



Frodsham Solar

Environmental Statement: Volume 2

Appendix 11-6: Policy Tables

May 2025



PINS Ref: EN010153

Document Ref: EN010153/DR/6.2

**Planning Act 2008; and Infrastructure Planning (Applications:
Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations Regulation 5(2)(a)**

Revision P01

Document Control

Revision	Date	Prepared By	Reviewed / Approved By
P01	May 2025	G Millward	L Roy

© AXIS P.E.D. Ltd 2025. All rights reserved.

This document and its accompanying documents contain information which is confidential and is intended only for the use of the client. If you are not one of the intended recipients any disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken in reliance on the contents of the information is strictly prohibited.

Unless expressly agreed, any reproduction of material from this document must be requested and authorised in writing from AXIS P.E.D. Ltd. Authorised reproduction of material must include all copyright and proprietary notices in the same form and manner as the original and must not be modified in any way. Acknowledgement of the source of the material must also be included in all references.

Prepared For:
Frodsham Solar Ltd

Prepared By:



Well House Barns, Chester Road, Bretton, Chester, CH4 0DH
1st Floor, Barfield House, Alderley Road, Wilmslow, SK9 1PL
Maling Exchange, Studio 307, Hoults Yard, Walker Road, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE6 2HL

T: 0344 8700 007
enquiries@axis.co.uk
www.axis.co.uk

TABLES

Table 1- Summary of National Policy Statements for energy infrastructure 1
Table 2 - Summary of National Planning Policy Framework..... 24
Table 3 – Summary of Local Planning Policy..... 34



Table 1- Summary of National Policy Statements for energy infrastructure

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
NPS EN-1	Paragraph 5.9.7	Notes that impacts upon non-designated assets should also be considered by the Secretary of State in determining applications and this is done on the basis of <i>'clear evidence that such heritage assets have a significance that merits consideration... even though those assets are of lesser significance than designated heritage assets.'</i>	<p>The potential for impacts upon non-designated heritage assets has been assessed.</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.5.11 to 11.5.13 and Table 11-4 of Chapter 11 of the ES present the methodology and approach to determining significance of heritage assets (including non-designated assets).</p> <p>The identified and potential non-designated heritage assets which may be subject to direct and indirect impacts are presented in Section 6 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Table 11-9 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not predicted to directly or indirectly impact upon most of the identified heritage assets within its extent, as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.4 to 11.8.8 and Table 11-10 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>A balanced approach to recommended mitigation strategies for the identified direct and indirect impacts (none of which are significant in EIA terms) upon non-designated assets is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			No non-designated heritage assets which may be subject to settings impacts were identified during this assessment.
	Paragraph 5.9.8	Impacts on heritage assets specific to types of infrastructure are included in the technology specific NPSs.	Summary of the policies within NPS EN-3 (relating to renewable energy infrastructure) are included in this table, below.
	Paragraph 5.9.9	<p>States that the Applicant <i>'should undertake an assessment of any likely significant heritage impacts of the proposed development as part of the EIA, and describe these along with how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied in the ES.</i></p> <p><i>'This should include consideration of heritage assets above, at, and below the surface of the ground. Consideration will also need to be given to the possible impacts, including cumulative, on the wider historic environment.</i></p> <p><i>'The assessment should include reference to any historic landscape or seascape character assessment and associated studies as a means of assessing impacts relevant to the proposed project'.</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the likely effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The incorporated mitigation in relation to direct or indirect impacts is largely related to the design avoiding known heritage assets and the utilisation of a pile depth that is not anticipated to reach the recorded depth of any previously recorded buried peat deposits, as is presented in Paragraphs 11.7.1 to 11.7.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not predicted to directly or indirectly impact upon most of the identified heritage assets within its extent, as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.4 to 11.8.8 and Table 11-10 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The recommended mitigation strategies for the identified direct and indirect impacts (none of which are significant in EIA terms) upon heritage</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>assets is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The assessment of potential setting effects has considered all Locally Listed Buildings within 1km, all designated assets within 3km and all designated assets of highest importance out to 5km. The buffers created for the 3km and 5km Study Areas exclude the Main Site Access route, SPEN Grid Connection, Private Wire Connection to local businesses and the Skylark Mitigation Area. These Study Areas are detailed in Section 1.1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraphs 11.6.19 to 11.6.21 and Table 11-8 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>No significant cumulative effects have been identified as detailed within Section 11.11 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			Historic Landscape Character information has been consulted and incorporated within the assessment of the archaeological baseline, as presented in Section 5 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] .
	5.9.10	<i>'As part of the ES the applicant should provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected by the proposed development, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage assets and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum, the applicant should have consulted the relevant Historic Environment Record... and assessed the heritage assets themselves using expertise where necessary according to the proposed development's impact.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has described the significance of heritage assets that will be impacted by the proposed development.</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.5.11 to 11.5.13 and Table 11-4 of Chapter 11 of the ES present the methodology and approach to determining significance of heritage assets (including non-designated assets) and paragraph 11.5.4 sets out the data sources that were consulted including the Cheshire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>Descriptions of all heritage assets identified within the Study Areas is included within the Appendix 11-2 [EN010153/DR/6.2] with further discussion of the identified heritage baseline (formed by these assets) outlined in Section 5 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2]</p> <p>The identified and potential non-designated heritage assets (with an assessment of their importance defined by the methodology utilised above) which may be subject to direct and indirect</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>impacts are presented in Section 6 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Table 11-9 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.5.14 to 11.5.18 and Table 11-5 of Chapter 11 of the ES present the methodology and approach to for establishing the relative sensitivity of a Heritage Asset to changes to its setting.</p> <p>The assessment of potential setting effects includes descriptions of the significance of the settings of the Heritage Assets as is presented in Table 1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraphs 11.8.21 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>
	Paragraph 5.9.11	<i>'Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or the available evidence suggests it has the potential to include, heritage assets with an archaeological interest, the applicant should carry out appropriate desk-based assessment and, where such desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field evaluation. Where proposed development will affect the setting of a heritage asset, accurate representative visualisations may be necessary to explain the impact'.</i>	<p>The Applicant has produced a desk-based assessment (inclusive of the results of a walkover survey) outlining the archaeological baseline which forms Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and a detailed assessment of settings effects which forms Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2].</p> <p>No significant effects (in EIA terms) have been identified, and the above have been used to inform the recommended mitigation strategy (which include geoarchaeological investigation) as</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.
	Paragraph 5.9.12	<i>'The applicant should ensure that the extent of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of any heritage assets affected can be adequately understood from the application and supporting documents. Studies will be required on those heritage assets affected by noise, vibration, light and indirect impacts, the extent and detail of these studies will be proportionate to the significance of the heritage assets affected.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the extent of the impact of the development within ES Chapter 11 with cross-reference to supporting appendices:</p> <p>Appendix 11-1: Cultural Heritage Assessment [EN010153/DR/6.2] Appendix 11-2: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets and Events [EN010153/DR/6.2] Appendix 11-3: Historic Map Extracts and Lidar Data [EN010153/DR/6.2] Appendix 11-4: Photographic Plates [EN010153/DR/6.2] Appendix 11-5: Setting Assessment [EN010153/DR/6.2] Appendix 11-6: Legislation, Policy and Guidance Tables [EN010153/DR/6.2]</p> <p>As no significant effects have been predicted no representative visualisations, beyond those already produced for ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [EN010153/DR/6.1], have been produced for this assessment.</p> <p>The settings assessment has been in part informed by review of the ZTVs produced as part</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>of ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [EN010153/DR/6.1].</p> <p>The assessment of direct and indirect impacts has been, in part, informed by ES Vol 1 Chapter 10: Ground Conditions [EN010153/DR/6.1], which included details of the anticipated peat depths across the Site.</p> <p>It was not considered likely that noise, vibration, or light would affect any assets identified within the Study Areas with the levels of direct, indirect and visual impacts on setting representing the worst case in terms of levels of potential impact.</p>
	Paragraph 5.9.13	<i>'The applicant is encouraged, where opportunities exist, to prepare proposals which can make a positive contribution to the historic environment, and to consider how their scheme takes account of the significance of heritage assets affected...'</i>	<p>The Applicant has considered how the Proposed Development accounts for the significance of the heritage assets affected. This is shown by how the incorporated mitigation includes measures to avoid known heritage assets and the utilisation of a pile depth that is not anticipated to reach the recorded depth of any previously recorded buried peat deposits, as is presented in Paragraphs 11.7.1 to 11.7.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The completion of the recommended mitigation works (which include geoarchaeological investigation) as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES would</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			provide for an opportunity to enhance our understanding of any buried remains encountered and refine the modelling of the anticipated peat deposits, and their depths, across the area.
	Paragraph 5.9.14	<i>'Careful consideration in preparing the scheme will be required on whether the impacts on the historic environment will be direct or indirect, temporary, or permanent.'</i>	<p>The Applicant had considered whether impacts upon the historic environment will be direct, indirect, temporary or permanent.</p> <p>Direct (which would also be permanent) and indirect impacts are presented in Section 6 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Table 11-9 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The potential for temporary impacts on the historic environment (related to Construction Phase effects upon setting) is presented in Section 3.1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>
	Paragraph 5.9.15	<i>'Applicants should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset'</i>	<p>The Applicant has considered whether there are opportunities for enhancing or better revealing the significance of heritage assets, however, no opportunities have been identified.</p> <p>The Site is not located within the extent of any Conservation Areas or World Heritage Sites.</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
		<i>(or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.'</i>	No significant effects (in EIA Terms) upon the settings of any designated assets have been identified as is presented in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.
	Paragraph 5.9.16	With regard to mitigation, the NPS states: "A <i>documentary record of our past is not as valuable as retaining the heritage asset, and therefore the ability to record evidence of the asset should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted, and whether or not consent should be given</i> '.	The Applicant has avoided, where possible, direct and indirect impacts upon identified heritage assets allowing for them to continue to be preserved in situ, as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.7.1 to 11.7.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.
	Paragraph 5.9.17	<i>'Where the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset's significance is justified the Secretary of State will require the applicant to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost (wholly or in part). The extent of the requirement should be proportionate to the asset's importance and the significance and the impact. The applicant should be required to publish this evidence and to deposit copies of the reports with the relevant Historic Environmental Record. They should also be required to deposit the archive generated in a local museum or other public repository willing to receive it.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has avoided, where possible, direct and indirect impacts upon identified heritage assets.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not predicted to directly or indirectly impact upon most of the identified heritage assets within its extent, as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.4 to 11.8.8 and Table 11-10 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The recommended mitigation strategies for the identified direct and indirect impacts (none of which are significant in EIA terms) upon heritage</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			assets is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES. It is anticipated that any WSI produced and agreed with HE and CAPAS in relation to the proposed mitigation works would include a requirement for the deposition of the results with the Historic Environment Record and a suitable archiving strategy. These proposed mitigation strategies are considered proportionate to the importance of the assets that are predicted to be impacted within the assessment.
	Paragraph 5.9.18	<i>'Where appropriate, the Secretary of State will impose requirements on the Development Consent Order to ensure that the work is undertaken in a timely manner, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation that complies with the policy in this NPS and which has been agreed in writing with the relevant local authority, and to ensure that the completion of the exercise is properly secured.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has recommended a mitigation strategy related to the potential for direct and indirect impacts on archaeological remains as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The Draft Development Consent Order [Document Ref] includes a Requirement stating that no phase of the authorised development may commence until an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (including any required written scheme of archaeological investigation (WSI)) has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with Cheshire Archaeology Planning Advisory Service (CAPAS). It is anticipated that any WSI produced and</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			agreed with HE and CAPAS in relation to the proposed mitigation could include a requirement for the completion of the works in a timely manner.
	Paragraph 5.9.19	<p><i>'Where the loss of significance of any heritage asset has been justified by the applicant on the merits of the new development and the significance of the asset in question, the Secretary of State should consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• imposing a requirement in the Development Consent Order</i> <i>• requiring the applicant to enter into an obligation.'</i> 	<p>The Applicant has assessed that the Proposed Development would result in no significant effects (in EIA terms), either direct, indirect or in respect of effects upon settings.</p> <p>The Applicant has recommended a mitigation strategy related to the potential for direct and indirect impacts on potential archaeological remains as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES. As stated above, the obligation for the Applicant to submit an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy for approval by the relevant planning authority is secured by a Requirement in the Draft Development Consent Order.</p>
	Paragraph 5.9.22	<p><i>In determining applications, the Secretary of State should seek to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by the proposed development, including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset (including assets whose setting may be affected by the proposed development), taking account of:</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has described the significance of heritage assets that will be impacted by the proposed development.</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.5.11 to 11.5.13 and Table 11-4 of Chapter 11 of the ES present the methodology and approach to determining significance of</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>relevant information provided with the application and, where applicable,</i> <i>relevant information submitted during the examination of the application</i> <i>Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy</i> <i>any designation records, including those on the National Heritage List for England...</i> <i>historic landscape character records</i> <i>the relevant Historic Environment Record(s), and similar sources of information</i> <i>representations made by interested parties during the examination process</i> <i>expert advice, where appropriate, and when the need to understand the significance of the heritage asset demands it</i> 	<p>heritage assets (including non-designated assets) and paragraph 11.5.4 sets out the data sources that were consulted including the Cheshire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.5.14 to 11.5.18 and Table 11-5 of Chapter 11 of the ES present the methodology and approach to for establishing the relative sensitivity of a Heritage Asset to changes to its setting.</p> <p>The assessment of potential setting effects includes descriptions of the significance of the settings of the Heritage Assets as is presented in Table 1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraphs 11.8.21 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>
	Paragraph 5.9.24	<i>In considering the impact of a proposed development on any heritage assets, the Secretary of State should consider the particular nature of the significance of the heritage assets and the value that they hold for this and future generations. This understanding should be used to avoid or minimise conflict between their conservation and any aspect of the proposal.</i>	<p>The Applicant has described the significance of heritage assets that will be impacted by the proposed development.</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.5.11 to 11.5.13 and Table 11-4 of Chapter 11 of the ES present the methodology and approach to determining significance of heritage assets (including non-designated assets) and paragraph 11.5.4 sets out the data sources</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>that were consulted including the Cheshire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed that the Proposed Development would result in no significant effects (in EIA terms), either direct, indirect or in respect of effects upon settings.</p> <p>The Applicant has recommended a mitigation strategy related to the potential for direct and indirect impacts on potential archaeological remains as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>
	Paragraph 5.9.27	<p><i>When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should give great weight to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss, or less than substantial harm to its significance.</i></p>	<p>The assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>Minor adverse effects that equate to '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are predicted upon the settings of:</p> <p>The Promontory Fort On Helsby Hill 250 m North West Of Harmers Lake Farm Scheduled Monument (Asset 1);</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>The Grade II Listed War Memorial (Asset 93);</p> <p>Frodsham Conservation Area (Asset 154);</p> <p>Castle Park (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 155) and the Castle Park Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153); and the</p> <p>Overton, St Lawrence's (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 156).</p>
	Paragraph 5.9.32	<i>Where the proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.</i>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Proposed Development upon designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Minor adverse effects (as detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.21 to 11.8.55) that equate to '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are predicted upon the settings of the Helsby Hill Scheduled Monument (Asset 1), a Grade II Listed War Memorial (Asset 93); Frodsham Conservation Area (Asset 154); Castle Park (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 155) and the Castle Park Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153); and Overton, St Lawrence's (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 156).</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>The predicted levels of '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are at the lower end of the scale and it is considered that there is no potential to mitigate these effects (which are not significant in EIA terms).</p> <p>Paragraph 11.8.61 of Chapter 11 of the ES notes that upon the completion of the decommissioning the long-term effects of the Operational Phase on the setting of assets would be removed, with the setting of those assets restored to the current baseline condition with the exception of the elements of new green infrastructure (including the NBBMA) which would be left in place at the point of decommissioning. The public benefits of the proposal, including the demonstrable need for the Proposed Development, are set out in Section 2.0 and 5.0 of the Planning Statement [EN010153/DR/5.6].</p>
NPS EN-3	Paragraph 2.10.107	<i>'The impacts of solar PV developments on the historic environment will require expert assessment in most cases and may have effect both above and below ground.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has conducted expert assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development which is presented in Chapter 11 of the ES and supported by:</p> <p>Appendix 11-1: Cultural Heritage Assessment [EN010153/DR/6.2];</p> <p>Appendix 11-2: Gazetteer of Heritage Assets and Events [EN010153/DR/6.2];</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>Appendix 11-3: Historic Map Extracts and Lidar Data [EN010153/DR/6.2];</p> <p>Appendix 11-4: Photographic Plates [EN010153/DR/6.2];</p> <p>Appendix 11-5: Setting Assessment [EN010153/DR/6.2];</p> <p>Appendix 11-6: Legislation, Policy and Guidance Tables [EN010153/DR/6.2].</p>
	Paragraph 2.10.108	<i>‘Above ground impacts may include the effects on the setting of Listed Buildings and other designated heritage assets as well as on Historic Landscape Character.’</i>	<p>The Applicant carried out an assessment of the effects on the setting of Listed Buildings and other designated heritage assets.</p> <p>The assessment of potential setting effects has considered all Locally Listed Buildings within 1km, all designated assets within 3km and all designated assets of highest importance out to 5km, as detailed in Section 1.1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraphs 11.6.19 to 11.6.21 and Table 11-8 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>The development of the historic landscape and its character were considered as part of the baseline assessment which is detailed within Section 5 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2]</p> <p>Where appropriate changes to landscape character are assessed with reference to the setting of heritage assets and specifically where a change in the landscape could be considered to affect the way in which heritage assets are understood, appreciate and experienced as is detailed within the assessment of settings effects which forms Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2].</p> <p>The Applicant has also provided assessment of impacts and likely significant effects upon the landscape within ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [EN010153/DR/6.1].</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
	Paragraph 2.10.109	<i>'Below ground impacts, although generally limited, may include direct impacts on archaeological deposits through ground disturbance associated with trenching, cabling, foundations, fencing, temporary haul routes etc.'</i>	<p>The Applicant carried out an assessment of the potential for direct and indirect effects upon buried archaeological remains.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not predicted to directly or indirectly impact upon most of the identified heritage assets within its extent, as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.4 to 11.8.8 and Table 11-10 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>
	Paragraph 2.10.112	The NPS states that assessments <i>'should be informed by information from Historic Environment Records (HERs) or the local authority.'</i>	The Applicant has produced assessment that has utilised information from the Cheshire Historic Environment Record (HER) as is detailed in the list of data sources utilised in Section 4.2 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraph 11.3.1 of Chapter 11 of the ES.
	Paragraph 2.10.113	States that <i>'where a site on development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest the applicant should submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. These should be carried out using expertise where necessary and 'in consultation with the local planning authority, and should identify archaeological study areas and propose appropriate</i>	The Applicant has produced desk-based assessment (inclusive of the results of a walkover survey) outlining the archaeological baseline which forms Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and a detailed assessment of settings effects which forms Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] .

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
		<i>schemes of investigation, and design measures, to ensure the protection of relevant heritage assets.'</i>	<p>The scope of the assessment was agreed and refined via Scoping consultation, PEIR consultation and other direct engagement with various stakeholders including HE, CAPAS and the Conservation Team at CWACC, with details of this presented in Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>No significant effects (in EIA terms) have been identified, and the above have been used to inform the recommended mitigation strategy (which include geoarchaeological investigation) as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES."</p>
	Paragraph 2.10.114	<i>'In some instances, field studies may include investigative work (and may include trial trenching beyond the boundary of the proposed site) to assess the impacts of any ground disturbance, such as proposed cabling, substation foundations or mounting supports for solar panels on archaeological assets.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has produced desk-based assessment (inclusive of the results of a walkover survey) outlining the archaeological baseline which forms Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and a detailed assessment of settings effects which forms Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2].</p> <p>No significant effects (in EIA terms) have been identified, and the above have been used to inform the recommended mitigation strategy (which include geoarchaeological investigation) as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>The Draft Development Consent Order [Document Ref] includes a Requirement stating that no phase of the authorised development may commence until an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (including any required written scheme of archaeological investigation (WSI)) has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with Cheshire Archaeology Planning Advisory Service (CAPAS). It is anticipated that any WSI produced and agreed with HE and CAPAS in relation to the proposed mitigation could include a requirement for the completion of the works in a timely manner.</p>
	Paragraph 2.10.116	<i>'Applicants should take account of the results of historic environment assessments in their design proposal.'</i>	<p>The Applicant, from the outset of the project, has utilised results of historic environment assessments i.e. the desk -based information on heritage assets, to inform the design and avoid the potential for significant effects on these assets where possible, as set out in ES Vol 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010153/DR/6.1], and the Design Approach Document [EN010153/DR/5.8].</p> <p>The Applicant has avoided, where possible, direct and indirect impacts upon identified heritage</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			assets allowing for them to continue to be preserved in situ, as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.7.1 to 11.7.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.
	Paragraph 2.10.117	<i>'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.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has avoided, where possible, direct and indirect impacts upon identified heritage assets allowing for them to continue to be preserved in situ (which is a manner of conservation appropriate to their significance as heritage assets), as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.7.1 to 11.7.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>Where direct and indirect impacts cannot be avoided a mitigation strategy (including geoarchaeological investigation), as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES, which would allow for them to be preserved by record (which is a manner of conservation appropriate to their significance as heritage assets).</p> <p>The Applicant's assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES. No further steps are required to conserve</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			these heritage assets in relation to the Proposed Development
	Paragraph 2.10.118	<i>'As the significance of a heritage asset derives not only from its physical presence but also from its setting, careful consideration should be given to the impact of large-scale solar farms which depending on their scale, design, and prominence, may cause substantial harm to the significance of the asset.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the likely effects of the Proposed Development, including those derived from impacts upon the setting of designated assets.</p> <p>The assessment of potential effects on setting has considered all Locally Listed Buildings within 1km radius of the Site, all designated assets within 3km and all designated assets of highest importance out to 5km, as detailed in Section 1.1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraphs 11.6.19 to 11.6.21 and Table 11-8 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant's assessment identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>
	Paragraph 2.10.119	<i>'Applicants may need to include visualisations to demonstrate the effects of a proposed solar farm on the setting of heritage assets.'</i>	The Applicant's assessment of potential effects on setting of designated heritage assets has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>As no significant effects have been predicted no representative visualisations, beyond those already produced for ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [EN010153/DR/6.1], have been produced for this assessment.</p> <p>This is supported by and includes cross references to ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1].</p>
NPS EN-5	n/a	There are no specific requirements in this NPS in relation to the assessment of cultural heritage and archaeology.	n/a

Table 2 - Summary of National Planning Policy Framework

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
NPPF	Paras 207-208 and 210	<p><i>'Paragraph 207</i></p> <p><i>In determining applications, local planning authorities 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. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the likely effects of the proposed development upon heritage assets. Paragraphs 11.5.11 to 11.5.13 and Table 11-4 of Chapter 11 of the ES present the methodology and approach to determining significance of heritage assets (including non-designated assets) and paragraph 11.5.4 sets out the data sources that were consulted including the Cheshire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>The incorporated mitigation in relation to direct or indirect impacts is largely related to the design avoiding known heritage assets and the utilisation of a pile depth that is not anticipated to reach the recorded depth of any previously recorded buried peat deposits, as is</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
		<p><i>require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation’.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 208</i></p> <p><i>Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 210.</i></p> <p><i>In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:</i></p> <p><i>(a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;</i></p> <p><i>(b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and</i></p> <p><i>(c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</i></p>	<p>presented in Paragraphs 11.7.1 to 11.7.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not predicted to directly or indirectly impact upon most of the identified heritage assets within its extent, as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.4 to 11.8.8 and Table 11-10 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The recommended mitigation strategies for the identified direct and indirect impacts (none of which are significant in EIA terms) upon heritage assets is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The assessment of potential setting effects has considered all Locally Listed Buildings within 1km, all designated assets within 3km and all designated assets of highest importance out to 5km, as detailed in Section 1.1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraphs 11.6.19 to 11.6.21 and Table 11-8 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES



Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
	Para 212	<i>'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Proposed Development upon designated heritage assets.</p> <p>No direct or indirect impacts on the significance of any designated asset are predicted, so all assessment of effects in relation to harm to designated assets is related to impacts of the Proposed Development upon their settings.</p> <p>The assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>Minor adverse effects that equate to '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are predicted upon the settings of:</p> <p>The Promontory Fort On Helsby Hill 250 m North West Of Harmers Lake Farm Scheduled Monument (Asset 1);</p> <p>The Grade II Listed War Memorial (Asset 93);</p> <p>Frodsham Conservation Area (Asset 154);</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			Castle Park (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 155) and the Castle Park Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153); and Overton, St Lawrence's (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 156).

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
	Para 213	<i>Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification...</i>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Proposed Development upon designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Minor adverse effects (as detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.21 to 11.8.55) that equate to '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are predicted upon the settings of the Helsby Hill Scheduled Monument (Asset 1), a Grade II Listed War Memorial (Asset 93); Frodsham Conservation Area (Asset 154); Castle Park (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 155) and the Castle Park Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153); and Overton, St Lawrence's (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 156).</p> <p>The predicted levels of '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are at the lower end of the scale and it is considered that there is no potential to mitigate these effects (which are not significant in EIA terms).</p> <p>Paragraph 11.8.61 of Chapter 11 of the ES notes that upon the completion of the decommissioning the long-term effects of the Operational Phase on the setting of assets would be removed, with the setting of those assets restored to the current baseline condition with the exception of the elements of new green infrastructure (including the NBBMA) which would be left in place at the point of decommissioning.</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
	Para 214	Notes that where substantial harm to a designated heritage asset is anticipated the local planning authority should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.	The Applicant's assessment of potential settings effects predicts no substantial harm upon or total loss of significance of the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.
	Para 215	<i>'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Proposed Development upon designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Minor adverse effects (as detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.21 to 11.8.55) that equate to '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are predicted upon the settings of the Helsby Hill Scheduled Monument (Asset 1), a Grade II Listed War Memorial (Asset 93); Frodsham Conservation Area (Asset 154); Castle Park (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 155) and the Castle Park Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153); and Overton, St Lawrence's (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 156).</p> <p>The predicted levels of '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are at the lower end of the scale and it is considered that there is no potential to mitigate these effects (which are not significant in EIA terms).</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			Paragraph 11.8.61 of Chapter 11 of the ES notes that upon the completion of the decommissioning the long-term effects of the Operational Phase on the setting of assets would be removed, with the setting of those assets restored to the current baseline condition with the exception of the elements of new green infrastructure (including the NBBMA) which would be left in place at the point of decommissioning. The public benefits of the proposal, including the demonstrable need for the Proposed Development, are set out in Section 2.0 and 5.0 of the Planning Statement [EN010153/DR/5.6] .
	Para 216	<i>'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Proposed Development upon non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Paragraphs 11.5.11 to 11.5.13 and Table 11-4 of Chapter 11 of the ES outline present the methodology and approach to determining significance of heritage assets (including non-designated assets).</p> <p>The identified and potential non-designated heritage assets which may be subject to direct and indirect impacts are presented in Section 6 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Table 11-9 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not predicted to directly or indirectly impact upon most of the identified heritage assets within its extent, as is detailed in Paragraphs</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>11.8.4 to 11.8.8 and Table 11-10 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>A balanced approach to recommended mitigation strategies for the identified direct and indirect impacts (none of which are significant in EIA terms) upon non-designated assets is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>No non-designated heritage assets considered to be sensitive to settings impacts were identified during this assessment. No settings impacts upon non-designated assets are predicted.</p>

Document	Policy	Summary of Policy	Where addressed in the ES
	Para 218	<i>'Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.'</i>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon heritage assets.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not predicted to directly or indirectly impact upon most of the identified heritage assets within its extent, as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.4 to 11.8.8 and Table 11-10 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>Where direct and indirect impacts cannot be avoided a mitigation strategy (including geoarchaeological investigation), as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES, which would allow for them to be preserved by record (which is a manner of conservation appropriate to their significance as heritage assets).</p>

Table 3 – Summary of Local Planning Policy

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
CWaCC Local Plan (Part One)	Strategic Objective 12	<i>'Ensure new development is of sustainable and high-quality design that respects heritage assets, local distinctiveness and the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape'.</i>	<p>The Applicant has designed the Proposed Development to, where possible, respect known heritage assets. The incorporated mitigation in relation to direct or indirect impacts is largely related to the design avoiding known heritage assets and the utilisation of a pile depth that is not anticipated to reach the recorded depth of any previously recorded buried peat deposits, as is presented in Paragraphs 11.7.1 to 11.7.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed potential likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on landscape and townscape within ES Vol 1 Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity [EN010153/DR/6.1].</p>
	Policy STRAT 1 Sustainable development	<p>Element of Policy Strategy relevant to this chapter is:</p> <p><i>'Protect, enhance and improve the natural and historic environment whilst enhancing and restoring degraded and despoiled land, seeking opportunities for habitat creation'.</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has designed the Proposed Development to, where possible, protect known heritage assets.</p> <p>The Applicant has avoided, where possible, direct and indirect impacts upon identified heritage assets allowing for them to continue to be preserved in situ (which is a manner of conservation appropriate to their significance as heritage assets), as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.7.1 to 11.7.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>Where direct and indirect impacts cannot be avoided a mitigation strategy (including geoarchaeological investigation), as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES, which would allow for them to be preserved by record (which is a manner of conservation appropriate to their significance as heritage assets).</p> <p>The completion of the recommended mitigation works (which include geoarchaeological investigation) as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES would provide for an opportunity to enhance our understanding of any buried remains encountered and refine the modelling of the anticipated peat deposits, and their depths, across the area.</p>
	Policy ENV 5 Historic environment	<p><i>'Development should safeguard or enhance both designated and non-designated heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged significance.'</i></p> <p><i>'Development will be required to respect and respond positively to designated heritage assets and their settings, avoiding loss or harm to their significance'.</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon heritage assets (both designated and non-designated).</p> <p>The Applicant has avoided, where possible, direct and indirect impacts upon identified heritage assets allowing for them to continue to be preserved in situ (which is a manner of safeguarding appropriate to their significance as heritage assets), as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.7.1 to 11.7.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
		<i>'Development which is likely to have a significant adverse impact on designated heritage assets and their settings which cannot be avoided or where the heritage asset cannot be preserved in situ will not be permitted'.</i>	<p>Where direct and indirect impacts cannot be avoided a mitigation strategy (including geoarchaeological investigation), as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES, which would allow for them to be preserved by record (which is a manner of conservation appropriate to their significance as heritage assets). The completion of the recommended mitigation works (which include geoarchaeological investigation) as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES would provide for an opportunity to enhance our understanding of any buried remains encountered and refine the modelling of the anticipated peat deposits, and their depths, across the area</p> <p>No direct or indirect impacts on the significance of any designated asset are predicted, so all assessment of effects in relation to harm to designated assets is related to impacts of the Proposed Development upon their settings.</p> <p>The assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
	ENV 7 Alternative energy supplies	<p><i>'The Local Plan will support renewable and low carbon energy proposals where there are no unacceptable impacts on:..</i></p> <p><i>'...Biodiversity, the natural or historic environment.'</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon heritage assets (both designated and non-designated).</p> <p>No significant effects (in EIA terms) are predicted in relation to the historic environment, as is presented in Paragraphs 11.12.4 to 11.12.8 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>
CWACC Local Plan (Part Two)	DM 46 - Development in conservation areas	<p><i>'Development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas, as identified on the policies map, will be expected to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, taking account of the significance of heritage assets...'</i></p> <p><i>'Applicants will be expected to submit a Heritage Impact Assessment for all applications which affect heritage assets, including as a minimum, a description of their significance and the impact which proposals may have upon this'.</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development is not located within the extent of a Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon the setting of the following Conservation Areas (as defined by scoping):</p> <p>Asset 154 Frodsham (Town) Asset 155 Castle Park (Frodsham) Asset 156 Overton St Lawrence's (Frodsham) Asset 158 Weston Village Asset 156 Overton, St Lawrence's (Frodsham) Asset 157 Halton Village Asset 159 Higher Runcorn Asset 312 Overton, Five Crosses Asset 313 Ince</p> <p>The assessment of these took into account the significance of these heritage assets. The methodology</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
			for establishing the significance of heritage assets is outlined in Paragraphs 11.5.9 to 11.5.23 of Chapter 11 of the ES and the results of the settings assessment for these Conservation Areas (and other designated assets scoped into the assessment) are detailed in Table 1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.
	DM 47 - Listed buildings	<i>'Development proposals or works, including alterations, extensions and changes of use shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Where relevant, development proposals or works will only be supported which would:</i> 1. <i>conserve the significance of a listed building and its setting, securing its optimum viable use;</i> 2. <i>preserve or enhance a listed building or structure, and any curtilage listed structures or features of special architectural or historic landscape interest'</i> .	<p>The Applicant has assessed the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon the settings of Listed Buildings.</p> <p>The assessment of potential setting effects has considered all Listed Buildings within 3km and all designated assets of highest importance out to 5km. The buffers created for the 3km and 5km Study Areas exclude the Main Site Access route, SPEN Grid Connection, Private Wire Connection to local businesses and the Skylark Mitigation Area as is detailed in Section 1.1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraphs 11.6.19 to 11.6.21 and Table 11-8 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets as is detailed in Section 3 of</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
			Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.
	DM 48 - Non-designated heritage assets	<p><i>'Development proposals will be encouraged and supported where they are designed to preserve or enhance the significance of non-designated heritage assets.'</i></p> <p><i>'The significance of non-designated heritage assets and their setting should be assessed in development proposals or works...'</i></p> <p><i>'Development which would remove, harm or undermine the significance of such non-designated heritage assets, or their contribution to the character of a place, will only be permitted where the benefits of the development outweigh the harm having regard to the scale of the harm and significance of the non-designated heritage asset.'</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the loss of the non-designated heritage asset, an appropriate level of survey and recording will be expected including where appropriate archaeological investigation. The results of which</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the impact of the Proposed Development upon non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>The identified and potential non-designated heritage assets which may be subject to direct and indirect impacts are presented in Section 6 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Table 11-9 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not predicted to directly or indirectly impact upon most of the identified non-designated heritage assets within its extent, as is detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.4 to 11.8.8 and Table 11-10 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>A balanced approach to recommended mitigation strategies for the identified direct and indirect impacts (none of which are significant in EIA terms) upon non-designated assets is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
		<i>should be deposited on the Historic Environment Record’.</i>	The completion of the recommended mitigation works (which include geoarchaeological investigation), as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES, would provide for an opportunity to enhance our understanding of any buried remains encountered and refine the modelling of the anticipated peat deposits, and their depths, across the area. No non-designated heritage assets considered to be sensitive to settings impacts were identified during this assessment. Therefore, no settings impacts upon non-designated assets are predicted.
	DM 49 - Registered parks and gardens and battlefields	<i>‘Development proposals affecting landscapes identified on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England (Registered Parks and Gardens) as identified on the policies map will only be supported where it has been demonstrated that: ‘1. great weight is given to the asset's conservation and significance, taking into consideration the appearance, historic characteristics, integrity of the landscape, setting and key views’.</i>	The Applicant has assessed the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon the setting of the following Registered Park and Garden (as defined by scoping): Grade II Listed Castle Park Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153). The assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of the Grade II Listed Castle Park Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153) as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.43 to 11.8.50 of Chapter 11 of the ES.

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
			<p>It is predicted that there will be Minor adverse effect that equates to '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' upon the setting of the Grade II Listed Castle Park Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153).</p> <p>The predicted levels of '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are at the lower end of the scale.</p> <p>There are no registered battlefields within the assessment, so these elements of the policy are not applicable.</p>
	DM 50 - Archaeology	<p><i>'Development proposals will need to take into account the significance of the heritage asset and their setting, and the scale of any loss or harm.'</i></p> <p><i>'For sites of known or potential archaeological interest, applications must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment of the archaeological impact of the development. A field evaluation prior to determination of the planning application may also be required.'</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the potential for impacts upon archaeological remains.</p> <p>The identified and potential archaeological remains, in the form of non-designated heritage assets, which may be subject to direct and indirect impacts are presented in Section 6 of Appendix 11-1 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Table 11-9 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>No archaeological remains, in the form of non-designated heritage assets, considered to be sensitive to settings impacts were identified during this assessment. Therefore, no settings impacts upon archaeological remains, in the form of non-designated assets are predicted.</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
			Where direct and indirect impacts cannot be avoided a mitigation strategy (including geoarchaeological investigation), as is presented in Paragraphs 11.9.1 to 11.9.3 of Chapter 11 of the ES, which would allow for them to be preserved by record (which is a manner of conservation appropriate to their significance as heritage assets). As stated above, the obligation for the Applicant to submit an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy for approval by the relevant planning authority is secured by a Requirement in the Draft Development Consent Order.
	DM 52 - Solar Energy	<i>'Proposals for ground mounted solar energy developments will be supported where they meet the requirements of the Local Plan (Part One) policy ENV 7 and the following criteria: '7. there would be no unacceptable harm to the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting.'</i>	The Applicant has assessed the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon heritage assets (both designated and non-designated). No significant effects (in EIA terms) are predicted in relation to the historic environment, as is presented in Paragraphs 11.12.4 to 11.12.8 of Chapter 11 of the ES. Minor adverse effects (as detailed in Paragraphs 11.8.21 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.) that equate to ' <i>less than substantial harm</i> ' are predicted upon the settings of the Helsby Hill Scheduled Monument (Asset 1), a Grade II Listed War Memorial (Asset 93); Frodsham Conservation Area (Asset 154); Castle Park (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 155) and the Castle Park Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153); and the Overton, St Lawrence's (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 156).

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
			The predicted levels of ' <i>less than substantial harm</i> ' are at the lower end of the scale and it is considered that there is no potential to mitigate these effects (which are not significant in EIA terms).
Ince Neighbourhood Plan	Policy HER1 – Heritage	<p><i>'Proposals will be supported if they preserve or enhance Ince's designated and non-designated heritage assets. Proposals will be supported which preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Ince's Conservation Area, taking account of significant heritage assets.'</i></p> <p><i>'Proposals will be supported which preserve or enhance Ince's listed buildings, structures or any curtilages, and which conserve the significance of a listed building and its setting, securing its optimum use. Reference should be made to the most recent designated Conservation Area Appraisal.'</i></p> <p><i>'Proposals for development must take into account the scale of any possible harm or loss and the significance of any heritage assets and will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that benefits will be achieved when weighed against the harm or loss. Measures should be put in place to avoid or minimise impact or mitigate damage.'</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the potential for impacts upon the character and appearance of Ince Conservation Area (Asset 313) and the settings of its Listed Buildings. The assessment of effects upon Ince Conservation Area and its associated designate heritage assets are presented in full in Table 1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and summarised in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>This assessment was undertaken with reference to the most recent Conservation Area Appraisal for Ince Conservation Area.</p> <p>No significant effects (in EIA terms) upon and no harm or loss to the character of Ince Conservation Area or the settings of its associated designated assets is predicted.</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
		<i>The historic integrity of the landscape and component heritage features and assets should be preserved, and the interpretation of these features will be promoted and supported where this would not be at odds with the conservation of these assets.'</i>	
	Policy HER3 – Views and Setting of Ince Conservation Area	Includes guidance noting the development proposals must consider their effect upon the views and setting of Ince Conservation Area and lists the key views in to and out of the Conservation Area.	<p>The assessment of effects upon Ince Conservation Area and its associated designate heritage assets are presented in full in Table 1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and summarised in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>This assessment included a review and assessment of the key views within and out of the Conservation Area as defined in the most recent Conservation Area Appraisal for Ince Conservation Area.</p>
Frodsham Neighbourhood Plan	Policy H6: Heritage assets	<p>The intention of the policy is <i>'To ensure that new developments take account of the desirability of preserving or enhancing designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest, along with archaeological remains and landscapes...'</i></p> <p><i>'Development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas, will be expected to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or</i></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon heritage assets (both designated and non-designated) within Frodsham.</p> <p>The assessment of potential setting effects has considered all Locally Listed Buildings within 1km radius of the Site (concentrated within Frodsham), all designated assets within 3km and all designated assets of highest importance out to 5km, as detailed in Section 1.1 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and Paragraphs</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
		<p><i>enhancing the character or appearance of that area, taking account of the significance of heritage assets.'</i></p> <p><i>'Development should conserve the significance of and preserve or enhance designated heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged significance, and archaeological remains and landscapes and buildings identified (both statutory and non-statutory) in the 2010 Town Design Statement'.</i></p> <p><i>'In considering applications for development that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.</i></p>	<p>11.6.19 to 11.6.21 and Table 11-8 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The assessment of potential settings effects has identified no Significant (in EIA terms) effects upon the setting of any heritage assets within Frodsham as is detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 11-5 [EN010153/DR/6.2] and in Paragraphs 11.8.9 to 11.8.14 and 11.8.16 to 11.8.55 of Chapter 11 of the ES.</p> <p>It is predicted that there will be Minor adverse effect that equates to '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' upon the setting of the following assets in the Frodsham area:</p> <p>The Grade II Listed War Memorial (Asset 93);</p> <p>Frodsham Conservation Area (Asset 154);</p> <p>Castle Park (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 155) and the Castle Park Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden (Asset 153); and</p> <p>Overton, St Lawrence's (Frodsham) Conservation Area (Asset 156).</p> <p>The predicted levels of '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' are at the lower end of the scale.</p>

Document	Policy / Paragraph Reference	Summary of Policy / Paragraph	Where addressed in the ES
			Paragraph 11.8.61 of Chapter 11 of the ES notes that upon the completion of the decommissioning the long-term effects of the Operational Phase on the setting of assets would be removed, with the setting of those assets restored to the current baseline condition with the exception of the elements of new green infrastructure (including the NBBMA) which would be left in place at the point of decommissioning.