

Light Valley Solar

Environmental Statement Volume 3

Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline

Document Reference EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01

February 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN0110012
APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)



Light Valley
Solar

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

Light Valley Solar

DCO Submission

Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline

Regulation Reference	APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Case Reference	EN0110012
Application Document Reference	EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01
Author	Light Valley Solar Limited

Version	Date	Status of Version
1.0	February 2026	DCO Submission

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Assessment methodology	1
2.1	Data and information sources	1
2.2	Study Area	2
2.3	Chronology	4
2.4	Assumptions and limitations	4
3	Overview of baseline conditions	5
3.1	Summary	5
3.2	Potential heritage assets	6
3.3	Previous archaeological investigations	17
3.4	LiDAR and aerial photography	18
3.5	Geophysical survey	18
3.6	Trial trench evaluations	23
3.7	Geology and topography	29
3.8	Map regression	31
4	Archaeological and historical baseline	34
5	Archaeological potential	45
6	Impact assessment	48
	References	49

List of tables

Table 2-1	Archaeological and Historic Periods	4
-----------	-------------------------------------	---

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This Technical Appendix accompanies Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.08] and provides a baseline for the assessment contained in that chapter.
- 1.1.2 The aim of this document is to describe the existing baseline for the historic environment, including built heritage, archaeological remains and historic landscape character.

Structure

- 1.1.3 The historic environment baseline includes:
- 1) An overview of the historic environment through which the Proposed Development passes;
 - 2) A more detailed summary of the historic environment of each Solar Development Site, the Cable Route Corridor and surrounding area;
 - 3) An appended gazetteer of all identified heritage assets (including those designated and non-designated by local and national heritage bodies); and
 - 4) A discussion of archaeological potential.

2 Assessment methodology

2.1 Data and information sources

- 2.1.1 The following sources of information have been reviewed and form the basis of this assessment:
- 1) Archaeology Data Service (Ref 1) for information on previous cultural heritage assessments and fieldwork surveys;
 - 2) British Geological Survey (BGS) online (Ref 2);
 - 3) Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data (Ref 3);
 - 4) Office of National Statistics (ONS) on Counties and Unitary Authorities (UK) and Parish and Non-civil Parish Areas (England and Wales) (Ref 4);
 - 5) Local authority data including conservation area maps and appraisals (where available);
 - 6) National Heritage List for England (NHLE) for designated heritage assets datasets; (Ref 5)
 - 7) National Library of Scotland for historic Ordnance Survey mapping (Ref 6);
 - 8) North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (NYHER) (CNY21141, Ref 7);
 - 9) York City Historic Environment Record (YCHER) (Ref 8);

- 10) Regional Research Agenda for South Yorkshire (Ref 9); and
- 11) North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire Archives.

2.1.2 In addition to the above, publicly available data, this report has drawn from the results of an initial site visit to selected locations in and around Solar Development Sites 1-4 (21-22 May 2024) and a comprehensive walkover survey of Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 (27-31 January 2025) and the Cable Route Corridor (1-5 September 2025). The following surveys have also been carried out and used to inform the existing baseline conditions:

- 1) Full review of all Environment Agency LiDAR data for the Proposed Development. Details of features identified by this survey are available in Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02]**, and are shown Figure 8.3: Heritage Assets identified through Archaeological Investigation (ES Volume 2) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.08.03]**;
- 2) Review of publicly available aerial photographs including Historic England's Aerial Archaeology Mapping Explorer (Ref 10), the National Collection for Aerial Photographs (NCAP) (Ref 11), and Britain From Above (Ref 12);
- 3) Geophysical survey of Solar Development Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8, and Cable Construction Compounds, where impacts will occur, the full results of which are available in Appendix 8.3: Geophysical survey results (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0.6.03.08.03]**;
- 4) Geophysical survey of the majority of the Cable Route Corridor working with Appendix 8.3: Geophysical survey results (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/0.6.03.08.03]**; and
- 5) Trial trenching within areas of Solar Development Sites 1-4, 6-8, where impacts will occur, the full results of which are available in Appendix 8.4: Trial Trenching Reports (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]**.

2.1.3 Whilst 273.6 ha of the total surveyable area of the Cable Route Corridor has been subject to a geophysical survey, a remaining 58.4 ha remains outstanding at submission.

2.2 Study Area

Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8

2.2.1 A 2 km radial buffer surrounding each Solar Development Site has been applied to create a Study Area for designated heritage assets, including conservation areas. The following additional assets outside of this buffer with the potential to experience effects as a result of the Proposed Development have been scoped based on professional judgement/ZTV and based on the responses of stakeholders received as part of the EIA Scoping Opinion (see Appendix 1.2 (ES Volume 3)) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.02]**.

- 1) Grade II* Ledston registered park and garden [RPG 1001221] and all associated listed buildings contained within, including the Grade I listed Ledston Hall [LB 1237569]; and
- 2) the Ledsham Conservation Area located c. 2 km west of the Study Area

2.2.2 For heritage assets without designated status, a radial buffer of 1 km was applied to each Solar Development Site to create the Study Area.

Cable Route Corridor and Cable Construction Compound locations

2.2.3 The Cable Route Corridor is typically 50m wide, increasing in places (such as road and rail crossings) up to approximately 450 m to allow flexibility for final crossing design alignment and to allow space for temporary Cable Construction Compounds. For assessment purposes, the placing of the cable anywhere within the Cable Route Corridor has been considered, and it is assumed that the construction working width will typically be 25m wide.

2.2.4 The Study Area comprises of a 500 m radial buffer for all other heritage assets, applied around each Cable Route Corridor section and Cable Construction Compound location.

Highways Improvement Areas

2.2.5 Highways improvements will be made to facilitate construction traffic movements for the Proposed Development; works for these improvements will include vegetation management, the provision of temporary passing places within existing highways boundaries, traffic management and provision of visibility splays. Within the wider area, several Highways Improvement Areas (HIAs) are required, which will comprise minor, temporary modifications such as the removal of street furniture, widening of junctions and vegetation removal. These Highways Improvement Areas are listed in Chapter 2: The Proposed Development (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02] and shown in Figure 2.3: Field numbering plan (ES Volume 2) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.03]. Due to the temporary and intermittent nature of these works, the Study Area has not been buffered around them. Each HIA has therefore been assessed individually, and impacts to heritage assets (designated and non-designated) and below-ground archaeological remains have been assessed where necessary below.

2.2.6 Together, Solar Development Sites 1-4, 6-8, the Cable Route Corridor, and the Highways Improvement Areas are referred to as the Proposed Development.

Study Area

2.2.7 The radial buffers outlined above were combined to produce the Study Area used to inform the archaeological and historical baseline.

2.3 Chronology

2.3.1 The archaeological and historical periods referenced in this report are based on those set out by the Forum on Information Standards in Heritage (FISH) (Ref 13).

Table 2-1 Archaeological and Historic Periods

Archaeological Period Name	Historic Period Time
Palaeolithic	1,000,000 – 10,000 BCE
Mesolithic	10,000 – 4,000 BCE
Neolithic	4,000 – 2,200 BCE
Bronze Age	2,600 – 700 BCE
Iron Age	800 BCE – 43 CE
Roman (and Romano-British)	43CE – 410 CE
Early medieval	410 – 1066 CE
Medieval	1066 – 1540 CE
Post-medieval	1540 – 1901 CE
Modern	1901 – present day

2.4 Assumptions and limitations

2.4.1 The assessment has relied upon data and records provided by third parties and therefore it has been assumed that this information is accurate and up to date at the time of reporting.

3 Overview of baseline conditions

3.1 Summary

- 3.1.1 Designated heritage assets have been identified from Historic England's NHLE dataset. Local Planning Authority information has been consulted for information on conservation areas and HER records of aircraft crash sites which will fall under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Ref 14).
- 3.1.2 No designated heritage assets are located within Solar Development Sites 1-4, 6-8, Cable Construction Compounds, or directly intersect with the Cable Route Corridor route.
- 3.1.3 A total of 128 designated heritage assets were identified within the Study Area.

Designated heritage assets

- 3.1.4 Designated heritage assets have been identified from Historic England's NHLE dataset. The LPA have been consulted for information on conservation areas, and the NYHER and YCHER for records of aircraft crash sites which will fall under the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986.
- 3.1.5 The Grade II listed Milestone approximately 0.5 miles east of Junction with Lowfield Road [NHLE 1148541] is the only designated heritage asset located within the Order Limits. It is located on the southern verge of the A63 within Cable Route Corridor (CRC) 2-4. The milestone was observed in situ and in good condition during walkover surveys in January 2025.
- 3.1.6 A total of 128 designated heritage assets were identified within the Study Area and are detailed on Figure 8.1: Designated Heritage Assets (ES Volume 2) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.08.01]**.
- 3.1.7 These comprise:
- 1) Four scheduled monuments (Steeton Hall medieval magnate's residence and manorial centre [NHLE 1015504]; Danes Hills Square barrow cemetery on Crook Moor [NHLE 1016619]; Thorpe Hall moated monastic grange [NHLE 1017460]; and World War II bombing decoy control building 270m south of Scalm Park Cottages [NHLE 1020499]).
 - 2) Four Grade I listed buildings (Church of Saint Helen [NHLE: 1148467]; Church of Saint Mary [NHLE 1316671]; Church of Saint Wilfrid NHLE 1296769; and Church of Saint Mary [NHLE 1316671]).
 - 3) Seven Grade II* listed buildings (Gateforth Hall [NHLE 1132514]; Former Coach House and Stables Adjoining Escrick Park to the rear right [NHLE 1148489]; Monk Fryston Hall [NHLE 1148544]; Escrick Park, NHLE 1167878; Church of St Helen [NHLE 1167966]; Skipwith Hall [NHLE 1172750] and Prebendal House [Monk Fryston, NHLE 1296762]).
 - 4) 78 Grade II listed buildings (detailed in full within Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02]**).

- 5) Four conservation areas (Escrick, Hillam, Monk Fryston, and Riccall).
- 6) 32 potential military aircraft crash sites, protected under The Protection of Military Remains Act (1986). It should be noted that the locations provided for many of these sites are either approximate or estimated from contemporary sources and therefore remains within the Proposed Development cannot be completely discounted.

3.1.8 Additionally, the following receipt of the Scoping Opinion consultation response of Leeds City Council the following assets will be included within the assessment:

- 1) Grade II* Ledston registered park and garden [RPG 1001221] and all associated listed buildings contained within, including the Grade I listed Ledston Hall [LB 1237569], located c.4 km west of the Study Area; and
- 2) the Ledsham Conservation Area located c. 2 km west of the Study Area.

3.1.9 There are no World Heritage Sites, registered battlefields or protected wreck sites within the Proposed Development or study area.

3.2 Potential heritage assets

Heritage and potential heritage assets

3.2.1 435 heritage assets and 17 findspots are recorded within the NYHER and YCHER throughout the Order Limits and Study Area. A further 215 potential heritage assets were identified through:

- 1) geophysical survey of the Solar Development Sites (44 potential assets);
- 2) geophysical survey of the Cable Route Corridor (15 potential assets);
- 3) desk-top historic map and LiDAR survey (127 potential assets);
- 4) walkover survey (10 potential assets);
- 5) important hedgerow assessment (three potential assets); and
- 6) archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) of Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 (17 potential assets).

3.2.2 The heritage and potential heritage assets located entirely or partially within the Order Limits are presented below. No heritage assets from the YCHER are located entirely or partially within the Order Limits.

Solar Development Site 1

3.2.3 The NYHER records 40 heritage assets within Solar Development Site 1:

- 1) Escrick Park (Fields 1.1, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20; [MNY17654])
- 2) Possible field system north-east of Little Shallows (Field 1.45; [MNY17727])
- 3) Roman British Site, South of Keldcarrs Plantation, Escrick (Field 1.34; [MNY24075])

- 4) Ditch at Site C, Yorkshire Derwent Aqueduct Duplication Main (Field 1.45; [MNY24078])
- 5) Ditch at Site D, Yorkshire Derwent Aqueduct Duplication Main (Field 1.40; [MNY24079])
- 6) Pond or Drain 374m south-east of Duck Decoy (Field 1.20; [MNY26118])
- 7) Water Channel (Dike) 30 metres north of Nursery Plantation (Field 1.28; [MNY26122])
- 8) Pond 232 m west of Pallion Wood (Field 1.36; [MNY26123])
- 9) Pond located 162 m south-west of Pallion Wood (Field 1.39; [MNY26124])
- 10) Pond 142 m north-west of Pallion Wood (Field 1.39; [MNY26125])
- 11) Dike 112 metres north of Bridge Farm (Field 1.43; [MNY26157])
- 12) Footbridge 27 m east of Little Shallows (Field 1.45; [MNY26158])
- 13) Footbridge south-west of Winter's plantation (Field 1.36; [MNY26159])
- 14) Footbridge 16 m south of Winters Plantation (Field 1.37; [MNY26160])
- 15) Pond 460 m west of Roth Hill (Field 1.46; [MNY26238])
- 16) Footbridge (Field 1.44; [MNY26239])
- 17) Drain and sluice south-west of Gilbertson House (Field 1.16; [MNY26243])
- 18) Pond 11 m north of Partridge Remise (Field 1.7; [MNY26244])
- 19) Pond south-east of Tiled Farm (Field 1.7; [MNY26245])
- 20) Pump east of Partridge Remise (Field 1.9; [MNY26246])
- 21) Pond 20m east of Fairburn Gorse (Field 1.9; [MNY26247])
- 22) Pond 56 m south of Partridge Remise (Field 1.24; [MNY26248])
- 23) Pond 243 m east of Easterby's Plantation (Field 1.23; [MNY26249])
- 24) pond 225 m north-west of Easterby's Plantation (Field 1.13; [MNY26252])
- 25) Pond 262 m north-west of Easterby's Plantation (Field 1.13; [MNY26276])
- 26) Pond 224 metres northwest of Easterby's Plantation (Field 1.13; [MNY26277])
- 27) Pond 133 m north-west of Coronation Plantation (Field 1.26; [MNY26278])
- 28) Pond north of Duck Decoy (Field 1.18; [MNY26279])
- 29) Pond 350 m north-east of Escrick Park Duck Decoy (Field 1.18; [MNY26280])
- 30) Pond(s), 35 m north-west of Keldcarrs Plantation (Field 1.17; [MNY26308])
- 31) Pond 146 m north-east of Escrick Park Duck Decoy (Field 1.18; [MNY26336])
- 32) Pond 357 m south-west of Pallion Plantation (Field 1.37; [MNY26346])

- 33) Pit/Quarry 55 m west of Partridge Remise (Field 1.13; [MNY26351])
- 34) Pond 170 metres south of Easterby's Plantation (Field 1.22; [MNY26352])
- 35) Footbridge east of Acorn Plantation (Field 1.34; [MNY26360])
- 36) Footbridge (Field 1.41; [MNY26361])
- 37) Pond (Field 1.16; [MNY26365])
- 38) Skipwith Bridge, 244 metres north west of Bridge Farm (Field 1.43; [MNY26374])
- 39) Building (Field 1.46; [MNY26376])
- 40) Field system south of Mount Pleasant Farm (Field 1.37; [MNY37042])

3.2.4

A further 37 potential heritage assets have been identified through geophysical survey (17 potential assets), desktop historic map and LiDAR survey (11 potential assets), walkover survey (two potential assets), important hedgerow assessment (two potential assets) and archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) (five potential assets). These assets are presented below:

- 1) Possible 19th Century stone working site (Field 1.4; [GS_S1_7])
- 2) Possible linear features (Field 1.9; [GS_S1_10])
- 3) Possible farmstead (Field 1.16; [GS_S1_14])
- 4) Possible farmstead (Field 1.17; [GS_S1_15])
- 5) Area of possible industrial activity (Field 1.17; [GS_S1_16])
- 6) Regular enclosure and ditches (Field 1.13; [GS_S1_17])
- 7) Regular enclosure (Field 1.25; [GS_S1_18])
- 8) Large rectangular enclosure and cluster of ring ditches (Field 1.29; [GS_S1_19])
- 9) Cluster of ring ditches (Field 1.29; [GS_S1_20])
- 10) Regular enclosure and ring ditches (Field 1.28; [GS_S1_21])
- 11) Possible linear features (Field 1.30; [GS_S1_22])
- 12) Possible ditches, trackway, enclosure, and boundaries associated with Romano-British settlement site (Field 1.34; [GS_S1_23])
- 13) Possible pits near Romano-British settlement site (Field 1.34; [GS_S1_24])
- 14) Cluster of ring ditches and linear and curvilinear features (Field 1.39; [GS_S1_25])
- 15) Possible remains of field system south of Mount Pleasant Farm (Field 1.37; GS_S1_25]
- 16) Possible enclosure and associated ditches (Field 1.40; [GS_S1_26])
- 17) Linear and curvilinear features (Field 1.45; [GS_S1_27])
- 18) Pallion Farm (Field 1.38; [UHA_012])

- 19) Pump, Pallion Farm (Field 1.38; [UHA_013])
- 20) Building north-west of Pallion Farm 1.38; (Field [UHA_014])
- 21) Pond (Field 1.17; [UHA_038])
- 22) Pond (Field 1.17; [UHA_039])
- 23) Pond (Field 1.27; [UHA_040])
- 24) Pond (Field 1.34; [UHA_041])
- 25) Pond (Field 1.34; [UHA_042])
- 26) Pond (Field 1.40; [UHA_043])
- 27) Pond (Field 1.40; [UHA_044])
- 28) Pond (Field 1.46; [UHA_045])
- 29) Possible former due pond (Field 1.42; [UHA_128])
- 30) Small bridge over drain (Field 1.38; [UHA_129])
- 31) Important Hedgerow (Between Fields 1.28 and 1.37; [H1.16])
- 32) Important Hedgerow (Between Fields 1.23 and 1.25; [H1.65])
- 33) Enclosure in proximity to Iron Age/Romano British farmsteads GS_S1_19 and GS_S1_20 (Field 1.20; [TT_S1_1])
- 34) Ditches northwest of GS_S1_19 and GS_S1_20 (Field 1.28; [TT_S1_2])
- 35) Ditches and pits located between Iron Age/Romano-British farmsteads GS_S1_19 and GS_S1_20 (Field 1.28; [TT_S1_3])
- 36) Field System in proximity to Iron Age/Romano-British farmsteads (Field 34; [TT_S1_4])
- 37) Posthole and ditch in proximity to features of Romano-British date (Field 1.37; [TT_S1_5])

Solar Development Site 2

- 3.2.5 The NYHER does not currently record any heritage assets within Solar Development Site 2.
- 3.2.6 Two potential heritage assets have been identified through geophysical survey (one potential asset), walkover survey (one potential asset) and archaeological evaluation (three potential assets). These comprise:
 - 1) Likely settlement site, field system and trackway (Field 2.3; [GS_S2_1])
 - 2) Brick and stone arched bridge/crossing (Field 2.4; [UHA_132])
 - 3) Kiln (Field 2.3; [TT_S2_1])
 - 4) Kiln (Field 2.3; [TT_S2_2])
 - 5) Ditches (Field 2.3; [TT_S2_3])

Solar Development Site 3

- 3.2.7 The NYHER does not currently record any heritage assets within Solar Development Site 3.
- 3.2.8 Geophysical survey did not identify any areas of definite archaeological interest, although several linear and curvilinear trends are present across the Solar Development Site. One potential heritage asset was observed during walkover survey.
- 1) Crossing point/bridge (Between Fields 3.1 and 3.2; [UHA_133])

Solar Development Site 4

- 3.2.9 The NYHER records four potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 4:
- 1) Roe Field Moat: A medieval moat north of Birkin (Field 4.5; [MNY9905])
 - 2) Low Cottage and enclosure (Field 4.7; [MNY9906])
 - 3) Undated field system (Field 4.12; [MNY7247])
 - 4) A medieval moat east of Barkhouse Wood Lane (Field 4.12; [MNY9907])
- 3.2.10 Additionally, a probable find spot of a Roman Coffin (Field 4.14; [MNY9911]) is recorded as being located in the south-east corner of Solar Development Site 4. This was removed to a local churchyard at unrecorded date and the location is approximate only.
- 3.2.11 A further ten potential heritage assets have been identified through geophysical survey (four potential assets), archaeological evaluation (five potential assets) and desk-top historic map and LiDAR survey (one potential asset). These comprise:
- 1) Possible field system and trackways (Field 4.12; [GS_S4_3])
 - 2) Possible regular enclosures, part field system and/or trackway(s) (Field 4.14; [GS_S4_4])
 - 3) Possible Romano-British settlement site (Field 4.14; [GS_S4_5])
 - 4) Linear features (Field 4.14; [GS_S4_7])
 - 5) Two ditches in close proximity to moated enclosure GS_S4_2 and regular enclosures GS_S4_3 [Field 4.12; [TT_S4_1])
 - 6) North-west – south-east orientated ditch [Field 4.13; [TT_S4_2])
 - 7) North-east – south-west orientated ditch [Field 4.13; [TT_S4_3])
 - 8) East-west orientated ditch [Field 4.13; [TT_S4_4])
 - 9) North-south orientated ditch, 7.1m wide and in close proximity to TT_S4_4 (Field 4.13; [TT_S4_5])
 - 10) Middle Barn (Field 4.10; [UHA_066])

Solar Development Site 6

3.2.12 The NYHER records nine potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 6:

- 1) Undated Trackway, Milford Common (Field 6.3 [MNY10359])
- 2) Ditch east of Milford Junction (Field 6.4 [MNY10365])
- 3) Ring ditch south of Turpin Lane (Field 6.4; [MNY17144])
- 4) Ring ditch south of Turpin Lane (Field 6.4; [MNY17143])
- 5) Ring Ditches and rectilinear Crop marks, South Milford (Field 6.2; [MNY10364])
- 6) Enclosure on Milford Common (Field 6.3; [MNY10360])
- 7) A possible medieval drove way with integrated enclosures, east of Milford Common, South Milford (Field 6.5; [MNY39993])
- 8) Cropmark indicative of possible enclosure (Field 6.6; [MNY10350])
- 9) Ring ditch south of Gascoigne Wood Mine (Field 6.6; [MNY17137])

3.2.13 A further six potential heritage assets have been identified through geophysical survey (three potential assets), important hedgerow assessment (one potential asset) and archaeological evaluation (two potential assets). These comprise:

- 1) Network of ditches indicating trackways with appended fields (Field 6.3; [GS_S6_2])
- 2) Possible barrow or round house (Field 6.3; [GS_S6_4])
- 3) Possible long linear ditch (Field 6.4; [GS_S6_5])
- 4) Important Hedgerow (Between Field 6.8 and Common Lane; [H6.10])
- 5) Ditch (Field 6.4; [TT_S6_1])
- 6) Well (Field 6.5; [TT_S6_2])

Solar Development Site 7

3.2.14 The NYHER does not currently record any heritage assets within Solar Development Site 7. One potential heritage asset was identified through archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) and is presented below. No other potential heritage assets were identified through any of the survey methods previously described.

- 1) Enclosure of unknown date (Field 7.1; [TT_S7_1])

Solar Development Site 8

3.2.15 The NYHER records one heritage asset within Solar Development Site 8:

- 2) Enclosure, Hambleton (Field 8.1; [MNY10343])

3.2.16 In addition, eight potential heritage assets have been identified through geophysical survey (one potential asset), desktop historic map and LiDAR survey (six potential assets) and archaeological evaluation (one potential asset). These comprise:

- 1) Partial enclosure and possible double ditch (Field; [GS_S8_1])
- 2) Ruddings (farm house and yard) (Field; [UHA_027])
- 3) Pond (Field; [UHA_028])
- 4) Pond (Field; UHA_029])
- 5) Pond (Field; [UHA_030])
- 6) Triangulation Point (marked) (Field; [UHA_032])
- 7) Possible former field boundary (Field; [UHA_135])
- 8) Ditch (Field 8.2; [TT_S8_1])

Cable Route Corridor

CRC 1-4 and CRC 1-4a (Solar Development Site 1 to Solar Development Site 4)

3.2.17 The NYHER records 17 heritage assets and two findspots within CRC1-4 and CRC1-4a. Geophysical survey identified eight potential heritage assets and desktop historic map and LiDAR survey identified three potential assets. These comprise:

- 1) Cawood Wistow & Selby Light Railway (Field CR180; CR186; CR187; CR189; CR198; [MNY10400])
- 2) Enclosures and field system shown as cropmarks, Hambleton (Field CR259 and CR266; [MNY10417])
- 3) Trackway south of railway line (Field CR256; CR258; CR259; [MNY10418])
- 4) Enclosure, Hambleton (Field CR281; [MNY10423])
- 5) Charity Plantation (Field CR40; [MNY12093])
- 6) Moor Lane (Field CR93; CR94; CR96; [MNY12101])
- 7) King Rudding Lane (Field Boundary) (Field CR91; [MNY12103])
- 8) King Rudding Lane (Field Boundary) (Field CR91; [MNY12104])
- 9) Charity Farm sand pit (Field CR21; CR23; [MNY23436])
- 10) Old Mill, Riccall (Field CR100; [MNY23818])
- 11) Drainage dike 390 metres northeast of Charity Farm (Field CR22; [MNY26198])
- 12) Drainage dike 420 metres west of Field House Farm (Field CR20; [MNY26199])

- 13) Footbridge 240 m south-east of Common wood (Field CR20; [MNY26200])
- 14) Footbridge 630 m south-west of Skipworth Bridge (Field CR20; [MNY26200])
- 15) Pond 73 m North Of Charity Farm (Field CR23; [MNY26341])
- 16) Field system south-west of Whinchat Hall (Field CR6; [MNY37043])
- 17) Enclosure, Gateforth (Field CR317; CR319; CR324; [MNY9899])
- 18) Findspot, Hambleton (Field CR281; [MNY10407])
- 19) Riccall (Field CR100; [MNY12169])
- 20) Rectilinear enclosure with attached ditch (Field CR40; [CGS_C1-4_1])
- 21) Field system, comprising four parallel north-south orientated linear features (Field CR247; [CGS_C1-4_2])
- 22) Partial east-west orientated linear feature (Field CR281; [CGS_C1-4_3])
- 23) Two parallel north-west-south-east orientated linear anomalies, c.55m long (Field CR6; [CGS_C1-4_4])
- 24) Large, subcircular anomaly, c.45-50m in diameter (Field CR22; [CGS_C1-4_5])
- 25) Anomaly of a ring ditch, c.15m in diameter, with an attached north-west-south-east orientated linear anomaly (Field CR23; [CGS_C1-4_6])
- 26) North-west – south-east orientated linear anomaly, c.95m long (Field CR23; [CGS_C1-4_7])
- 27) Two partial curvilinear anomalies, c.10-20m in diameter (Field CR324; [CGS_C1-4_8])
- 28) Pond (Field CR156; [UHA_078])
- 29) Pond (Field CR169; [UHA_080])
- 30) Sand pit north-east of Wood Hall Farm (Field CR21; CR23; [UHA_098])

CRC 2-8 (Solar Development Site 2 to Solar Development Site 8)

- 3.2.18 The NYHER records no heritage assets or findspots within CRC 2-8. No potential heritage assets were identified through any of the survey methods previously described.

CRC 3-4 and CRC 3-4a (Solar Development Site 3 to Solar Development Site 4)

3.2.19 The NYHER records no heritage assets or findspots within CRC 3-4 or CRC 3-4a). Geophysical survey of CRC 3-4a identified one potential heritage asset. No further potential heritage assets were identified through any of the survey methods previously described.

- 1) Two parallel north-east-south-west orientated linear features (Field CR403; [CGS_C3-4a_1])

CRC 2-4 (Solar Development Site 2 to Solar Development Site 4)

3.2.20 The NYHER records no heritage assets of findspots within CRC 2-4. No potential heritage assets were identified through any of the survey methods previously described.

CRC 4-POC (Solar Development Site to National Grid Monk Fryston)

3.2.21 The NYHER records nine heritage assets and no findspots within CRC 4-POC. Geophysical survey identified five potential heritage assets, and desktop historic map and LiDAR survey identified one potential asset. These assets are presented below:

- 1) (Monk) Fryston Lodge (Field [MNY31793])
- 2) A ditch of likely Prehistoric date, Monk Fryston Electricity Sub Station (Field; [MNY40677])
- 3) A quarry pit of probable Post-Medieval date, Monk Fryston Electricity Sub Station (Field; [MNY40678])
- 4) Brickwork pattern field system, Burton Salmon (Field CR413; CF414; CF418; CF412; CR418; CR416; [MNY9922])
- 5) Undated field system (Field CR365; CR387; [MNY9953])
- 6) Undated trackway through field system, Burton Salmon (Field CR365; [MNY9954])
- 7) Undated trackway through field system, Burton Salmon (Field CR365; [MNY9955])
- 8) Undated trackway (Field CR387; [MNY9956])
- 9) Undated enclosure (Field CR387; [MNY9960])
- 10) Partial enclosure (Field CR418; [CGS_C4POC_1])
- 11) Possible farmstead or settlement (Field CR387; [CGS_C4POC_2])
- 12) Partial enclosure (Field CR365; [CGS_C4POC_3])
- 13) North-east – south-west orientated linear feature (Field CR411; [CGS_C4POC_4])

- 14) Two parallel north-south orientated linear features, directly adjacent to the west of partial enclosure CGS_C4POC_1 (Field CR418; [CGS_C4POC_5])
- 15) Linear feature (Field CR420; [UHA_115])

CRC 2-6 (Solar Development Site 2 to Solar Development Site 6)

3.2.22 The NYHER records no heritage assets and no findspots within CRC 2-6. Two potential heritage assets have been identified through walkover survey, and one potential heritage asset has been identified through geophysical survey.

- 1) Possible ridge and furrow (Field CR466; [UHA_134])
- 2) Crossing point (Field CR466; [UHA_136])
- 3) Ditches associated with Fleet Street Dyke (Field CR464; [CGS_C2-6_1])

CRC 6-7 (Solar Development Site 6 to Solar Development Site 7)

3.2.23 The NYHER records no heritage assets and no findspots within CRC6-7. No potential heritage assets were identified through any of the survey methods previously described.

Highways Improvements Areas

3.2.24 The NYHER records four heritage assets and no findspots within the HIAs. No potential heritage assets were identified through any of the survey methods previously described. The assets comprise:

- 1) Guide Post (HIA 8. Checker Land, Main Street and A19, south of Riccall; [UHA_069])
- 2) Footbridge (HIA 12. Sand Lane and Lordship Lane; [UHA_077])
- 3) Finger Post (HIA 18. Hospital Lane and Greenlands Lane; [UHA_094])
- 4) Wooden Bridge (HIA 19. Dam Lane, immediately north of Thorpe Willoughby; [UHA_095])

Site 8 Access

3.2.25 Desktop historic map and LiDAR survey has identified 12 potential assets within the Site 8 Access area. No potential heritage assets were identified through any of the other survey methods previously described. These assets comprise:

- 1) Enclosures and field system shown as cropmarks, Hambleton (Solar Development Site 8 Access – A63; [MNY10417])
- 2) Possible settlement (Solar Development Site 8 Access – A63; [MNY17256])
- 3) Moat, Sherburn-in-Elmet (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [MNY10342])
- 4) Possible moat south-west of Low Rest Park Farm (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [MNY17167])

- 5) Possible pond (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [UHA_120])
- 6) Possible ridge and furrow remain (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [UHA_121])
- 7) Trackway (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [UHA_122])
- 8) Historic Boundary (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [UHA_123])
- 9) Field Boundary (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [UHA_124])
- 10) Possible ditch (field boundary) (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [UHA_125])
- 11) Possible ditch (field boundary) (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [UHA_126])
- 12) Possible ditch (field boundary) (Solar Development Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane; [UHA_127])

Construction compounds

Solar Development Site Construction Compounds

- 3.2.26 Three of the heritage assets and three of the potential heritage assets within the Solar Development Sites (Solar Development Site 1, Solar Development Site 6, and Solar Development Site 8) are located within the Solar Development Site Construction Compounds. These comprise:
- 1) Pond 203 m east of Easterby's Plantation (Solar Development Site 1, Solar Development Site 1 Construction Compound A; [MNY26249])
 - 2) Pond? Drain 374 metres south-east of Duck Decoy (Solar Development Site 1, Solar Development Site 1 Construction Compound B; [MNY26118])
 - 3) Enclosure on Milford Common (Solar Development Site 6, Solar Development Site 6 Construction Compound 2; [MNY10360])
 - 4) Network of ditches indicating trackways with appended fields (Solar Development Site 6, Solar Development Site 6 Site Construction Compound; [GS_S6_2])
 - 5) Irregular enclosure and ditches (Solar Development Site 6, Solar Development Site 6 Site Construction Compound; [GS_S6_3])
 - 6) Possible former field boundary (Solar Development Site 8, Solar Development Site 8 Site Construction Compound 2; [UHA_130])
- 3.2.27 No other heritage assets or potential heritage assets identified within any of the Solar Development Sites interact with the Solar Development Site Construction Compounds.

Cable Construction Compounds

3.2.28 One of the heritage assets within CRC 4-POC also extends within a Cable Construction Compound (Compound 5). This asset is presented below. No other heritage assets of potential heritage assets identified within the Cable Route Corridor interacts with the Cable Construction Compounds.

- 1) Brickwork pattern field system, Burton Salmon [Field CR413; CF414; CF418; CF412; CR418; CR416; [MNY9922]]

3.3 Previous archaeological investigations

3.3.1 Previous archaeological investigations within the Proposed Development are limited. Solar Development Sites 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 and all construction compounds have no recorded archaeological interventions or surveys within the NYHER (desk-top studies have been excluded as these are synoptic and do not present new data).

Solar Development Site 1

3.3.2 The southern part of Solar Development Site 1 (Fields 1.43, 1.45, 1.39, 1.40, 1.41, 1.33, 1.34) is bisected by the route of the Yorkshire Derwent Aqueduct Duplication Main, which also closely aligns with Cable Route Corridor 1-4. This included three areas of geophysical survey [ENY3478-3480]. Two of these areas showed no geophysical survey responses, however the third [ENY3480] recorded responses in Field 1.34 which corresponded to known cropmarks. Subsequent excavation [ENY2612] and [ENY2613] revealed Romano-British features including a large boundary ditch and a sub-rectangular enclosure site of Romano-British date [MNY24075].

Solar Development Site 4

3.3.3 Field 4.10 and 4.11 were subject to partial geophysical survey [ENY8541] as part of the Ferrybridge D Gas Connection Corridor. Areas 21-27 intersect with the Solar Development Site 4 boundary, however the majority of features identified are likely to be natural or agricultural origin. A weak linear anomaly measuring c.32m in length, does not follow the alignment of any agricultural anomalies in the vicinity and does not appear to have a clear modern origin, therefore an archaeological origin cannot be ruled out (Ref 15).

Cable Route Corridor

3.3.4 As noted above, the Yorkshire Derwent Aqueduct Duplication Main broadly follows the proposed alignment of Cable Route Corridor (CRC) 1-4/1-4a, between Solar Development Site 1 and Riccall. A watching brief on the pipeline [ENY2611] identified a significant quantity of archaeological features which resulted in additional phases of geophysical survey [ENY815, ENY3472-ENY3477] and fieldwalking [ENY3463-ENY3465]. At Charity Plantation, geophysical survey and fieldwalking suggested the presence of a Romano-British field system

[MNY12093]. In the area around Selby Road [MNY12101] and King Rudding Lane [MNY12103, MNY12104], a number of flints, medieval sherds and post-medieval pottery sherds were identified during fieldwalking. Geophysical survey also identified a number of anomalies including a possible Romano-British field system (NMY12093) with Romano-British pottery found during nearby fieldwalking. These features are adjacent to a historically known, potential Roman settlement site [MNY12173] with geophysical survey identifying anomalies which could represent structural remains. Fieldwalking of the area recovered six flint finds, nine sherds of Romano-British pottery, and 42 sherds of medieval pottery.

3.3.5 CRC 1-4/1-4a also intersects with part of the Asselby to Pannal Pipeline including fieldwalking surveys [ENY3509; ENY6813], monitoring of geotechnical test pits [ENY8374] and geophysical survey [ENY6750]. No features were identified within the Cable Route Corridor.

3.3.6 CRC 4-POC intersects with a scheme of geophysical survey surrounding the Monk Fryston Substation which identified a number of possible enclosures and agricultural features [ENY9349]. Monitoring of a geotechnical scheme of works which intersects with the Cable Route Corridor at Stocking Lane revealed no archaeological layers [ENY8924].

3.4 LiDAR and aerial photography

3.4.1 A full review of up to date Environment Agency LiDAR (1m DTM, 2022, processed with multidirectional hillshade) and publicly accessible aerial photographs of the Proposed Development has been undertaken. An additional seven assets were identified within the Proposed Development. Where applicable, they have been listed in Section 3.2, from paragraph 3.2.4 onwards, and their significance is assessed in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05]

3.5 Geophysical survey

Solar Development Sites

3.5.1 Geophysical survey was undertaken in all Solar Development Sites between 8 April 2024 and 9 September 2025. The survey has identified a number of potential archaeological features across Solar Development Sites 1-8 (Ref 23, Ref 24, Ref 25, Ref 26).

Solar Development Site 1

3.5.2 The geophysical survey recorded multiple anomalies across Solar Development Site 1. The anomalies indicated the presence of several nucleated settlements or small farmsteads, likely Iron Age or Romano-British in age. The anomalies comprised rectilinear enclosures, some of which included circular or semi-circular ditches, which indicated the presence of roundhouses. Zones of increased magnetic response were also detected within these enclosures, possibly evidencing small-scale industrial activity, such as ovens or kilns. Two such

enclosures were detected in the northeastern end of the Solar Development Site [GS_S1_14, GS_S1_15], with a further example to the west [GS_S1_17]. Three areas of further possible settlement activity were detected in the western end of the Solar Development Site; all three included multiple ring ditches, several of which were inside of rectilinear enclosures [GS_S1_19, GS_S1_20, GS_S1_21]. A final area of possible settlement was found in the southeastern end of the Solar Development Site (GS_S1_25]. This example was the most densely populated, as three ovate ditches were clustered together, the middle and largest feature opening out onto a possible double-ditched entrance.

- 3.5.3 Outside of the farmsteads, the linear geophysical anomalies generally indicated previous agricultural field systems or enclosures, which could be of any period in date. Finally, an area of increased magnetic response in the northern end of the Solar Development Site, which included strong linear anomalies and trends within it, was identified as being of possible interest [GS_S1_7]. Responses such as these often indicate relatively modern building foundations or demolition debris, but no such examples could be found on historic mapping. As a 19th century quarry (MNY26351) is recorded south of the responses, it was considered that it could be an extension of this activity.

Solar Development Site 2

- 3.5.4 A large area of agricultural activity was detected in the northeastern end of the Solar Development Site during the geophysical survey [GS_S2_1]. The anomalies included ditched enclosures, a double-ditched trackway, a ring ditch and large pits, possibly for refuse. Areas of increased magnetic response were thought to mark spreads of habitation features. These enclosures may indicate the locations of small farmsteads or nucleated, small settlements, within wider field systems.

Solar Development Site 3

- 3.5.5 No anomalies of definite archaeological interest were detected in Solar Development Site 3. A large, discrete response detected in the southwest of the Solar Development Site was categorised as an anomaly of uncertain archaeological interest. This feature, which measured 10m wide, was thought to indicate an infilled extraction pit or pond, or a large area of buried refuse material.

Solar Development Site 4

- 3.5.6 The geophysical survey of Solar Development Site 4 uncovered several areas of archaeological potential. This included anomalies which corresponded with two separate medieval moated sites recorded on the HER. Within the western end of the Solar Development Site, a D-shaped enclosure, measuring 95m by 75m, was detected [GS_S4_1]; discrete responses inside the enclosure indicated internal divisions, and breaks in the outer 'ring' were thought to potentially indicate entrances. This enclosure corresponded with 'Roe Field Moat' [MNY9905]. The second moated site was located towards the southwestern end of the Solar

Development Site, and comprised an anomaly of a rectangular enclosure, measuring 55m by 45m; a clear break could be seen to the southern side, indicating a possible entrance [GS_S1_2]. This enclosure corresponded with a medieval moat originally identified via aerial photography [MNY9907].

3.5.7 Agricultural activity of an unknown period was indicated in the southwestern end of the Solar Development Site, by anomalies of ditches and pits [GS_S4_3], as well as less-certain linear and curvilinear trends [GS_S4_4]. These features were tentatively identified as potential agricultural enclosures.

3.5.8 Finally, a possible farmstead was indicated by numerous anomalies of ditches, pits and trends in the southeastern end of the Solar Development Site, some of which were curvilinear and could suggest the presence of roundhouses [GS_S4_5].

Solar Development Site 6

3.5.9 Anomalies corresponding with the location of features previously identified via cropmarks observed on aerial photography were recorded during the geophysical survey in Solar Development Site 6. This included two pits and a semi-circular anomaly [GS_S6_1], which corresponded with two ring ditches recorded on the HER [MNY10364], and an extensive network of ditches and enclosures. This network included a ditch and an irregular enclosure [GS_S6_2, GS_S6_3] which corresponded with an undated trackway and enclosure detailed in HER records MNY10359 and MNY10360. Further ditches, similar to the possible trackway, were also detected [GS_S6_5], along with a single circular ring, which measured 14m in diameter [GS_S6_4]. The ring was thought to mark a barrow or possibly a roundhouse. A second, partial circular anomaly was detected in the southern end of the Solar Development Site, extending further than the Order Limits. This feature measured 26m in diameter, and was double-ditched, possibly indicating the presence of an enclosure, mound or barrow.

Solar Development Site 7

3.5.10 No anomalies of definite archaeological origin were identified by the geophysical survey in Solar Development Site 7. However, a number of northwest-southeast orientated field boundaries were detected, along with several linear trends of uncertain origin, which may be indicative of natural variation or agricultural processes, such as ploughing. A circular area of increased magnetic response was also detected in the northeastern corner of the Solar Development Site.

Solar Development Site 8

3.5.11 The geophysical survey in Solar Development Site 8 identified only two anomalies of archaeological origin. This included a partial enclosure in the northern end of the Solar Development Site [GS_S8_1]. Parallel linear trends indicated a double ditch along the southern side of the enclosure, and a gap in the eastern side was thought to indicate a possible entrance. The western side of the enclosure was obscured by land drains. The second feature was an area

of strong ferrous response on the site of an infilled pond. The pond was identified via historic mapping. Outside of the two archaeological features, anomalies indicated good survival of former field boundaries, and weak magnetic responses suggested several partial linear features, which may represent former field systems. Two groups of small, pit-like anomalies were detected in the eastern half of the Solar Development Site, but their purpose was unclear due to their irregular morphology.

Cable Route Corridor

- 3.5.12 Geophysical survey was undertaken across 273.6 hectares (ha) of the total surveyable area of the Cable Route Corridor, between 21 April and 12 December 2025. The remaining 58.4 ha was inaccessible during this time, but will be surveyed once the land becomes available. The survey has identified a number of potential archaeological features across the Cable Route Corridor (Ref 28 and Ref 29).

Cable Route Corridor 1-4/1-4a

- 3.5.13 In the northeastern end of the cable route corridor, a group of archaeological features indicated by the geophysical survey was located in a field southeast of Charity Plantation, bound to the east by Glade Road [CGS_C1-4_1]. The anomalies comprised a northeast-southwest orientated linear feature, c.90m long, with an attached square enclosure to the south (c.25m by 30m); the corner of another possible enclosure lay further southwest (c. 50m long). These features likely represent the remnants of a former field system: as their morphology is not distinct, the date of the features is uncertain.
- 3.5.14 A group of anomalies were grouped in a field to the northwest of Thorpe Willoughby; they comprised a series of four parallel N-S orientated linear features, each between c.115-130m apart [CGS_C1-4_2]. The easternmost linear feature was part of, or possibly truncated, a corner of a rectangular enclosure, c.50m long. Internal subdivisions were visible within this enclosure. These features likely represent the remains of former field boundaries, or perhaps a former field system.
- 3.5.15 An anomaly of a partial east-west orientated linear feature, c.90m long, was located in a field bound to the west by Morrets Lane, and to the south by Field Lane [CGS_C1-4_3].
- 3.5.16 Two parallel northwest-southeast orientated linear anomalies, c.55m long [CGS_C1-4_4], were detected in Field CR6, within the section of the Cable Route Corridor which connects with Solar Development Site 1. These features may represent the remains of an agricultural trackway.
- 3.5.17 Several anomalies were detected within the section of the Cable Route Corridor which travels through a series of fields bound by Common Wood and Nightingale Wood, southwest of Solar Development Site 1. A large subcircular anomaly, around 45-50m in diameter, was detected within Field CR22 [CGS_C1-4_5]. This anomaly may represent the remains of an infilled pond of extraction pit, possibly

indicating the presence of further quarrying activity in proximity to Charity Farm Sand Pit [MNY23436]. An anomaly of a curvilinear feature, c.20m in diameter, with an appended northwest-southeast orientated linear feature, was detected within Field CR23 [CGS_C1-4_6]. The full extent of this feature is unknown, as it was obscured by interference from overhead cables. However, it may represent a ring ditch, possibly for a roundhouse or animal pen. Finally, a northwest-southeast orientated linear anomaly, c.95m long, was recorded within Field CR23 [CGS_C1-4_7]. This feature does not align with any known field boundaries and may represent a drainage ditch or part of a field system.

- 3.5.18 Two anomalies of partial curvilinear anomalies, c.10-20m in diameter, were detected within Field 324, within the section of CRC 1-4 which diverges from the alternate CRC 1-4a to connect with Solar Development Site 4 [CGS_C1-4_7]. These features may represent the remains of roundhouses, or animal pens; the interpretation of them as roundhouses is supported by their proximity to several cropmarks of roundhouses recorded on the HER [MNY9902, MNY9903 and MNY17060], and their presence within a large enclosure [MNY9899].

Cable Route Corridor 3-4/3-4a

- 3.5.19 Anomalies of two parallel northeast-southwest orientated linear features were identified within CRC 3-4/3-4a [CGS_C3-4a_1]. These partial features measured between 52-57m long, and may represent former field boundaries, or infilled drainage dikes.

Cable Route Corridor CRC 4-POC

- 3.5.20 A partial enclosure was identified in a field west of Burton Salmon, bound to the west by Bywater Wood. The anomaly comprised the northwestern corner of a probable square or rectangular enclosure, c.70m by 90m [CGS_C4POC_1]. Two faint anomalies of parallel north-south orientated linear features, c.50-60m long, were also detected, directly adjacent to the west of the partial enclosure [CGS_C4POC_5].
- 3.5.21 A group of anomalies was located in a field north of Burton Salmon, bound on either side by the A162 and Hillam Lane. The anomalies indicated a much denser area of activity than anywhere else along the corridor, representing a possible former farmstead or nucleated settlement [CGS_C4POC_2]. The anomalies comprised a curving, double-ditched trackway, c.190m long, from which several northwest-southeast linear features extended, suggesting the presence of a former field system. To the east of the trackway was a ring ditch, c.37m in diameter; this was bisected by a rectilinear enclosure, to which a semi-circular linear feature, c.40m in diameter, was attached. A northwestern-orientated spur extended from the southwestern end of the trackway; three possible rectangular enclosures lay either side of this spur, between c.25m and 40m long. Finally, a number of discrete pits or post holes were visible either side of the trackway. The presence of a ring ditch may suggest a former, ploughed out barrow or a roundhouse. If so, the activity may date from the Bronze Age to the Romano-British periods, but a later date cannot be ruled out.

- 3.5.22 In the northwestern end of the Cable Route Corridor, adjacent to the southeast of its connection with Monk Fryston Substation, a group of anomalies indicating the presence of a partial enclosure was detected [CGS_C4POC_3]. The anomalies were intermittent but indicated three sides of a northeast-southwest orientated rectangular enclosure, c.80m by 60m, from which east-west linear features extended.
- 3.5.23 A northeast-southwest orientated linear anomaly, c.145m long, was detected within Field CR411. This feature does not align with any known field boundaries and may represent the remains of an infilled drainage dike.

Cable Route Corridor 2-6

- 3.5.24 Within Field CR464, where the Cable Route Corridor bends to travel northwards to Solar Development Site 6, two parallel northeast-southwest orientated linear anomalies were detected, either side of an infilled continuation of Fleet Street Dyke [CGS_2-6_1]. They may represent the remains of agricultural tracks or routes alongside the dike.

3.6 Trial trench evaluations

- 3.6.1 Archaeological trial trench evaluations were undertaken at all Solar Development Sites between 28 July 2025 and 30 September 2025 (Ref 34, Ref 35, Ref 36, Ref 37, Ref 38 and Ref 39). A discussion of the results is presented below, by Solar Development Site.

Solar Development Site 1

- 3.6.2 A total of 98, 50m by 1.8m trenches, were excavated across Solar Development Site 1. Overall, the features were indicative of a rural, agricultural settlement which began in the Iron Age and continued into the Romano-British period. Remains largely dated to the Iron Age period and were clustered in dispersed areas of activity in the northeastern, western and central areas of the Solar Development Site. This included groups of ring ditches, likely indicative of roundhouses, which were often sited within or associated with rectilinear enclosures; however, several rectilinear enclosures without roundhouses were also encountered, which were likely purely agricultural.
- 3.6.3 Two separate enclosures were indicated by the geophysical survey in the northeastern end of the Solar Development Site [GS_S1_14; GS_S1_15]. Evidence of internal subdivisions for both enclosures was recorded during the evaluation, including possible roundhouses. The outer enclosures were more substantial, whilst the ring ditches were found to be shallow and ephemeral in nature. No datable material was recovered from any features in this area of the Solar Development Site.
- 3.6.4 The presence of a large, ditched enclosure, which was indicated by a geophysical anomaly of a rectangular enclosure measuring 30m x 35m and associated ditches [GS_S1_17] in Field 1.13, was only partially confirmed by the trial trench

- evaluation. A single gully was uncovered, which corresponded with the northeastern side of the enclosure.
- 3.6.5 The presence of a regular rectilinear enclosure, measuring 28m x 34m, was confirmed within Field 1.25 [GS_S1_18], as the northern and southern sides were uncovered during the trial trench evaluation. Iron Age pottery was recovered from one of the ditch slots.
- 3.6.6 Evidence of a further four enclosures or farmsteads was found within the southern end of the Solar Development Site. The geophysical survey indicated a series of three discrete areas of settlement, on a northeast-southwest alignment. A fourth rectilinear enclosure was uncovered by the trial trench evaluation [TT_S1_1], to the northwest of the enclosures identified by the geophysical survey. These features comprised two interconnected ditches, which represented the corner of a larger enclosure, and two sub-ovate pits.
- 3.6.7 Southwest of these features, anomalies of two partial ring ditches, as well as an irregular enclosure were detected [GS_S1_20]. Evidence of the central ring ditch, as well as elements of the irregular enclosure, was found: these features included Iron Age to Romano-British pottery sherds.
- 3.6.8 Moving to the northeast, anomalies of an intermittent rectilinear enclosure were detected by the geophysical survey; three ring ditches were also detected in the southern end of the enclosure [GS_S1_19]. Evidence of all three ring ditches was found, but relationships between them were unclear due to the visual limitations posed by the width of the trial trench. Evidence of the northwestern and southern sides of the outer, rectilinear enclosure were found within the trenches: the southern end was found to be a substantial feature, measuring 2.72m wide and 1.22m deep. By contrast, the northwestern end was much smaller, measuring 1.82m wide and 0.6m deep; this suggests a lower degree of survival to the northern end of the enclosure, which is also indicated by the intermittent responses detected by the geophysical survey.
- 3.6.9 The third enclosure in the northeastern end of this alignment was also found to survive in good condition [GS_S1_21]. Two sides of a probable square enclosure were excavated; as with the outer enclosure ditches in the other farmsteads, this feature was found to be the most substantial, with each ditch measuring 3.05m wide and 0.78m deep. Evidence of two ring ditches was found within this enclosure, though again, relationships between them were unclear; one intervention indicated the presence of a wider drainage ditch and a less substantial structural gully. Iron Age to Romano-British pottery was recovered from features within this cluster. Interestingly, several trenches recorded further ditches and pits which were not indicated by the geophysical survey, and which contained 1st to 2nd century AD pottery [TT_S1_2, TT_S1_3]; these may indicate a wider Romano-British field system connecting the farmsteads, or perhaps a later phase of activity.
- 3.6.10 A square enclosure indicated by the geophysical survey was targeted in the southern end of the Solar Development Site [GS_S1_25]. No evidence of this enclosure was found in any of the trenches, but evidence of another possible

enclosure was found to the southeast; these features had also been indicated by geophysical anomalies of interconnected ditches. A curvilinear feature containing Romano-British pottery was found, as well as two post holes and an east-west orientated linear ditch in close proximity. Another ditch aligned northwest-southeast, and a posthole were recorded to the southwest of these features [TT_S1_5]. The posthole contained a possible preserved wooden stake, but no datable material.

- 3.6.11 Further areas of archaeological activity were indicated by ditches and other discrete features to the northwest, east and south. Where these separate features were isolated and unconnected from the areas of settlement or agricultural enclosures, they likely held other agricultural purposes, such as demarcating land boundaries, functioning as drainage, or managing livestock.

Solar Development Site 2

- 3.6.12 A total of 55 50m by 2m trenches were excavated across five fields. In general, where the geophysical survey indicated anomalies of strong magnetic response, the results of the trial trench evaluation in Solar Development Site 2 encountered corresponding archaeological features. Areas of possible archaeological activity indicated only by 'trends' of weaker magnetic response were not confirmed by the trial trench excavation [GS_S2_1], which suggests they may correspond with geomorphological changes, or more modern agricultural activity.
- 3.6.13 Overall, the archaeological features recorded by the trial trench evaluation were indicative of both agricultural and small-scale industrial activity during the Romano-British period. The industrial activity comprised an area of small-scale pottery production, evidenced by two kilns within the same field. The westernmost kiln, [TT_S2_1], was keyhole-shaped, with a circular chamber and a northeast to southwest aligned flue. The second kiln, [TT_S2_2], was formed of two adjacent, stone-lined parallel flues with two separate chambers. Fragments of mid-2nd century whiteware and greyware pottery were recovered from the surface of this feature. Possible Romano-British enclosures were indicated by the discovery of several V- and U-shaped ditches, on broadly northeast-southwest alignments [TT_S2_3]. Other undated linear features encountered across the Solar Development Site were generally indicative of ridge and furrow cultivation, or former field boundaries, likely dating to between the medieval and post medieval periods.

Solar Development Site 3

- 3.6.14 Overall, the trial trench evaluation corresponded with the geophysical survey, which did not detect any anomalies of probable archaeological origin. Of the eleven 50m x 2m trenches excavated, only three contained archaeological features, all of which were linear ditches. These ditches represented the remains of former post medieval field boundaries.

Solar Development Site 4

- 3.6.15 A total of 118 50m x2m trenches were excavated across Solar Development Site 4. In general, the evaluation confirmed the results of the geophysical survey, as well as the presence of both moated sites recorded on the HER [MNY9905, MNY9907].
- 3.6.16 Roe Field Moat [MNY9905, GS_S4_1], which had previously been interpreted as a high status, medieval moated residence, was confirmed to survive in good condition. Three sides of the enclosure were excavated and found to measure between 10.8-4.3m wide and 2.2m-0.8m deep; the southeastern corner was exposed but left unexcavated. Internal features were also recorded within the enclosure, comprising a parallel ditch in the southern end, and a pit. Pottery dating to the 14th century, mostly green glazed, was recovered from several of the features. Such pottery is common in towns, but less so in rural areas, where it was owned by wealthier people; this supports the interpretation of the moat as a high-status residence.
- 3.6.17 A second moated residence, adjacent to Barkhouse Wood Lane [MNY9907, GS_S1_2], was also confirmed to survive in good condition. Only one intervention was excavated for this enclosure, in its northwestern side, where it was found to be 6.6m wide and 2.4m deep. The southeast and southwest sides were exposed but left unexcavated during the evaluation. No datable material was recovered from the intervention excavated, but a metal object was retrieved from the surface of the southwestern side. Due to the enclosure's proximity to a cluster of Roman activity, it may be of a similar date, but its morphology – particularly its width and depth – is suggestive of a moated residence.
- 3.6.18 Geophysical survey revealed a series of ditch - and pit-like features alongside linear and curvilinear features approximately 100m south-west of the Medieval moated site [MNY9907, GS_S4_2] also in Field 4.12. The presence of this field system was confirmed by the trial trench evaluation, where archaeological features corresponding with the geophysical anomalies of partial enclosures were excavated. This included the possible corner of an enclosure, and substantial north-south orientated ditches which corresponded with anomalies of a probable trackway. Artefactual evidence recovered from these features included Roman pottery from the late 1st to 3rd centuries, as well as a fragments of amphora from North Africa and Andalucia, and unidentified metal objects.
- 3.6.19 The geophysical survey identified a cluster of ditch and pit like features, approximately 100m southwest of GS_S1_2, which indicated the presence of a possible field system [GS_S1_3]. The presence of two north-south orientated parallel linear features was confirmed, indicating the presence of a trackway; the western side was substantial, measuring 4.26m wide and 0.82m deep. Linear features corresponding with geophysical anomalies of partial enclosures were also uncovered, from which pottery dating from the late 1st to 3rd century were recovered, as well as fragments of amphorae. Further activity, not indicated by geophysical anomalies, was excavated to the south and northeast of the partial

enclosures. These features comprised multiple ditches on different alignments [TT_S4_1].

- 3.6.20 Remains corresponding with geophysical anomalies indicative of a Romano-British settlement were recorded [GS_S4_5], north of Woodhouse Farm. The geophysical anomalies suggested the presence of several interconnected enclosure ditches, as well as discrete features such as pits and ring ditches. These features were largely confirmed by the evaluation, including weaker anomalies which could not be definitively assigned an archaeological origin during the geophysical survey. Several features contained Romano-British pottery, largely dating to the 2nd century, and four metal objects were also recovered from two parallel northwest-southeast orientated ditches.
- 3.6.21 Another series of geophysical anomalies, this time indicative of regular enclosure, or a partial field system, was recorded southwest of Woodhouse Farm [GS_S4_4]. These features were not confirmed by the trial trench evaluation. However, two intercutting, north-south orientated ditches, one of which contained 2nd century pottery, were uncovered south of these anomalies.
- 3.6.22 A group of ditches was identified by the geophysical survey in the southeastern end of the Site [GS_S4_7]. A trench was sited in the location of the anomalies, and four separate ditches were uncovered, three of which were on a northeast-southwest alignment. One of these ditches contained 14th century pottery, suggesting that they may have functioned as medieval field boundaries. The fourth ditch followed an east-west alignment and was found to contain 3rd century pottery; this feature was likely associated with the probable farmsteads to the southwest of the Order Limits, identified by the geophysical survey (as the extent of the geophysical survey was greater than the Order Limits).
- 3.6.23 Outside of the clusters of activity described above, the undated linear and discrete features largely reflected the long agricultural use of land within the Site, [TT_S4_2, TT_S4_3, TT_S4_4, TT_S4_5].

Solar Development Site 6

- 3.6.24 A total of 61 50m by 1.18m trenches were excavated across Solar Development Site 6. In general, the results of this evaluation confirmed the results of the geophysical survey and indicated phases of agricultural activity in both the Iron Age/Romano-British and post medieval periods. A possible area of settlement was indicated by a ring ditch [GS_S6_4] excavated in the southeastern end of Field 6.3, but further investigation is needed, as no internal features were recorded. Artefactual material recovered from the ring ditch confirmed an Iron Age to Romano-British date.
- 3.6.25 Outside of the ring ditch, features largely comprised linear ditches, indicative of former field systems, enclosures, or field boundaries [GS_S6_2, GS_S6_5, TT_S6_1]. The remains of a circular brick well, likely post medieval in date, were uncovered in the eastern end of the Solar Development Site [TT_S6_2]. No evidence of a possible circular enclosure, indicated by cropmarks and recorded

on the HER [MNY10364, GS_S6_1], or a separate irregular enclosure and associated ditches [MNY10359, MNY10360, GS_S6_3], was recovered.

Solar Development Site 7

- 3.6.26 Three trenches were excavated in Solar Development Site 7, positioned on a random grid array. The geophysical survey conducted within this area did not detect any anomalies of a distinct archaeological character, but several weaker anomalies of intermittent linear enclosures were observed.
- 3.6.27 Of the three trenches, only one contained archaeological features, comprising three linear ditches. The ditches were thought to mark two sides of a possible rectilinear enclosure [TT_S7_1] and may correspond with several of the 'uncertain' geophysical anomalies detected in this field. No dateable material was recovered, but animal bone was found in one of the ditches, indicating a probable agricultural use.

Solar Development Site 8

- 3.6.28 A total of 14 trenches were excavated across two fields in Solar Development Site 8. Archaeological features were encountered in five of these trenches. The geophysical survey indicated the presence of a rectangular enclosure in the northwestern end of the Solar Development Site [GS_S8_1], which may have been double-ditched along its southwestern edge. Other, uncertain anomalies were indicative of partial enclosure in the southern end of the Solar Development Site, and strong responses indicating the presence of former field boundaries were also detected.
- 3.6.29 The trial trench evaluation broadly confirmed the results of the geophysical survey, with a few caveats. The rectangular enclosure [GS_S8_1] was indicated by the presence of a pit, ditch and ditch terminus within its location, but no evidence of the outer enclosure, or its southwestern double ditch was recovered. The features contained Roman pottery.
- 3.6.30 The presence of two former field boundaries was confirmed by ditches excavated in the southwestern end of the Solar Development Site; a third and final ditch did not correspond with any geophysical anomalies but was interpreted as a field boundary on the basis of its alignment, which followed others in its vicinity. No artefactual material was recovered from these features, but they are likely post medieval in date.
- 3.6.31 Finally, a large ditch on an east-west alignment was excavated in the northeastern corner of the Solar Development Site [TT_S8_1]. This feature may correspond with a partial linear anomaly of uncertain origin. It was the largest feature recorded by the excavation, being 4m wide and 0.8m deep, and its shape is suggestive of a former drain or field boundary. A single piece of 19th century pottery was recovered from this feature.

3.7 Geology and topography

Geology

- 3.7.1 The Proposed Development spans three distinct areas of bedrock geology (British Geological Survey, n.d.);
- 1) Brotherton Formation - Limestone, Dolomitic
 - 2) Roxby Formation - Mudstone, Calcareous
 - 3) Sherwood Sandstone Group - Sandstone
- 3.7.2 The underlying geology of an area strongly influences its topography and, by extension, its land use. The Brotherton Formation comprises dolomitic limestone (grey with abundant calcinema) and crops out from north Nottinghamshire to north Yorkshire. It underlies Monk Fryston Substation, the western part of CRC 4-POC, Solar Development Site 7, CRC 6-7 and the western part of Solar Development Site 6 (Fields 6.1-6.4). Within the Study Area, the limestone bedrock is intermittently overlain with superficial deposits of Harrogate Till and Hemingbrough Glaciolacustrine (laminated clays, silts and sands), set down at the end of the last Ice Age. The soils which extend across the dolomitic limestone geology comprise primarily of freely draining lime-rich loamy soils, historically supporting herb-rich chalk and limestone pastures; lime-rich deciduous woodlands (Ref 16).
- 3.7.3 The Roxby Formation is a narrow swathe of mudstone running from the Sedgefield area to the north of Nottingham. The geology underlies Solar Development Site 3, part of CRC 2-4, CRC 2-6, CRC 3-4, CRC 3-4a and CRC 4-POC, the western part of Solar Development Site 2 (Fields 2.1, 2.2, 2.4), eastern part of Solar Development Site 6 (Fields 6.5-6.7) and northern part of Solar Development Site 4 (Fields 4.1-4.3). The remainder of the Proposed Development sits atop the Sherwood Sandstone Group (British Geological Survey, n.d.). Superficial deposits of Beighton Sand Formation and Hemingbrough Glaciolacustrine Formation are recorded across both bedrock geologies, supporting a range of predominantly loamy overlying soils, including naturally and seasonally wet environments in and around the historic floodplains of the River Ouse and River Aire (Cranfield University, n.d.). Many of the superficial deposits were laid down by the extensive glacial Lake Humber, which covered much of the Study Area, and was formed when melt water from the last glaciation became trapped by further ice sheets. These fluvial deposits can be very varied, and include material brought down from both the Pennines and the Magnesian Limestone ridge to the west. Blocked from discharging into the sea, Lake Humber deposited clay layers up to 20m deep across the Humberhead Levels region (Historic England, 2020). Whilst later rivers cut channels through the Lake Humber deposits, these then filled due to rising sea levels, resulting in a predominantly flat landscape, with extensive flooding and wetting of the soils, and the development of large areas of peaty fen and bog. The majority of the Study Area is now under agricultural cultivation with limited pockets of rural

settlement. The fertile soils are maintained by drainage and produce a range of root crops and cereals (Ref 17).

Topography

- 3.7.4 Despite covering an extended area, the topographic profile of the Study Area remains largely consistent. This is due to the majority of the Proposed Development being located within National Character Area (NCA) 39 - the Humberhead Levels; a flat, low-lying and large scale agricultural landscape bounded to the west by the low ridge of the Southern Magnesian Limestone (Brotherton Formation; NCA 30) and, to the north, it merges into the slightly undulating landscape of the Vale of York (NCA 28), at the line of the Escrick Moraine (Ref 17).
- 3.7.5 The topography across the Proposed Development ranges from 4-12 m above Ordnance Datum (AOD), with gradual elevation in height from Hillam Lane to the Monk Fryston Substation, as the underlying geology changes, and at the northern extent of Solar Development Site 1, towards Escrick.

Historic landscape character

- 3.7.6 The North Yorkshire, York and Lower Tees Valley Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) (Dalton, Rowe, & Toase, 2013) designates all areas within the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor under the 'Broad Type' of Enclosed Land, with the exception of CRC 1-4 which passes through the Designed Landscape (HNY5580; Ornamental Parkland) or Woodland (HNY22354; Broad-Leaved Planation) as it enters Solar Development Site 1. However, historic mapping shows the area covered by polygon HNY22354 as part of an enclosed field system beyond the Escrick designed landscape, and it remains under agricultural cultivation.
- 3.7.7 The Study Area includes a number of areas classified under the Broad Types of Woodland, Settlement, Extractive and Designated Landscape (Escrick Park).
- 3.7.8 The majority of the HLC polygons which intersect with the Proposed Development are classified under the sub-type of Modern Improved Fields (HNY5386; HNY5384; HNY6555; HNY5442; HNY5107; HNY24570; HNY5204; HNY551). Within the context of the project, this refers to areas of enclosure which have seen a large degree of boundary loss since the first edition six-inch County Series Ordnance Survey mapping (1846-63) to create large enclosures over 10 ha. Modern improved fields are derived from earlier character types, often piecemeal enclosure and are illustrative of historic field boundary erosion as a result of agricultural modernisation initiatives such as the Common Agricultural Policy and Mansholt Plan (Ref 18).
- 3.7.9 A number of areas identified as Piecemeal Enclosure intersect with the Proposed Development (HNY6145; HNY5839; HNY5999; HNY5516; HNY5512; HNY6088). These fields retain the less organised, structure of early enclosure usually associated with the early post-medieval period (1540-1750 CE) unlike the extremely regular pattern of the planned enclosure, found later post-medieval

period. The field systems also contrast with the more structured field patterns from the medieval period. Piecemeal Enclosure represents a relatively common HLC type, accounting for 14% of the total survey area, however its survival is better in upland areas and the proliferation of Modern Improved Fields across the Study Area is indicative of its gradual erosion from the lower lying areas across the 20th century (Ref 18).

- 3.7.10 Planned Large Scale Parliamentary Enclosure (HNY5838; HNY6007; HNY5151; HNY5853) and Unknown Planned Enclosure (HNY6149; HNY6374; HNY5514; HNY22372) represent all but three of the remaining HLC types. Planned Enclosure is generally characterised by fairly regular fields, defined by straight boundaries (the boundary type varies depending on location, topography and geology). It is more prevalent in lowland areas, such as those which make up the majority of the Study Area and refers to a specific series of historic events that occurred in the post-medieval period, broadly between 1750 and 1850. Many of these were agreed by acts of Parliament with the first Yorkshire Parliamentary enclosure act signed in 1726 (Toase, 2010). Land around Escrick was 'inclosed' by an Act of Parliament in 1781, Monk Fryston, Beal and 'Kellingly' in 1793, Thorpe Willoughby in 1803, and Birkin in 1815 (Ref 19).

3.8 Map regression

- 3.8.1 The Study Areas is covered by Thomas Jeffreys 'Survey of the County of Yorkshire' map of 1775, sheet 3. Whilst a number of villages, as well as the towns of Esrick and Selby are depicted, the scale and style of the map mean that identifying the areas covered by Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 is not possible. The map does not show field systems or field boundaries.

Solar Development Site 1

- 3.8.2 Early Ordnance Survey mapping (1851 and 1852) shows a mixture of regular and irregular/piecemeal enclosed land, interspersed with small areas of pasture and plantation, the majority of which survive within the modern landscape. A number of ponds are visible across the extent of Solar Development Site 1. All surviving buildings (Shallows Farm, Mount Pleasant, Gibertson's Farm, the Old Tile Shed House and Whinchat Hall have been excluded from the Solar Development Site 1 boundary, however one complex, Pallion Farm, is recorded within Fields 1.38 and 1.37.
- 3.8.3 The First (1891-2) and Second (1901-2) Edition Ordnance Survey show an increasingly formalised field layout with many field boundaries having been removed. However, two hedgerows have been identified as surviving within the Solar Development Site, forming the boundary between Fields 1.23 and 1.25 [H1.65] and between Fields 1.28 and 1.37, adjacent to Winter's Plantation [H1.16]. The gradual removal of field boundaries continues across the 20th century, with the current landscape layout largely formalised by the late 1980s. Pallion Farm was demolished between 1995 and 2002.

Solar Development Site 2

- 3.8.4 The 1850 edition local Ordnance Survey shows Solar Development Site 2 as enclosed land (mostly regular) with Common Lane separating Field 2.1 from the rest of Solar Development Site 2. Fleet Dike runs through the southern part of Solar Development Site 2. Siddle House is located immediately outside the Solar Development Site 2 boundary in Field 2.3. A milestone (Milestone Approximately 0.5 Miles East of Junction with Lowfield Road [LB 1148541]) is recorded of The First Edition Ordnance Survey (1892) shows a more standardised regular field pattern across Solar Development Site 2, with Fox Bridge noted immediately outside the south-eastern corner.
- 3.8.5 The field pattern within Solar Development Site 2 remained consistent throughout the 20th century, with the majority of historic field boundaries removed between 1995-2002.

Solar Development Site 3

- 3.8.6 Solar Development Site 3 is shown on the 1850 and 1852 edition local Ordnance Survey mapping as an area of strip fields and regular enclosure. The majority of field boundaries were removed and fields amalgamated between 1950 and 1961.

Solar Development Site 4

- 3.8.7 The 1850 edition local Ordnance Survey identifies two cottages within Solar Development Site 4 which are no longer extant. Low Cottage [MNY9906], located in Field 4.7, and Middle Barn (later Cottage) in Field 4.10. A large, moated site (recorded on the NYHER [MNY9905] and confirmed during geophysical survey in Field 4.5) is identified as Roe Field Mount. Tracks named as Wood Lane and Hagg Lane run either side of Field 4.12, and Maspin Moor Road runs across the northern extent of Solar Development Site 4. Fields 4.15 and Fields 4.16 are separated from the main Site by the road between West Haddlesey and Birkin, with Fields 4.4 and 4.5 separated by Roe Lane. Roe Lane Bridge is located just outside of the north-east corner of Field 4.4. Bowers House, Roe Field House and the Birkin House complex [LB1316672] are located just outside of the Solar Development Site 4 boundary. As is 'Bone Mill' which is not recorded on any subsequent Ordnance Survey editions and located next to Roe Field House. Solar Development Site 4 is primarily comprised of regular and piecemeal enclosure, with two areas of woodland; Thorny Hagg and Little Wood/Bawn Moor.
- 3.8.8 Low and Middle Cottage are last shown on the Second edition (1908) Ordnance Survey. Amalgamation of post-enclosure fields across Solar Development Site 4 takes place gradually across the second half of the 20th century. Thorny Hagg and Little Wood/Bawn Moor were felled between 1985 and 1987, with the 1987 edition Ordnance Survey showing substantial reorganisation of the land boundaries to their current configuration.

Solar Development Site 6

- 3.8.9 The 1850 and 1852 Ordnance Survey identifies Solar Development Site 6 as 'Milford Common'. The fields are arranged in a medieval-style strip field configuration with Milford Grange and Milford Lodge located immediately outside of the Solar Development Site 6 boundary. A spur of the York and North Midland Railway bounds the north-western edge of Solar Development Site 6. With an industrial area described as 'Malt Kiln', and later 'Malthouses' to the west, adjacent to the railway. An area of plantation marked as 'Ragged Shaw' covers Field 6.6 with a moated site identified immediately outside the north-eastern Order Limit.
- 3.8.10 Solar Development Site 6 remained largely unchanged until the majority of field boundaries were removed between 1967 and 1984. One hedgerow has been identified as surviving within this Solar Development Site, forming part of the boundary between Field 6.8 and Common Lane [H1.10]. Ragged Shaw plantation was removed and the land turned over to agricultural use between 1957 and 1961.

Solar Development Site 7

- 3.8.11 As with Solar Development Site 6, Solar Development Site 7 is covered by medieval-style strip fields recorded on 1850 and 1852 local Ordnance Survey mapping. It is bounded to the north and west by the York and North Midland Railway.
- 3.8.12 Solar Development Site 7 remained largely unchanged until all internal field boundaries were removed between 1967 and 1984.

Solar Development Site 8

- 3.8.13 The 1850 Ordnance Survey records irregular and piecemeal enclosure across Solar Development Site 8. A farmstead identified as 'Ruddings' is located in Field 8.1.
- 3.8.14 The majority of field boundaries were removed between 1961 and 1967. The Ruddings was demolished between 1986 and 1994.

4 Archaeological and historical baseline

Palaeolithic

- 4.1.1 The Palaeolithic period spans the Pleistocene, the era of the Quaternary Ice Ages. The Palaeolithic record reflects a number of brief occupations of the country, probably by very small groups, and in terms of the late Lower, Middle and Upper Pleistocene, humans were absent as much as they were present (Research Frameworks Network, 2025). During this time, Human subsistence would have relied on hunting and gathering, with associated material culture comprising flint artefacts, and bone and antler tools (Ref 20). The glacial front of the Last Glacial Maximum, when the ice sheet covering the Britain and Ireland was at its greatest extent c. 27000 years BP, is believed to have run across the northern part of the Study Area, through what is now Escrick (Ref 21).
- 4.1.2 Evidence for potential Palaeolithic activity within the Study Area is limited to a single hollow containing burnt material with possible early prehistoric origins, which was identified within CRC 1-4 [MNY24076]. This feature was discovered as part of the Yorkshire Derwent Aqueduct Duplication Main mitigation works and was not definitively dated.

Mesolithic

- 4.1.3 Following the retreat of the British-Irish Ice Sheet, the post-glacial landscape largely comprised treeless tundra. By the early Mesolithic period this gave way to woodland as the climate improved. Such environmental change increased the potential for human activity as the spread of woodland led to an expansion in animal and plant resources (Ref 20). Humans maintained a largely seasonal, migratory existence during this period, with rivers often acting as waymarkers and corridors, followed year on year as groups moved through the landscape. Settlement archaeology is rare and most archaeological material from this period is limited to lithic artefacts and palaeoenvironmental deposits, with many finds made as a result of soil erosion due to intensive agriculture (Ref 22).
- 4.1.4 Superficial alluvial deposits, of Mesolithic date onwards, have been identified by the British Geological Survey across the river valleys of the Ouse and Aire. Alluvium has the potential to contain well-preserved archaeological remains and paleoenvironmental evidence, including stratified stone tools and organic remains. This may include early prehistoric archaeological remains, as well as paleoenvironmental evidence and remains from later periods. Geophysical survey has revealed potential palaeochannel/alluvial deposits to the south of Solar Development Site 4, in close proximity to the River Aire.
- 4.1.5 No sites of a Mesolithic date have been recorded within the Study Area. A small scatter of flint and fire cracked stones of uncertain date was recovered south-east of Lennerton Farm, Sherburn-in-Elmet [MNY37227]. The Study Area contains a range of soils capable of supporting woodland and it is likely that this area was a mixture of woodland and waterlogged, marshy river valleys.

Neolithic and Bronze Age

- 4.1.6 The Neolithic period is marked by the introduction of farming, as nomadic hunter-gatherer subsistence gave way gradually to agriculture and animal domestication. The lighter soils at the northern extent of the Study Area, were extensively cleared of woodland for small-scale pastoral farming. Further south, the early landscape was marshy with a complex system of rivers and creeks (Ref 17). This is believed to have remained largely unpopulated.
- 4.1.7 Neolithic archaeology is present within the Study Area, but evidence remains extremely limited. There is no natural source of flint or chert within the region, meaning that the overall quantity of the lithic assemblage is lower than in other regions of the country, and individual implements tend to be smaller than elsewhere in Britain during the Neolithic and Bronze Age (Ref 22). The NYHER records a small scatter of flint identified during field walking for the British Rail East Coast Main Line Diversion in 1980 [MNY10410], however none was retained for detailed study.
- 4.1.8 Two stone hand axes were retrieved from the Riccall area [MNY12169] in the early 20th century, however their exact location was not recorded. Similarly, the NYHER records a findspot attributed to a Neolithic date c.330 m to the northwest of Solar Development Site 4, given only as 'within Gateforth Wood' [MNY9915].
- 4.1.9 Whilst no Neolithic settlement has been definitively identified to-date, the Study Area contains a high number of cropmarks of potential prehistoric date some of which could relate to early agricultural activity and settlement.
- 4.1.10 Bronze Age evidence is similarly sparse, with much of the Study Area remaining uncolonized due to extensive wetland conditions (Historic England, 2020). Settlement activity would likely have been confined to the west and northern extents of the Study Area during this time. Aside from a tentatively dated findspot of a hand axe [MNY17660], c.850 m to the west of Solar Development Site 1, only a ring ditch to the east of CRC 1-4 is recorded within the NYHER. Nationally, the Bronze Age saw the introduction of limited copper and bronze working but is also marked by a change in burial practices, moving away from collective inhumations and cremation to single burials, often placed beneath barrows (some barrow forms date from the Neolithic). When barrows are completely ploughed out, they often present as ring ditches, with the infilled former quarry ditch presenting as a circular or sub-circular feature. A number of potential ring ditches (largely undated) have been identified in and around Solar Development Site 6 [MNY17137; MNY17140; MNY17143; MNY17144] and across CRC 1-4 [MNY9901; MNY9902; MNY9903], with small clusters of similar cropmarks identified in pockets across the Study Area. The features within Solar Development Site 6 lie close to the interface between the mudstone and limestone geologies, on slightly higher ground, which increases the likelihood that these could be prehistoric in date.

Iron Age and Roman period

- 4.1.11 Whilst much of the Humberhead levels remained relatively sparsely populated into the Iron Age and Roman periods, there is some evidence of agriculture, settlement and even funerary activity within the Study Area. The corpus of evidence for this and earlier periods relies heavily on remote sensing techniques with the majority of data relating to features identified from aerial photographs and satellite imagery.
- 4.1.12 The area was controlled by the Brigantes tribal group during the late Iron Age but was subsequently annexed by the invading Roman forces c.70 CE. The Romans constructed a network of forts between the mid first and second centuries CE to defend their interests across the newly created province of Britannia. A Roman fort survives within the Study Area, c.1 km south-east of Solar Development Site 4, near Roall Road [SM1017822], with a further example identified at Castleford (Lagentium) c.6.5 km to the west of the Proposed Development. Waterfront features associated with the fort are believed to survive to the north-east of the fort, although no record of these is made within the NYHER.
- 4.1.13 Any settlement activity during this period is likely to be restricted to higher ground away from the marshy wetlands of the river valleys or islands of slightly higher, drier land, comprising of fluvio-glacial deposits, within the mashes and wetlands.
- 4.1.14 Two Iron Age roundhouses have been tentatively identified on aerial photography c.950 m to the south-west of Solar Development Site 1 [MNY37048] with likely contemporary field systems visible as cropmarks [MNY17704; MYO3546] and earthworks [MNY37386; MNY40274] to the east, within the Study Area. Within Solar Development Site 1, geophysical survey has identified a number of potential archaeological features, not currently recorded within the NYHER, which may be indicative of later prehistoric settlement (Ref 23). This includes an isolated rectilinear enclosure in Field 1.13 [GS_S1_17], which was confirmed by the trial trench evaluation and found to contain Iron Age pottery. Geophysical anomalies GS_S1_14, GS_S1_15, GS_S1_19, GS_S1_20 and GS_S1_21 (Fields 1.16, 1.28 and 1.29), comprising of ring ditches within rectangular anomalies were thought to be indicative of roundhouse settlement. The presence of these features was confirmed by the trial trench evaluation. In particular, Features GS_S1_19, GS_S1_20 and GS_S1_21 were found to survive in good condition and produced pottery dating from the Iron Age and Romano-British periods. In addition, features not indicated by geophysical anomalies were also found in proximity [TT_S1_1], suggesting a larger, interconnected area of activity which is likely have begun in the Iron Age and continued into the early Romano-British period. These features are in close proximity to a number of tentative trends and ditch-like anomalies [GS_S1_25 (Field 1.37)], which align with a possible Iron Age or Romano British field system, identified from aerial photography [MNY37042]; however, no features corresponding with these anomalies were uncovered during the trial trench evaluation.
- 4.1.15 A second cluster of field systems and enclosures is recorded to the west of Solar Development Site 1 [MNY37043; MNY37044; MNY37045; MNY37047]. The

rectangular or 'co-axial' field system layouts common to the later prehistoric and Romano-British periods are characterised by uniformly small, conjoined, square/rectangular, field plots and an adherence to a particular axial symmetry, however the longevity of this style of agriculture makes attributing a precise period to these features challenging (Ref 30). Two boundary ditches [MNY24078; MNY24079], one including a sherd of Roman pottery were excavated within Fields 1.45 and 1.40, respectively, as part works associated with the Yorkshire Derwent Aqueduct Duplication Main. Similar features were excavated at Charity Plantation immediately adjacent to CRC 1-4, as part of the same scheme of works. This included a field boundary tentatively given a Romano-British date [MNY12093].

- 4.1.16 Adjacent to the northern boundary of Solar Development Site 1, Fields 1.2 and 1.3 contain two parallel linear anomalies, aligned east-west, which mark the location of a trackway (Feature 3). A number of enclosures extend north-south from the trackway, including another well-defined ring ditch (Features 4 and 5). This trackway alignment and similar features are detected again in Field 1.8 (Features 8 and 9). These features resemble the layout of a Romano-British ladder settlement, although no firm interpretation can be made without excavation.
- 4.1.17 Excavations have also identified an Iron Age and Romano-British settlement to the south-east of at Riccall [ENY6435] with a possible square barrow [MNY17704] to the immediate east, adjacent to Section 1 of Cable Route Corridor 1-4. The possibility of a Roman Villa was also investigated in this area [MNY12173], with stone blocks unearthed during ploughing interpreted as potential foundation stones. Sherds of Romano-British pottery were also recovered from the area, but no definitive structure was subsequently identified. The settlement at Riccall is recorded in Domesday, being at least early medieval in origin, with these remains suggesting that this area has been a preferred location for human settlement since the later prehistoric period.
- 4.1.18 To the east of Solar Development Site 8, historic settlement features [MNY17258] and nearby enclosures, visible as cropmarks, may be of Iron Age or Romano-British date [MNY10344; MNY110345].
- 4.1.19 Immediately south of Solar Development Site 4, geophysical survey, produced two complex areas of intercutting features which may represent two farmsteads (GS_S4_6). The presence of ring ditches indicative of roundhouse settlement could tentatively date these to the later prehistoric or Roman periods. The geophysical survey also identified a series of enclosures and probable track way in Field 4.12 (GS_S4_3), as well as numerous ditch-like responses, pits and trends, and perhaps an additional farmstead in the south-east of Field 4.14 (GS_S4_5). Both groups of features were confirmed by the trial trench evaluation, and 2nd to 3rd century pottery was recovered from features within GS_S4_5.
- 4.1.20 A 'Roman' grit-stone coffin was removed from the location of the geophysical anomalies at GS_S4_5, and relocated to St. Mary's Church, Birkin [LB1167351]. Whilst cremation cemeteries dominate Romano-British burial practice during the

early Romano period, from the early 2nd century inhumation gradually became the preferred method of interment. Roman burials were typically located on the periphery of settlements, often alongside roads and outside of any defensive structures (Ref 31).

- 4.1.21 Geophysical survey also identified a previously undocumented area of intercutting enclosures, ditches, trackway, pits and ring-ditch, within Solar Development Site 2 (Field 2.3). The alignment may represent later prehistoric or Romano-British settlement however a later date (early medieval or medieval) is also possible. The trial trench evaluation did not confirm the presence of this feature. However, activity dating to the Romano-British period, not indicated by geophysical anomalies, was uncovered in close proximity. This included two kilns, which contained 2nd century pottery [TT_S2_1 and TT_S2_2], and a series of ditches on northeast-southwest alignments [TT_S2_3].
- 4.1.22 A dense area of activity, possibly indicating the presence of an Iron Age or Romano-British farmstead or nucleated settlement, was identified by the geophysical survey, within Field CR387 of the Cable Route Corridor. Features included a curving, double-ditched trackway to which paddocks or field divisions were appended. Anomalies of ring ditches and discrete features such as pits were also identified within this area. Additionally, two separate anomalies of ring ditches, within Field CR23 [CGS_C1-4_6] and Field CR23 [CGS_C1-4_7], have been identified by the geophysical survey, which may indicate the presence of further roundhouses.

Early Medieval

- 4.1.23 Following the withdrawal of the Roman empire from Britannia, the extensive river system across the Humberhead levels was used by invading Angles and Danes to penetrate deep into the country, although evidence of settlement from this period is scarce (Ref 32). This may be due to high deposition of alluvial soils in riverside and marshland areas which have masked archaeological remains.
- 4.1.24 Within the Study Area, only a single findspot, a Saxon copper alloy disc brooch [MNY23523] has been definitively dated to the early medieval period. This was recovered from the area east of CRC 1-4. The exact findspot location of the spectacular 'Escrick Ring (Accession ref: YORYM-715F42)' has never been confirmed, however the ring was recovered from a field near Escrick and represents an unusually high-status object. It is believed to have been manufactured in the 5th or 6th century CE.
- 4.1.25 The landscape across the Study Area would have been organised into pockets of small agricultural settlement, interspersed with marsh and wetlands. A number of settlements are recorded in Domesday indicating origins in the early medieval period; Beal, Birkin (including a mill), Burton [Hall], Hambleton, Kellington, Thorpe Willoughby, and Escrick are noted, alongside Riccall, which was more substantial, comprising of 27 households (split across land belonging to archbishop of York and the bishop of Durham). The proximity of the settlement to

the River Ouse and known early medieval crossing/landing points likely accounts for its prosperity during this time.

- 4.1.26 Documentary evidence also points to an early medieval date for the settlement of Gateforth ('goats ford' [MNY10014]), Hillam [MNY9894] and the Church of St. Wilfrid in Monk Fryston is reported to have early medieval origins [LB1296769], although the settlement was not recorded in Domesday.
- 4.1.27 The archaeological features identified in Solar Development Site 2 (Field 2.3) may represent settlement archaeology from this period.

Medieval

- 4.1.28 Evidence for medieval activity across the Study Area is widespread and diverse including high status and monastic settlement, parkland, ecclesiastical and early industrial activity.
- 4.1.29 The medieval period is synonymous with the emergence of moated manorial sites. The majority of moated sites served as prestigious aristocratic and seigneurial residences with the provision of a moat intended as a status symbol rather than a practical military defence. Geophysical survey in Solar Development Site 4 confirmed the presence of a previously identified moats in Field 4.12 [MNY9907; GS_S4_2] and Field 4.5 [MNY9905; GS_S4_1], the latter of which is c.100m in width. Remains of both moats were uncovered during the trial trench evaluation; MNY9905/GS_S4_1 in Field 4.5 contained medieval pottery dating to the 14th century, and internal features, such as a parallel ditch and pit were recorded. A single intervention into Moat MNY9907/GS_S4_2 was excavated, but no datable material was recovered. Its period of use is therefore uncertain, particularly as it is located in close proximity to a cluster of well-dated Romano-British activity.
- 4.1.30 Similarly, Solar Development Site 1 includes a large rectangular enclosure with a clearly defined ditch. Further possible moated sites area recorded across the Study Area [MNY12079; MNY10348; MNY10347; MNY10292]. Whilst some were undoubtedly the location of moated manorial properties, such as the Archbishop's House at Manor Garth [MNY10292], other moats, such as the one identified in Field 4.12, are relatively small in scale and are more likely to represent the location of higher status farmsteads.
- 4.1.31 It is unclear if the manorial house of Birkin Hall [MNY9912] was originally a moated settlement, however its earliest phase was constructed in the 12th century, c.1180. It is unclear how much of the original building survived when it was demolished in the early 20th century. A pair of later gate piers [LB1132451], dated to the 18th century, survive at the entrance to the former estate. Heavily modified, high status residences also survive as Monk Fryston Hall [LB1148544] and Steeton Hall [SM 1015504], a magnate's residence at the western edge of the Study Area. Similarly, Escrick Park [MNY17654] was originally home to a medieval manor house, later rebuilt during the 17th century [LB1167878], and parkland estate.

- 4.1.32 It is rare for lower status structural remains to survive from the medieval period. A possible deserted area of settlement is located to the south of the modern Escrick village [MNY17659], however, in most cases medieval structures were simply demolished and built over as time progressed. Building foundations have been identified in the historic core of Monk Fryston [MNY39470] which correspond to medieval occupation levels. These excavations also revealed a yard and late medieval road [ENY7785].
- 4.1.33 Medieval agricultural activity is evidenced through the survival of areas of early ridge and furrow and contemporary field systems. This is particularly well preserved in the north of the Study Area, outside of the wetlands and into the Vale of York, close to or within areas utilised for agriculture since the later prehistoric periods (MYO2515; MYO4876; MYO2468; MYO2469, MYO2470; MYO2490; MYO2491; MYO2515; MNY31990; MNY36985; MNY37357). Three ditches on a northeast-southwest alignment were recorded in Field 4.14 of Solar Development Site 4 during the trial trench evaluation, one of which contained 14th century pottery [GS_S4_7]. These likely represent medieval field boundaries. Within Solar Development Site 1, a small medieval farmstead [MNY17722] was identified from historic mapping in Field 1.40, with geophysical survey detecting possible undated ridge and furrow across much of the Solar Development Site. Although formal, large-scale drainage of the wetlands did not begin until the post-medieval period, the process began with the occupants of medieval towns situated along river trade routes, and ecclesiastical site during the medieval period and it is likely that new areas within the Study Area were opened up to agriculture at this time.
- 4.1.34 Solar Development Site 1 and its environs appear to be mostly under agricultural cultivation during the medieval period. Located on lower ground and closer to the River Aire, it is likely that the rest of the Study Area comprised of a mix of agricultural and wetland areas during this period.
- 4.1.35 Evidence for early industrial activity is sparse but present in localised pockets, including a former Mill and Mill Pond on the outskirts of Monk Fryston [MNY39473], with documentary evidence for limestone quarries and lime kilns nearby [MNY9890]. These quarries are recorded as supplying some of the stone for Selby Abbey.
- 4.1.36 Religion was pervasive in the lives of all people during the medieval period, with the Catholic Church being the only variant of Christianity in western Europe. The Pope had blessed the Norman invasion after William the Conqueror had promised to bring the practices of the English Anglo-Saxon church closer in line with those of Rome. The medieval ecclesiastical landscape across the Study Area remains highly visible through the survival of a number of parish churches with medieval origins, which remain as prominent way-markers in the landscape. The churches of St. Mary, Birkin [LB1316671], St. Edmund, Kellington, and St. Wilfrid, Monk Fryston, all contain medieval elements, although subject to renovation and alteration during the 19th and 20th centuries. A medieval churchyard cross, dating to the 13th century, survives within the churchyard of St.

Wilfrid's, Monk Fryston [LB1295742], base of a medieval cross [MNY9895] is noted at Hillam.

- 4.1.37 The Norman period saw a monastic revival with the establishment of many new monasteries. Monastic activity is evidenced within the Study Area, to the north of Thorpe Willoughby, c.350 m from the CRC 1-4. The moated monastic grange at Thorpe Willoughby [SM1017460] was originally a grange of the Benedictine abbey at Selby. In 1539 it was described as being a mansion house with a dovecot and orchard, all surrounded by a moat. Other monastic granges of unknown affiliation have been tentatively identified using documentary resources only, including Milford Grange, adjacent to Solar Development Site 6 [MNY17151] and c.500 m north of Solar Development Site 4 [MNY9904].
- 4.1.38 Second edition OS mapping (1908) indicates that the area around Monk Fryston Hall may have been a monastic site [MNY9887], but no other evidence exists to support this. The presence of 'Monk' in the village's name is suggestive of monastic associations.

Post-medieval

- 4.1.39 The post-medieval period spans a period of agricultural and technological revolution, beginning with the dissolution of the monasteries and concluding at the end of the 19th century.
- 4.1.40 The majority of designated heritage assets within the Study Area date to the post-medieval era. These represent a broad cross section of uses from agricultural buildings, high and lower status domestic properties, early industrial structures, educational facilities, transport infrastructure and landscape features.
- 4.1.41 A number of medieval estates survive within the Study Area, with their manorial manors having been demolished and rebuilt across the post-medieval period (Gateforth Hall [LB1132514], Birkin Hall [MNY9912], Riccall Hall [MNY9889], Escrick Park [LB1167878]). Elements of landscaping associated with manorial gardens and parkland are also preserved, such as the ha-ha [LB1316662] within the Gateforth Hall designated landscape garden [MNY31754] and various contemporary statues and garden ornaments within the Escrick estate [LB1148454; LB1316304; LB1296655]. Escrick Park [MNY17654] has been developed as part of the Escrick Estate since the 17th century, reaching its current size in the 19th century, it retains many of its original features including two ice houses and duck decoy ponds.
- 4.1.42 Settlement centres across the Study Area were largely defined by the end of the medieval period. Thomas Jeffreys 'Survey of the County of Yorkshire' map of 1775 depicts a highly stylised representation of the Study Area. The high water table, and later, value of the drained land resulted in limited expansion with all settlements remaining small hamlets or villages. The historic cores of Monk Fryston, Hillam, Hambleton, and Escrick contain numerous nationally important examples of domestic properties from the 17th to 19th centuries.

- 4.1.43 A changing religious landscape across the 17th and 18th centuries initially saw movement away from the Church of England to new non-conformist denominations. This division played a key role in the English Civil War and non-conformist religious groups remained popular amongst the labouring classes throughout the post-medieval periods. Later, the Victorian resurgence of the Church of England (influenced by the Oxford movement of the 1830s) saw the mass refurbishment of existing churches which had fallen into disrepair. 19th century Methodist chapels are recorded in Thorpe Willoughby [MNY10385] and Monk Fryston [LB1148545]. New Anglican churches were constructed in South Milford [St. Mary, LB1316271], Hambleton [St. Mary, LB1474381], and Escrick [St. Helen, LB1167966], which rehoused a medieval effigy of a possible crusader knight.
- 4.1.44 Significant drainage activity across the Humberhead levels began in the 1620s when Dutch drainage engineers began large-scale river diversions and land drainage. They introduced the practice of ‘warping’ where farmland was inundated with seasonally impounded tidal waters to deposit fertile alluvial silt (Ref 32).
- 4.1.45 Drainage and warping continued into the 18th century and created today’s characteristic flat treeless landscape drained by a network of drains and dykes. Land drains and drainage dykes are present within the Study Area [MNY37290; MNY37289; MNY26157; MNY26302; MNY26198; MNY26303; MNY26199] as well as a number of undated features with a potential drainage function [MNY12112; MNY10346]. A large number of ponds are also recorded across the Study Area (documented from early OS mapping), most notably across Solar Development Site 1 and its immediate environs. Light industrial infrastructure from this period is recorded across the Study Area in the form of wind [MNY17658; MNY12175] and water powered mills [MNY23818]. A steam mill later replaced the windmill in East Field, adjacent to CRC 1-4 [MNY12175].
- 4.1.46 In the 18th and 19th century, new technologies encouraged more efficient drainage, and private and parliamentary inclosure followed, enabling increasingly productive agriculture. Land around Escrick was inclosed by an Act of Parliament in 1781, at Monk Fryston, Beal and ‘Kellingly’ in 1793, Thorpe Willoughby in 1803, and Birkin in 1815 (Ref 19).
- 4.1.47 Many of the listed structures within the Study Area were originally agricultural in use. Historic barns survive in large numbers, the earliest of which is believed to have 16th century elements [MNY24275], as do contemporary farmhouses (although many are now repurposed for solely domestic use). Hillam contains an example of a 17th century farm complex including Hall Farm [LB 1148538], cowshed and granary [LB1167589], stables [LB1316266], threshing barn [LB1167597] and Burton Cottage and Chantries Cottage [LB1148539]. 1850 Ordnance Survey mapping records numerous farmsteads across the Study Area including several, now demolished, farm complexes and cottages within Solar Development Sites 1, 4 and 8. Within Solar Development Site 1, Pallion Farm was formerly situated in Fields 1.37 and 1.38. Two farm cottages, Low Cottage [MNY9906] and Middle Cottage were also recorded within Solar Development

Site 4, demolished during the first half of the 20th century and, within Solar Development Site 8, the 'Ruddings' is located in Field 8.1.

- 4.1.48 The post-medieval period is characterised by improved transport networks across the country which facilitated both the movement of goods and people across the rapidly industrialising nation. The Selby Canal, constructed in the late 18th century to connect the River Aire and River Ouse, passes through the eastern extent of the Study Area. Road traffic also increased during the 18th and 19th centuries, with turnpike trusts set up to collect tolls to support the construction and maintenance of roads across the country. Four turnpikes ran into Selby including the Leeds to Selby Turnpike, which ran to the south of Solar Development Site 2, along what is now the A63. A road identified as 'Turnpike Lane' runs along the western boundary of Solar Development Site 6. From 1767 milestones were compulsory on all turnpikes. Eight (Grade II listed) milestones fall within the Study Area, including one to the immediate south of Solar Development Site 2 [LB1148541].
- 4.1.49 The use of turnpikes declined with the coming of the railways. The Leeds and Selby Railway, the first mainline railway in Yorkshire, runs immediately north of Solar Development Site 7 and Solar Development 6, and south of Solar Development Site 8. The line opened in 1834 with various original elements surviving in the surrounding landscape, such as Mill Lane Bridge located c.180 m north-west of Solar Development Site 7 [MNY38111]. The York and North Midland Railway opened in 1839, connecting York with the Leeds and Selby Railway. It intersects with CRC 1-4a.

Modern

- 4.1.50 The 20th century is characterised nationally by continued expansion of urban settlement, the impact of two World Wars and introduction of Common Agricultural Policy, which reshaped the European agricultural landscape.
- 4.1.51 Whilst much of the Study Area remains under agricultural cultivation, map regression demonstrates that the 20th century saw the gradual erosion of historic field boundaries, to create large 'improved' fields, and removal of areas of meadow and plantation.
- 4.1.52 Industrial encroachment, although limited, is present in the form of occasional light industrial areas and deep mining of the coal seam near Selby. Outside of the Study Area, the plentiful supply of water drawn from the main rivers for cooling, along with the local source of coal, resulted in the construction of several power stations, including the iconic Drax.
- 4.1.53 Military remains are a key feature of the Study Area and wider North Yorkshire region, through a long established connection with the Royal Air Force. World War II bombing decoy control building 270 m south of Scalm Park Cottages Immediately outside of the Study Area, the RAF had sites at Church Fenton and Burn including bomb storage, aircraft pens, barracks and hangers. At Sherburn-in-Elmet, an airfield [MNY10281] with adjacent aircraft factory [MNY10284] was used first in World War One as a Royal Flying Corps/Royal Air force aircraft

acceptance park. Good rail and road access made it ideal for aircraft production and the site produced 162 Sopwith T1 aircraft in World War One and 1,700 Fairey Swordfish during World War Two. Much of the site has now been repurposed as a light industrial estate, however the runway and some infrastructure survive. These remain in use as a runway and storage area for light aircraft.

4.1.54 An additional World War Two airfield [MNY12150] was constructed south-east of Riccall, intersecting with CRC 1-4. Opening in 1942 and closing in 1957. The site was returned to agricultural use soon after with the remaining buildings demolished by 2002.

4.1.55 The concentration of military air traffic within the area surrounding the Proposed Development resulted in an atypically high concentration of military aircraft crash sites. These are protected under the Protection of Military Remains Act (1986) and cannot be excavated without a licence. 34 potential crash sites are located within the Study Area, dating from 1937-1956.

Undated

4.1.56 Around a quarter of the potential heritage assets recorded within the Study Area remain undated. This is reflective of both the limited level of archaeological investigation within the Study Area and the absence of industrial period development, meaning that cropmarks are frequently visible on satellite imagery and aerial photographs during periods of dry weather. Drainage of the wetlands and marsh areas of the Study Area remained small-scale until the post-medieval period, meaning that many features on lower ground and within river valleys are likely to be medieval, or later, in date. However, there is evidence of earlier settlement and cultivation on marginally higher ground around Riccall and Escrick, illustrative of human activity in some parts of the Study Area from the later prehistoric period, onwards.

5 Archaeological potential

5.1.1 This section also provides an assessment of the potential for archaeological remains across the Proposed Development. This is informed by current archival sources, site walkover, geophysical survey of all Solar Development Sites and the Cable Route Corridor, and archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) of the Solar Development Sites.

Early prehistoric (Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic)

5.1.2 There is limited potential for early prehistoric material across the Proposed Development which remained under the glacial ice sheet or Lake Humber for much of the early Prehistoric periods. During the Mesolithic and Neolithic, the river corridors of the Aire and the Ouse could have provided easily navigable routes across the landscape, with their alluvial deposits potentially preserving finds and palaeoenvironmental deposits. Land immediately south of Solar Development Site 4, and CRC 1-4 lie within the extent of these alluvial areas.

Later prehistoric (Bronze Age, Iron Age) and Roman

5.1.3 The archaeological potential across the Proposed Development is heavily influenced by the landscape topography. Rising sea levels across the prehistoric epochs saw much of Proposed Development transform into an extensively flooded area of wetlands and marsh. Solar Development Site 1, Cable Construction Compound 3, and sections of CRC 1-4 lie on the periphery of this landscape, south of the Vale of York. Their desirable location for both settlement and agriculture is evidenced by recorded later prehistoric and Romano-British field systems and occupation. Geophysical survey has confirmed the likely presence of previously undocumented features of this nature within Solar Development Site 1.

5.1.4 Across the Humberhead levels, small areas of slightly higher, drier land, comprising of fluvio-glacial deposits, created islands across the mashes and wetlands. These are known to have formed the focus of settlement and small scale agricultural activity from the later prehistoric onwards but are difficult to differentiate within the modern, drained landscape. Geophysical survey has identified settlement features consistent with those of a later prehistoric or Romano-British date at the southern extent of Solar Development Site 4, with cropmarks typical of later prehistoric date also present within Solar Development Site 6.

5.1.5 As is evidenced by previous excavation across these areas, the potential for later prehistoric and Romano-British archaeology across the Proposed Development is considered moderate to high. The highest potential areas are located within Solar Development Site 1, Solar Development Site 2, Solar Development Site 4 (southern half), Solar Development Site 6, Cable Construction Compound 3, and sections of CRC 1-4.

Early medieval

- 5.1.6 Documentary and archaeological sources suggest that settlement patterns within the landscape surrounding the Proposed Development were well defined by the end of the early medieval period. Similarly, geophysical survey of Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor has not revealed features indicative of the typical settlement plans of this era, however geophysical survey within Solar Development Site 2 identified a number of undated features which could be indicative of small scale settlement. It is likely that occupation and agricultural activity identified in and around Solar Development Site 1 continued into the early medieval period although the settlement focus appears to have moved into Escrick and a now deserted area west of Solar Development Site 1. Evidence of early medieval agricultural practices is frequently eroded by later activity but may be retained in the form of cropmarks or early ridge and furrow.
- 5.1.7 The potential for archaeological material relating to the early medieval period within Solar Development Site 1, Cable Construction Compound 3, and sections of CRC 1-4 is considered moderate, as these areas show clear activity from the later prehistoric and Roman period which is likely to have continued into the early medieval era. The potential for Solar Development Sites 2-4, 6-8 is considered to be moderate to low. If present, evidence is likely to comprise of features relating to agricultural activity. These are difficult to date as little diagnostic material culture is found in association with these features.

Medieval

- 5.1.8 Within the Proposed Development there is a high potential for remains relating to medieval agriculture. Ridge and furrow of medieval date has been identified immediately adjacent to Solar Development Site 1. Undated ridge and furrow is present in some form across all Solar Development Sites, and much of the Cable Route Corridor.
- 5.1.9 There is a high potential for features associated with medieval settlement within Solar Development Site 4, which contains cropmarks associated with two medieval moated sites, confirmed by geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation. Site 1 also contains a large rectangular enclosure which could be indicative of a moated settlement. Ancillary features associated with these settlements could remain within the surrounding landscape.

Post-medieval

- 5.1.10 Localised, small-scale drainage across the Humberhead Levels was upscaled to an industrial level across the post-medieval period. This land was then subject to enclosure across the late 18th and 19th centuries.
- 5.1.11 There is high potential for remains relating to medieval agriculture across the Proposed Development. Map regression has identified now demolished structures including residential properties within Solar Development Sites 1, 4 and 8. Evidence of these and associated settlement features may also remain.

Modern

- 5.1.12 Whilst substantial military infrastructure relating to the Royal Air Force is documented in the landscape surrounding the Proposed Development, the 20th century saw the removal structures and field boundaries within the Proposed Development. Therefore, the potential for archaeological remains from this period is considered low, however the possibility of war-time remains associated with aircraft cannot be discounted.

6 Impact assessment

- 6.1.1 There are numerous potential heritage assets, including likely previously unrecorded archaeological features within the Proposed Development, which could experience direct, physical impacts as a result of the Proposed Development. These impacts are characterised as the partial or total removal of these assets.
- 6.1.2 The Proposed Development also has the potential to impact the significance of heritage assets beyond the Proposed Development through changes in their setting.
- 6.1.3 A full assessment of the significance of, and potential impacts to, all heritage assets within the Study Area can be found in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05]**.

References

- Ref 1 Archaeology Data Service, "Archaeology Data Service," [Online]. Available at:
[REDACTED]
- Ref 2 British Geological Survey, "GeoIndex," [Online]. Available at:
[REDACTED]
- Ref 3 Environment Agency, "LiDAR Composite DTM and DSM," [Online]. Available at:
<https://environment.data.gov.uk/dataset/lidar-composite>
- Ref 4 Office for National Statistics, "Counties and Unitary Authorities (UK) and Parish and Non-civil Parish Areas (England and Wales)," [Online]. Available at:
<https://www.ons.gov.uk>
- Ref 5 Historic England, "National Heritage List for England (NHLE)," 2025. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED]
- Ref 6 National Library of Scotland, "Historic Ordnance Survey Mapping," [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED]
- Ref 7 North Yorkshire County Council, "North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (NYHER)," [Online]. Available at:
[REDACTED]
- Ref 8 City of York Council, "York City Historic Environment Record (YCHER)," [Online]. Available at: <https://www.york.gov.uk/HistoricEnvironmentRecord>
- Ref 9 South Yorkshire Archaeology Service, "Regional Research Framework for South Yorkshire," [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED]
- Ref 10 Historic England, "Aerial Archaeology Mapping Explorer," [Online]. Available at:
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- Ref 11 National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP), "National Collection of Aerial Photography," [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED]
- Ref 12 Historic Environment Scotland, "Britain From Above," [Online]. Available at:
[REDACTED]
- Ref 13 Forum on Information Standards in Heritage (FISH), "Forum on Information Standards in Heritage," 2024. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- Ref 14 UK Government, "Protection of Military Remains Act 1986," 1986. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents>
- Ref 15 Magnitude Surveys, "Geophysical Survey Report of Ferrybridge D Gas Connection Corridor," Report No. MSSE395, 2018. s.l.: Unpublished Report
- Ref 16 Cranfield University, LandIS: The Land Information System. Soil data for England and Wales, n.d. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED]

- Ref 17 Natural England, National Character Area Profiles, n.d. [Online]. Available at:
[REDACTED]
- Ref 18 Toase, S., 2010. The North Yorkshire & Lower Tees Valley Historic Landscape Characterisation. Northallerton: North Yorkshire County Council & English Heritage
- Ref 19 Kain, R., Chapman, J. & Oliver, R., 2004. The Enclosure Maps of England and Wales 1595–1918. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ref 20 R. Van de Noort and P. Davies, Wetland Heritage: An Archaeological Assessment of the Humber Wetlands, Hull: English Heritage, 1993
- Ref 21 The University of Sheffield, “BRITICE Glacial Map V.2.0,” 2017. [Online]. Available at:
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- Ref 22 Research Frameworks Network, “South Yorkshire Historic Environment Research Framework,” 2025. [Online]. Available at:
[REDACTED]
- Ref 23 SUMO Geosurveys, “Geophysical Survey Report. Light Valley Solar Project: Site 1. Report no. 16614-1.,” 2024. s.l.: Unpublished
- Ref 24 SUMO Geosurveys, “Geophysical Survey Report. Light Valley Solar Project: Site 2. Report no. 16614-2,” 2024b. s.l.: Unpublished
- Ref 25 SUMO Geosurveys, “Geophysical Survey Report. Light Valley Solar Project: Site 3. Report no. 16614-3,” 2024c. s.l.: Unpublished
- Ref 26 SUMO Geosurveys, “Geophysical Survey Report. Light Valley Solar Project: Site 4. Report no. 16614-4,” 2024d. s.l.: Unpublished
- Ref 27 SUMO Geosurveys, “Geophysical Survey Report. Light Valley Solar Project: Site 5. Report no. 16614-5,” 2024e. s.l.: Unpublished
- Ref 28 AOC. “Light Valley Cable Route, North Yorkshire. Archaeological Geophysical Survey Interpretation Summary. AOC Project No: 40920,” 2025. s.l. Unpublished.
- Ref 29 ASWYAS, “Light Valley Solar Cable Route Near Selby, North Yorkshire. Geophysical Survey. Report no. 4411,” 2026. s.l. Unpublished.
- Ref 30 Historic England, “Field Systems: Introductions to Heritage Assets,” 2018. Swindon: Historic England
- Ref 31 Historic England, “Pre-Christian Cemeteries: Introductions to Heritage Assets,” 2018. Swindon: Historic England
- Ref 32 Historic England, “Farmstead and Landscape Statement: Humberhead Levels. National Character Area 39,” 2020. Swindon: Historic England
- Ref 33 Wenham, P., “Seven Archaeological Discoveries in Yorkshire,” 1960. Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, 40(1), pp. 298–327

-
- Ref 34 CFA Archaeology Ltd, "Light Valley Solar Project Site 1, North Yorkshire: Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report, No. 4752," 2025. s. I. Unpublished.
- Ref 35 CFA Archaeology Ltd, "Light Valley Solar Project Site 2, North Yorkshire: Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report, No. 4758," 2025. s. I. Unpublished.
- Ref 36 CFA Archaeology Ltd, "Light Valley Solar Project Site 3, North Yorkshire: Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report, No. 4773," 2025. s. I. Unpublished.
- Ref 37 CFA Archaeology Ltd, "Light Valley Solar Project Site 4, North Yorkshire: Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report, No. 4764," 2025. s. I. Unpublished.
- Ref 38 CFA Archaeology Ltd, "Light Valley Solar Project Site 6, North Yorkshire: Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report, No. 4755," 2025. s. I. Unpublished.
- Ref 39 CFA Archaeology Ltd, "Light Valley Solar Project Sites 7 & 8, North Yorkshire: Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report, No. 4759," 2025. s. I. Unpublished.



Light Valley
Solar

W: Lightvalleysolar.co.uk
E: info@lightvalleysolar.co.uk