect [the asset]" - as defined in Table 9.6 of the ES) and the harm will be at the lower end of less than substantial.

## 4. Conclusion

- 4.1.1. Both the NPS EN-1 and NPPF require an assessment of harm to heritage significance. The NPPF further categorises that harm into 'substantial' and 'less than substantial'. The PPG which supports the NPPF heritage policies expects potential harm to designated heritage assets to be categorised as either less than substantial harm or substantial harm (which includes total loss) and that within each category of harm identified, the extent of the harm should be clearly articulated.
- 4.1.2. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN01010149/APP/6.1]** has identified a number of effects to designated and non-designated assets as a result of the proposals. The majority of these are not significant and in the case of the designated heritage assets affected (outlined in **Table 1**) the effects can be reasonably equated with less than substantial harm, at the lower end of the spectrum.
- 4.1.3. The ES identifies significant effects to a single scheduled monument. Significant effects have a greater potential to represent substantial harm and have, therefore been assessed in this Statement in detail, non-significant effects to designated heritage assets may represent substantial or less than substantial harm. In this case the magnitude of impact is negligible, reflecting a low level of harm to significance and the significance of effect is a product of the high importance of this heritage asset.
- 4.1.4. The Scheduled Brauncewell Medieval Village (NHLE 1018397) represents a good example of earthwork remains of a medieval village, associated with a surviving medieval church and later farm complex. The setting of the earthwork remains will experience a change through alterations within the surrounding agricultural landscape. Specifically, land approximately 400m northwest of the monument and approximately 600m to the north of the monument will be utilised for solar arrays and some visibility of the arrays is predicted from the monument though this will be filtered by proposed planting. The Order Limits extend into the Scheduled Monument to accommodate a proposed permissive path. These changes will slightly alter the appreciation of the wider rural surroundings and their contribution to the significance of the monument, however their historic relationship will remain. The changes do not constitute substantial harm to the significance of the asset as a whole and therefore less than substantial harm to the significance of the asset as result of the Proposed Development is concluded.

## 5. References

**Ref. 1** BEIS (2024) National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)

**Ref. 2** BEIS (2024) National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3)

**Ref. 3** Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) (2024) National Planning Policy Framework.

**Ref. 4** Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2019) Planning Practice Guidance.

**Ref. 5** Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2. Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment

## 6. Tables

Table 6.1: Effects as reported in Environmental Statement and Harm Category Assessment Summary

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
Designated Asset – Scheduled Monument	Brauncewell Medieval Village	<p>The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a former rural settlement.</p> <p>A permissive path adjacent to the monument will increase the ability to appreciate the earthwork remains.</p>	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through removing panels from the field closest to the monument, and through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b><i>Negligible Not Significant</i></b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>

Table 6.2: Effects reported in Annex 12 and Annex 14 of Appendix 9.1 and Harm Category Assessment Summary

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
<b>Designated Asset – Scheduled Monument and Grade I Listed Building</b>	Remains of Preceptory Church / Church Tower North of Temple Farmhouse	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the remains of the church as part of the Templar estate. The effects will be negligible due to the distance to the nearest solar arrays.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order Limits.	<b><i>Negligible Not Significant</i></b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Temple Farmhouse	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a farmhouse. The effects will be negligible due to the distance to the nearest solar arrays.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order Limits.	<b><i>Negligible Not Significant</i></b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Conservation Area</b>	Scopwick Conservation Area	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design	<b><i>Minor Not Significant</i></b>	<b>Less than substantial –</b>

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
<b>Area</b>		elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a rural settlement.	through removing panels from the fields closest to the conservation area and the fields adjacent to the B1188 between Blankney and Scopwick and through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.		<b>lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Conservation Area</b>	Blankney Conservation Area	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a rural settlement. The effects will be minor as only part of the Conservation Area (around the church) is predicted to have visibility of the Proposed Development.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through removing panels from the field closest to the conservation area and the fields adjacent to the B1188 between Blankney and Scopwick and through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Conservation Area</b>	Bloxholm Conservation Area	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>



Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
		the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a rural settlement. The effects will be minor as only a small part of the Conservation Area is predicted to have visibility of the Proposed Development at a range of 1.3km.	periphery of the Order limits.		
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Home Farmhouse	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a farmhouse. The effects will be minor due to the 1 km distance to the nearest solar arrays.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II* Listed Building</b>	Church of St Oswald	Construction vehicle movement past the church will result in short term changes to the setting.	None necessary	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Kennel House	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a farmhouse.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Wright's Farmhouse	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a farmhouse.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Farmyard To The North Of Number 10 (The Manor House)	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as part of a farmstead.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	37 And 39, Main Street	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a pair of rural dwellings.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	97-103 Main Street	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a group of rural dwellings.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	High House	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a rural dwelling.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Stable Block At Blankney Hall	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as part of a rural estate complex. The association with other estate buildings including Blankney Hall will not be altered.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Cottage To West Of Kirkby Green Mill	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a rural dwelling. The association with Kirkby Green Mill will not be altered.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset –</b>	Thompson's Bottom Farmhouse	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
<b>Grade II Listed Building</b>		ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a farmhouse. Relationship with associated farm buildings will not be altered.	through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.		
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Stables And Coach House At Thompson's Bottom Farmhouse	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as part of a farmstead.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Rowston Manor	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a rural dwelling.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II</b>	Farmyard To	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial –</b>

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
<b>Listed Building</b>	North Of The Firs	asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as part of a farmstead.	planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.		<b>lower end</b>
Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building	Kirkby Green Millhouse	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a rural dwelling. The association with Kirkby Green Mill will not be altered.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building	Scopwick Mill	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a former mill.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through removing panels from the fields closest to the mill and minimizing visibility of panels in views of the mill and through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building	The Manor House	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a farmhouse. Relationship with associated farm buildings will not be altered.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order limits.	<b>Minor Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset Grade II Listed Building</b>	Walled Garden North of Ashby Hall	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset but this will have a negligible effect on the ability to appreciate and understand the walled garden as part of the designed landscape around Ashby Hall.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through removing solar panels and other infrastructure from the fields closest to the walled garden and through enhancement planting within and on the periphery of the Order Limits	<b>Negligible – Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>
<b>Designated Asset – Grade II Listed Building</b>	Ashby Hall	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through removing solar panels and other infrastructure from the fields closest to Ashby Hall and through	<b>Negligible – Not Significant</b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>

Designation	Description	Description of impact	Additional Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation	Harm category assessment
		appreciate the asset as a country house. The effect will be negligible due to the distance of over 1.1km to the arrays.	enhancement planting within and on the periphery of the Order Limits		
<b>Designated Asset-Scheduled Monument</b>	Dunsby medieval village	The Proposed Development will introduce infrastructure elements in the setting of this asset that are likely to affect the ability to understand and appreciate the asset as a former rural settlement. The effect will be negligible due to the distance of over 1km to the solar arrays.	Any mitigation has been integrated into the design through enhancement planting within, and on the periphery of the Order Limits.	<b><i>Negligible – Not Significant</i></b>	<b>Less than substantial – lower end</b>



