

Light Valley Solar

Environmental Statement Volume 1

Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage

Document Reference: EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08

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

Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage

Regulation Reference	APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Case Reference	EN0110012
Application Document Reference	EN0110012/APP/06.01.08
Author	Light Valley Solar Limited

Version	Date	Status of Version
1.0	February 2026	DCO Submission

Contents

8	Cultural Heritage	1
8.1	Introduction	1
8.2	Scope of the assessment	2
8.3	Relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance	5
8.4	Stakeholder engagement and Consultation	15
8.5	Methodology	30
8.6	Assumptions and limitations	39
8.7	Baseline conditions	41
8.8	Embedded and good practice mitigation and enhancement measures	56
8.9	Assessment of likely impacts and effects	59
8.10	Additional mitigation	75
8.11	Residual effects	76
8.12	Monitoring	77
8.13	Summary	77
8.14	Cumulative assessment	79
	References	85

List of tables

Table 8-1	Cultural Heritage assessment scope	2
Table 8-2	Additional designated heritage assets scoped in for assessment	4
Table 8-3	Cultural Heritage - Legislation	5
Table 8-4	Cultural Heritage - Policy	7
Table 8-5	Cultural Heritage - Standards and Guidance	12
Table 8-6	Cultural Heritage EIA Scoping Opinion comments	15
Table 8-7	Statutory consultation comments	19
Table 8-8	Targeted consultation comments	26
Table 8-9	Cultural Heritage - Engagement undertaken	27
Table 8-10	Criteria for the determination of the importance of heritage assets	33
Table 8-11	Criteria for determining magnitude of impact (degree of change)	34
Table 8-12	Matrix for determining significance of effect	36
Table 8-13	Criteria for determining significance of effect	36
Table 8-14	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 1	43
Table 8-15	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 2	46
Table 8-16	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 3	47
Table 8-17	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 4	47
Table 8-18	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 6	48
Table 8-19	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 7	49
Table 8-20	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 8	49
Table 8-21	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within CRC 1-4 and CRC 1-4a Alternative	50
Table 8-22	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 7	52
Table 8-23	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within CRC 4-POC	52
Table 8-24	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within CRC 2-6	53

Table 8-25	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Highways Improvements Areas and Site 8 Access	54
Table 8-26	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site Construction Compounds	55
Table 8-27	Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Cable Construction Compounds	55
Table 8-28	Cultural Heritage - summary of likely significant effects	78
Table 8-29	Plans and projects relevant to the Cultural Heritage cumulative assessment	79

8 Cultural Heritage

8.1 Introduction

- 8.1.1 This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of the likely significant effects arising from the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Proposed Development on Cultural Heritage.
- 8.1.2 This chapter sets out the relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance applied to the assessment process; consultation undertaken to inform the assessment; assessment methodology; the relevant baseline conditions upon which the assessment is based; embedded mitigation considered in place before the assessment is undertaken; the likely significant effects that may arise as a result of the Proposed Development considering embedded mitigation; further mitigation requirements to reduce or remove any identified likely significant effects; the remaining residual effects following further mitigation; and any monitoring required for remaining significant effects.
- 8.1.3 The conclusions of the following chapters and topic assessments are considered relevant to the receptors considered within this assessment, and as such are taken into account in the overall assessment for Cultural Heritage:
- 1) Chapter 1: Introduction (ES Volume 1) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.01**].
 - 2) Chapter 2: The Proposed Development (ES Volume 1) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02**].
 - 3) Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (ES Volume 1) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10**].
 - 4) Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (ES Volume 1) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11**].
 - 5) Chapter 15: Water Resources and Flood Risk (ES Volume 1) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.15**].
- 8.1.4 This chapter is supported by the following figures:
- 1) Figure 8.1: Designated Heritage Assets (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.08.01**].
 - 2) Figure 8.2: Heritage Assets and Non-Designated Heritage Assets (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.08.02**].
 - 3) Figure 8.3: Heritage Assets identified through Archaeological Investigation (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.08.03**]; and
 - 4) Figure 8.4: Archaeological Mitigation Areas (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.08.04**].
- 8.1.5 This chapter is supported by the following appendices:
- 1) Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01**].

- 2) Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02].
- 3) Appendix 8.3: Geophysical Survey Results (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03].
- 4) Appendix 8.4: Trial Trenching Reports (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04].
- 5) Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05].

8.2 Scope of the assessment

The EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1.1 (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.01]) set out the proposed scope for the assessment of Cultural Heritage. The scope of the assessment is summarised in Table 8-1.

Table 8-1 Cultural Heritage assessment scope

Aspect	Phase	Scoped in / out	Summary comments
Designated built heritage assets and Conservation Areas (Listed buildings and registered park and gardens of all grades, and conservation areas)	Construction	Scoped in	N/A
	Operation	Scoped in	N/A
	Decommissioning	Scoped in	In line with the EIA Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS), effects arising from indirect impacts to designated heritage assets during decommissioning are considered as part of this assessment.
Non-designated and other built heritage assets (built heritage assets, locally listed buildings and locally listed park and gardens)	Construction	Scoped in	N/A
	Operation	Scoped in	In line with the EIA Scoping Opinion received from PINS, effects arising from operation are considered as part of this assessment.
	Decommissioning	Scoped in	In line with the EIA Scoping Opinion received from PINS, effects arising from decommissioning are considered as part of this assessment.
	Construction	Scoped in	N/A

Aspect	Phase	Scoped in / out	Summary comments
Archaeological heritage assets (Designated and non-designated sites, monuments, features and other remains)	Operation	Solar Development Sites - Scoped out Cable Route Corridor – Scoped in	In line with the response received from PINS and Historic England, potential operational effects are scoped in relating to the Cable Route Corridor only.
	Decommissioning	Scoped in	In line with the EIA Scoping Opinion received from PINS effects arising from decommissioning are considered as part of this assessment.
Unrecorded archaeology (In situ features, remains and/or deposits, including palaeoenvironmental deposits)	Construction	Scoped in	N/A
	Operation	Scoped out	N/A
	Decommissioning	Scoped in	In line with the EIA Scoping Opinion received from PINS effects arising from decommissioning are considered as part of this assessment.

Study Area

- 8.2.1 The Study Area for Cultural Heritage comprises a radial buffer (see Section 8.2.2 below) applied to the Order Limits of the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor.
- 8.2.2 For designated heritage assets and sites protected by another act of parliament (such as possible military remains), a 2 km radial buffer was applied around Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 and combined with a 500 m radial buffer applied around the Cable Route Corridor. The buffer around the Cable Route Corridor is smaller because it is anticipated that following completion of the construction phase for these locations, the landscape will be reinstated with no residual above ground elements.
- 8.2.3 For other non-designated heritage assets, a 1 km radial buffer was applied around Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 and combined with a 500 m radial buffer applied around the Cable Route Corridor.
- 8.2.4 The Study Area extents were based on previous experience of similar developments within a rural setting, initial projections taking account of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and professional judgement.
- 8.2.5 In response to the comments received from Leeds City Council on the EIA Scoping Report (Section 8.4) 16 designated heritage assets located beyond the 2 km and 500 m radial buffers have been included in this assessment. These assets are presented in Table 8-2.

- 8.2.6 Radial buffers have not been applied to the Highways Improvements Areas (HIA) and the northern extent Site 8 Access at Scalm Lane, which are as described in Chapter 2: The Proposed Development (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02] and comprise access points and routes, visibility splays, passing places, and Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) access. No Study Area extension was applied in relation these works as they are highly localised relating to access and visibility improvements, largely comprising vegetation management and temporary removal of street furniture that are not expected to affect heritage assets. Any temporary changes to the setting of heritage assets will be considered on an individual basis. Any HIA or access works with the potential to result in limited below ground impacts (such as road widening) will be managed through measures set out within the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11].
- 8.2.7 Furthermore, all but the following four HIAs and part of Site 8 Access (Scalm Lane) fall within the radial buffer of the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor. Where potential heritage impacts from these HIAs and the Scalm Lane Site Access may arise they are considered in Section 8.9:
- 1) HIA – Selby Road, Pinfold Hill, Garman Carr Lane;
 - 2) HIA – Bishopdyke Road and Long Lane;
 - 3) HIA – Long Lane and Broad Lane;
 - 4) HIA – Sherburn Road and Wistow Road; and
 - 5) Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane (northern extent only).
- 8.2.8 The potential impacts of all proposed works within the Order Limits relating to the Proposed Development (Solar Development Sites, Cable Route Corridor, Site 8 Access and HIAs) have been assessed within this chapter and its appendices, regardless of whether these locations fall within the Study Area. The radial buffer is graded based on the anticipated sensitivity of the assets. Where appropriate, impacts from those works associated with the HIAs are discussed within Section 8.9.

Table 8-2 Additional designated heritage assets scoped in for assessment

Designation	NHLE	Name
Grade I listed building	1237515	Barn forming east side of stable yard approximately 100 metres (m) east of Ledston Hall
	1237569	Ledston Hall
	1247674	Stable block approximately 50 m east of Ledstone Hall
	1264072	Ledston Lodge
	1234075	Entrance gates and lodges
Grade II* listed building	1237514	Garden House at north end of west terrace of Ledston Hall
	1264016	Gate Piers on former drive approximately 150 m north of Ledstone Hall

Designation	NHLE	Name
Grade II listed building	1237512	Gate piers to former north drive to Ledstone Hall
	1247687	Loggia in sunken garden forming south end of terrace to west of Ledstone Hall
	1247689	Statue in sunken garden approximately 100 m west of Ledstone Hall
	1255300	Two sets of steps up terraces to east of Ledston Hall
	1263986	Wall bounding the south, west and north sides of stable yard to east of Ledston Hall
	1263992	Steps in centre of grassed terraces of sunken garden to west of Ledston Hall
	1264076	Gate and steps at southeast corner of sunken garden to west of Ledston Hall
Grade II* registered park and gardens	1001221	Ledston Hall and Park
Conservation area	n/a	Ledsham Conservation Area

8.3 Relevant legislation, policy, standards and guidance

8.3.1 The following section identifies the relevant legislation, planning policy, standards and guidelines which underpin the assessment methodology for Cultural Heritage and have informed the assessment, including the identification of mitigation.

Legislation

Table 8-3 Cultural Heritage - Legislation

Legislation	Relevance to assessment
Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 (Ref 1)	<p>These regulations prescribe a list of matters for consideration by the Infrastructure Planning Commission or the Secretary of State (SoS) when taking decisions on applications for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. With regard to the historic environment, the regulations impart the definitions and tests for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ scheduled monuments (previously 'scheduled ancient monuments') which warrant protection due to being of national importance as defined in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (Ref 12); ▪ listed buildings, as defined in Section 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Ref 13); and ▪ conservation areas, as defined under section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Ref 13). <p>Provision 3 of the regulations state: <i>"(1) When deciding an application which affects a listed building or its setting, the Secretary of State must have regard to the</i></p>

Legislation	Relevance to assessment
	<p><i>desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. (2) When deciding an application relating to a conservation area, the Secretary of State must have regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. (3) When deciding an application for development consent which affects or is likely to affect a scheduled monument or its setting, the Secretary of State must have regard to the desirability of preserving the scheduled monument or its setting.”</i></p> <p>Designated heritage assets are identified in Section 8.7.1.</p>
Treasure Act 1996 (Ref 14)	<p>There is the potential that ‘treasure’ may be encountered as a result of activities associated with the Proposed Development. This Act defines ‘treasure’ as any object that is at least 300 years old when found and which is an object that has at least 10% gold or silver, is one of at least two coins in the same find which are at least 300 years old and have that percentage of metal or when found is one of at least ten coins in the same fine which are at least 300 years old, objects at least 200 years old belonging to a designated class, objects formerly classed as ‘treasure trove’ (therefore deliberately deposited items with a high content of gold or silver), and any objects found in association with the above (even if found at different times). The SoS may designate any class of object as treasure which they consider to be of outstanding historical, archaeological or cultural importance. Any find of ‘treasure’ must be reported to the local Coroner.</p>
Burial Act 1857 (Ref 15)	<p>There is the potential that human remains could be encountered as a result of activities associated with the Proposed Development. Under Section 25 of this Act, it is generally a criminal offence to remove human remains from any place of burial without an appropriate licence issued by the Ministry of Justice.</p>
Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 (Ref 16)	<p>This Act provides protection for the wreckage of military aircraft and designated military vessels. Certain activities are prohibited at protected sites without the authority of the Ministry of Defence. Military Remains are identified in Section 8.7.5 and detailed in full in Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02].</p>
Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 (Ref 17)	<p>The Act authorises Historic England to compile a register of gardens and other land of special historic interest. A registered park or garden is not protected by a separate consent regime, but applications for planning permission will give great weight to their conservation.</p>
The Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (Ref 22)	<p>This set of regulations provides the criteria used to determine if a hedgerow is ‘important’ archaeologically or historically and</p>

Legislation	Relevance to assessment
	how management of these ‘important’ hedgerows should be conducted including removal, permitted work and replacement.

Policy

Table 8-4 Cultural Heritage - Policy

Policy	Relevance to assessment
Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), 2025 (Ref 18)	<p>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 instructs the SoS to consider the potential harm caused to the significance of a heritage asset by impact(s) resulting from a proposed development. Harm to significance can be assessed as ‘substantial’ – which also includes the destruction (described as ‘total loss’) of a heritage asset – and ‘less than substantial’.</p> <p>NPS EN-1 advises that during decision making there should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and that any harm or loss of significance affecting any designated assets should require clear and convincing justification. Within Section 5.9.9 NPS EN-1 also refers to considering impact on non-designated heritage assets on the basis that assets have a heritage significance that merits consideration in decision making, even though non-designated assets are of lesser value than designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Substantial harm or loss of significance of assets of the highest significance (such as Scheduled Monuments; Protected Wreck Sites; Registered Battlefields; Grade I and II* listed buildings; Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens and World Heritage Sites) should be wholly exceptional. Substantial harm or loss of significance to assets of this calibre (and Grade II listed monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens) should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits. Less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets should be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. For non-designated heritage assets, applications that directly or indirectly affect them should be weighed against the scale of the harm and the significance of the heritage asset. Section 4.2 of the NPS explain how these tests should be applied in respect of Critical National Priority projects such as the Proposed Development.</p>
National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), 2025 (Ref 19)	NPS EN-3 states (2.10.129-130) that the ability of Applicants to microsite specific elements of a development during construction should be an important consideration of the SoS when assessing risk of damage to archaeology. The SoS should also consider granting consents which allow micro-siting within a specified tolerance of elements of the permitted infrastructure so that precise locations can be amended during construction if unknown archaeology is encountered.

Policy	Relevance to assessment
	<p>NPS EN-3 states the following key messages concerning the impact of solar farms on cultural heritage, which can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The impacts on the historic environment will require expert assessment in most cases and may have effect both above and below ground. ▪ Above ground impacts may include effects on the setting of Listed Buildings and other designed heritage assets and Historic Landscape Character, and below ground impacts are generally limited although may include direct impacts on archaeological deposits through ground disturbance associated with trenching, cabling, foundations, fencing, temporary haul routes and other associated groundworks. ▪ Development may have a positive effect on cultural heritage assets. <p>Applicant assessments should be informed by information from Historic Environment Records (HERs) or the local authority (Section 8.5.3 details the sources consulted for ES).</p> <p>Where a site has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, the Applicant should submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Geophysical survey has been conducted across Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 and within the Cable Route Corridor. This is discussed in Section 8.7 and detailed in Appendix 8.3: Geophysical Survey Results (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.03.08.03].</p> <p>In some instances, field studies may include investigative work to assess the impacts of any ground disturbance. The extent of investigative work should be proportionate to the sensitivity of, and extent of proposed ground disturbance. Field surveys are listed in Section 8.5.4, discussed in Section 8.7, and detailed in Appendix 8.4: Trial Trenching Reports (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04] with regard to archaeological evaluation (trial trenching).</p> <p>Applicants should take account of the results of historic environment assessments in their design proposal.</p> <p>Applicants should ensure heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the impact of large-scale solar farms which have the potential to cause substantial harm to the significance of heritage assets.</p>
<p>National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5), 2025 (Ref 20)</p>	<p>NPS EN-5 advises on the factors affecting decisions in site selection and sets out the government’s position on the use of overhead lines and underground (and sub-sea) cables concerning heritage assets, archaeology, and sensitive landscapes. Section 2.9.26 indicates that the potentially disruptive impacts from electricity network infrastructure, such</p>

Policy	Relevance to assessment
	<p>as cabling, on designated, archaeological and heritage assets should be considered in any application.</p>
<p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2024 (Ref 21)</p>	<p>The NPPF deals with all types of heritage in a single document. It takes an integrated approach to the historic environment, moving beyond a distinction between buildings, landscapes and archaeological remains. The policies outlined in ‘Section 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ are relevant to this assessment.</p> <p>The NPPF defines three levels of harm to heritage assets: substantial harm, less than substantial harm and no harm. This is consistent with NPS EN-1 sections 5.9.26-34. It also defines the heritage interests that contribute to the cultural significance of heritage assets (historic, architectural, artistic and archaeological), these definitions are also used within NPS EN-1 in section 5.9.3.</p> <p>The NPPF states that, when considering the impact of a proposed development, great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset; this is irrespective of the level of harm (paragraph 212).</p> <p>In considering proposals that would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal (paragraph 215).</p> <p>Effects on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account when determining an application; when weighing applications, a balanced judgement is required, which has regard to the scale of the harm or loss, and the significance of the heritage asset (paragraph 216).</p> <p>In footnote 75 NPPF states that non-designated heritage of archaeological interest and unrecorded archaeology which are/is <i>“demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage”</i></p> <p>Heritage Assets with the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development are set out in Section 8.7 and in full in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05].</p>
<p>Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan, adopted 2013 (Ref 23)</p>	<p>Objective 11 of the Core Strategy is concerned with: <i>“Protecting and enhancing the character of the historic environment, including buildings, open spaces and archaeology, and acknowledging the contribution the District’s heritage and economic prosperity, local distinctiveness and community well-being.”</i></p>

Policy	Relevance to assessment
	<p>Strategic policy SP18 Protecting and Enhancing the Environment states that:</p> <p>“The high quality and local distinctiveness of the natural and man-made environment will be sustained by:</p> <p><i>Safeguarding and, where possible, enhancing the historic and natural environment including the landscape character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance.</i></p> <p><i>Conserving those historic assets which contribute most to the distinct character of the District and realising the potential contribution that they can make towards economic regeneration, tourism, education and quality of life.”</i></p> <p>Strategic policy SP19 Design Quality states:</p> <p><i>“Proposals for all new development will be expected to contribute to enhancing community cohesion by achieving high quality design and have regard to the local character, identity and context of its surroundings including historic townscapes, settlement patterns and the open countryside.”</i></p>
<p>Selby District Local Plan, adopted 2005 (Ref 24)</p>	<p>. These policies comprise:</p> <p>Environmental policy ENV22 Protection of Listed Buildings states:</p> <p><i>“Development will not be permitted where it would have a detrimental effect on the character, fabric or setting of a listed building.”</i></p> <p>Environmental policy ENV27 Scheduled Monuments and Important Archaeological Sites states:</p> <p><i>“Where scheduled monuments or other nationally important archaeological sites or their settings are affected by Proposed Development, there will be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. In exceptional circumstances where the need for the development is clearly demonstrated, development will only be permitted where archaeological remains are preserved in situ through sympathetic layout or design of the development.”</i></p> <p>Environmental policy ENV28 Other Archaeological Remains states:</p> <p><i>“(A) Where development proposals affect sites of known or possible archaeological interest, the District Council will require an archaeological assessment/evaluation to be submitted as part of the planning application.</i></p> <p><i>(B) Where development affecting archaeological remains is acceptable in principle, the Council will require that archaeological remains are preserved in situ through careful design and layout of new development.</i></p>

Policy	Relevance to assessment
	<p><i>(C) Where preservation in situ is not justified, the Council will require that arrangements are made by the developer to ensure that adequate time and resources are available to allow archaeological investigation and recording by a competent archaeological organisation prior to or during development."</i></p>
<p>Selby Local Plan, draft 2024 (Ref 25)</p>	<p>The draft Selby Local Plan, revised in 2024, contains four policies concerning the historic environment. While development of this plan has now been abandoned, and the policies do not hold any status as part of an emerging development plan, they are set out below for context:</p> <p>Policy SG9 Design states: <i>"Development should, where appropriate, seek to: Respond to its location in terms of the natural, historic and built environment reflecting important views and landscapes and reinforce the distinctiveness and character of the local area having regard to the existing form, scale, density, layout, building materials and detailing."</i></p> <p>Policy SG10 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy states: <i>"Proposals for low-carbon and renewable energy storage and generation...will be supported where: appropriate weight, consideration and mitigation has been given to...Designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings."</i></p> <p>Policy SG12: Valuing the Historic Environment states: <i>"The former Selby district area's heritage assets will be preserved and where appropriate enhanced in a manner commensurate to their significance. Developments which will help in the management, conservation, understanding and enjoyment of the area's historic environment, especially for those assets which are at risk, will be encouraged. Particular attention will be paid to the conservation of those elements which contribute most to the former Selby district area's distinctive character and sense of place."</i></p> <p>Those elements most relevant to the Proposed Development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "The 19th Century farming heritage of the area ▪ 20th Century military remains, most notably the airfields of former RAF Riccall and RAF Church Fenton ▪ The designated heritage assets of the former Selby district area" <p>Policy SG13 Planning Applications and the Historic Environment states:</p>

Policy	Relevance to assessment
	<p><i>“In order to preserve and/or enhance the historic environment, a development scheme will be supported which meets the following;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A. Development affecting a heritage asset should preserve, and where appropriate, enhance those elements which contribute to its significance.</i> <i>B. Harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a designated heritage asset (or an archaeological site of national importance) will only be supported where this is clearly justified and outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a designated heritage asset (or an archaeological site of national importance) will be permitted only in those circumstances set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.</i> <i>C. Development affecting a Conservation Area should preserve and where appropriate enhance those elements which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area, including its setting, and should be in accordance with the guidance set out in adopted Conservation Area Appraisals.</i> <i>D. Development which would remove, harm, or undermine the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will only be permitted where the benefits are considered sufficient to outweigh the harm, having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the asset.</i> <i>E. Proposals for the sympathetic reuse of vacant and “at risk” buildings will be supported where they prevent further deterioration of the buildings condition, maintain, or enhance their significance, and support their long-term conservation.”</i>
<p>The Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) (Ref 26)</p>	<p>The Environmental Improvement Plan is a 25-year plan that looks to improve all parts of the environment including Cultural Heritage. Within the EIP, Commitment 90 states a need to <i>Improve the condition, diversity and character of our landscapes and the condition of the historic environment and heritage features, including designated geological sites and scheduled monuments.</i></p>

Standards and Guidance

Table 8-5 Cultural Heritage - Standards and Guidance

Standards and guidance	Relevance to assessment
<p>Archaeology and Construction: good practice guidance (C799D), CIRIA, 2021 (Ref 28)</p>	<p>This guide shows how combined construction, and archaeological processes can be managed by an integrated, multi-disciplinary team to deliver beneficial commercial, sustainable, and public outcomes. It offers practical advice</p>

Standards and guidance	Relevance to assessment
	applicable to all scales of construction project and is relevant to all stages of the life of the Proposed Development.
Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK (Ref 29)	This document provides guidance for cultural heritage practitioners regarding the principles of assessing impact to the historic environment, specifically understanding cultural heritage assets and evaluating the consequences of change and offers additional supporting direction ('good practice') on achieving the best outcomes for a development.
Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment: Historic England Advice Note 15 (Ref 31)	This advice note describes the potential impacts on the historic environment of commercial renewable energy proposals, which could occupy large areas of land or sea. Technologies covered include large-scale development proposals for wind power, solar photovoltaics, and biomass and energy from waste. The advice note includes consideration of NSIPs and other large-scale proposals that do not meet the criteria for inclusion in the NSIP regime, but which require assessment under EIA regulations to determine what harm might be caused, including to cultural heritage, and whether this can be avoided or reduced.
Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 104 Environmental assessment and monitoring (Ref 32) and DMRB LA 106 Cultural heritage assessment (Ref 33)	Although primarily intended for use in assessing the impact of highways projects on cultural heritage, the DMRB methodology is suitable for adaptation to assess impact and environmental effects brought about by large, complex linear and non-linear developments. The methodology for assessment set out in Section 8.5 is adapted from the standards presented in the DMRB.
Code of conduct: professional ethics in archaeology (Ref 34)	The code applies to individual members and Registered Organisations of the Chartered Institute for Archaeology. The code promotes the standard of acceptable conduct and self-discipline required by members and Registered Organisations in the interests of the public and in the study and care of the physical evidence of the past.
Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (Ref 35)	<p>The standard states that an historic environment desk-based assessment will, so far as reasonably possible:</p> <p><i>“Determine from existing records the nature, extent, and significance of the historic environment within a specified area.</i></p> <p><i>Be conducted using appropriate methods and practices which satisfy the stated aims of the project and comply with the Code of conduct and other relevant regulations of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists; and</i></p> <p><i>In a development context, establish the impact of a Proposed Development or scheme on the significance of the historic environment (or identify the need for further evaluation to do so) to enable reasoned proposals and decisions to be made whether to mitigate, offset, or accept impact(s) without further intervention.”</i></p>

Standards and guidance	Relevance to assessment
Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets. Historic England Advice Note 12 (Ref 36)	This advice note provides a methodology for decision makers to follow when taking a staged approach to understanding significance and assessing the impact(s) of proposals.
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG): Historic Environment (Ref 37)	The PPG Historic Environment guidance advises on enhancing and conserving the historic environment.
The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) (Ref 38)	<p>This advice in planning note lays out a five-stage/step approach to assessing the setting of heritage assets and the impacts of developments on them. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Step 1. Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected. ▪ Step 2. Assess the degree to which these settings and views contribute to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated. ▪ Step 3. Assess the effects of the proposed scheme on the significance, or on the ability to appreciate it. ▪ Step 4. Explore ways to maximise enhancement or minimise harm. ▪ Step 5. Make and document the decision and monitor the outcomes. <p>Assessment of setting for heritage receiving impact(s) as a result of the Proposed Development is set out in Section 8.9. A full assessment of setting, and the contribution this makes (if any) to cultural significance, is detailed for heritage assets in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05].</p>
Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 (Ref 39)	This good practice advice in planning note gives an overview of how assessing the cultural significance of heritage assets should be approached, and the factors affecting the nature of impacts from development or industry.
Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (Ref 40)	<p>Although not altered since 2008, these principles and policies are still an important source of guidance on how the cultural significance of heritage assets should be understood.</p> <p>Conservation Principles defines the values which contribute to the cultural significance of a heritage asset or an historic place and how people engage with and experience it.</p>

8.4 Stakeholder engagement and Consultation

Scoping Opinion

8.4.1 An EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 1.1 (ES Volume 3)) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.01] was submitted to PINS on 11 November 2024. The EIA Scoping Opinion was issued by PINS on 19 December 2024 (Appendix 1.2 (ES Volume 3)) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.01.02]. A summary of key comments and how these have been addressed is presented Table 8-6.

Table 8-6 Cultural Heritage EIA Scoping Opinion comments

EIA Scoping Opinion I.D	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	How is this comment addressed
PINS [ID 3.6.1]	PINS stated that the ES should assess indirect impacts to designated built heritage assets during decommissioning.	The assessment of potential indirect impacts to designated built heritage assets during decommissioning is presented in Section 8.9.
PINS [ID 3.6.2]	PINS stated that the ES should assess impacts to non-designated built heritage assets during operation and decommissioning.	The assessment of operational and decommissioning impacts to non-designated built heritage assets is presented in Section 8.9.
PINS [ID 3.6.3]	PINS stated that the ES should assess indirect impacts to designated and non-designated archaeological heritage assets during operation and decommissioning.	The assessment of operational and decommissioning impacts to designated and non-designated archaeological heritage assets is presented in Section 8.9.
PINS [ID 3.6.4]	PINS stated that the ES should assess impacts to potential unrecorded archaeology during decommissioning.	The assessment of decommissioning impacts to unrecorded archaeology is presented in Section 8.9.
PINS [ID 3.6.5]	PINS stated that the LVIA should include an assessment of the impact on designated heritage assets, and the ES should provide information on whether any significant effects on the setting of heritage assets are likely.	The assessment of significant effects arising as a result of changes within the setting of heritage assets is presented in Section 8.9. This comment is further responded to in Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.10].
PINS [ID 3.6.6]	PINS stated that the ES should include an assessment of any likely significant effects on below ground archaeology from any piling, cable ploughing or trenching methods used during the Proposed Development construction.	The assessment of impact(s) from these activities to unrecorded archaeology is presented in Section 8.9.

EIA Scoping Opinion I.D	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	How is this comment addressed
PINS [ID 3.6.7]	PINS stated that the ES should include but not be limited to consideration of installation and removal of piling, cable trenching, any tracking platforms and any deep ploughing, along with any alterations to drainage patterns or dewatering	The assessment of impact(s) to archaeology (known and unrecorded) is presented in Section 8.9. In addition, ES Chapter 2: The Proposed Development (Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02] , sets out the proposed removal practices during the decommissioning phase.
Canal and River Trust (CRT)	<p>CRT requested that vibrations from Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) activities should be referenced and assessed within the report.</p> <p>CRT also requested that specific impacts upon Paper House Bridge (Grade II listed) and Tankards Bridge (Grade II listed)] should be specifically referenced in the Environmental Report.</p>	<p>Where appropriate, sound, noise and vibration impacts have been considered in this chapter.</p> <p>Following revision of the Order Limits, Paper House Bridge [NHLE 1174087] and Tankards Bridge [NHLE 1316360] are located 2.3 km and 2.5 km from the boundary of Solar Development Site 4, outside of the Cultural Heritage Study Area. These assets will therefore experience no effects from the Proposed Development.</p>
Historic England	Historic England stated that they would expect the assessment to clearly demonstrate that the extent of the proposed Study Area is of the appropriate size to ensure that all heritage assets likely to be affected by this development have been included and can be properly assessed.	The scope of the Study Area is set out in Section 8.2. This has been defined through the application of professional judgement and experience, as well as review of the ZTV to ensure that the Study Area is sufficient to capture all heritage assets and archaeology with the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development.
Historic England	Historic England stated that, in relation to the EIA Scoping Report particularly section 14.5.8.1, views which may contribute to the setting of heritage assets, and thereby to their significance, are not restricted to just public views. Historic England noted that impact on private views of designated heritage assets should also be considered. Similarly, kinetic/dynamic viewpoints should be considered as they would allow what	<p>The assessment of setting, and the contribution of that setting to the cultural significance of heritage assets impacted by the Proposed Development is presented in Section 8.9.</p> <p>Detailed assessment of the contribution made by setting to heritage assets is provided in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3)</p>

EIA Scoping Opinion I.D	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	How is this comment addressed
	<p>someone would see whilst moving around or through a landscape.</p> <p>The views should also include a third-point view where the proposal site with a secondary subject i.e. a designated heritage asset. It is acknowledged this is a large site however it is important that the views of heritage assets existing with the proposal are considered as much as views to and from/ between the proposal site and the heritage assets.</p>	<p>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05].</p> <p>All setting assessments within this chapter and Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3)</p> <p>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05] consider the overall context of heritage assets including, where appropriate, private views and dynamic and third point views, such as Public Rights of Way (PRoW).</p>
Historic England	<p>Historic England note that Paragraph 2.4.2.11 of the EIA Scoping Report outlines that it is not known where 'raft' or 'raft and piled' foundations would be necessary, but the piling could potentially have a high impact on the significance of underground archaeology and so this decision would need to be made as to allow the ES to make this impact assessment.</p>	<p>Indicative design is provided within Chapter 2: The Proposed Development (Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02].</p> <p>A worst-case scenario of a 'raft' foundation of up to 2.6 m depth and up to 15 m depth for piled foundations has been assessed.</p> <p>Where geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching (Appendix 8.3: Geophysical Survey Results (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03] and Appendix 8.4: Trial Trenching Reports (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04] has identified areas of high archaeological potential, design modifications have been employed (through use of concrete footings and, in some areas, exclusion from the scheme). Where below ground impacts remain, these are assessed within Section 8.9.</p>
Historic England	<p>Historic England note that paragraph 2.4.2.33 outlines the 'cable ploughing' or 'trenching' methods to create the cable routes which we have identified as having a potentially large impact on the significance of below ground archaeology. This partly coincides with the need to more closely define the cable routes as to understand what the</p>	<p>The potential impacts of installation of the cable have been considered throughout the design process. Where potential impacts upon archaeological remains within the Cable Route Corridor have been identified as a result of geophysical surveys (available in Appendix 8.3 :Geophysical Survey</p>

EIA Scoping Opinion I.D	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	How is this comment addressed
	<p>potential impact on the significance of below ground archaeology is or isn't.</p>	<p>Results (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03]) mitigation for these impacts is set out within the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]. The potential impacts on below ground archaeological remains are assessed within Section 8.9.</p>
<p>North Yorkshire Council (NYC) – Built Heritage</p>	<p>The setting of the named heritage assets above would be affected through this development proposal. Their significance falls in various levels and for the most part it is the space which is around them or their agricultural setting which adds to their significance. The cable corridors would on a temporary basis create setting concerns along with the plant equipment and associated works to lay the cable and erect the Solar PVs and battery storage. The proposal would amount to less than substantial harm. It is recognised that national policy states that where harm has been identified a justification, and a public benefit needs to be applied and be convincing to meet the tests which fall within it. There may be other benefits derived from this scheme but not on a heritage level.</p>	<p>Assessment of setting and the contribution of that setting to the cultural significance of heritage assets impacted by the Proposed Development is presented in Section 8.9. Detailed assessment of the contribution made by setting to heritage assets is provided in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05].</p>
<p>North Yorkshire Council – Archaeology</p>	<p>NYC recommend that, going forward, the term 'non-designated heritage asset' is only used for those assets such as local list buildings or items specifically identified in neighbourhood plans or conservation area appraisals. Other assets, which are not designated, or locally identified, should be referred to as 'heritage assets' or similar. The assessment may, of course, make recommendations for the planning authority to identify new 'non-designated heritage assets' as part of the planning process.</p>	<p>This chapter refers to heritage assets not designated through an Act of Parliament as 'heritage assets' or 'potential heritage assets' and not as 'non-designated heritage assets'.</p>

EIA Scoping Opinion I.D	EIA Scoping Opinion comment	How is this comment addressed
North Yorkshire Council – Archaeology	NYC supports the approach of embedded mitigation supplemented by archaeological recording. They advise that any nationally significant archaeological remains should be subject to a design solution.	Details of embedded and good practice mitigation are presented in Section 8.8 and details of additional mitigation are presented in Section 8.10.
North Yorkshire Council – Archaeology	NYC noted the suggestion from the scoping report that a design solution would be taken in the first instance, in order to limit impacts to below-ground archaeological features. However, they raised concerns that there may be discrete areas where unavoidable ground disturbance coincided with significant archaeological deposits. They stated that, where this is the case, and a design solution is not possible, that field evaluation in form of archaeological trial trenching be carried out.	Details of design solutions undertaken in order to limit impacts to below-ground archaeological features are presented in Section 8.8. Archaeological trial trenching has been undertaken across all Solar Development Sites; the results of this evaluation have informed the assessments made in this chapter and are discussed in Sections 8.7 and 8.9. Full details of the trial trench evaluation can be found within Appendix 8.4: Trial Trenching Reports (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04] .

Statutory consultation

- 8.4.2 A period of statutory consultation took place between 26 June and 7 August 2025 wherein consultees were able to respond to preliminary environmental information set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). Table 8-7 outlines the statutory consultation responses relating to Cultural Heritage and how these have been addressed through the ES.
- 8.4.3 Full responses to the Statutory Consultation are outlined in the Consultation Report **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01]**

Table 8-7 Statutory consultation comments

Consultee	Comments	How has this comment been addressed	Location of response in this ES
North Yorkshire Council	The PEIR report sets out a range of desktop sources that will be reviewed to inform the baseline conditions. I agree with this range of sources and can see no notable omissions. I note that	Publicly available aerial photographs (online resources and North Yorkshire Archives) have been consulted to inform the baseline assessment and, where appropriate,	Heritage assets identified as part of the assessment process are listed within Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02] and have been used to inform Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline (ES Volume 3)

Consultee	Comments	How has this comment been addressed	Location of response in this ES
	8.5.4 mentions the review of publicly available aerial photographs and I would recommend that the collections held by North Yorkshire Archives are cross checked against the Historic Environment Record for cropmark features as these might not have been verified for some time.	these have been cross checked with the results of geophysical survey Appendix 8.3: Geophysical Survey Results (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03] .	[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01] .
North Yorkshire Council	The Study Area contains a number of records detailing aircraft crash sites. I would recommend that the project team check the information on www.yorkshireaircraft.co.uk as this contains detailed research into many crashes, over and above the level of basic information given in many of the high-level gazetteers from which our Historic Environment Record data is derived.	No crash sites are located within the Order Limits. Where appropriate, additional research on potential crash sites has been carried out to inform the scheme baseline.	Heritage assets identified as part of the assessment process are listed within Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02] and have been used to inform the Cultural Heritage Baseline (Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01]).
North Yorkshire Council	The report discusses embedded mitigation, i.e. mitigation by design (Section 8.8). I note that the identification of geophysical anomalies within Site 1 has led to a design option to avoid impact to a linear settlement along	The Order Limits have been adjusted to remove both the linear area to the north of Solar Development Site 1 (avoided previously) and the area around the group of enclosures in Solar Development Site 4.	Design assumptions are set out within Section 8.6. Embedded mitigation is detailed within Section 8.8.

Consultee	Comments	How has this comment been addressed	Location of response in this ES
	<p>the northern edge of the area which appears to be Iron Age or Roman in date, with the potential for complex and significant deposits, including square barrows. I support this design option. I would recommend that similar consideration is given to the complex anomalies noted at Site 4 (see Figure 8.3, Sheet 14 of 17), where a group of enclosures with internal features is present in a density that suggests that complex and significant deposits are present.</p>	<p>Within the Order Limits, areas of high potential and others with the potential to contain archaeological features based on the results of the geophysical survey have been set aside from development as part of the scheme and reserved for environmental or other mitigation based on the results of the geophysical survey, thus limiting the potential for ground intrusion. These include areas in the south-east of Solar Development Site 4 and south of Solar Development Site 1.</p>	
<p>North Yorkshire Council</p>	<p>8.9.5 suggests that the results from the geophysical survey have identified sites of negligible to medium importance. I would suggest that this estimation is too low, and that in particular the medieval moated sites might be of much higher importance. There are many moated sites in the Selby area that are Scheduled Monuments and there is no reason to suspect that the moats within Site 4 are not of</p>	<p>The importance of the moated sites within the gazetteer has been adjusted based on this guidance. Designated moated sites within the surrounding landscape typically hold a higher historic interest through documented association with religious orders or notable historic figures, or through associated features such as fishponds.</p>	<p>Both moated sites have been assigned a high importance based on this guidance. This can be found within Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02].</p>

Consultee	Comments	How has this comment been addressed	Location of response in this ES
	equivalent significance to these.		
North Yorkshire Council	<p>The NPPG references the NPPF regarding the historic environment and provides further clarification on the setting of a heritage asset. It states (Reference ID: 18a013-20190723) that: “The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to the visual relationship between the asset and the proposed development and associated visual/physical considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part in the assessment of impacts on setting, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust, smell and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.</p> <p>The setting of ...heritage assets above would be</p>	This definition of setting is applied within the ES.	The contribution of setting to the significance of heritage assets within the gazetteer is addressed within Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05] and, where relevant, within Section 8.9.

Consultee	Comments	How has this comment been addressed	Location of response in this ES
	<p>affected through this development proposal. Their significance falls in various levels and for the most part it is the space which is around them or their agricultural setting which adds to their significance. The cable corridors would on a temporary basis create setting concerns along with the plant equipment and associated works to lay the cable and erect the solar PV's and battery storage.</p>		
<p>North Yorkshire Council</p>	<p>National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), 2024, National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 instructs the Secretary of State to consider the potential harm caused to the significance of a heritage asset by impact(s) resulting from a proposed development. Harm to significance can be assessed as 'substantial' – which also includes the total loss of a heritage asset and less than substantial. NPS EN-1 advises that during decision making there should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and that loss</p>	<p>The Application considers potential harm as per NPS EN-1.</p>	<p>An assessment of 'harm' arising from the Proposed Development is set out in Section 8.9.</p>

Consultee	Comments	How has this comment been addressed	Location of response in this ES
	<p>affecting any designated assets should require clear and convincing justification. It also refers to considering impact on non-designated heritage assets on the basis that assets have a heritage significance that merits consideration in decision making.</p>		
<p>Historic England</p>	<p>The method for assessing the cultural significance of designated heritage assets has been carried out using matrixes relating to the ‘importance’ of heritage assets, the ‘magnitude of impact’ of the proposals, and the ‘significance of effect’. Historic England does not entirely agree with this methodology used to assess the impact to significance of heritage assets. We do not consider that this is a particularly effective or sensitive enough approach when assessing significance of designated heritages or indeed when assessing the potential impact and harm a proposal might</p>	<p>The significance of all heritage assets with the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development has been assessed, through a consideration of their heritage interests (in line with those outlined in the NPPF/NPS), and then assigned an environmental value, which aligns with their cultural significance (value). Where appropriate an assessment or signpost of the level of ‘harm’, as per NPPF, has been added for clarity.</p>	<p>The environmental value (cultural significance) of all heritage assets is addressed in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05] and, where relevant, within Section 8.9. Further detail of EIA terminology and its correspondence to cultural significance is addressed from paragraph 8.5.6. Additionally, the criteria for determination of importance of heritage assets is outlined in Table 8-10.</p>

Consultee	Comments	How has this comment been addressed	Location of response in this ES
	cause to this significance.		
Historic England	Paragraph 8.5.13 states that assessments of impact will include those of the NPPF i.e. less than substantial and substantial harm. We agree that this is an appropriate methodology to understanding potential impact of the proposals upon significance however it seems in this PEIR report that where the impact on a heritage assets significance has been assessed at construction, operational and decommissioning stages, these have been made using the matrixes in isolation without articulating harm to significance in terms of less than substantial harm etc. We would recommend that this approach to assessing impact is employed at ES stage.	The assessments of impact utilise the terminology outlined in Section 8.5. For the purposes of this assessment, an effect of moderate adverse or above is considered to be significant, and could be equivalent to Substantial Harm, as outlined in the NPPF. All effects below moderate adverse are considered to be equivalent to Less than Substantial Harm, unless no change is to occur. However, in some cases, an effect of moderate adverse may be equivalent to Less than Substantial Harm, based on professional judgement. Where appropriate a judgement of the level of harm has been included within Section 8.9.	The methodology for assigning magnitude of impact is outlined from paragraph 8.5.10 onwards. Impacts to all heritage assets are addressed in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05] and, where relevant, within Section 8.9.
Historic England	Similarly, to assist the above approach we would also ask that in paragraph 8.6.1 where it says that the ‘importance’ of all assets would be assessed at ES stage that this is an assessment of	Importance is equivalent to significance for the purposes of this assessment.	As above, the cultural significance (value) of all heritage assets is addressed in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05] and, where relevant, within Section 8.9. Further detail of EIA terminology and its

Consultee	Comments	How has this comment been addressed	Location of response in this ES
	significance as well as, or in lieu of, an 'importance' assessment.		correspondence to cultural significance is addressed from paragraph 8.5.6.

Targeted consultation

- 8.4.4 A period of targeted consultation took place between 16 October 2025 and 20 November 2025, during which feedback was encouraged to comment on minor changes to the development boundary area, in relation to access points during construction and operation; visibility splays to ensure safe sightlines for vehicles entering and exiting the Proposed Development; passing places on narrow roads; access requirements for abnormal indivisible loads (less frequent but large delivery vehicles that have wider turner circles); cable route adjustments to avoid environmental and engineering constraints; and permissive paths to enable increased public access routes within the Solar Development Sites. Table 8-8 outlines the statutory consultation responses relating to cultural heritage and how these have been addressed through the ES.
- 8.4.5 Full responses to the targeted consultation are outlined in the Consultation Report [EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.01].

Table 8-8 Targeted consultation comments

Consultee	Comment	Applicant response
Leeds City Council	Thank you for including the relevant listed buildings and Ledsham Conservation Area within Leeds into your assessment.	The Applicant notes this response.
Local Residents	Heavy construction traffic and proposed road modifications could pose significant risks to the Grade I listed St Helen's Church, as well as to nearby roads that have recently experienced subsidence and sinkholes. What provisions will assess the potential damage caused?	Assessment of the potential impacts of the HIA works at the eastern extent of Skipwith has been undertaken within the ES [EN0110012/APP/LVS/ 06.01.08.00]. Works will be restricted to the carriageway in front of the designated structures and will not result in physical impacts to any heritage asset or change their setting in such a way that will impact their significance. The route outside of St. Helen's church will be used for AIL only. Other HGV traffic will not be routed along Main Street. As a result, there is no risk of vibration damage to the church tower as a result of the Proposed Development. A full assessment of potential effects is reported within the ES [EN0110012/APP/06.01.08].

Consultee	Comment	Applicant response
Local Resident	Skipwith Heritage Group (SHG) requests a commitment from LVS and associated stakeholders to involve SHG throughout all stages of the village's road-enhancement works, so they can help ensure the protection of Skipwith's historic character	The route through Skipwith and outside of St. Helen's church will be used for AIL only. Other HGV traffic will not be routed through the village or along Main Street.

Stakeholder engagement

8.4.6 The following stakeholders have been engaged with regards to Cultural Heritage as part of the assessment process:

- 1) NYC (Principal Archaeologist and Conservation Officer); and
- 2) Historic England.

8.4.7 The outputs of the engagement undertaken are presented in Table 8-9.

Table 8-9 Cultural Heritage - Engagement undertaken

Stakeholder	Date engaged	Matters raised	Response
Historic England	13 January 2025	<p>Meeting to introduce the Proposed Development, provide a high-level review of identified heritage assets, geophysical survey results of Sites 1-4 and discuss proposed methodology.</p> <p>Discussion points included: The reliability of geophysical survey results and ground truthing methodology via trial trenching. The importance of including any offsite ecological or construction areas within the assessment. Potential cumulative impacts from multiple solar schemes and importance of connection with Landscape and Visual assessment. Potential for community engagement with the project.</p>	<p>Consultation with the Principal Archaeologist to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) was conducted with regard to archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) of Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 following receipt of the geophysical survey results.</p> <p>All construction or mitigation areas for the Proposed Development have been included in the assessment scope as part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The project has set out opportunities for engagement with local community groups within the AMS [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12].</p>
NYC Principal Archaeologist	20 January 2025	Meeting to introduce the Proposed Development, provide a high-level	The validity of geophysical survey

Stakeholder	Date engaged	Matters raised	Response
and Conservation Officer		<p>review of identified heritage assets, geophysical survey results of Solar Development Sites 1-4 and discuss proposed methodology.</p> <p>Reliability of geophysical survey results and ground truthing methodology via trial trenching.</p> <p>Importance of including any offsite ecological or construction areas within the assessment.</p> <p>Potential cumulative impacts from multiple solar schemes and importance of connection with Landscape and Visual assessment.</p>	<p>results has been determined through a scheme of archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) in Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 in compliance with a methodology agreed with NYCs Principal Archaeologist.</p> <p>Assessments consider all areas which impacted as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts are assessed in Section 8.14.</p>
NYC Principal Archaeologist	21 February 2025	Trial trenching strategy for Solar Development Sites only.	A pre-determination targeted scheme of archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) within the Solar Development Sites has been agreed with NYCs Principal Archaeologist. Only areas impacted as a result of the Proposed Development have been trenched.
NYC Principal Archaeologist	28 July 2025	Consultation on PEIR conclusions and update on geophysical survey and trial trenching strategy	<p>NYCs Principal Archaeologist stated his broad agreement with the conclusions of the PEIR and had no further comments.</p> <p>Agreement that the geophysical survey results across the Site look clear and that non-agricultural archaeological features are generally present in isolated pockets across the landscape. Trial trenching was due to start imminently at the time of the meeting with</p>

Stakeholder	Date engaged	Matters raised	Response
			NYC's archaeologist retaining oversight of trench sign off. Trial trenching was completed in October 2025.
NYC Conservation Officer	1 September 2025	Clarification sought on confusion between Solar Development Sites 4 and 5 in S42/43 response to PEIR.	NYCs Conservation Officer confirmed that Solar Development Site 4 remained within the Proposed Development and understood that Solar Development Site 5 has been removed from the Order Limits. In their opinion, any harm to Birkin House, adjacent to Solar Development Site 4, will be less than substantial.
Historic England	6 November 2025	<p>Results of further geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching were provided.</p> <p>Updates on scheme design, demonstrating removal of areas of high archaeological potential from the Proposed Development, provision of embedded mitigation to protect archaeological features within the scheme design and measures committed to within the OEM to minimise effects arising through changes in the setting of heritage assets.</p> <p>PEIR/ES methodology and the need for clarity on EIA outcomes in relation to the NPPF/NPS test of 'substantial/less than substantial harm'.</p>	<p>Historic England were pleased to note the level of consideration given to archaeology and heritage within the design of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Consideration to the NPPF / NPS test will be given within the ES Chapter (Section 8.9).</p> <p>Areas of embedded mitigation are shown in Figure 2.6: Concrete feet locations or other non-ground penetrative techniques (ES Volume 2)</p> <p>[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.06].</p>
NYC Principal Archaeologist	23 December 2025	<p>Results of geophysical survey in the Cable Route Corridor and archaeological trial trenching in the Solar Development Sites were presented.</p> <p>Updates on scheme design, demonstrating removal of areas of high archaeological potential from the Proposed Development, and provision of embedded mitigation to</p>	The scheme of archaeological mitigation was provisionally agreed with NYC's Principal Archaeologist subject to their review of survey reports.

Stakeholder	Date engaged	Matters raised	Response
		<p>protect archaeological features within the scheme design.</p> <p>Discussion of planned archaeological mitigation, to comprise delineated areas of Strip, Map and Sample excavation within both the Solar Development Sites and the CRC, and archaeological monitoring of other areas of the CRC and ecological works in Solar Development Site 1.</p>	

8.5 Methodology

Overview

8.5.1 The following methodology has been developed in line with relevant planning policy and appropriate industry guidance in order to assess the likely significant effects arising from the Proposed Development on Cultural Heritage.

Baseline methodology

8.5.2 The cultural heritage baseline and gazetteer, presented in Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01] and Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02] respectively, includes field survey and investigation data and desk-based research. The scope of the assessments for Cultural Heritage is set out below.

Desktop sources

8.5.3 The following desktop sources were used to inform the existing baseline conditions of the Study Area:

- 1) Archaeology Data Service (Ref 1) for information on previous Cultural Heritage assessments and fieldwork surveys and for additional Historic Landscape Character (HLC) data and reporting;
- 2) British Geological Survey (BGS) online (Ref 2);
- 3) Light Detection And Ranging (LiDAR) data, provided as 1 m Digital Terrain Model (DTM) composite tiles (Environment Agency) (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), for Leeds City Council (Ref 5) and Selby District Council (Ref 6);

- 6) National Heritage List for England (NHLE) for designated heritage asset datasets (Ref 7);
- 7) National Library of Scotland for historic Ordnance Survey (OS) and pre-OS mapping (Ref 8);
- 8) North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record (NYHER) (CNY21141, report dated 6 December 2024) for heritage asset datasets, HLC data and reporting, and archaeological events;
- 9) York City Historic Environment Record (YCHER) (report dated 23 May 2024) for heritage asset datasets, HLC data and reporting, and archaeological events;
- 10) Regional Research Agenda for South Yorkshire (Ref 9);
- 11) Groundsure, historic (including first and second edition) and modern OS map sheets;
- 12) North Yorkshire Country Record Office for pre-OS historic map sheets, such as tithe and/or enclosure and/or estate maps;
- 13) West Yorkshire Archive Services (Wakefield) for pre-OS historic map sheets, such as tithe and/or enclosure and/or estate maps;
- 14) Borthwick Institute, University of York for pre-OS historic map sheets, such as tithe and/or enclosure maps; and
- 15) Google Earth for publicly available aerial photographs and composite aerial/satellite imagery (Ref 10).

Survey

8.5.4 The following surveys have been undertaken and used to inform the existing baseline conditions assessed in this Chapter, following granting of permission from landowners and/or availability and suitability of land parcels for survey under agricultural, specifically arable, use or rotation:

- 1) Walkover of Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8;
- 2) Geophysical survey of Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8;
- 3) Archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) of Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 (see also, Section 8.6);
- 4) Walkover of the Cable Route Corridor;
- 5) Geophysical survey of the Cable Route Corridor (see also, Section 8.6); and
- 6) Setting assessment survey of sensitive heritage assets, or groups of heritage assets, within the Study Areas described in Section 8.2 and, where deemed appropriate and proportionate through the application of professional judgement and experience or in specific response to consultees (for example Leeds City Council, see Section 8.2), beyond these distances.

Assessment methodology

- 8.5.5 Construction, operation, and decommissioning effects to heritage assets and unrecorded archaeology are assessed using a methodology adapted from the standards presented in the DMRB (Ref 41) and incorporate standards and guidance from the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Historic England and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment where appropriate.

Assessment of cultural significance (value)

- 8.5.6 In England, different vocabularies are applied to defining what constitutes the cultural significance of a heritage asset. For example, NPS EN-1 (Ref 18) and Section 16 of the NPPF (Ref 21) refer to 'heritage interests' when discussing cultural significance; whereas Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (Ref 40) and the assessment methodology in the DMRB (Ref 41) use the term 'value'. At the root of these nuances in vocabulary and meaning, however, is an emphasis on the need to understand exactly what it is that makes heritage assets culturally significant
- 8.5.7 In this assessment, the value/interest of heritage assets will be defined as 'cultural significance (value)'. Cultural significance (value) will be guided by designations but derived from the heritage interest(s) presented in NPS EN-1 (Ref 18) and described in Annex 2 of the NPPF (Ref 21) (these interests can be archaeological, architectural, artistic, or historic) which are broadly analogous to heritage value(s) as described in Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (Ref 40) (these can be evidential, historical, aesthetic, or communal).
- 8.5.8 The cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset may also be influenced by its setting or also be derived from, or enhanced by, its group value with other assets. NPS EN-1 (Ref 18) and the NPPF (Ref 21) consider the setting of a heritage asset, archaeological or built, to be the surroundings within which it is experienced. This is not limited to public views and may include a third-point view, considering the asset in a landscape context. These surroundings may benefit, detract from, or not contribute to cultural significance (value) of an asset. Historic England's guidance on the Setting of Heritage Assets acknowledges that the extent of a heritage asset's surroundings "*is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve*" (Ref 38). The setting of a heritage asset may also extend beyond that which is intervisible.

Assigning receptor importance

- 8.5.9 Cultural significance (value) can be defined as the sum of the value(s)/interest(s) that society places upon a heritage asset, and it is not appropriate to refer to a heritage asset as having a low, medium, or high value/interest (Ref 29). However, as the DMRB methodology requires a quantifiable descriptor, heritage assets have been assigned an 'importance'. This importance is derived from a heritage asset's cultural significance (value) and determined according to the criteria set

out in Table 8-10 alongside the application of professional judgement and experience.

Table 8-10 Criteria for the determination of the importance of heritage assets

Importance	Typical descriptors
Very high	Very high importance and rarity, international scale and very limited potential for substitution. Includes some World Heritage Sites and nominated sites, where their Outstanding Universal Value is derived from cultural heritage value.
High	Rare nationally with a limited potential for their substitution. Examples of archaeological heritage assets are scheduled monuments or previously unrecorded or non-designated archaeological features, remains, and/or deposits of a schedulable quality as defined by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (Ref 12). All listed buildings. Archaeological features, remains, and/or deposits that are common nationally but are rare regionally may also be determined as being of high importance. Grade I and Grade II* registered parks and gardens. Conservation areas containing very important buildings, undesignated structures of clear national importance, or undesignated resources of schedulable quality and importance.
Medium	Common nationally with some potential for substitution. Examples of archaeological heritage assets include recorded non-designated archaeological sites and previously unrecorded archaeological features, remains, and/or deposits that are not of a schedulable quality as defined by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (Ref 12). Archaeological features, remains, and/or deposits that are rare within a region may also be determined as being of medium importance. Grade II registered parks and gardens. Conservation areas containing buildings that contribute to its historic character.
Low	Very common with a limited ability to enhance understanding of the historic environment. Examples include partially lost archaeological features and disturbed or destroyed archaeological remains and deposits that are already recorded. Unrecorded archaeological features, remains, and/or deposits that may enhance the understanding of the historic environment on a local scale may also be determined as being of low importance. Built heritage examples include locally listed buildings.
Negligible	Very common nationally, regionally, and locally and unlikely to enhance understanding of the historic environment. Examples include recorded and unrecorded material culture findspots with limited (if any) archaeological context.

Assigning magnitude of impact

8.5.10 Impact(s) to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset are assessed by determining the magnitude of impact (degree of change). This is the degree to which direct or indirect change(s) occur, the type of impact (whether this is adverse or beneficial), and the sensitivity of a heritage asset's cultural

significance (value) to change. Impact(s) can occur as a result of direct, physical impacts to heritage asset(s) or arise through change(s) in their setting, where such change(s) impact those elements within the setting that contribute to the heritage asset’s cultural significance (value).

8.5.11 The magnitude of impact (degree of change) has been determined according to the descriptions set out in Table 8-11 alongside the application of professional judgement and experience. The assessment also takes into account guidance on determining ‘substantial harm’ and ‘less than substantial harm’ as set out in NPS EN-1 (Ref 18) and the NPPF (Ref 21).

Table 8-11 Criteria for determining magnitude of impact (degree of change)

Magnitude of impact (degree of change)	Type	Typical impact
Major	Adverse	The total physical loss of a heritage asset and the removal of its integrity. Severe damage, either directly or indirectly, to several key characteristics that contribute to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.
	Beneficial	Large scale improvement to the integrity of a heritage asset and/or the extensive conservation or restoration, other improvements to condition, and the active and sustainable management of physical remains. The removal of, or a considerable reduction in, vulnerabilities and/or a reduction in critical risks. Extensive enhancements and favourable alterations, either directly or indirectly, to several key characteristics that contribute to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.
Moderate	Adverse	The partial physical loss of a heritage asset and the removal of some of its integrity. Damage, either directly or indirectly, to key characteristics that contribute to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.
	Beneficial	Improvements to, and the active management of, physical condition and improvements to its integrity. This may include the design and/or implementation of management plans. Reduction in vulnerabilities and a reduction in risks.

Magnitude of impact (degree of change)	Type	Typical impact
		Favourable alterations and enhancement, either directly or indirectly, to key characteristics that contribute to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.
Minor	Adverse	Some minor physical loss to part of a heritage asset or a measurable loss of its integrity or quality, or an increase in its vulnerability. Minor detrimental alteration, either directly or indirectly, to at least one key characteristic that contributes to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.
	Beneficial	Some minor improvement to physical condition or reduction in vulnerability. Minor favourable alterations, either directly or indirectly, to at least one key characteristic that contributes to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.
Negligible	Adverse	Very minor physical loss to part of a heritage asset or an alteration to its integrity or quality. Very minor detrimental alteration, either directly or indirectly, to one or more characteristics that contribute to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.
	Beneficial	Very minor improvement of physical condition or reduction in vulnerability. Very minor favourable alterations, either directly or indirectly, to one or more characteristics that contribute to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.
No change	-	There are no physical adverse or beneficial impacts to a heritage asset or alterations, either directly or indirectly, to the attributes that comprise its cultural significance (value).

Assessment of significance of effect

8.5.12 The effect of the Proposed Development upon the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset has been determined using the matrix presented in Table 8-12. Combining the importance of a heritage asset with the magnitude of impact (degree of change) resulting from the Proposed Development establishes the effect upon the heritage asset.

Table 8-12 Matrix for determining significance of effect

Importance	Magnitude of impact (degree of change)				
	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	No change
Very high	Major	Major	Moderate or Major	Minor	Neutral
High	Major	Moderate or Major	Minor or Moderate	Minor	Neutral
Medium	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Minor or Neutral	Neutral
Low	Moderate or Minor	Minor	Neutral or Minor	Minor or Neutral	Neutral
Negligible	Minor	Minor or Neutral	Neutral or Minor	Neutral	Neutral

8.5.13 According to the matrix, a heritage asset may be subject to an effect that has two possible outcomes. In instances where this occurs the criteria for describing effects outlined in the DMRB and shown in Table 8-13 has been used alongside the application of professional judgement to arrive at a robust, single effect.

Table 8-13 Criteria for determining significance of effect

Matrix result	Adverse or Beneficial	Description
Major	Adverse	Result in the total, or almost total, loss of recorded and/or unrecorded heritage assets regardless of its importance. Be highly intrusive and seriously damage the setting of the recorded and/or unrecorded heritage assets, where this contributes to its cultural significance (value) such that this is totally or almost totally degraded. Conflict with legislation and/or national policies for the protection of recorded and/or unrecorded heritage assets.
	Beneficial	Result in the total removal, relocation, or substantial mitigation of very damaging or discordant existing impacts (direct or indirect) to the

Matrix result	Adverse or Beneficial	Description
		<p>cultural significance (value) of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Result in extensive restoration or enhancement of the characteristics and/or setting, which contribute to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.</p> <p>Exemplify national policies and approaches to the protection or enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>Remove or successfully mitigate existing impacts so that the that the integrity, understanding, and sense of place of a site, or group of sites, is re-established.</p>
Moderate	Adverse	<p>Result in the partial loss of recorded and/or unrecorded heritage assets such that the feature, remains, or deposit is compromised but not destroyed.</p> <p>Be highly intrusive in the setting of the recorded and/or unrecorded heritage assets, where this contributes to its cultural significance (value) such that this is partially degraded.</p>
	Beneficial	<p>Result in the partial removal, relocation, or mitigation of damaging or discordant existing impacts (direct or indirect) to the cultural significance (value) of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Partially restore or enhance the characteristics and/or setting, which contribute to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset.</p> <p>Exemplify regional or local policies and approaches to the protection or enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>Restore and enhance the integrity, understanding, and sense of place of a heritage asset, or group of heritage assets.</p>
Minor	Adverse	<p>Have a detrimental impact on the setting of recorded and/or unrecorded heritage assets, where this contributes</p>

Matrix result	Adverse or Beneficial	Description
		<p>to its cultural significance (value) such that this is diminished.</p> <p>Conflict with local policies for the protection of the historic environment and local character.</p>
	Beneficial	<p>Enable removal or mitigation of damaging or discordant existing impacts (direct or indirect) so that understanding of the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset is improved, and the impact(s) diminished.</p> <p>Enable enhancement of the characteristics and/or setting which contribute to the cultural significance (value) of a heritage asset so that appreciation and understanding is improved, and the impact(s) diminished.</p> <p>Restore the integrity, understanding, and sense of place of a heritage asset or archaeological site, or group of heritage assets, through design choices.</p>
Neutral	-	<p>Have no appreciable impacts, either beneficial or adverse, on recorded and/or unrecorded heritage assets OR has a balance of beneficial and adverse impacts.</p> <p>Not result in severance or loss of integrity context or understanding within a historic landscape.</p> <p>No conflict with, and does not contribute to, policies for the protection or enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>Either no effects or effects that are beneath levels of perception within normal bounds of variation or within the margin of forecasting error.</p>

- 8.5.14 All effects of moderate or greater are considered to be significant for the purposes of this assessment.
- 8.5.15 Whilst adverse significant effects typically equate to ‘substantial harm’ as described in NPS EN-1 (Ref 18) and defined in the NPPF (Ref 21), moderate adverse effects might, depending on the nature of the asset affected, equate to

an NPS EN-1/NPPF assessment outcome of 'less than substantial harm'. This assessment is made based on professional judgement.

8.6 Assumptions and limitations

8.6.1 The following assumptions and limitations have informed this assessment:

- 1) It is assumed that data, information, and primary and secondary sources obtained from all organisations, institutions, bodies, or individuals is accurate at the time of its acquisition and/or consultation.
- 2) No Ancient Woodland will be impacted by the Proposed Development as a result of embedded mitigation applied.
- 3) So far as can be determined through the findings of geophysical survey and the application of professional judgement and experience, parts of Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8 with a high intensity of unrecorded archaeology have been removed from areas of built development and subjected to embedded mitigation measures during the design process (see Section 8.8), so far as reasonably practicable.
- 4) Assessment is based on the evidence collated at the time of submission. Impacts have been assessed on a reasonable worst-case basis which assumes medium to high adverse physical effects to assets which have been identified (and where surveys have not been carried out, assumed to be present) within the Order Limits, whilst taking account of the limits of deviation to the Works Plans and the commitments set out in the Design Parameters and Commitments Document. Therefore it is assumed that any missing or unavailable field data will either validate or improve the conclusions reached in this chapter.
- 5) Geophysical survey has been undertaken across all Solar Development Sites, and across 273.6 ha of the Cable Route Corridor. Archaeological evaluation (via trial trenching) has been undertaken for all Solar Development Sites. Results of the geophysical survey within the Cable Route Corridor received up to 5 December 2025 have been incorporated into this assessment; the results of the survey undertaken within the remaining 58.4 ha will be submitted early in Examination once available. Where access for survey cannot be achieved, provision is made for additional mitigation (strip, map and sample, or archaeological monitoring) within the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11].
- 6) A limited section of the Cable Route Corridor near Skipwith has not been subjected to walkover survey as permission to access the land parcels was temporarily suspended during the survey period. These land parcels were assessed from PRow but were subject geophysical survey to ensure a robust assessment of potential archaeological impacts.
- 7) Small sections of some HIAs have not been subjected to walkover survey. Based on the limited nature of the HIA works, the existing body of information gathered from previous site visits and other survey data was

sufficient to assess any potential impacts arising from changes within the setting of heritage assets. Archaeological impacts are discussed below.

- 8) Where HIA and access improvement works fall outside of geophysical survey areas and could result in impacts to previously unidentified archaeological remains (e.g. through topsoil stripping for road widening works), monitoring of these works will be managed through the Archaeological Management Strategy **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11]** (See Section 8.8).
- 9) Where permission to access private land containing sensitive heritage assets could not be obtained (e.g. private properties within Conservation Areas), reasonable efforts were made to obtain proportionate and useful data and/or information. This includes, for example, gathering additional external views, and views from Public Rights of Way when assessing the contribution (if any) made by the setting of a heritage asset to its cultural significance (value).
- 10) The method for constructing the Cable Route is provided in Appendix 2.1: Cable Route Construction Method Statement (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.02.01]** and outlines the approach to the proposed construction methodologies of open cut trenching and trenchless technologies such as HDD. The start and end points for the two construction methods for the entirety of the Cable Route Corridor will not be confirmed until the detailed design stage, however, it is assumed that trenchless technologies, mostly likely HDD, will be used in areas where open cut trenching is to be avoided. These areas are set out within Chapter 2: The Proposed Development (ES Volume 1) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02]** and will include the necessary space required for launch and reception pits.
- 11) The assessment of potential important hedgerows, as defined by the Hedgerows Regulations (see Section 8.3), has been conducted in line with the approach to hedgerow recording and assessment presented in Chapter 6: Biodiversity (ES Volume 1) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.06]**. The assessment of potential important hedgerows presented within this chapter is, therefore, concerned only with:
 - a) Hedgerows that will receive direct, physical impact(s) because of the Proposed Development; and
 - b) Hedgerows containing indicator species (typically English Bluebells in the case of those brought forward for assessment) highlighted for consideration by the biodiversity technical specialists.

There remains, therefore, the potential for unrecorded important hedgerows to be present throughout the Order Limits. All identified important hedgerows located within the Order Limits are discussed, where appropriate, in Appendix 8.1 Cultural Heritage Baseline (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01]** and detailed in Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02]**.

- 12) The operational life of the Proposed Development is anticipated to be up to 60 years with decommissioning anticipated to be undertaken over a period of between 12 and 24 months. Once decommissioned, the Solar Development Sites would be returned to their original use and condition, as far as practicable, meaning any indirect impacts incurred through changes in setting will be reversed. Potential impacts to archaeological remains not previously truncated by the construction phase of the Cable Route are unlikely as cables are anticipated to be either left in-situ, or removed through trenchless methods such as pull techniques. Archaeologically sensitive areas identified along the cable route will be subject to appropriate mitigation to record archaeological features in advance of cable installation. Decommissioning impacts are discussed in Section 8.9.

8.7 Baseline conditions

Existing baseline conditions

- 8.7.1 The baseline assessment provided in Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01] sets out the full Cultural Heritage baseline for the Proposed Development including archaeological and historical background and HLC appraisal.

Sensitive receptors (Heritage Assets)

Designated Heritage Assets

- 8.7.2 Designated heritage assets have been identified from Historic England's NHLE dataset. NYC 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.
- 8.7.3 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.
- 8.7.4 A total of 130 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].
- 8.7.5 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 270 m south of Scalm Park Cottages [NHLE 1020499]).

- 2) Three Grade I listed buildings (Church of Saint Mary [NHLE 1316671]; Church of Saint Wilfrid NHLE 1296769]; and Church of Saint Mary [NHLE 1316671]).
- 3) Six 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]; and Prebendal House [Monk Fryston, NHLE 1296762]).
- 4) 75 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.

8.7.6 As outlined in Section 8.2 and shown in Table 8-2, an additional 16 listed buildings (comprising five Grade I, two Grade II*, and seven Grade II listed buildings) a Grade II* registered park and garden, and Ledsham Conservation Area have been included in the scope of assessment at the request of Leeds City Council. Due to their distance from the scheme, and their cultural significance (value) primarily being derived from their association with the Ledsham historic settlement core, the eight listed buildings located within Ledsham Conservation Area are not included as individually designated heritage assets within this assessment.

8.7.7 All designated heritage assets considered as part of this assessment are detailed in Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02].

8.7.8 There are no World Heritage Sites, registered battlefields or protected wreck sites within the Order Limits or Study Area.

Heritage and potential heritage assets

8.7.9 435 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).
- 8.7.10 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.
- 8.7.11 All heritage assets and potential heritage assets considered as part of this assessment are detailed in Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02]. Detailed reporting regarding all geophysical surveys is available in Appendix 8.3: Geophysical Survey Results (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03].

Solar Development Sites

Solar Development Site 1

- 8.7.12 The NYHER records 40 heritage assets and no findspots within Solar Development Site 1. 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). All these assets are presented in Table 8-14.

Table 8-14 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 1

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY17654	Escrick Park (estate parkland)	None.
MNY17727	Possible field system north-east of Little Shallows	None.
MNY24075	Roman British Site, South of Keldcarrs Plantation, Escrick	None.
MNY24078	Ditch at Site C, Yorkshire Derwent Aqueduct Duplication Main	None.
MNY24079	Ditch at Site D, Yorkshire Derwent Aqueduct Duplication Main	None.
MNY26118	Pond? Drain 374 m south-east of Duck Decoy	None.
MNY26122	Water channel (Dike) 30 m north of Nursery Plantation	None.
MNY26123	Pond 232 m West of Pallion Wood	None.
MNY26124	Pond located 162 m southwest of Pallion Wood	None.
MNY26125	Pond 142 m northwest of Pallion Wood	None.
MNY26157	Dike 112 m north of Bridge Farm	None.

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY26158	Footbridge 27 m east of Little Shallows	None.
MNY26159	Footbridge	None.
MNY26160	Footbridge 16 m south of Winters Plantation	None.
MNY26238	Pond 460 m west of Roth Hill	None.
MNY26239	Footbridge	None.
MNY26243	Drain and Sluice	None.
MNY26244	Pond	None.
MNY26245	Pond	None.
MNY26246	Pump	None.
MNY26247	Pond 20 m east of Fairburn Forse	None.
MNY26248	Pond 56 m south of Partridge Remise	None.
MNY26249	Pond 243 m east of Easterby's Plantation	None.
MNY26252	Pond 255 m northwest of Easterby's Plantation	None.
MNY26276	Pond 262 m northwest of Easterby's Plantation	None.
MNY26277	Pond 224 m northwest of Easterby's Planation	None.
MNY26278	Pond 133 m northwest of Coronation Plantation	None.
MNY26279	Pond	None.
MNY26280	Pond 380 m northeast of Escrick Park Duck Decoy	None.
MNY26308	Pond(s) 35 m northwest of Keldcarrs Plantation	None.
MNY26336	Pond 146 m northeast of Escrick Park Duck Decoy	None.
MNY26346	Pond 357 m southwest of Pallion Plantation	None.
MNY26351	Pit/Quarry 55 m west of Partridge Remise	None.
MNY26352	Pond 170 m south of Easterby's Plantation	None.
MNY26360	Footbridge	None.
MNY26361	Footbridge	None.
MNY26365	Pond	None.
MNY26374	Skipwith Bridge, 244 m northwest of Bridge Farm	None.
MNY26376	Building	None.
MNY37042	Field system south of Mount Pleasant Farm	None.

Reference	Name	Notes
GS_S1_7	Possible 19 th Century stone working site	Possibly associated with MNY23621, which is located to the south
GS_S1_10	Possible linear features	None.
GS_S1_14	Possible farmstead	None.
GS_S1_15	Possible farmstead	None.
GS_S1_16	Area of possible industrial activity	None.
GS_S1_17	Regular enclosure and ditches	None.
GS_S1_18	Regular enclosure	None.
GS_S1_19	Large rectangular enclosure and cluster of ring ditches	The feature straddles the field boundary
GS_S1_20	Cluster of ring ditches	None.
GS_S1_21	Regular enclosure and ring ditches	None.
GS_S1_22	Possible linear features	None.
GS_S1_23	Possible ditches, trackway, enclosure, and boundaries associated with Romano-British settlement site	In proximity to Romano-British settlement and possible metal-working site MNY24075
GS_S1_24	Possible pits near Romano-British settlement site	In proximity to Romano-British settlement and possible metal-working site MNY24075
GS_S1_25	Cluster of ring ditches and linear and curvilinear features	None.
	Possible remains of field system south of Mount Pleasant Farm	May be part of the Iron Age/Roman field system MNY37042
GS_S1_26	Possible enclosure and associated ditches	None.
GS_S1_27	Linear and curvilinear features	May be part of field system MNY17727
UHA_012	Pallion Farm	None.
UHA_013	Pump. Pallion Farm	None.
UHA_014	Building north-west of Pallion Farm	None.
UHA_038	Pond	None.
UHA_039	Pond	None.
UHA_040	Pond	None.
UHA_041	Pond	None.
UHA_042	Pond	None.
UHA_043	Pond	None.
UHA_044	Pond	None.
UHA_045	Pond	None.
UHA_128	Possible former due pond	None.

Reference	Name	Notes
UHA_129	Small bridge over drain	None.
H1.16	Important Hedgerow	None.
H1.65	Important Hedgerow	None.
TT_S1_1	Enclosure	In proximity to Iron Age/Romano-British farmsteads and likely to be of a similar date
TT_S1_2	Ditches	Not detected in geophysical survey and are northwest of GS_S1_19 and GS_S1_20
TT_S1_3	Ditches and pits	Located between Iron Age to Romano-British farmsteads GS_S1_19 and GS_S1_21, and are likely of a similar date
TT_S1_4	Field system	The proximity of this potential asset to likely farmsteads of Iron Age to Romano-British date may indicate the presence of another enclosure
TT_S1_5	Posthole and ditch	Proximity to features of Romano-British date suggests a potential association.

Solar Development Site 2

8.7.13 The NYHER does not currently record any heritage assets or findspots within Solar Development Site 2. Five potential heritage assets have been identified through geophysical survey (one potential asset), walkover survey (one potential asset), and archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) (three potential assets). These assets are presented in Table 8-15.

Table 8-15 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 2

Reference	Name	Notes
GS_S2_1	Likely settlement site, field system and trackway	None.
UHA_132	Brick and stone arched bridge / crossing	None.
TT_S2_1	Kiln	Romano-British in date. Recorded during the trial trench evaluation, but not excavated
TT_S2_2	Kiln	Romano-British in date. Recorded during the trial trench evaluation, but not excavated

Reference	Name	Notes
TT_S2_3	Ditches	None.

Solar Development Site 3

- 8.7.14 The NYHER does not currently record any heritage assets or find spots within Solar Development Site 3.
- 8.7.15 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. It is presented in Table 8-16.

Table 8-16 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 3

Reference	Name	Notes
UHA_133	Crossing point / bridge	None.

Solar Development Site 4

- 8.7.16 The NYHER records four heritage assets, and one find spot within Solar Development Site 4. A further ten potential heritage assets have been identified through geophysical survey (four potential assets), archaeological evaluation (five potential assets) and desktop historic map and LiDAR survey (one potential asset). All these assets are presented in Table 8-17.

Table 8-17 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 4

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY7247	Undated field system	None.
MNY9905	Roe Field Moat: A medieval moat north of Birkin	Understanding of the extent and likely form of this heritage assets was enhanced as part of the geophysical survey of Solar Development Site 4. It is recorded as GS-S4_1.
MNY9906	Low Cottage and enclosure	None.
MNY9907	A medieval moat east of Barkhouse Wood Lane	Understanding of the extent and likely form of this heritage asset was enhanced as part of the geophysical survey of Solar Development Site 4. It is recorded as GS_S4_2.
MNY9911	Find spot of Roman Coffin, Birkin	None.
GS_S4_3	Possible field system and trackways	Located approximately 100 m south of MNY9907.

Reference	Name	Notes
GS_S4_4	Possible regular enclosures, part field system and/or trackway(s)	None.
GS_S4_5	Possible Romano-British settlement site	The Roman Coffin MNY9911 was found in this same area
GS_S4_7	Linear features	Possibly associated with GS_S4_6
TT_S4_1	Two ditches	In close proximity to moated enclosure GS_S4_2 and regular enclosures GS_S4_3.
TT_S4_2	North-west – south-east orientated ditch	None.
TT_S4_3	North-east – south-west orientated ditch	None.
TT_S4_4	East-west orientated ditch	In close proximity to TT_S4_5.
TT_S4_5	North-south orientated ditch	In close proximity to TT_S4_4.
UHA_066	Middle Barn	None.

Solar Development Site 6

8.7.17 The NYHER records nine heritage assets and no findspots within Solar Development Site 6. A further six potential heritage assets have been identified through geophysical survey (three potential assets), important hedgerow assessment (one potential asset), and archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) (two potential assets). All these assets are presented in Table 8-18.

Table 8-18 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 6

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY10350	Cropmark indicative of possible enclosure	None.
MNY10359	Undated trackway, Milford Common	Potentially associated with MNY10360
MNY10360	Enclosure on Milford Common	Understanding of the extent and likely form of this heritage asset was enhanced as part of the geophysical survey of Solar Development Site 6. It is recorded as GS_S6_3.
MNY10364	Ring ditches and rectilinear cropmarks, South Milford	Understanding of the extent and likely form of this heritage asset was enhanced as part of the geophysical survey of Solar Development Site 6. It is recorded as GS_S6_1.
MNY10365	Ditch east of Milford Junction	Did not show as responses in geophysical survey
MNY17137	Ring ditch south of Gascoigne Wood Mine	None.

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY17141	Ditched enclosure north-west of Milford Lodge	None.
MNY17143	Ring ditch south of Turpin Lane	Did not show as responses in geophysical survey
MNY17144	Ring ditch south of Turpin Lane	Did not show as responses in geophysical survey
MNY39993	Possible Medieval drove way with integrated enclosures east of Milford Common, South Milford	None.
GS_S6_2	Network of ditches indicating trackways with appended fields	Previously unrecorded elements of MNY10359
GS_S6_4	Possible barrow or round house	None.
GS_S6_5	Possible long-linear ditch	None.
H6.10	Important Hedgerow	Marked on First OS Edition.
TT_S6_1	Ditch	Possibly a former field boundary
TT_S6_2	Well	Likely Post Medieval / 20th Century in date

Solar Development Site 7

8.7.18 The NYHER does not currently record any heritage assets or findspots within Solar Development Site 7. One potential heritage asset was identified through archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) and is presented in Table 8-20. No other potential heritage assets were identified through any of the survey methods previously described.

Table 8-19 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 7

Reference	Name	Notes
TT_S7_1	Enclosure	Period of use uncertain

Solar Development Site 8

8.7.19 The NYHER records one heritage asset and no findspots within Solar Development Site 8. 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). All these assets are presented in Table 8-20.

Table 8-20 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 8

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY10343	Enclosure, Hambleton	None.

Reference	Name	Notes
GS_S8_1	Partial enclosure and possible double ditch	None.
UHA_027	Ruddings (farmhouse and yard)	None.
UHA_028	Pond	None.
UHA_029	Pond	None.
UHA_030	Pond	None.
UHA_032	Triangulation Point (marked)	None.
UHA_135	Possible former field boundary	None.
TT_S8_1	Ditch	Possible former field boundary or drain

Cable Route Corridor

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

8.7.20 The NYHER records 17 heritage assets and two findspots within CRC1-4 and CRC1-4a. Geophysical survey identified three groups of anomalies (which may comprise multiple individual potential assets) and desktop historic map and LiDAR survey identified three potential assets. All these assets are presented in Table 8-21.

Table 8-21 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within CRC 1-4 and CRC 1-4a Alternative

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY10400	Cawood Wistow & Selby Light Railway	No remains of the railway were visible during walkover survey in September 2025. Metal detectorists have recovered objects thought to be associated with the railway in the area.
MNY10417	Enclosures and field system shown as cropmarks, Hambleton	This heritage asset also interacts with Solar Development Site 8 Access – A63.
MNY10418	Trackway south of railway line	None.
MNY10423	Enclosure, Hambleton	None.
MNY12093	Charity Plantation	None.
MNY12101	Moor Lane	None.
MNY12103	King Rudding Lane	None.
MNY12104	King Rudding Lane	None.
MNY23436	Charity Farm sand pit	None.
MNY23818	Old Mill, Riccall	None.

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY26198	Drainage dike 390 m northeast of Charity Farm	None.
MNY26199	Drainage ditch 420 m west of Field House Farm	None.
MNY26200	Footbridge 240 m southeast of Common Wood	None.
MNY26201	Footbridge 630 m southwest of Skipworth Bridge	None.
MNY26341	Pond 73 m north of Charity Farm	None.
MNY37043	Field system south-west of Whinchat Hill	This heritage asset interacts with Solar Development Site 1
MNY9899	Enclosure, Gateforth	This heritage asset interacts with CRC 1-4 and CRC 1-4a alternative.
MNY10407	Findspot, Hambleton	None.
MNY12169	Riccall	None.
[CGS_C1-4_1]	Rectilinear enclosure with attached ditch	None.
[CGS_C1-4_2]	Field system, comprising four parallel north-south orientated linear features	None.
[CGS_C1-4_3]	Partial east-west orientated linear feature, c.90 m long,	None.
[CGS_C1-4_4]	Two parallel north-west-south-east orientated linear anomalies	None.
[CGS_C1-4_5]	Large, subcircular anomaly	None.
[CGS_C1-4_6]	Anomaly of a ring ditch, c.15 m in diameter, with an attached north-west-south-east orientated linear anomaly	None.
[CGS_C1-4_7]	North-west – south-east orientated linear anomaly	None.
[CGS_C1-4_8]	Two partial curvilinear anomalies, c.10-20 m in diameter	None.
UHA_078	Pond	None.
UHA_080	Pond	None.
UHA_098	Sand pit north-east of Wood Hall Farm	None.

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

- 8.7.21 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)

- 8.7.22 The NYHER records no heritage assets or findspots within CRC 3-4 or CRC 3-4a). Geophysical survey of CRC 3-4a identified one group of anomalies (which may comprise multiple individual potential assets) presented in Table 8-20. No potential heritage assets were identified through any of the survey methods previously described.

Table 8-22 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site 7

Reference	Name	Notes
[CGS_C3-4a_1]	Two parallel northeast-southwest orientated linear features	May represent former field boundaries or infilled drainage dikes

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

- 8.7.23 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 4 to National Grid Monk Fryston)

- 8.7.24 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. All these assets are presented in Table 8-23.

Table 8-23 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within CRC 4-POC

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY31793	(Monk) Fryston Lodge	None.
MNY40677	A ditch of likely Prehistoric data, Monk Fryston Electricity Sub Station	None.
MNY40678	A quarry pit of probable Post-Medieval date, Monk Fryston Electricity Sub Station	None.
MNY9922	Brickwork pattern field system, Burton Salmon	None.
MNY9953	Undated field system	None.
MNY9954	Undated trackway through field system, Burton Salmon	None.

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY9955	Undated trackway through field system, Burton Salmon	None.
MNY9956	Undated trackway	None.
MNY9960	Undated enclosure	None.
[CGS_C4POC_1]	Partial enclosure	West of Bywater Wood.
[CGS_C4POC_2]	Possible farmstead or settlement	Located within field system recorded on NYHER [MNY9953]. Several anomalies correspond with further records on the NYHER [MNY9953, MNY9954, MNY9955, MNY9956, MNY9957, MNY9958, MNY9959, MNY9960].
[CGS_C4POC_3]	Partial enclosure	Adjacent to the south-east of the connection with Monk Fryston Substation.
[CGS_C4POC_4]	North-east – south-west orientated linear feature	None.
[CGS_C4POC_5]	Two parallel north-south orientated linear features	West of partial enclosure CGS_C4POC_1.
UHA_115	Linear feature	None.

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

8.7.25 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 by the geophysical survey. These presented in Table 8-24.

Table 8-24 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within CRC 2-6

Reference	Name	Notes
UHA_134	Possible ridge and furrow	None.
UHA_136	Crossing point	None.
CGS_C2-6_1	Ditches associated with Fleet Street Dyke	None.

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

8.7.26 The NYHER records no heritage assets and no findspots within CRC 6-7. No potential heritage assets were identified through any of the survey methods previously described.

Highways Improvements Areas and Site 8 Access

8.7.27 The NYHER records four heritage assets and no findspots within the HIAs and Site 8 A. Desktop historic map and LiDAR survey has identified 12 potential assets. All these assets are presented in Table 8-25.

Table 8-25 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Highways Improvements Areas and Site 8 Access

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY10417	Enclosures and field system shown as cropmarks, Hambleton	Site 8 Access – A63. This heritage asset also interacts with CRC 1-4 and CRC 1-4a.
MNY17256	Possible settlement	Site 8 Access – A63
MNY10342	Moat, Sherburn-in-Elmet	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
MNY17167	Possible moat south-west of Low Rest Park Farm	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
UHA_120	Possible pond	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
UHA_121	Possible ridge and furrow remain	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
UHA_122	Trackway	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
UHA_123	Historic Boundary	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
UHA_124	Field Boundary	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
UHA_125	Possible ditch (field boundary)	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
UHA_126	Possible ditch (field boundary)	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
UHA_127	Possible ditch (field boundary)	Site 8 Access – Scalm Lane
UHA_069	Guide Post	HIA – Checker Land, Main Street and A19, south of Riccall
UHA_077	Footbridge	HIA – Sand Lane and Lordship Lane
UHA_094	Finger Post	HIA – Hospital Lane and Greenlands Lane
UHA_095	Wooden Bridge	HIA – Dam lane, immediately north of Thorpe Willoughby

Construction Compounds

Solar Development Site Construction Compounds

8.7.28 Three of the heritage assets and three of the potential heritage assets within the Solar Development Sites (Site 1, Site 6, and Site 8) are located within the Solar Development Site Construction Compounds. These are presented in Table 8-26.

Table 8-26 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Solar Development Site Construction Compounds

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY26249	Pond 203 m east of Easterby’s Plantation	Solar Development Site 1, Construction Compound A1
MNY26118	Pond? Drain 374 m south-east of Duck Decoy	Solar Development Site 1, Construction Compound A2
MNY10360	Enclosure on Milford Common	Solar Development Site 6, Construction Compound 2
GS_S6_2	Network of ditches indicating trackways with appended fields	Solar Development Site 6, Construction Compound 2
GS_S6_3	Irregular enclosure and ditches	Solar Development Site 6, Construction Compound 2
UHA_135	Possible former field boundary	Solar Development Site 8, Construction Compound 2

8.7.29 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

One of the heritage assets within CRC 4-POC also extends within a Cable Construction Compound (Compound 6). This asset is presented in Table 8-27. No other heritage assets or potential heritage assets identified within the Cable Route Corridor interacts with the Cable Construction Compounds.

Table 8-27 Heritage assets and potential heritage assets within Cable Construction Compounds

Reference	Name	Notes
MNY9922	Brickwork patter field system, Burton Salmon	Cable Construction Compound 6

Future baseline

- 8.7.30 The future baseline for Cultural Heritage is expected to remain broadly similar to the existing baseline in the absence of the Proposed Development.
- 8.7.31 Changes to the historic environment may occur as a result of future committed development, which could physically impact or alter the setting of heritage assets within the Study Area.
- 8.7.32 Minor variation may occur in the composition of the built heritage assets located throughout the Study Area, for example, through changes in the designation of built heritage assets (through listing or de-listing), or the creation of local lists.
- 8.7.33 The use of the Study Area for mixed agricultural and pasture farming and other rural land management activities is likely to continue and is therefore unlikely to

bring about notable change to the conditions of below ground archaeological remains. However, surface earthworks such as ridge and furrow may be eroded by continued deep ploughing.

- 8.7.34 Extremes of weather associated with environmental and climate change could, potentially, affect the condition of built and archaeological heritage assets and unrecorded archaeology however, the extent to which this would or could occur cannot be determined.

8.8 Embedded and good practice mitigation and enhancement measures

Embedded mitigation

- 8.8.1 The Proposed Development has been designed to, as far as practicable, minimise impacts on the historic environment resource.
- 8.8.2 Embedded measures are modifications to the design of a scheme that are an inherent part of the design and do not require additional action to be taken. Good practice measures are standard approaches and actions undertaken to avoid or reduce environmental impacts in line with best practice guidance and legislative requirements.

Construction

- 8.8.3 The Proposed Development has committed to the following approaches and enhancement measures:
- 1) Direct physical impact(s) to designated heritage assets has been avoided.
 - 2) As set out through the limits of deviation on the **Works Plans [EN110012/APP/LVS/02.03]** and the **Design Parameters and Commitments Document [EN0110012/APP/LVS/05.06]**, indirect impact(s) to designated heritage assets have been and will continue to be minimised within the design process. This has been achieved through the micro-siting of panels within the Solar Development Sites; removing panels from areas considered to be of higher archaeological potential and, either, setting these areas aside completely or reserving them for appropriate ecological and landscape mitigation (none of which is envisaged to result in impacts to below ground archaeological remains).
 - 3) Where appropriate the installation of non-ground penetrating techniques for the panels will serve to preserve sub-surface archaeological remains *in situ* (in line with Historic England's Advice Note 15: Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment (Ref 31). This has been applied within Solar Development Sites 1, 2 and 4, to avoid areas containing potential archaeological features identified during geophysical survey (see Figure 2.5: Concrete feet locations or other non-ground penetrative techniques (ES Volume 2) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.06]**). The exact locations of where

archaeological protection is required will be confirmed in the final Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) to be produced at detailed design stage (as outlined within the Outline CEMP (oCEMP) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02].

- 4) Steps will be taken to minimise light, noise and vibration as a result of temporary construction works through the best practice measures that are outlined in the oCEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02].
- 5) Construction access routes (as set out in the oCTMP) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12]) have been sited to avoid large increases in traffic movement and mitigation measures identified to minimise the potential for physical impacts to assets adjacent to roadways.
- 6) Full landscape reinstatement will be undertaken following the installation of the Cable Route Corridor to minimise changes in the setting of heritage assets.
- 7) The underground cables will be located in existing gaps in hedgerows wherever feasible, and the final design will seek to retain trees and hedgerows, as far as possible, to retain existing Historic Landscape Character.
- 8) Existing hedgerows in poor condition will be reinforced with new planting, where feasible, to strengthen landscape pattern and habitat connectivity which will reinforce Historic Landscape Character (as set out within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.05]). Additionally, two Important Hedgerows, identified via ecological and historic research in Solar Development Site 1 [H1.16] and [H.165], will remain in situ and thus will not be impacted by the Proposed Development. H6.10 will have a small section (c.10 m) removed for access purposes.
- 9) The Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 15.1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.01] and Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 15.4) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.15.04]) are provided in ES Volume 3. No significant changes have been identified to the hydrology to the Site, no increased risk of flooding which could impact buried archaeological remains, and no significant changes are anticipated to soil morphology as a result of changes to drainage patterns, which could impact archaeological assets.

Operation

- 8.8.4 Embedded mitigation measures relevant to the operational phase would be implemented during construction and are referenced above (Section 8.8.3). Replacement and maintenance activities are assumed to be less intensive than those conducted during construction, as it is envisaged that no intrusive groundworks in addition to those carried out during the construction phase are needed. This will ensure impacts to below-ground archaeological remains are

limited. Activities such as increased traffic, implementation of hoarding, light and noise may occur within the setting of heritage assets during replacement and maintenance works, but it is assumed that any temporary impacts resulting from these changes will not exceed those incurred during the construction phase.

8.8.5 Where preservation of features *in situ*, e.g. through the use of non-ground penetrating techniques or setting aside of areas within the Proposed Development (as shown on Figure 2.5: Concrete feet locations or other non-ground penetrative techniques (ES Volume 2) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.06]), this will be carried through into the operation and decommissioning phases.

8.8.6 Landscape mitigation and planting undertaken as part of the construction phase will reach maturity during the operation phase to reduce visibility of the Proposed Development from heritage assets.

Decommissioning

8.8.7 Historic England (Ref 31) provides the examples of best practice embedded mitigation measures to be considered during decommissioning, and these will be used to inform the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (as set out in the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]) for the Proposed Development. This includes advice to ensure that *decommissioning techniques will ensure the avoidance of any archaeological remains preserved below ground during construction*.

Good practice measures

8.8.8 All archaeological survey works and, if required, additional archaeological mitigation within the Proposed Development will be carried out by suitably qualified professionals and in line with the relevant Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standards and Guidance.

Management plans

8.8.9 In addition, all embedded mitigation is detailed within a suite of management plans. Those directly relevant to Cultural Heritage include:

- 1) Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02];
- 2) Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03];
- 3) Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04]; and
- 4) Outline Construction Traffic Mitigation Plan (oCTMP) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.12].

8.8.10 These management plans incorporate embedded and good practice measures, as well as any further mitigation that arises out of the EIA process.

- 8.8.11 These management plans incorporate embedded and good practice measures, as well as any further mitigation that arises out of the EIA process. Outline versions of these management plans are submitted alongside the ES as part of this DCO Application to secure the commitments within each assessment. A Requirement is included in the draft DCO [EN0110012/APP/LVS/03.01] to ensure detailed management plans will be prepared to full versions by the appointed Contractor(s), substantially in accordance with the outline management plans, and will be submitted for approval by NYC in advance of starting the relevant phase of works.

8.9 Assessment of likely impacts and effects

- 8.9.1 This section presents the results of the assessment of likely significant effects with the embedded and good practice mitigation measures described in Section 8.8 in place.

Construction effects

- 8.9.2 Effects arising from construction have the potential to be temporary, relating to short-term reversible changes resulting from construction activities, or permanent. Temporary construction effects may result from the presence of construction compounds, laydown and storage areas, movement of plant, or noise from construction activities. Temporary effects are short-term and reversible in nature, meaning that any significant effects would return to neutral following completion of the construction phase.
- 8.9.3 Permanent effects relate to any impact that cannot be returned to its previous baseline following the conclusion of construction activities. For the purposes of this assessment, a permanent effect is considered to be either a physical impact to the heritage resource (e.g. the full or partial removal of below-ground archaeological remains), or a long-term change within an asset's setting as a result of the Proposed Development (e.g. the installation of solar panels within a designed viewpoint for a heritage asset). Whilst solar developments are 'temporary' in the sense that solar panels are currently designed to have a lifespan of around 60 years, impacts arising through changes in setting will extend into the operation phase and, although these may be resolved upon decommissioning, are described as 'permanent' for the purposes of this assessment, as the extent of their duration will continue into the operational phase (up to 60 years). In the case of permanent impacts on buried archaeological remains, these remains are non-replicable and once removed cannot be replaced.
- 8.9.4 There is potential for permanent effects arising from construction groundworks associated with the Proposed Development, comprising installation of Solar PV Panels, Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS), substations and Cable Route Corridor installation to directly impact archaeological remains within the Order Limits. Any activities resulting in topsoil stripping, such as the creation of access roads and temporary works compound areas, have the potential to cause

physical damage to archaeological remains. Similarly, there is potential for physical damage or vibration from HGV and construction traffic to cause direct physical impacts to heritage assets. If such impacts occur, they are also likely to be long term and irreversible.

- 8.9.5 Temporary and permanent effects may also occur through changes in the setting of heritage assets which could result from views towards infrastructure associated with the lifetime of the scheme.
- 8.9.6 Construction of the project therefore has the potential for adverse effects upon Cultural Heritage resources both within the Proposed Development, and outside of it. These effects are assessed below and are further detailed in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05].

Construction impacts to archaeological remains

Solar Development Sites, Construction Compounds and Cable Route Corridor

- 8.9.7 Desk-based assessment, supplemented by geophysical survey and archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) has characterised the presence, nature and condition of archaeological remains within the Solar Development Sites, Construction Compounds and Cable Route Corridor.
- 8.9.8 The geophysical survey identified a number of previously unrecorded archaeological remains across the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor. These are detailed in Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02] with reports and interpretation supplied within Appendix 8.3: Geophysical Survey Results (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.03].
- 8.9.9 Findspots, whilst used to inform the baseline, are considered to be of no cultural significance (value) due to the objects having been removed, with these sites being only indicative of historic activity, not the current location of physical remains.
- 8.9.10 The cultural significance (value) of archaeological remains ranges from **negligible** to **high** importance, with the majority of features of **negligible** or **low** importance. The cultural significance (value) of these assets is derived from their archaeological, and in some cases, historic interest.
- 8.9.11 Features of potentially **high** cultural significance (value) are the two moated sites within Solar Development Site 4 [MNY9907/GS_S4_2; MNY9905/GS_S4_1], the presences of both of which were confirmed by the trial trench evaluation.
- 8.9.12 Geophysical anomalies detected in Solar Development Sites 1, 2, 4 and 6, the presence of which were largely confirmed by the trial trench evaluation, have been assessed as of **medium** cultural significance (value). This is due to their archaeological interest, as they comprise remains of rural settlement dating to the Iron Age/Romano-British period, which contain archaeological and environmental

evidence for their construction, habitation and landscape context. These features comprise probable farmsteads [GS_S1_14, GS_S1_15, GS_S1_17, GS_S1_19, GS_S1_20, GS_S1_21, GS_S1_25 (southern section)], potential settlements (some with attached field systems) [GS_S2_1, GS_S4_3, GS_S4_5] and an isolated ring ditch which may represent a possible roundhouse [GS_S6_4].

- 8.9.13 Within the Cable Route Corridor (CRC4-POC), a group of geophysical anomalies [CGS_C4POC_2] aligning with a recorded field system [MNY9953] including a probable trackway, several linear features, ring ditch and rectilinear enclosure align with a number of recorded cropmarks [MNY9957; MNY9960]. These have cumulatively been assessed as of **medium** cultural significance (value) due to their archaeological interest and may be of Iron Age or Romano-British date, based on similar known features within the surrounding landscape.
- 8.9.14 Embedded mitigation detailed above has been employed to minimise impacts to the archaeological resource within the Solar Development Sites. Non-ground penetrating techniques have been incorporated into the scheme design to avoid direct impacts to [GS_S1_14], [GS_S1_15], [GS_S1_17], [GS_S1_19], [GS_S1_21], [GS_S2_1], [MNY9905 (GS_S4_1)], and [MNY9907 (GS_S4_2)] and Features [GS_S1_25] (southern section), [GS_S1_26], [GS_S1_27] and [GS_S4_5] have been excluded from solar infrastructure areas. These and all additional proposed archaeological mitigation measures are detailed within Table 3 of the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11] The potential for effects arising from construction traffic and indirectly through changes in the setting of the asset have also been considered within the assessment, which is detailed in section 5 of Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04]; broadly, it was concluded that the elements of the assets' setting that contribute to their significance would not be affected. Once embedded mitigation has been taken into account, the overall effect of the Proposed Development on these assets is **minor adverse**, which is **not significant** for the purposes of this assessment.
- 8.9.15 Individual assessments of the potential for likely significant construction effects upon all Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits is detailed in Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.04].
- 8.9.16 A worst-case scenario of physical impacts has been adopted during the assessment for assets within the Order Limits to retain maximum flexibility within the design. Impacts from the solar PV mounting structures (which will utilise a technique in which solar panels are fixed to the ground on narrow metal mounts, thereby limiting the amount of intrusive groundworks needed) will be widespread across the Proposed Development, but highly localised in their effect due to the limited level of ground penetration. However, where proposed cable routes, BESS components and substations are situated, higher levels of impact will occur. Construction works for these elements could include topsoil stripping and, for the cable installation, cut and cover trenching methods. These works could fully remove archaeological remains, which would be considered a major adverse

impact. Similarly, topsoil stripping for construction compounds, temporary laydown areas and access enhancement works could damage below ground archaeological remains. Archaeological surveys have identified no archaeological remains within the footprints of the proposed BESS and substation locations set out on the Works Plans [EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.03], and embedded mitigation is proposed for cabling impacts, set out within the Archaeological Management Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11].

- 8.9.17 Due to the prevailing cultural significance (value) of the archaeological assets identified (**negligible to low**) and the embedded mitigation measures committed to by the Proposed Development (Set out above 8.9.11), the assessment results identified that the majority of impacts to archaeological assets would result in effects ranging between **neutral** and **minor adverse**, even where the magnitude of impact may be **major adverse**. This is **not significant** in EIA terms.
- 8.9.18 There are four assets within the Solar Development Sites where there is the potential for significant effects to occur:
- 1) Cluster of ring ditches (possible farmstead) (Solar Development Site 1, Field 1.29; [GS_S1_20]);
 - 2) Possible field system and trackways (Solar Development Site 4, Field 4.12; [GS_S4_3]);
 - 3) Possible Romano-British settlement site (Solar Development Site 4, Field 4.14; [GS_S4_5]); and
 - 4) Iron Age/Romano-British ring ditch adjacent to potential Romano-British field system (Solar Development Site 6, Field 6.3; [GS_S6_4]).
- 8.9.19 Construction of the Proposed Development in Solar Development Sites 1, 4 and 6 would require the installation of solar panels in areas occupied by these features, which could cause permanent damage to or removal of the assets, resulting in a **major adverse** magnitude of impact. As the above features are of **medium** importance, their complete physical removal would result in a **moderate adverse** effect, which is **significant** in EIA terms.
- 8.9.20 Within the Cable Route Corridor, one group of features has been identified as having the potential for significant effects to occur:
- 5) Group of geophysical anomalies aligning with a recorded field system [CRC4-POC; CGS_C4POC_2].
- 8.9.21 Installation of the cable within the Cable Route Corridor will required cut and cover excavation which will permanently remove archaeological features resulting in a **major adverse** magnitude of impact. As these features are of **medium** importance, their complete physical removal would result in a **moderate adverse** effect, which is **significant** in EIA terms.

Highways Improvement Areas

- 8.9.22 Where small areas of the Proposed Development fall outside of geophysical survey and archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) areas (HIA and access enhancements), there remains the potential for previously unidentified archaeological features to be present.
- 8.9.23 These areas have not been subject to archaeological survey because it is unlikely that significant effects will result from the localised impacts associated with these works. Where topsoil stripping is proposed the works will be discussed with the Archaeological Advisor to the LPA to determine if archaeological monitoring (watching brief) is required following production of the final design for the Proposed Development. This approach is set out within the Archaeological Management Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11].
- 8.9.24 Where relevant, potential changes within the setting of heritage assets, arising from HIA are considered below from paragraph 8.9.37 onwards, and within Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05].

Access to Site 8

- 8.9.25 The access options for Solar Development Site 8 will be refined following consent of the Proposed Development if needed. There are a number of recorded potential archaeological features which could experience impacts as a result of access route construction including a moated site [MNY10342] and additional possible moated site south-west of Low Rest Park Farm [MNY17167]. Flexibility has been retained within the Order Limits to allow for route modifications based on the archaeological potential of this section of the Order Limits. Depending on the finalised route, archaeological monitoring of works in this area may be required. This is recorded within the Archaeological Management Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04], and any monitoring will be agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to the LPA following finalisation of the project design.

Construction impacts to Important Hedgerows

- 8.9.26 Three potential Important Hedgerows, as defined by The Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (Ref 22), have been identified through ecological and historical research. They are located within Solar Development Site 1 [H1.16; H1.65] and Solar Development Site 6 [H6.10] and further details are available in Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01] and Appendix 8.2: Cultural Heritage Gazetteer (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.02].
- 8.9.27 Construction of the Proposed Development requires the permanent physical removal of a small section (c.10m) of one the Important Hedgerows in Solar Development Site 6 [H6.10]. The hedgerow is c.85m in length, and as such, the scale of the removal could result in a **moderate adverse** magnitude of impact to cultural significance (value). As the hedgerow is of **low** importance, its partial

physical removal (c.12%) would result in a **minor adverse effect**, which is **not significant** in EIA terms.

- 8.9.28 The other Important Hedgerows, in Solar Development Site 1, [H1.16] and [H1.65], will remain unaltered *in situ*.

Construction impacts to Historic Landscape Character

- 8.9.29 The HLC of a region is not, itself, a heritage resource. It is, however, part of the living landscape where the time-depth of past use is still visibly legible and/or archaeologically identifiable. It is these elements of the landscape that give it its character, and it is this character that holds heritage interest(s) and can therefore be affected by change.
- 8.9.30 In line with Historic England's guidance (Ref 45) cultural significance (value) was ascribed to HLC types during the North Yorkshire, York and Lower Tees Historic Landscape Characterisation project.
- 8.9.31 As outlined in the Cultural Heritage Baseline (Appendix 8.1: Cultural Heritage Baseline (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.01]) the majority of the Proposed Development has been assigned a HLC sub-type of 'Modern Improved Fields' (Ref 44), with smaller areas of Piecemeal Enclosure, Planned Large Scale Parliamentary Enclosure and Unknown Planned Enclosure (Ref 44) .
- 8.9.32 These are all of **negligible** or **low** importance. A single polygon of Ornamental Parkland [HNY5580] intersects with Section A of CRC 1-4. This is of **medium** importance.
- 8.9.33 Within the Solar Development Sites, whilst a change in land use would occur, there are minimal changes proposed to the current layout of the landscape, meaning that current visibility of historic field patterns within the landscape would be retained throughout the lifetime of the project. Whilst limited hedgerow removal will occur within the Solar Development Sites (particularly in the southern end of Solar Development Site 1, where the Bird Mitigation Area will be located), this removal will be kept to a minimum, reducing impacts to no more than a **negligible adverse** magnitude of impact. In some areas, restoration of hedgerows in poor condition may result in a **minor beneficial** magnitude of impact.
- 8.9.34 Within the Cable Route Corridor, the design assumes that any hedgerow loss will be kept to a minimum and landscape reinstatement following the installation of the cable will minimise impacts on the HLC. This would result in no more than a **negligible adverse** significant effect.
- 8.9.35 Any further changes to HLC would be temporary in nature as a result of construction activities and would be returned to neutral following completion of this phase.
- 8.9.36 On an HLC type of **medium** importance (Ornamental Parkland), a **negligible adverse** impact would result in a **minor adverse** significance of effect. This is considered **not significant**.

Construction impacts to heritage assets beyond the Order Limits

- 8.9.37 In addition to direct, physical impacts, the Proposed Development has the potential to result in non-physical impacts to heritage assets within the wider landscape. This is primarily as a result of changes in their setting.
- 8.9.38 All designated heritage assets within the Order Limits and Study Area were scoped in for assessment of potential impacts. A full assessment of setting, its contribution to the cultural significance (value) of all identified heritage assets within the Study Area, and any impacts upon that cultural significance (value) is presented within Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05].
- 8.9.39 There are no current, publicly available Conservation Area Appraisals for Monk Fryston, Hillam, Riccall or Escrick. An assessment of their cultural significance (value) based on professional judgement is included within Appendix 8.5: Statements of Significance and Impact Assessments (ES Volume 3) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.08.05].
- 8.9.40 Impacts to heritage assets beyond the Order Limits may include temporary, short-term impacts, comprising of the movement of plant (including routing through conservation areas), increases in noise and light, construction and laydown areas however these will be minimised through measures set out within the oCEMP, where practicable, and fully resolved upon completion of the construction phase and therefore will not result in permanent significant effects. Similarly, full landscape restoration is anticipated for impacts arising from construction of the Cable Route Corridor meaning no permanent changes to the setting of heritage assets will arise from its installation. Permanent impacts may arise through the presence of the Solar Development Sites within the setting of heritage assets, resulting in changes which may impact upon the significance of heritage assets.
- 8.9.41 With the application of embedded mitigation, no assets have been identified as experiencing a significant effect as a result of the Proposed Development, however for transparency, where professional judgement has been applied in this decision for assets which have the potential for an outcome of minor or moderate significance of effect, these are listed below. The conclusion of minor adverse impacts is, in all circumstances, considered to be equivalent to less than substantial harm.

Thorpe Hall moated monastic grange [NHLE 1017460]

- 8.9.42 The monument includes the remains of a medieval moated manor house on north bank of Selby Dam, near Thorpe Willoughby village. Originally a grange of Selby Abbey and leased to Willoughby in the 13th century, the asset is currently entered onto Historic England's Heritage At Risk register. The asset is of **high** importance and derives its cultural significance (value) from its archaeological interest, as remains could survive throughout the site; further archaeological interest is derived specifically from the moat, which could provide conditions favourable to

the survival of organic remains. The monument also derives significance from its historic interest, from its origins as a monastic grange, a farm owned and run by the Benedictine community and separate from the secular manorial system. Further historic interest is also derived from the monument's associations with the Willoughby family, the village of Thorpe Willoughby and the surviving Thorpe Hall.

- 8.9.43 The monument is located in close proximity to CRC 1-4 and CRC 1-4a, though it lies outside of the Order Limits. Temporary construction activities would occur within the setting of the asset, which contributes to its cultural significance (value). However, there is some existing screening provided by the designated buildings to the west and woodland to the north and south and any changes will be temporary only. This will at most result in a **minor adverse** impact which will result in a **minor adverse** significance of effect which will return to neutral following the completion of the construction phase and is **not significant**.

Church of St Mary [NHLE 1316671]

- 8.9.44 The Church of St Mary is a Grade I Listed parish church of **high** importance. The structure dates from the 12th century with 14th century south aisle and upper stage of tower, and 19th century additions and alterations.
- 8.9.45 The Church of St Mary derives significance from its architectural, historic, and artistic interests. It is located in the southern end of the village of Birkin. Its churchyard is bound to the west by Intake Lane, which connects to Birkin Lane and Main Street, reflecting the church's importance as the religious centre of the community. Views of the tower can be gained from all three roads, marking it as a landmark for the village of Birkin. Its setting, both its surroundings and views towards it, make a positive contribution to its significance.
- 8.9.46 The church is located immediately adjacent to a Highways Improvement Area (HIA). Construction activities would occur within the setting of the church, to the northwest, including moving plant, lighting and noise.
- 8.9.47 The solar panels and all associated infrastructure at Solar Development Site 4 would introduce an industrial character to the periphery of the asset's setting. However, this impact will be, at most, limited to glimpsed views, as the church is heavily screened by intervening built form.
- 8.9.48 The works will at most result in a **minor adverse** impact which will result in a **minor adverse** significance of effect which is **not significant**.

Former Coach House And Stables Adjoining Escrick Park To Rear Right [NHLE 1148489]

- 8.9.49 The Grade II* Listed Former Coach House forms part of the Escrick Park estate complex which has now been converted into a school. Its architectural interest is derived from its 18th century design, which includes a dentil pediment containing a clock, surmounted by a columned peristyle with a domed lead roof. Its historic interest is derived from its association with Escrick Park, and its former function

as a coach house and stables, as well as from its architect, John Carr. It is of **high** importance.

8.9.50 Whilst the structure has now been converted to an educational function, its surrounding park and garden has been retained, alongside designed elements of the landscape, such as the drive from Skipwith Road. This allows for an understanding of its original design. Therefore, its setting (i.e. the historic park and garden) makes a positive contribution to its cultural significance (value).

8.9.51 Construction activities could occur within the vicinity of the asset, including moving plant, lighting and noise. Once the solar panels and their associated infrastructure are installed, there is the potential for changes to the asset's setting, as glimpsed views of the solar panels could be gained from the upper floors of the building. These would be sporadic and limited only to certain angles, and no physical change will be made to the current boundaries of its park. The relationship between the asset and the other park estate buildings would not be altered. As such, it is considered that this would result in a **minor adverse** impact leading to a **minor adverse** significance of effect, which is **not significant**.

Escrick Park [NHLE 1167878]

8.9.52 Escrick Park is a 17th century, Grade II* Listed building of **high** importance located in the southern end of the village of Escrick. It has been used as a school since 1974. Escrick Park derives significance from its architectural and historic interests, with much of the original designed landscape, surrounding the structure, having been retained. In particular, the long drive which branches off from Skipwith Road towards, which affords observer a clear view of the building and would have been designed to impress upon the visitor the wealth and status of its owners. This setting makes a positive contribution to the cultural significance (value) of the asset.

8.9.53 Construction activities will occur within the vicinity of the asset, including moving plant, lighting and noise. This will be at a minimum distance of c.820 m, meaning any impact will be limited to no more than a **minor adverse effect**. Once the solar panels and associated infrastructure are installed, there is the potential for impacts upon the asset's setting, as glimpsed views could be gained from the upper floors of the building. The asset's facade can also be glimpsed from Solar Development Site 1. As the setting is a key element of the asset's significance, and uninterrupted views across its park and the rural land that surrounds it would have been a central design point of the estate, these glimpsed views would result in a **minor adverse effect**. As these would be sporadic and limited only to certain angles, and no physical change will be made to the current boundaries of its park, it is considered that the significance of effect, for both temporary and permanent effects, will be **minor adverse**, which is **not significant**.

Garden Temple [NHLE 1148453]

8.9.54 Garden Temple is of **high** importance within the Escrick Park estate. The Grade II Listed structure was constructed in the mid-late 18th century of ashlar dressed

stone. The Garden Temple derives significance from its architectural, historic and artistic interests. The temple is set within a small, wooded area, located at the southern end of a long drive lined with trees, at around 1.1 km southeast of the heart of the Escrick Park estate. This is reflective of its historic context, as its position would have been designed as part of the park layout.

- 8.9.55 Construction activities will occur within the vicinity of the asset, including moving plant and lighting; however, as the asset is c.800 m south-west of Solar Development Site 1, these activities would be only intermittently visible. Once the solar panels and their associated infrastructure have been installed, there is the potential for changes within the asset's setting, as glimpsed views of the solar panels could be gained from the temple. As these would be sporadic and limited only to certain angles, and no physical change will be made to the designed landscape of the Escrick Park estate (which is a key element of its significance), it is considered that both the temporary and permanent magnitude of impact will be no greater than **minor adverse** and the significance of effect will be **slight adverse**, which is **not significant**.

Wheldrake Lodge [NHLE 1148456]

- 8.9.56 The Grade II Listed Lodge to Escrick Park is of **high** importance. The structure was built in the early 19th century incorporating medieval fragments and is located behind a crescent of metal gates, which is separately listed (NHLE 1316305).
- 8.9.57 Wheldrake Lodge primarily draws its cultural significance (value) from its historic interest, which is derived from its group value as part of the Escrick Park estate. Whilst the lodge itself dates to the early 19th century, further historic interest is derived from the medieval corbel stones incorporated into its main facade. Some limited architectural interest is drawn from its design, which includes an oriel window.
- 8.9.58 Temporary construction effects could occur within the asset's setting (which contributes to its significance), including movement of plant, light and noise, as well as increased traffic. Though the asset is partially screened by hedged boundaries, as well as further buildings to the north, glimpsed views of the solar panels and their associated infrastructure within Site are possible. The Proposed Development will not alter the relationship between the Lodge, its gates, piers and railings, and the wider Escrick Estate. As such both the temporary and permanent magnitude of impact is judged to be no greater than **minor adverse** and the significance of effect will be **minor adverse**, which is **not significant**.

Gates, Piers and Railings at Wheldrake Lodge [NHLE 1316305]

- 8.9.59 Cast iron gates, ashlar end piers and railings surrounding at Wheldrake Lodge dating to the early 19th century. These are Grade II Listed and of **high** importance.
- 8.9.60 The gates, gate piers and railings at Wheldrake Lodge derive their cultural significance (value) from their historic and artistic interests. The gates form a

crescent, accessed via Skipwith Road, which acts as the entrance to Wheldrake Lodge. The vehicular access to Queen Margaret's School (formerly Escrick Park) is directly adjacent to the west. This has caused a loss of historic function, and the railings are now less easily understood as an entrance to the estate.

- 8.9.61 Temporary construction effects would occur within the asset's setting (which contributes to its significance), including movement of plant, light and noise, as well as increased traffic. Though the asset is partially screened by hedged boundaries, as well as further buildings to the north, glimpsed views of the solar panels and their associated infrastructure within Site are possible. The Proposed Development will not alter the relationship between the asset, Wheldrake Lodge and the wider Escrick Estate. As such the magnitude of impact is judged to be no greater than **minor adverse** and the significance of effect will be **minor adverse**, which is **not significant**.

Thorpe Hall [NHLE 1365820]

- 8.9.62 Thorpe Hall is a Grade II Listed, two storey building constructed around 1800 from yellow brick with a pitched slate roof. It is of **high** importance and derives its cultural significance (value) from historic and architectural interest. Its rural setting contributes to its cultural significance (value).
- 8.9.63 The asset lies c.50 m north of the Order Limits for CRC 1-4. Temporary construction activities would occur within the setting of the asset, including moving plant, lighting and noise, as well as increased traffic. Though the asset is partially screened by hedged boundaries, due to its proximity to the Order Limits, glimpsed views of the moving plant are possible, which would introduce an adverse setting impact for the duration of these works. The magnitude of impact is judged to be no greater than **minor adverse** and the significance of effect will be **minor adverse**, which is **not significant**.

Rectangular Range opposite Thorpe Hall, Consisting of Stables, Open Cart Shed, Barn, Wall, Pump And Basin [NHLE 1132561]

- 8.9.64 Two, Grade II Listed, two-storey stable buildings of **high** importance. The asset's cultural significance (value) is drawn primarily from its historic interest, as a relatively intact rectangular range of agricultural buildings of the 19th century, associated with Thorpe Hall.
- 8.9.65 The asset lies c. 110 m north of the Order Limits for CRC 1-4. Temporary construction activities would occur within the setting of the asset, including moving plant, lighting and noise, as well as increased traffic. Though the asset is partially screened by hedged boundaries, as well as further buildings to the west, due to its proximity to the Order Limits, glimpsed views of the moving plant could be possible, which would introduce an adverse change within the setting of the asset for the duration of these works. The magnitude of impact is judged to be no greater than **minor adverse** and the significance of effect will be **minor adverse**, which is **not significant**.

Birkin House [NHLE 1316672]

- 8.9.66 Birkin House is a Grade II Listed, residential building constructed of pinkish-brown brick with red brick dressings and stone slate roof. It is of **high** importance.
- 8.9.67 Birkin House derives its cultural significance (value) from its architectural and historic interests. Its architectural interest is derived its mid to late 18th century design elements, which include the four and five bay sash windows to the facade. The house's historic interest derives from its survival as a relatively high-status residence.
- 8.9.68 The asset is located a short distance northeast of the village of Birkin, accessed via two offshoot roads from Haddlesey Road and Tinkler's Lane respectively. Its setting is well defined. It is positioned within a field edged by trees, which may represent a survival of a former park or garden. The land directly north has been given over to industrial buildings which reduces the contribution that the rural, enclosed setting of the property makes to its cultural significance (value).
- 8.9.69 Birkin House lies in close proximity to Solar Development Site 4. Temporary construction activities would occur nearby, including moving plant, lighting and noise. The installation of the solar panels and associated infrastructure would result in a permanent, adverse change to rural landscape surrounding the asset. The wood and hedge-lined borders provide some screening from the Proposed Development, but as the vegetation is deciduous, this screening will fluctuate in density throughout the seasons, allowing for glimpsed views of the solar panels. Designed mitigation, including native woodland planting will increase the level of screening these borders provide. The Proposed Development will not encroach on the well-defined setting of Birkin House, and any remaining glimpsed views will be minimal, with industrial buildings already present within the setting of the asset. As such the magnitude of impact is **minor adverse** and the significance of effect is **minor adverse**, which is **not significant**.

Common Lane Bridge, HUL3/4 [NHLE 1419073]

- 8.9.70 The bridge is a Grade II Listed, single-span intersector bridge constructed 1839-40 by Robert Stephenson, the renowned 19th century railway engineer, for the York and North Midland Railway. It is of **high** importance. The bridge retains its historic function as it is located at the intersection of two functioning railway lines. Beyond these railway lines, the setting is largely rural, though industrial elements have been introduced, such as the Sherburn-in-Elmet airfield and Gascoigne Wood power plant.
- 8.9.71 The asset lies immediately adjacent to the southeast of Solar Development Site 7. Temporary construction activities would occur within the setting of the resource, including moving plant, lighting and noise. The installation of the solar panels and associated infrastructure would result in a permanent change to the setting of the bridge; however, it would not affect the core relationship of the bridge and other elements related to the railway. The magnitude of impact is therefore **minor adverse**, and the significance of effect is **minor adverse**, which is **not significant**.

Church of St Mary, Hambleton [NHLE 1474381]

- 8.9.72 The Church of St Mary was constructed in 1882 and designed by the nationally renowned architect, John Loughborough Pearson. It is constructed of red brick with ashlar dressings, the roof is clad in red plain clay tiles, with cast-iron rainwater goods, and a timber-framed pyramidal bellcote clad in shingles. The Church is Grade II Listed and is of **high** importance.
- 8.9.73 The asset derives significance from its architectural interests, as an example of a late 19th century Gothic Revival church, which survives largely unaltered. Significance is also gained from its historic interest.
- 8.9.74 The church is positioned within its churchyard, in the centre of the village of Hambleton, alongside Station Road, close to the village's Main Road. Beyond the village, the landscape is largely rural. The modern setting reflects its original context, as the church was designed to accommodate Hambleton's 19th century expansion and was therefore located in a prominent position as a religious centre. The setting therefore makes a positive contribution to the asset's significance through its connection to its historic interest.
- 8.9.75 Construction activities relating to temporary road widening would occur within the setting of the church, to the northwest, including traffic, lighting and noise, which would introduce an adverse setting impact for the duration of these works. Permanent change to the landscape would occur once the solar panels and associated infrastructure are installed at Site 8, as they would introduce a new industrial element to the landscape. However, this impact is likely to be limited to glimpsed views from the tower only, as the church is at a distance of 1.12 km from Solar Development Site 8, and additionally screened by intervening built form. The magnitude of impact from both temporary and permanent works is therefore no more than **minor adverse**, and the significance of effect is **minor adverse**, which is **not significant**.

Highways Improvement Areas

- 8.9.76 The works proposed by the majority of HIAs will be temporary in nature and it is not anticipated that any will result in significant temporary or permanent effect(s) to the heritage resource. Assessment within Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.11.00] has also confirmed that no significant effects will occur as a result of noise or vibration changes and that any increases in noise will be controlled through the detailed CEMP. Where works will occur within the setting of sensitive assets they are detailed below.

HIA – Skipwith Road and Main Street

- 8.9.77 Temporary road widening, temporary street furniture removal and vegetation management are proposed within the setting of the following assets of **high** importance: Village Hall and School House (Grade II Listed, NHLE 1148468), Skipton War Memorial (Grade II Listed, NHLE 1458812), Church of St Helen (Grade I Listed, NHLE 1148467) and Skipwith Hall (Grade II* Listed, NHLE 1172750). These works will be restricted to the carriageway in front of the

designated structures. The settings of the churchyard and war memorial within are well defined. Both sit within the clearly delineated graveyard boundary with views over the open landscape which will not be disrupted during any temporary works. Skipwith Hall is well screened from the carriageway, again within a clearly defined boundary, edged by a red-brick wall. The setting of the Village Hall and School House includes the Skipwith Road carriageway, as well as the surrounding properties and the wider village of Skipton. No physical impacts will be incurred to the assets as a result of the works and no permanent changes will occur which will result in a loss of cultural significance (value) as a result of changes in their setting. Vegetation clearance will not extend beyond usual highways clearance works for the roadway to allow AIL vehicles to pass safely along the roadway. Any removal of street furniture will be temporary, and the carriageway will be fully reinstated following any temporary amendments. As a result, any impacts will be no greater than a **negligible adverse** magnitude of impact and result in a **minor adverse** significance of effect, which is **not significant**.

HIA - Selby Road, Pinfold Hill, Garman Carr Lane

- 8.9.78 Temporary road widening and temporary removal of street furniture will take place adjacent to Oaklands Farmhouse (Grade II Listed, NHLE 1316665) which is of **high** importance. No physical impacts will occur as a result of the works.
- 8.9.79 The setting of Oaklands Farmhouse comprises its land plot, including historic associated structures to the rear of the property, its relationship the surrounding carriageways and the village of Wistow. All of which contribute, to varying degrees, to its cultural significance (value). Whilst temporary works may occur within the setting of the asset, these will not change the relationship between the asset and its setting, and all works will be temporary in nature. Any impacts will be no greater than a **negligible adverse** magnitude of impact and result in a **minor adverse** significance of effect, which is **not significant**.

HIA - A63, Gateforth Lane and Saint Mary's Approach, Hambleton

- 8.9.80 Temporary road widening works are proposed at Gateforth Lane in Hambleton, adjacent to the Grade II Listed Walmsley House (NHLE 1132516) which is of **high** importance. No physical impacts will occur as a result of the works. The setting of the asset can be characterised as its immediate boundary wall and garden, as well as its relationship to the surrounding carriageways and wider village of Hambleton. All of which contribute, to varying degrees, to its cultural significance (value). Whilst temporary works may occur within the setting of the asset, these will not change the relationship between the asset and its setting, and all works will be temporary in nature. Any impacts will be no greater than a **negligible adverse** magnitude of impact and result in a **minor adverse** significance of effect, which is **not significant**.

HIA - Roe Lane, Main Street and Haddlesey Road, Birkin

- 8.9.81 The temporary works comprise of the removal of street furniture. This is located immediately adjacent to the Church of St Mary (Grade I Listed, NHLE 1316671), which is of **high** importance, and its associated churchyard. Street furniture external to the churchyard does not contribute to the cultural value (significance) of the asset and so its removal will not impact the asset. There will be **no change** and so the significance of effect is **neutral** and **not significant**.

Operational effects

Approach to assessing operational impacts

- 8.9.82 Overall, the operational phase is assumed to result in less impacts than the construction phase, with activities primarily restricted to vegetation management, maintenance and servicing of equipment, and routine inspections of the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor.
- 8.9.83 In the case of major replacement campaigns, the assessment has considered the assumptions for replacement as set out in Chapter 2: Proposed Development (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02], which indicates that, given the different lifetimes of infrastructure, the scale of impacts that could occur during this phase would be limited.
- 8.9.84 Mitigation measures associated with the programme of replacement activities are outlined in the oOEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03].

Operational impacts to archaeological remains

- 8.9.85 Following the worst-case scenario laid out in Chapter 2: Proposed Development (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02], it is anticipated that operational impacts to archaeological remains within the Solar Development Sites and Cable Route Corridor will be highly limited. The majority of operational works (such as fence inspections, site monitoring and vegetation management) will not require intrusive groundworks and thus will not cause any impact to below-ground archaeological remains.
- 8.9.86 Replacement and maintenance activities are assumed to be less intensive than those conducted during construction, as it is envisaged that no intrusive groundworks are needed to affix replacement panels or BESS compound infrastructure. Components which will have required cut and fill operations during the construction phase (such as cabling, the Substation and BESS Compound buildings) are not anticipated to need replacement, resulting in no further disturbance to heritage assets. The potential for ad hoc replacement of elements of the Proposed Development cannot be ruled out, but should they be required, it is envisaged that access tracks, works footprints and methodologies will be the same as those used during the construction phase, resulting in no additional disturbance to heritage assets and no new impacts.

- 8.9.87 Should this situation change and additional groundworks be required, details of appropriate consultation and mitigation will be detailed within the Proposed Development's Archaeological Management Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11] and oOEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03] and agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to the LPA.

Operational impacts to Important Hedgerows

- 8.9.88 No additional impacts are anticipated to Important Hedgerows during the operational phase.

Operational impacts to Historic Landscape Character

- 8.9.89 No additional impacts are anticipated to HLC during the operational phase.

Operational impacts to heritage assets beyond the Order Limits

- 8.9.90 It is anticipated that operational impacts will represent a continuation of any permanent construction impacts. These have been considered as part of the construction phase assessment. Activities such as increased traffic, implementation of hoarding, light and noise may occur within the setting of heritage assets during replacement and maintenance works, but it is assumed that these impacts will not exceed those incurred during the construction phase. Therefore, no new impacts are anticipated to any heritage assets beyond the Order Limits at operational stage.

Decommissioning effects

Decommissioning impacts to archaeological remains

- 8.9.91 Decommissioning activities have the potential to impact archaeological remains (including those previously unrecorded) within the Proposed Development. Advances in engineering approaches and technologies mean that approaches to decommissioning are likely to change over the operational life of the Proposed Development. However, it is reasonable to assume that future changes to techniques are likely to improve efficiency and potentially result in lower impact.
- 8.9.92 It is envisaged that decommissioning impacts will be the reverse of construction phases impacts (i.e. the removal of solar infrastructure). It assumed that access tracks, works footprints and methodologies will be largely the same as those used during the construction phase. Additionally, it may be the case that cables are left in-situ, or that they will be removed through less intrusive techniques (such as excavating at intervals along the route and 'pulling' lengths of cable through, rather than re opening, removing, and then closing). In this case, impacts would be smaller than those incurred during construction. It is also assumed that any new impacts will be managed through revisions to the detailed Archaeological Management Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11] brought forward through the oDEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04] and agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to the LPA.

Decommissioning impacts to Important Hedgerows

- 8.9.93 It is assumed that the Important Hedgerows preserved *in situ* in Solar Development Sites 1 [H1.16, H1.65] and Solar Development Site 6 [H6.10] will not need to be removed or physically altered to enable decommissioning. Therefore, [H1.16], [H1.65] and [H6.10] will only receive temporary change(s) to setting which will not result in significant effect(s) to cultural significance (value).

Decommissioning impacts to Historic Landscape Character

- 8.9.94 No additional impacts are anticipated to HLC during the decommissioning phase.

Decommissioning impacts to heritage assets beyond the Order Limits

- 8.9.95 Plant movement and other activities during decommissioning, similar to those employed during the construction phase, could temporarily change the setting(s) of nearby heritage assets. It is considered that these would be of no greater magnitude than temporary impacts incurred during the construction phase and would ultimately result in the reversal of impacts arising from permanent changes in setting as a result of site infrastructure during the construction phase. As such, in line with the conclusions of the construction phase, it is not anticipated that significant effects will be incurred to assets beyond the Study Area during decommissioning. All effects will return to **neutral**, following completion of decommissioning.

8.10 Additional mitigation

- 8.10.1 Additional mitigation refers to actions that require additional site and project specific activity in order to achieve a reduction in effect, and/or anticipated outcome.
- 8.10.2 Additional mitigation identified for Cultural Heritage is presented below.

Construction

- 8.10.3 Where remains cannot be preserved *in situ* (e.g. within the footprint of permanent infrastructure) a scheme of archaeological excavation or archaeological monitoring will be undertaken to record archaeological features impacted by the Proposed Development. This commitment is outlined within the oCEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.02] and detailed within the Archaeological Management Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11]
- 8.10.4 Other additional mitigation measures within these documents also include on-site traffic management, toolbox talks, and protective barriers would be implemented to avoid impacts to remains preserved *in situ*.

Operation

- 8.10.5 No additional mitigation measures are proposed as it is anticipated that operational impacts to archaeological remains will be highly limited. Where replacement and maintenance works are required, it is envisaged that access tracks, works footprints and methodologies will be the same as those used during the construction phase, resulting in no new impacts to the archaeological resource.
- 8.10.6 Mitigation measures would be implemented and confirmed through the Proposed Development's detailed OEMP(s), which would include similar measures to the CEMP (e.g. traffic management, protective barriers and toolbox talks), as is set out in the oOEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.03].

Decommissioning

- 8.10.7 Decommissioning methodologies remain undefined however, it is anticipated that access tracks, works footprints and methodologies will be largely the same as those used during the construction and operation phases.
- 8.10.8 Mitigation measures would be implemented and confirmed through the Proposed Development's detailed DEMP(s), which would include similar measures to the CEMP and OEMP, seeking to avoid impacts to remains preserved *in situ*, as set out in the oDEMP [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04].

8.11 Residual effects

Construction effects

- 8.11.1 Due to the inclusion of embedded mitigation within the Proposed Development design, no significant effects to known buried archaeology or other heritage assets will occur as a result of the Proposed Development.
- 8.11.2 There remains a limited potential for as yet unidentified buried archaeological remains within un-surveyed areas of the Cable Route Corridor and in small areas adjacent to some HIAs and Site 8 access. As such, significant effects are unlikely but cannot be ruled out entirely. Where effects on the buried archaeological resource could occur, mitigation is set out within the Archaeological Management Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04].
- 8.11.3 No additional mitigation measures, beyond those embedded measures within the design and outlined in the OEMP are proposed for heritage assets beyond the Order Limits.

Operational effects

- 8.11.4 No new effects are anticipated during operation.

Decommissioning effects

- 8.11.5 No new effects on the buried archaeological resource or important hedgerows are anticipated as a result of decommissioning.
- 8.11.6 Decommissioning effects on heritage assets beyond the Order Limits will return any impacts to **neutral** following complete decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

8.12 Monitoring

- 8.12.1 The Archaeological Management Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.04] sets out the proposed approach to additional mitigation to reduce potential impacts to the buried archaeological resource.
- 8.12.2 Measures include:
- 1) Consultation with the Archaeological Advisor to NYC regarding Archaeological monitoring of topsoil stripping during HIA, compound set-up and access works; and
 - 2) Archaeological mitigation areas, subject to Strip, Map and Sample excavation, following the results of archaeological surveys. These will comprise of areas of the Proposed Development which have not been subject to mitigation by design (i.e. use of non-ground penetrating techniques, siting of piles to avoid archaeology, or repositioning of works which could result in ground intrusion) identified using professional judgement and agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to NYC. These areas are detailed within the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy, and shown on Figure 8.4: Archaeological Mitigation Areas (ES Volume 2) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.08.04].

8.13 Summary

- 8.13.1 Table 8-28 presents a summary of the Cultural Heritage assessment, detailing likely significant effects identified, further mitigation requirements and residual effects.
- 8.13.2 This assessment has determined that no likely significant effects are anticipated during operation or decommissioning phases. Significant effects anticipated during construction are detailed below.

Table 8-28 Cultural Heritage - summary of likely significant effects

	Receptor/aspect and sensitivity /value /importance	Description of impact	Magnitude	Significance of effect	Additional mitigation	Residual effect and significance
Construction	Archaeological remains within the Order Limits Importance: Negligible to medium	Partial or complete removal by construction activities.	Negligible to Major adverse	Up to Moderate adverse (significant)	Archaeological excavation or monitoring to ensure features are properly recorded prior to any impacts as set out within the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [EN0110012/APP/LVS/07.11].	Up to minor adverse (not significant)

8.14 Cumulative assessment

- 8.14.1 This section presents an assessment of cumulative effects between the Proposed Development and other proposed and committed plans and projects.
- 8.14.2 This assessment has been made with reference to the methodology and guidance set out in Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17.00] and the shortlist of cumulative plans and projects identified within it.
- 8.14.3 For individual receptors, this cumulative effect assessment identifies where the predicted effects of the Proposed Development could interact with effects arising from other plans and/or projects based on a spatial and/or temporal basis.
- 8.14.4 Plans and projects identified within Chapter 17: Cumulative and In-Combination Effects (ES Volume 1) [EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.17.00] which have the potential to result in cumulative effects on Cultural Heritage are set out in Table 8-29. The remaining plans and projects were reviewed in relation to the Cultural Heritage receptors identified in this assessment and no further potential for significant cumulative effects are identified due to the temporary nature of construction and limited impacted from operation and maintenance.

Table 8-29 Plans and projects relevant to the Cultural Heritage cumulative assessment

Application reference	Description	Distance from the Proposed Development	Potential cumulative effects
5 - Yorkshire Green	A proposed reinforcement project comprising a new 400 kV and 275 kV electricity transmission connection and associated development.	0 km to CRC 4-POC. 300 m to Solar Development Site 3.	There will be no cumulative effects on Monk Fryston Lodge [NHLE1167647]. The installation of CRC 4-POC will not result in permanent changes to the setting of the asset, meaning that the installation of the new overhead line will not result in cumulative impacts. Temporary construction effects from both scheme, should timelines overlap, could result in slight increases in noise and construction activities however these are unlikely to exceed those set out for the Yorkshire Green scheme in the immediate vicinity of the designated asset, and therefore no cumulative significant effects are anticipated.

Application reference	Description	Distance from the Proposed Development	Potential cumulative effects
<p>7 – Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station Also, local plan land allocation ES08</p>	<p>A generating station of up to 1.2 GW output capacity designed to run on 100% hydrogen and able to run on 100% natural gas and associated infrastructure including a gas pipeline of up to 10 km to connect with the existing Feeder 29 of the National Grid transmission system.</p>	<p>0 km (pipeline crosses Solar Development Site 4 and southern extent of DOL for CRC 4-POC)</p>	<p>There is the potential for cumulative effects on archaeological features within Solar Development Site 4. It is unlikely that this will result in significant effects as impacts to the archaeological resource from the Scheme will be mitigated both by design and through mechanisms outlined in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy. The designs for the Ferrybridge Next Generation Power Station are still under development and will be informed by the results of their own archaeological surveys. Temporary cumulative effects from construction activities are not anticipated.</p>
<p>43 - Erection and operation of a mushroom and algae cultivation facility ZG2024/1101/FULM</p>	<p>Erection and operation of a mushroom and algae cultivation facility, ancillary structures and associated scheme of landscaping and biodiversity enhancement</p>	<p>50 m to CRC 6-7. 11 m from Solar Development Site 7. 100 m from Solar Development Site 6.</p>	<p>Geophysical survey of Solar Development Site 7 has not revealed any features which would obviously continue into the site of the development. Nor have any archaeological features been identified within CRC 6-7 which may continue into the site of this development. The closest designated heritage asset is the Common Lane Bridge, HUL3/4 [NHLE1419073]. The setting of this asset is already industrialised through the presence of the railway and other industrial features to the south meaning there will not be significant cumulative effects, temporary or permanent, as a result of both developments.</p>
<p>44- Outline application for development of 150 dwellings ZG2023/1152/OUTM</p>	<p>Outline application with all matters reserved except for means of access to, but not within, the site for the</p>	<p>1.5 km from Solar Development Site 2. 280 m from CRC 1-4 and CRC 1-4a.</p>	<p>The development represents an infilling of a previously undeveloped parcel of land within the settlement of Hambleton and will not alter the setting of designated heritage assets within</p>

Application reference	Description	Distance from the Proposed Development	Potential cumulative effects
	development of up to 150 dwellings and associated landscaping and infrastructure works		the settlement in such a way that would impact upon their significance. As a result, no cumulative effects, temporary or permanent, will occur from this development.
67 - Erection of a Solar Farm AP/2025/0037/REF	Erection of a solar farm together with ancillary development	0 m from Solar Development Site 3. 0 m from CRC 3-4 and CRC 3-4a.	<p>Geophysical survey of Solar Development Site 3 has not revealed any features which would obviously continue into the site of the development meaning that no cumulative impacts on the buried archaeological resource are anticipated.</p> <p>The settlement of Hillam and Hillam Conservation Area includes Burton Cottage and Chuntries Cottage [NHLE1148539], Cowshed and Granary to Hall Twelve Meters South East of House [NHLE1167589], Former Carhouse and Stables to Hillam Hall [NHLE1148540], Hall Farmhouse [NHLE1148538], Hillam Hall and West House [NHLE1296821], Stable Block at Hillam Hall and the Coach House and House Adjoining [NHLE1167620], Stable to Hall Farm Twenty Meters to the South of House [NHLE1316266], Summerhouse in Grounds of Millstone Lodge [NHLE1316267], and Threshing Barn to Hall Farm Ten Metres to South West of House [NHLE1167597]. The development will introduce new areas of industrial character at the periphery of Hillam Village, these panels will sit between Solar Development Site 3 and the Hillam Conservation Area, leading to massing of industrial elements in the surrounding landscape, however, the existing</p>

Application reference	Description	Distance from the Proposed Development	Potential cumulative effects
			<p>screening provided by the village will curtail the majority of views towards both areas of development. Additionally, the interests which contribute to the significance of these assets, where they are derived from their setting, are not related to key views across, or historic association with, these land parcels. Should construction for both schemes occur simultaneously there may be the potential for cumulative effects to occur due to the increased traffic, light and noise which from both projects, but this is unlikely to be significant and will be temporary in nature, resolving to neutral on completion. As such, no significant cumulative effects are anticipated.</p>
<p>69 - Solar development with co-located Battery Energy Storage System ZG2024/1129/FULM</p>	<p>Solar development with co-located Battery Energy Storage System and associated works</p>	<p>100 m to CRC 1-4 and CRC 1-4a; 1.55 km from Solar Development Site 8</p>	<p>The development is located adjacent to Bishop Wood which, along with topographical variation and the intervening railway line breaks lines of sight between this development, the Scheme and Thorpe Hall [NHLE 1365820] and Rectangular Range Opposite Thorpe Hall, Consisting of Stables, Open Cart Shed, Barn, Wall, Pump and Basin [NHLE 1132561] meaning that no permanent cumulative effects will occur. Should construction activities occur simultaneously, there may be short-term cumulative effects from increased traffic, light and noise however the location of Thorpe Hall and associated assets to the south-east of the CRC means that these are unlikely to be a significant increase on those anticipated from the Proposed</p>

Application reference	Description	Distance from the Proposed Development	Potential cumulative effects
			Development and no significant temporary cumulative effects are anticipated.
70 - Development of Battery Energy Storage System ('BESS') ZG2024/1099/SCN	EIA Screening Opinion in relation to the development of Battery Energy Storage System ('BESS') and associated infrastructure	1.8 km to Solar Development Site 8. 0 m (intersects CRC 4-POC)	The development is situated to the north-west of Monk Fryston Lodge [NHLE 1167647], lying partially within the order limits. The construction of a BESS storage system would represent the introduction of a new industrial element within the setting of Monk Fryston Lodge. However, the Proposed Development will not result significant changes to the current landscape baseline (the presence of Monk Fryston substation), following completion of construction activities, and therefore there will not be significant cumulative effects arising from the schemes in combination. Should construction activities occur simultaneously, there may be short-term cumulative effects from increased traffic, light and noise however these would not represent a significant increase on those predicted for Proposed Development.
88 - Construction and operation of a solar farm ZG2023/0481/SCN	EIA Screening Opinion in relation to the construction and operation of a solar farm together with all associated works, equipment, necessary infrastructure, and landscaping	50 m to Solar Development Site 7. 10 m from CRC 6-7.	The development will be situated adjacent to the airfield and industrial estate at Sherburn-in-Elmet. The presence of additional industrial elements as a result of the development will not change the existing landscape character of the areas and will not result in any cumulative effects, temporary or permanent, with the Proposed Development.
160 - Development of an Agricultural Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility	Development of an Agricultural Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility and	70 m to Solar Development Site 7. 400 m to CRC 6-7.	The development will be situated adjacent to the airfield and industrial estate at Sherburn-in-Elmet. The presence of additional

Application reference	Description	Distance from the Proposed Development	Potential cumulative effects
NY/2024/0200/FUL	associated plant and equipment and soft landscaping		industrial elements as a result of the development will not change the existing landscape character of the areas and will not result in any cumulative effects, temporary or permanent, with the Proposed Development.
181 - 100 dwelling development ZG2025/0928/OUTM	Outline application for up to 100 residential dwellings with all matters reserved except for access	4 km to Solar Development Sites 4 and 8. 250 m CRC 1-4.	Should construction activities occur simultaneously, there may be short-term cumulative effects from increased traffic, light and noise in the vicinity of Thorpe Hall moated monastic grange [NHLE1017460] however, these are unlikely to be a significant increase on those anticipated from the Proposed Development and no significant temporary cumulative effects are anticipated.
182 - 75 dwelling development ZG2025/1019/FULM	Erection of up to 75 No. residential dwellings, open space, landscaping, drainage infrastructure and associated works	1.55 km to Solar Development Site 8. 30 m CRC 1-4.	Should construction activities occur simultaneously, there may be short-term cumulative effects from increased traffic, light and noise in the vicinity of Thorpe Hall moated monastic grange [NHLE1017460] however, these are unlikely to be a significant increase on those anticipated from the Proposed Development and no significant temporary cumulative effects are anticipated.

Conclusions

- 8.14.5 It is not anticipated that any significant cumulative effects relating to Cultural Heritage will arise as a result of the Proposed Development.

References

- Ref 1 Archaeology Data Service, [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 12 October 2025].
- Ref 2 British Geological Service, [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 1 May 2025].
- Ref 3 Environment Agency. “National LIDAR Programme” 2025. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/f0db0249-f17b-4036-9e65-309148c97ce4/national-lidar-programme> [Accessed December 2025].
- Ref 4 Office of National Statistics (ONS) on Counties and Unitary Authorities (UK) and Parish and Non-civil Parish Areas (England and Wales). Available at <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/>. [Accessed 10 October 2024].
- Ref 5 Leeds City Council, “Conservation Area locations, appraisals and management plans” [no date]. Available at: <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/conservation-protection-and-heritage/conservation-area>. [Accessed 10 October 2024].
- Ref 6 North Yorkshire Council, “Heritage, conservation areas and listed buildings” [no date]. Available at: <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/planning-and-conservation/heritage-conservation-areas-and-listed-buildings> [Accessed 10 October 2024].
- Ref 7 Historic England. “National Heritage List for England”, [no date] [Online]. Available [REDACTED] [Accessed 4 February 2025].
- Ref 8 National Library of Scotland. “Map Images,” [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 4 February 2025].
- Ref 9 Research Frameworks Network, “Regional Research Agenda for South Yorkshire”, [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 18 August 2025].
- Ref 10 Google Earth for publicly available aerial photographs and composite aerial/satellite imagery, [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 18 August 2025].
- Ref 11 UK Government, “The Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010,” 2010. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/305/contents/made>. [Accessed 18 August 2025].
- Ref 12 UK Government, “Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act,” 1979. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46>. [Accessed 18 August 2025].
- Ref 13 UK Government, “Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act,” 1990. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents>. [Accessed 18 August 2025].

- Ref 14 UK Government, "Treasure Act," 1996. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1996/24/contents>. [Accessed 18 August 2025].
- Ref 15 UK Government, "Burial Act," 1857. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/20-21/81/contents>. [Accessed 18 August 2025].
- Ref 16 UK Government, "Protection of Military Remains Act," 1986. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/35/contents>. [Accessed 18 August 2025].
- Ref 17 UK Government, "Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act," 1953. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Eliz2/1-2/49/contents>. [Accessed 18 August 2025].
- Ref 18 Department for Energy Security & Net Zero, "Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)," 2025. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1-2025>. [Accessed 13 January 2026].
- Ref 19 Department for Energy Security & Net Zero, "National Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)," 2025. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en-3-2025>. [Accessed 13 January 2026].
- Ref 20 Department for Energy Security & Net Zero, "National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5)," 2025. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-electricity-networks-infrastructure-en-5-2025>. [Accessed 13 January 2026].
- Ref 21 Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, "National Planning Policy Framework," 2024. [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/67aafe8f3b41f783cca46251/NPPF_December_2024.pdf. [Accessed 6 October 2025].
- Ref 22 UK Government, "The Hedgerow Regulations," 1997. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1997/1160/contents/made>. [Accessed 6 October 2025].
- Ref 23 Selby District Council, "Selby District Core Strategy Plan," 2013. [Online]. Available at: https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fileroot/planning_migrated/planning_policy/CS_Adoption_Ver_OCT_2013_REDUCED.pdf. [Accessed 2 February 2025].
- Ref 24 Selby District Council, "Selby District Local Plan. Part 1 - General Policies," February 2005. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/planning-and-conservation/planning-policy/planning-policy-your-local-area/selby-planning-policy/selby-development-plan/selby-district-local-plan-2005.%20Accessed%203%20March%202025>. [Accessed December 2025].

- Ref 25 North Yorkshire Council, “Selby Local Plan. Revised Publication (draft),” 2024 [Online]. Available at: <https://edemocracy.northyorks.gov.uk/documents/s28009/Appendix%201%20Revised%20Publication%20Local%20Plan%20Consultation%20Document.pdf>. [Accessed December 2025].
- Ref 26 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. “Environmental Improvement Plan 2025”. 2025 [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/692d8d9cce50d215cae962a5/Environmental_Improvement_Plan__EIP__2025.pdf [Accessed December 2025].
- Ref 27 Planning Inspectorate, “National Significant Infrastructure Projects: Technical Advice Page for Scoping Solar Development,” GOV.UK, 20 September 2024. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-technical-advice-page-for-scoping-solar-development> [Accessed 3 March 2025].
- Ref 28 T. Nixon, C. Holloway, K. Geary, P. Hinton and G. King, “Archaeology and Construction: good practice guidance (C799D),” 2021. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 9 September 2024].
- Ref 29 Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals, Chartered Institute for Archaeologist, and Institute of Historic Building Conservation, “Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK,” 2021. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 3 March 2025].
- Ref 30 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, “Archaeology and Solar Farms: Good Practice Guide,” Consultation Draft, 2025. [Online] Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 6 October 2025].
- Ref 31 Historic England, “Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment: Historic England Advice Note 15,” 2021. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 3 March 2025].
- Ref 32 Standards for Highways, “Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Sustainability & Environment Appraisal: LA 104 Environmental assessment and monitoring,” 2020. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2021/9/7/TG14-DMRB-LA-104-Environmental-assessment-and-monitoring.pdf> [Accessed 3 March 2025].
- Ref 33 Standards for Highways, “Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Sustainability & Environment Appraisal: LA 106 Cultural heritage assessment,” 2020. [Online]. Available at:

<https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2021/9/7/TG14-DMRB-LA-104-Environmental-assessment-and-monitoring.pdf>. [Accessed 3 March 2025].

- Ref 34 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, “Code of conduct: Professional ethics in archaeology,” 2014 rev.2025. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 20 November 2025].
- Ref 35 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, “Standards and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment,” 2014 rev.2020. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 20 November 2025].
- Ref 36 Historic England, “Statements of Significance: Analysis Significance in Heritage Assets. Historic England Advice Note 12,” 21 October 2019. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 20 November 2025].
- Ref 37 Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, “Planning Practice Guidance: Historic Environment,” Government of the United Kingdom Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 2014 rev.2019. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment>. [Accessed 3 March 2025].
- Ref 38 Historic England, “The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition),” 2017. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 5 March 2025].
- Ref 39 Historic England, “Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning Note 2,” 2015. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 3 March 2025].
- Ref 40 Historic England, “Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment,” 2008. [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 3 March 2025].
- Ref 41 National Highways, “Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB),” 2020. [Online] Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 3 March 2025].
- Ref 42 ClfA, “Codes, regulations and Standards, and guidance”, 2014 [Online]. Available at:

-
- Ref 43 [REDACTED] [Accessed 25 August 2025].
- Ref 44 M. Dalton, P. Rowe, S.Toase. "North Yorkshire, York and Lower Tees Valley Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) [data-set]", 2013 [Online]. Available at: [REDACTED] [Accessed 10 September 2025].
- Ref 45 Historic England, "Historic Landscape Characterisation" no date [Online] Available at: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [Accessed 10 September 2025].



Light Valley
Solar

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