WHITESTONE SOLAR FARM

Volume 6: Environmental Statement

6.8 Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology (Clean)

Application Document ref. EN0110020/APP/6.8.1
Revision 02
August 2026

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

whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk

Document Status					
Version	**Purpose of Document**	**Authored by**	**Reviewed by**	**Approved by**	**Review Date**
Rev01	DCO Submission	ERM	TLT, Pershing, DWD, Whitestone Net Zero Ltd	Whitestone Net Zero Ltd	1 June 2026
Rev02	Section 51 / 55 Updates	ERM	DWD, Pershing	Whitestone Net Zero Ltd	August 2026

Approval for Issue		
Whitestone Net Zero Ltd	[redacted]	1 August 2026

The following report and supporting infographics have been produced by human authors. Artificial Intelligence (AI) has not been used to create or alter the technical meaning of these materials. ERM is technology-enabled and may use technology including AI in service delivery, in compliance with all laws applicable to it. Where AI has been used as an administrative support function, this has been appropriately validated by human authors.

ERM take full ownership and responsibility for the report, notwithstanding that ancillary technology (including AI tools) may have been used in service provision.

Prepared by:

ERM

Prepared for:

Whitestone Net Zero Ltd

Contents

Tables

Figures (See ES Volume 3, Figures [EN0110020/APP/6.19])

Figure Number	Figure Title
7.4.15	Viewpoint 9: Ravenfield (East), Garden Lane / Ravenfield Footpath No.10 PRoW
7.4.35	Viewpoint 38: Thurcroft (South) / Thurcroft Footpath No.1 PRoW
7.4.36	Viewpoint 39: Ulley (South) / Ulley Footpath No.5 PRoW
7.4.48	Viewpoint 51: Harthill (South) / South Yorkshire Way - Boundary Route
8.1	Location of Study Areas
8.2	Geophysical Survey Results
8.3	Events within Order Limits

Figure Number	Figure Title
8.4	Areas of Heightened Archaeology within Order Limits
8.4.1	CH VP 1: Conisbrough Castle/Conisbrough Conservation Area
8.4.2	CH VP 2: Conisbrough Castle
8.4.3	CH VP 3: Clifton Conservation Area
8.4.4	CH VP 4: Roman Villa
8.4.5	Heritage Panorama Sequence 1 – 3, and 10: View towards Conisbrough Castle from Park Lane
8.4.6	Heritage Panorama Sequence 4 – 7 View towards Conisbrough Castle from PRoW Clifton to Firsby near Micklebring Gorse
8.4.7	Heritage Panorama Sequence 8 – 9: View towards Conisbrough Castle from Firsby Lane
8.4.8	Heritage Panorama Sequence 11: View towards Conisbrough from PRoW near Common Lane
8.4.9	Heritage Panorama Sequence 12 – 13: View towards Conisbrough Castle from near Kearsley Brook
8.4.10	Heritage Panorama Sequence 14: Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden North Elevation
8.4.11	Heritage Panorama Sequence 15: Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden Eastern Avenue
8.4.12	Heritage Panorama Sequence 16 – 17: Barlborough Conservation Area Ward Lane
8.4.13	Heritage Panorama Sequence 18 – 23: Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden Northern Avenue

Appendices (See Volume 3, Appendices [EN0110020/APP/6.20])

Appendix Number	Appendix Title
8.1	Legislation, Policy and Guidance
8.2	Cultural Heritage Baseline
8.3	Sieving Exercise
8.3.1	Sieving Exercise Assets
8.4	Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting
8.5	Geoarchaeological Desk Based Assessment
8.6	Geophysical Survey
8.7	Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy
8.8	Cable Corridor Geophysical Survey Report
8.9	Phase I Trial Trenching Report

Glossary

Term	Meaning
Cable Corridors	Corridors within which the high voltage cables would be constructed.
Conservation Area	Conservation Areas can be created where a local planning authority identifies an area of special architectural or historic interest, which deserves careful management to protect that character. An area has to be identified by the local authority as having a definite architectural quality or historic interest to merit designation. Conservation Areas are defined by local authorities within local plans and given extra protection through planning controls and considerations.
COSHH	Control of Substances Hazards to Health
Designated Asset	A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.
ES	Environmental Statement which presents the environmental information relating to the Proposed Development and assessment of potential effects. The ES has been prepared as part of the Application.
Heritage Asset	A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).
Heritage Significance	The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site's Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.
Historic Environment Records	Historic Environment Records (HERs) are information services maintained and managed by local authorities. They contain details on local archaeological sites and finds, historic buildings and historic landscapes and are regularly updated. This information is usually held in a database with a digital mapping system (Geographic Information System).
Listed Building	Designated asset. Buildings of special architectural and historic interest protected under relevant legislation.
Order Limits	Total area comprising the Site and Cable Corridor
Registered Park and Garden	The Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England (RPG) place on emphasis on designed landscapes. A registered park or garden is not protected by a separate consent regime. However, where planning permission is sought for development affecting a registered park or garden, the Local

Term	Meaning
	Planning Authority will consider the impact of the proposals on the site's special character and give great weight to its conservation.
Scheduled Monument	Designated asset. These sites can include standing stones, burial mounds, the remains of monastic buildings and more. They can be above or below ground and can consist of remains as well as structures that are still in use. Although archaeology and important historic sites are all around us, monuments are added to the Schedule if the Secretary of State considers that they are of national importance and that the protection which comes with scheduling would assist the monument's conservation. Scheduled Monuments are protected under relevant legislation.
Setting	The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.
The Applicant	Whitestone Net Zero Ltd
The Application	The Application will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero for a Development Consent Order.
The Proposed Development	The proposed Whitestone Solar Farm.
The Site	The land planned to be used for solar PV array and associated infrastructure, BESS substation, and landscaping and habitat enhancement. The Site is split into W1, W2, and W3.
Whitestone 1 (W1)	The northern parcels of the Whitestone Solar Farm.
Whitestone 2 (W2)	The middle parcels of the Whitestone Solar Farm.
Whitestone 3 (W3)	The southern parcels of the Whitestone Solar Farm.

Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
AD	Anno Domini
AOD	Above Ordnance Datum
BCE	Before Christian Era
BDC	Bolsover District Council
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System
BGS	British Geological Survey
BMPC	Braithwell with Micklebring Parish (BMPC)
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
CA	Conservation Area
CDC	City of Doncaster Council
CEMP	Construction and Environment Management Plan

Acronym	Meaning
CIfA	Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
CNP	Critical National Priority
CRAG	Conisbrough Research and Archaeology Group
DBA	Desk Based Assessment
DCC	Derbyshire County Council
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
HAS	Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity
HE	Historic England
HER	Historic Environment Records
LB	Listed Building
LDP	Local Development Plan
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MCIfA	Member of Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
NEDDC	North East Derbyshire District Council
NMP	National Mapping Project
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPS	National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
OS	Ordnance Survey
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
RMBC	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
RPG	Registered Park and Garden
SM	Scheduled Monument
SoS	Secretary of State
SYAS	South Yorkshire Archaeology Service
SYRF	South Yorkshire Historic Environment Research Framework
TA	Technical Appendix
oWSI	Outline Written Scheme of Investigation
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation
WWI	World War I/First World War
WWII	World War II/Second World War
W1	Whitestone 1
W2	Whitestone 2
W3	Whitestone 3
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility

Units

Units	Meaning
m	Metres
ha	Hectare
km	Kilometre

8 CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 This Chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) evaluates the potential effects of the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of Whitestone Solar Farm (the Proposed Development) in relation to Cultural Heritage and Archaeology. The Proposed Development is described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]**.

8.1.2 This Chapter of the Environmental Statement includes the following sections:

- Legislation, Policy, and Guidance
- Consultation
- Assessment Methodology
- Baseline
- Embedded Mitigation
- Assessment of Effects
- Additional Mitigation and Residual Effects; and
- Cumulative Effects.

Order Limits

8.1.3 The extent of the Order Limits is described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: The Site and Surrounding Area [EN0110020/APP/6.3]** and shown in **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.1: Order Limits [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**. The Proposed Development is described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and shown spatially on the **Works Plans [EN0110020/APP/2.3.1]**.

The Proposed Development

8.1.4 The Proposed Development involves the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of more than 100MW of solar photovoltaic (PV) array, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), onsite substations and supporting infrastructure, and grid connection infrastructure. The grid connection infrastructure would connect the Proposed Development to the National Grid at the new National Grid substation Brinsworth (Long Lane 400kV Substation), located east of Long Lane, Rotherham. National Grid has applied to Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council for the development of this new substation which is intended by National Grid to be operational in time for the Proposed Development to connect in 2029. This substation is therefore not included in the Proposed Development and is subject to a separate planning application taken forward by National Grid.

8.1.5 As the Proposed Development would have a generating capacity in excess of 100MW, it is considered to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under the Planning Act 2008.

8.1.6 The Proposed Development would be located within the Order Limits. The Order Limits encompass the total area of the Proposed Development comprising the Site and Cable Corridors. The Site is specifically the land that is planned to be used for solar PV array and associated infrastructure, BESS, substation, landscaping and habitat enhancement. The Site is split into Whitestone 1 (W1), Whitestone 2 (W2), and Whitestone 3 (W3).

8.1.7 Highway Works are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements, such as improvements to road edge where it is deteriorated, or temporary highway and traffic works required to safely accommodate the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) deliveries. These areas will support the movement of construction vehicles on narrower sections of the local highway network within parts of the construction vehicle routes to the Site (as described in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [EN0110020/APP/6.13.1]**).

8.1.8 This Chapter is supported by the following figures in **ES Volume 3, Figures [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**:

- **Figure 7.4.15: Viewpoint 9: Ravenfield (East), Garden Lane / Ravenfield Footpath No. 10 PRoW**
- **Figure 7.4.35: Viewpoint 38: Thurcroft (South) / Thurcroft Footpath No.1 PRoW**
- **Figure 7.4.36: Ulley (South) / Ulley Footpath No.5 PRoW**
- **Figure 7.4.48: Viewpoint 51: Harthill (South) / South Yorkshire Way – Boundary Route**
- **Figure 8.1: Location of Study Areas**
- **Figure 8.2: Geophysical Results**
- **Figure 8.3: Events within Order Limits**
- **Figure 8.4 Areas of Heightened Archaeology within Order Limits**
- **Figure 8.4.1: CH VP 1: Conisbrough Castle / Conisbrough Conservation Area**
- **Figure 8.4.2: CH VP 2: Conisbrough Castle**
- **Figure 8.4.3: CH VP 3: Clifton Conservation Area**
- **Figure 8.4.4: CH VP 4: Roman Villa**
- **Figure 8.4.5: Heritage Panorama Sequence 1 – 3, and 10: View towards Conisbrough Castle from Park Lane**
- **Figure 8.4.6: Heritage Panorama Sequence 4 – 7 View towards Conisbrough Castle from PRoW Clifton to Firsby near Micklebring Gorse**
- **Figure 8.4.7: Heritage Panorama Sequence 8 – 9: View towards Conisbrough Castle from Firsby Lane**
- **Figure 8.4.8: Heritage Panorama Sequence 11: View towards Conisbrough from PRoW near Common Lane**
- **Figure 8.4.9: Heritage Panorama Sequence 12 – 13: View towards Conisbrough Castle from near Kearsley Brook**

- **Figure 8.4.10: Heritage Panorama Sequence 14: Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden North Elevation**
- **Figure 8.4.11: Heritage Panorama Sequence 15: Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden Eastern Avenue**
- **Figure 8.4.12: Heritage Panorama Sequence 16 – 17: Barlborough Conservation Area Ward Lane**; and
- **Figure 8.4.13: Heritage Panorama Sequence 18 – 23: Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden Northern Avenue.**

8.1.9 Additional figures relevant to this Chapter are shown in **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic or Scheduled Monument Sites [EN0110020/APP/2.12]**.

8.1.10 This Chapter is also supported by the following appendices in **ES Volume 3, Appendices [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**:

- **Appendix 8.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance**
- **Appendix 8.2: Heritage Baseline**
- **Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise**
  - **Appendix 8.3.1: Sieving Exercise Assets**
- **Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting**
- **Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Desk Based Assessment**
- **Appendix 8.6: Geophysical Survey**
- **Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy**
- **Appendix 8.8: Cable Corridor Geophysical Survey Report; and**
- **Appendix 8.9: Interim Phase I Trial Trenching Report.**

8.1.11 This Chapter is to be read in conjunction with the following additional documents:

- **Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (oWSI) [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**
- **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**
- **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10]**
- **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP), [EN0110020/APP/5.11];** and
- **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) [EN0110020/app/5.13]**.

8.2 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

8.2.1 The relevant legislation, policy and guidance relating to cultural heritage, as detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Legislation Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, are outlined below.

Legislation

Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010

8.2.2 EN-1 (paragraph 5.9.24) provides the following:

> **"***The Secretary of State must also comply with the requirements on listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments, set out in Regulation 3 of the Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010.***"**

8.2.3 Regulation 3 provides as follows:

> (1) When deciding an application which affects a listed building or its setting, the decision-maker(1) must have regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
>
> (2) When deciding an application relating to a conservation area, the decision-maker must have regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
>
> (3) When deciding an application for development consent which affects or is likely to affect a scheduled monument or its setting, the decision-maker must have regard to the desirability of preserving the scheduled monument or its setting.

8.2.4 Clauses (1) and (2) of Regulation 3 are broadly equivalent to sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as applicable to applications determined under the Town and Country Planning Act[1].

8.2.5 Physical protection of Scheduled Monuments is provided under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979).[2] However, the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979) does not provide statutory protection for the *setting* of Scheduled Monuments, and, in doing so, Regulation 3(3) provides a higher level of statutory protection for Scheduled Monuments than would be the case under a TCPA application.

Treasure Act 1996

8.2.6 This legislation defines which object are classified as treasure and legally obliges the finder of treasure to report their find.

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

8.2.7 This Act consolidates and amends laws related to ancient monuments, providing for their investigation, preservation, and recording. It includes provisions for the protection of scheduled monuments and areas of archaeological importance.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

8.2.8 This Act provides special controls for buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest. It includes provisions for the listing of buildings, the control of works affecting listed buildings, and the designation of conservation areas.

National Heritage Act 2002

8.2.9 This act aims to expand the scope of responsibilities held by the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England to include vehicles, vessels, aircraft or movable structures in, on or under the seabed within the limits of the United Kingdom Territorial Waters adjacent to England. It is designed to enhance their capacity to fulfil their duties effectively. Additionally, it addresses associated matters to ensure comprehensive and effective governance.

Hedgerow Regulations 1997

8.2.10 The Hedgerow Regulations (1997) have no bearing on determinations of heritage 'significance' or 'impact' within the planning system. They are a triggering mechanism for notifying the Local Planning Authority (LPA) of the intended alteration or removal of any hedgerows classified as 'important'; such classification is to be determined with reference to a list of criteria appended to the regulations. A decision will then be made by the LPA, and consent either granted or refused in respect of the proposed alteration(s) / removal. Protection of Military Remains Act 1986

8.2.11 This legislation renders it unlawful to tamper with the remains of any downed, submerged, or stranded military aircraft or specified vessel without proper authorisation, regardless of casualties or whether the incident transpired during wartime or periods of peace. Any aircraft lost in the line of military duty is automatically classified as Protected Places under this statute.

Policy

National Policy Statements For Energy Infrastructure (2025)

8.2.12 The National Policy Statements for Energy Infrastructure outline the government's policy for delivering major energy infrastructure. The NPSs provide the primary policy against which the Secretary of State (SoS), and any examining authority/Planning Inspector appointed by the SoS, will determine Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) in England and Wales (including territorial waters and wider UK Renewable Energy Zones).

8.2.13 EN-1[3] comprises the 'Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy'. Section 4.2 of EN-1 establishes the principle of Critical National Priority (CNP) infrastructure (defined as nationally significant low carbon projects) – this applies a policy presumption that the urgent need for CNP Infrastructure to achieving energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, will in general outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy; and

- Section 5.9 of EN-1 sets out specific overarching provisions for the Historic Environment, all of which are aligned with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

8.2.14 EN-1 is supported by NPSs EN-2 to EN-6, of which the following is relevant to this EIA:

- EN-3 'National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure' 2025 [4].
- EN-5 'National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure' 2025, [5].

8.2.15 Applicants must continue to show how their application meets the requirements of the NPS's, as well as any other legal and regulatory requirements.

The National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

8.2.16 In addition to the aforementioned NPSs, the National Planning Policy Framework (2024)[6] is also of relevance insofar as that the provisions of NPS EN-1 are consistent with those of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Chapter 16. The majority of those provisions correspond directly. The consistency of the NPS provisions with those of the NPPF is acknowledged here because it bears on the validity of the guidance followed and methodology adopted in this Chapter; both are articulated with specific reference to the NPPF, but are considered applicable to Development Consent Order (DCO) applications, and have therefore been adopted. In addition to the aforementioned NPSs, the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) is also of relevance insofar as that the provisions of NPS EN-1 are consistent with those of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Chapter 16. The majority of those provisions correspond directly. The consistency of the NPS provisions with those of the NPPF is acknowledged here because it bears on the validity of the guidance followed and methodology adopted in this Chapter; both are articulated with specific reference to the NPPF, but are considered applicable to Development Consent Order (DCO) applications, and have therefore been adopted. Local Policy The following Local Policy is of relevance: City of Doncaster Council (CDC) – Doncaster Local Plan 2015-2035 (2021), policies 34 – 40[7];Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) – Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014)[8], policies SP40 – SP46 within Sites and Policies Document (2018)[9];

- North East Derbyshire District Council – North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2014 – 2034 (2021), policies SDC5 – SDC9[10]
- Sheffield City Council – Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009), policy CS74[11]
- Bolsover District Council – *Local Plan for Bolsover District* (2020), policies SC16 – SC21[12]
- Dinnington St John's Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2028 (Adopted May 2021), policy bed 1[13]
- Maltby Neighbourhood Plan (Adopted February 2024), policy M2[14]; and
- Wickersley Neighbourhood Plan 2012-2028 (Adopted May 2022), policy GP5[15].

Guidance

8.2.17 Supporting guidance that has been considered includes:

- Planning Practice Guidance – Historic Environment (July 2019)
- Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment
- Historic England (2016) Preserving Archaeological Remains Decision-Taking for Sites under Development

- Historic England (revised 2017) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets
- Historic England (2019) Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets. Historic England Advice Note 12
- Historic England (2020) Deposit Modelling and Archaeology: Guidance for Mapping Buried Deposits
- Historic England (2021) Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) guidelines: Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessment (2020); and
- CIfA (2020) Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeological and historic environment.

8.2.18 Further detailed information regarding the above legislation, policy and guidance can be found in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**.

8.3 Consultation

8.3.1 This section provides a summary of the consultation undertaken to date regarding Cultural Heritage and Archaeology for the Proposed Development.

EIA Scoping

8.3.2 A Scoping Opinion was sought from the Planning Inspectorate to determine the content of the assessment, as well as the approach and methods to be used. The outcomes of this exercise were documented in the Scoping Report (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**), which was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 23 April 2025. The Scoping Report captures the findings of the scoping exercise and outlines the technical guidance, standards, best practices, and criteria to be applied in the assessment to identify and evaluate the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.

8.3.3 A Scoping Opinion was received from the Planning Inspectorate on 03 June 2025 (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**).

8.3.4 **Table 8.1** summarises how this Chapter of the ES addresses key points from the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Opinion comments related to Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.

Table 8.1: Scoping Opinion Comments and How They Are Addressed in This ES

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
The Planning Inspectorate	**ID 3.3.1: Assessment of the Direct Effects to Heritage Assets Outside of the Site Boundary – All Phases** *"The Scoping Report proposes to scope the assessment of the direct effects to heritage assets outside the Site Boundary except those along transport routes on the basis that direct effects to heritage assets outside the Site Boundary would not be significant. However, Figure 9.5 identifies that there are a number of receptors that may located within close proximity to the Site Boundary and it is uncertain as to whether they would be subject to direct impacts from within the Site Boundary e.g. vibration from piling. In the absence of information such as evidence demonstrating clear agreement with relevant statutory bodies, the Inspectorate is not in a position to agree to scope these matters from the assessment. Accordingly, the ES should include an assessment of these matters, or the information referred to demonstrating agreement with the relevant consultation bodies and the absence of an LSE."*	This Chapter refers to these effects as Indirect Effects (Physical). Indirect Effects (Physical) to heritage assets located outside of the Order Limits, resulting from impacts such as ground vibration and potential ground contamination are assessed within this Chapter. Direct Effects within this Chapter are limited to physical disturbance of assets within the Order Limits.	Assumptions around Indirect Effects (Physical) and the level of ground vibration predicted as a result of the Proposed Development are outlined within Section 8.7.
The Planning Inspectorate	**ID 3.3.2: Indirect Effects to the Setting Heritage Assets within the Cable Route – All Phases** *"The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that above ground infrastructure associated with the cable route would be limited and the duration of indirect*	Indirect Effects (Setting) during the construction and decommissioning phases have been considered. It has been determined that temporary, short-term impacts to	An assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting, relating to the Cable Corridors are provided within Section 8.7.

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	effects relating to setting would be short during the construction phase. The Inspectorate agrees that significant indirect effects as a result of the operation within the cable route are unlikely to occur and this matter can be scoped out of the ES. However, the Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out of the construction and decommissioning phases as the estimated construction period would last for 24 to 36 months, and decommissioning is expected to take 12-24 months. The ES should include an assessment of significant effects for construction and decommissioning, unless evidence is provided in the ES demonstrating the absence of an LSE and agreement with the relevant consultation bodies."	the setting of assets within proximity to groundworks, e.g., plant engine noise during the stripping of overburden, might be generated, but would be **Not Significant**.	
The Planning Inspectorate	**ID 3.3.3: Study Area** *"The Scoping Report states that the Study Area including the Site itself and an area of 1 km from the scoping boundary will be used to inform the heritage baseline against potential direct impacts and effects of heritage assets and a Study Area of up to 3 km from the scoping boundary will be used to identify potential indirect effects to designated assets. However, the ZTV mapping provided at Appendix A2, Figure 8.1 identifies potential visibility beyond these extents. The ES should establish the Study Area with reference to the extent of the likely impacts and informed by fieldwork and the ZTV. The ES should demonstrate any agreement with relevant consultation bodies."*	The assessment of Indirect Effects has not been limited to a 3km Study Area. The Assessment of Indirect Effects has been guided by the bare earth ZTV of the Proposed Development, Setting site visits and the sensitivity of surrounding assets to a change in their setting. At a distance of greater than 3km from the Proposed Development, this sensitivity is guided by Setting Impacts resulting from changes to long distance views.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, provides a rationale for inclusion or exclusion within the detailed assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting. Both designated and non-designated assets are considered within the sieving exercise. **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting**

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
			[EN0110020/APP/6.20.1] considers the potential impacts and effects, with significant effects, in relation to EIA guidance, discussed within this Chapter.
The Planning Inspectorate	**ID 3.3.4: Study Area of Cumulative Impacts** *"The Scoping Report states that a 3 km Study Area will serve as the initial extent of the cumulative impact assessment and consideration would also be given to other relevant assets located beyond this search area. The Inspectorate considers the application of an arbitrary 3 km is not appropriate to determine the Study Area for cumulative effects. The ES should present an appropriate methodology for identifying and assessing cumulative effects and provide an assessment where effects are likely to be significant. The ES should demonstrate any relevant agreement with consultees."*	An assessment of Cumulative Effects is provided within Section 8.9. With regard to Cumulative Effects to heritage assets, assessment is guided by potential overlapping site boundaries, the bare earth ZTV of all projects under consideration and the sensitivity of surrounding assets to a change in their Setting. A 3km Study Area has not been used as a fixed boundary for assessment of Cumulative Setting Impacts.	An assessment of Cumulative Effects is provided within Section 8.9
Bolsover District Council (BDC)	It has been noted that the submitted documents have failed to identify the Grade I Listed Barlborough Hall (Historic England List Entry Number: 1108972), located approx. 1.15km from the development site boundary, and this will need including on the list of identified Heritage Assets, and appropriate assessment of the impacts of the development on this nationally important heritage	The Grade I Listed Barlborough Hall has been included within the Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1].** The listed building has been	Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**.

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	asset will need to be undertaken. Further to the above, we consider that it will be necessary to undertake viewpoint analysis from the upper floors and roof of the Grade I Listed Barlborough Hall, as well as additional viewpoints within or adjacent to its associated Conservation Area and Registered Park and Garden.	assessed as part of the associated Conservation Area and Registered Park and Garden. Photography from Barlborough Hall is presented in **ES Volume 3, Figures 8.4.10-8.4.13 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**	Consultation with the host and adjacent Local Planning Authorities (LPA), as well as Historic England (HE) has been conducted, with visualisations agreed for the ES., inclusive of bespoke cultural heritage visualisations intended to support the ES.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough (RMBC)	The Local Planning Policy section has not acknowledged the policies in the Core Strategy Document (CS23). As part of the local listing, the Council has been working collaboratively with other South Yorkshire local planning authorities on the South Yorkshire Local Heritage List and the Council has also formally adopted Rotherham heritage assets as part of the Rotherham Local Heritage List. The Council has adopted the Rotherham Heritage at Risk Strategy and the Register is regularly updated. South Yorkshire's Historic Environment Characterisation report is available on the Archaeology Data Service. These should be acknowledged and considered as part of the data source. The proposed methodology relating to assessment of heritage assets is noted (Chapter 9 onwards). The data sets identified at this stage include, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, as well as Registered Parks and Gardens, and Scheduled	This Chapter and its associated technical appendices have made reference to RMBC policy CS23. Production of the heritage baseline has made use of the South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation Project[16] and Local Heritage Lists. As above, the assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting has not been limited to a 3km Study Area. The Assessment of Indirect Effects has been guided by the bare earth ZTV of the Proposed Development and the sensitivity of surrounding assets to a change in their setting. At a distance of greater than 3km from the Proposed Development,	See **ES Volume 3, Appendices 8.1- 8.4 [EN0110020/APP/6.20].**

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	Monuments. A 1km radius search area is identified for all designated and non-designated heritage assets, and 3km for indirect effects (setting) to designated assets as well as selected non-designated assets. This search area should be increased to the higher-grade designated heritage assets Grade 1 and Grade II* to 5km. Particular concerns relate to the setting of the Grade I Listed Church of All Saints in Laughton-en-le-Morthen, whose spire is a very significant local landmark. The locations of the BESS and the Sub Stations should also be detailed on the reports and their impact on the designated and non-designated heritage assets should be assessed accordingly. RMBC have adopted a Local List of non-designated heritage assets which is attached at Appendix 2. This should be assessed within the appropriate search areas.	this sensitivity is guided by Setting Impacts resulting from changes to long distance views.	
South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS)	Development within the Site Boundary has the potential to impact upon any heritage assets of archaeological interest present, with the severity of the effect varying across the area dependant on the significance of the remains affected and the form of works proposed. The EIA Scoping Report identifies that direct impacts to heritage assets resulting in a significant impact are possible, and SYAS agree with the reports recommendation that is scoped into the EIA. We welcome the proposed methodology to further field evaluation, which is based on a multi-staged and iterative approach.	Consultation with SYAS regarding archaeology investigation and mitigation has been ongoing throughout the pre-submission process, including EIA production. Details on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology have also been included within the Construction, Operational and	Full details of embedded mitigation are provided in Section 8.6. See **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.9], Outline Operational Environmental**

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	The developer is already in direct communication with SYAS and has provided initial results of a geophysical survey and requested advice on the scope of further works. This work is essential to comply with planning policy and will enable an informed scheme to be developed that includes appropriate mitigation to avoid or minimise harm to heritage assets of archaeological interest. In respect to the commitments register (Appendix C of the EIA Scoping Report), we recommend that Cultural Heritage and Archaeology should be included as a consideration in the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan in order that appropriate measures are put in place to protect heritage assets across the full lifespan of the scheme. This would also be appropriate for Operation Environmental Management Plan, which is noted as proposed in the report but absent for the commitments register.	Decommissioning Management Plans.	**Management Plan (oOEMP) [EN0110020/APP/5.10],** and **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP), [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**
Braithwell with Micklebring Parish (BMPC)	This simple, intact historic landscape is designated as an Area of Special Landscape Value. It is a strongly rural and in places tranquil landscape due in part to the lack of roads. There are some long views to urban areas, but overall, the landscape value and quality are considered to be high. In BWMPC opinion LVIA Landscape viewpoints are taken from inside the development area and take no reference to views onto Conisbrough Parks or the impact on long range view both locally and outside the area. Viewers in this landscape include	Where the landscape character surrounding a heritage asset contributes towards its significance, and its setting may be changed as a result of the Proposed Development, this has been considered within **ES Volume 3, Technical Appendices 8.3 and 8.4**	See **ES Volume 3, Appendices 8.3 and 8.4 [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** for the assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting. See **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7]**

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	residents on the elevated urban edges of Conisbrough immediately to the north, residents in the villages on the edge of the limestone plateau to the east, residents of the scattered farmsteads and users of the network of Public Rights of Way. Less sensitive viewers include those using the roads just outside the LCA. The sprawl of this proposal is vast and affects residents far and wide from a vista perspective.	With regard to a more general assessment of impacts to landscape character, this is considered in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.7].**	
Historic England (HE)	Given the extent of the proposed solar array and the topography of the application site, this development is likely to be visible across a very large area. As a result, it could affect the significance of heritage assets at some distance from the Site itself. We would expect the assessment to clearly demonstrate that the extent of the proposed Study Area is of the appropriate size to ensure that all heritage assets likely to be affected by this development have been included and can be properly assessed. Our initial assessment shows that there are numerous designated heritage assets within 5km of the Proposed Development. We expect the ES to present a reasoned and appropriately detailed assessment of impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets. It is important that the assessment is designed to ensure that all impacts are fully understood. Section drawings and techniques such as photomontages are a useful part of this and should include both	HE guidance regarding sustainable development has been consulted and is detailed within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** The potential for sealed Early Prehistoric buried landforms and assets is discussed within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Desk Based Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1].** A geoarchaeological desk-based assessment to support the heritage baseline is provided within this document. Setting has not been limited to a 3km Study Area. The Assessment of Indirect Effects has been guided by the	See **ES Volume 3, Appendices 8.1-8.4 [EN0110020/APP/6.20].** See **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1].** Cumulative Effects are discussed in further detail in Section 8.9.

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	fixed and dynamic/kinetic viewpoints. The assessment should also take account of the potential impact which associated activities (such as construction, servicing and maintenance, and associated traffic) might have upon perceptions, understanding and appreciation of the heritage assets in the area. The assessment should also consider, where appropriate, the likelihood of alterations to drainage patterns. This might lead to in situ decomposition or destruction of below ground archaeological remains and deposits and can also lead to subsidence of buildings and monuments. We have the following specific comments to make regarding the content of the ES: • Conisbrough Castle occupies a strategic hilltop location at the northeast end of Conisbrough, a town itself situated on a prominent ridge. The outer bailey of the castle is roughly defined by Castle Hill to the west and extant earthworks to the north, east, and south. The Site is a significant example of medieval military architecture used as a statement of power in South Yorkshire, with its well-preserved keep being one of the finest examples of a late 12th-century great tower. As such, we would expect that the ES will include a full assessment looking at the contribution made to the significance of Conisbrough Castle by its setting, in line with Historic England: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice	bare earth ZTV of the Proposed Development and the sensitivity of surrounding assets to a change in their setting. At a distance of greater than 3km from the Proposed Development, this sensitivity is guided by Setting Impacts resulting from changes to long distance views. Further details of this and Consbrough Castle is discussed in **ES, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1].**	

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition): The Setting of Heritage Assets • The area has a dynamic later Pleistocene and early Holocene geomorphological history (Glacial Lake Humber, etc.) and may include areas of deep alluvium that can seal prehistoric land surfaces and human activity • Careful consideration should be given at this point, therefore, to the staged approach for archaeological survey and evaluation. The starting point should be a desk-based geoarchaeological study to consider the geomorphological history of the area • Magnetometry may not be the most appropriate geophysical survey technique for the development area as it is more suited to detecting near surface anomalies; • In specific circumstances, techniques such as earth resistance tomography may be better suited • A desk-based geomorphological study would also be invaluable when planning any necessary geoarchaeological and paleoenvironmental work (boreholes, deposit modelling, etc.) • It may also demonstrate that long, linear and shallow trial excavation trenches may not be appropriate in all circumstances; deep and stepped down trenches may be required to evaluate deeply buried prehistoric archaeology • Reference should be made to Historic England 2021: Commercial renewable energy development and the historic		

Consultee	Issue Raised	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	environment Historic England Advice Note 15. Swindon, in Section 6.2 to inform and guide the assessment works. • The ES should include Heritage Assessments for both designated and non-designated Archaeology and Built Heritage assets. The scope and methodology for these assessments will need to be defined and agreed at an early stage and clearly presented in the ES; and • Cumulative effects on the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets and the landscape character should be thoroughly analysed and presented in the ES. Cumulative effects of the development alongside those of other proposed developments in a defined geographic proximity to the project; and cumulative effects for a single receptor where multiple impacts are predicted to arise from the scheme, should be considered.		

Statutory Consultation

8.3.5 A statutory consultation period was held between 16 September and 28 October 2025 in line with Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008. Feedback was sought from the local community and a range of consultee bodies based on the preliminary information and assessments presented in the ES.

8.3.6 **Table 8.2** presents feedback from statutory consultees given at Statutory Consultation, and how this is addressed in this ES.

8.3.7 A targeted consultation period was held between 23 February and 25 March 2026 on proposed changes to the Order Limits. This included notifying relevant prescribed consultees. Feedback from this targeted consultation and the Applicant's response is included in the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.2].**

Table 8.2 Feedback from the Statutory Consultation Period

Consultee	Consultee Feedback	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
Historic England September 2025 and 28th January 2026	Criteria for assigning value: HE note *'…that the proposed approach to criteria for assigning value to heritage assets, as laid out in Table 8.3 Criteria for Assigning Value, is not appropriately robust.'* 3km Study Area: In May 2025 HE gave their initial response *'…that given the extent of the proposed solar array and the topography of the application site, this development is likely to be visible across a very large area. As a result, it could affect the significance of heritage assets at some distance from the site itself. We expected 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.'* With regard to Conisbrough Castle, *'…the proposed site is the only remaining area in which the castle can be experienced in combination with the historical main route into Conisbrough through to the verdant and agrarian landscape setting, rather than latter urban and suburban sprawl. This rural,*	<u>Criteria for assigning value:</u> The proposed methodology has been revised to align with the National Planning Policy Framework and Historic England Guidance. <u>3km Study Area:</u> A 3km Study Area has been used to inform the baseline of designated and non-designated heritage assets, a sieving exercise (see **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**) was produced following a review of all assets within a provisional 3km Setting Study Area. High value assets (Scheduled Monuments and Grade I Listed Buildings) beyond 3km were included within the sieving exercise and included for detailed assessment of Indirect Effects relating to Setting, where they fall within the bare earth ZTV and long-distance views towards the Proposed Development contribute towards their Setting and Cultural Significance. <u>Conisbrough Castle:</u> A dynamic assessment was undertaken for the setting of Conisbrough Castle, which included travelling on foot and car through the	Criteria for assigning value is addressed in Section 8.4. 3km Study Area is addressed in Section 8.5. Conisbrough Castle: The results of this dynamic assessment has been incorporated into the Setting assessment for Conisbrough Castle in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**

Consultee	Consultee Feedback	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	medieval town to castle transition through the landscape makes an important experiential contribution to the significance of the castle. The contribution the application site makes to the setting of the castle has been undervalued in the Draft ES.' HE noted that a geoarchaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) (**Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Desk Based Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**) has been undertaken. They continued to say '*Based on the geoarchaeological DBA, magnetometry is the most suitable geophysical survey technique for the majority of the proposed development area, which was Historic England's primary concern given the geomorphological history of the area. We also understand from the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) that an alternative geophysical survey technique, electromagnetic induction (EMI), will be employed in areas of Whitestone 1 affected by green waste that obscured any archaeological anomalies present. A further programme of archaeological evaluation will also be required to*	main thoroughfare of Doncaster to Sheffield road, as well as the public footpaths which cross through Conisbrough Parks to the south of the castle (**ES, Figure 8.4.1 – 8.4.2: Cultural Heritage Viewpoints [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**). A first phase of trial trenching (Phase I) has already been undertaken; this targeted those areas for which permanent infrastructure is proposed. Results are provided in **Volume 3, Appendix 8.9: Phase I Trial Trenching Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]** In addition, the following have been prepared and submitted alongside the Application: • An **outline Written Scheme of Investigation [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** presenting the scope and methodology for a programme of further archaeological fieldwork (Phase II), to be undertaken post-consent, in liaison with SYAS; and • An Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) (within **Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation**	

Consultee	Consultee Feedback	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	ground truth the geophysical survey results and assumptions made in the geoarchaeological DBA. This should be devised following advice from SYAS with input from the Historic England Science Advisor, as appropriate.'	**Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** presenting a strategy by which archaeological remains of a level of significance warranting preservation in situ would be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning. During the preparation of these documents, the use of EM Survey, and a wide variety of other methods, has been discussed with SYAS.	
City of Doncaster Council (CDC)	Regarding Historic Landscape: CDC refer to SYAS on this matter Regarding Conisbrough Park: CDC states that Conisbrough Park has exceptional heritage and archaeological significance that has been underestimated in existing assessments. The area's historic parkland, deer park field boundaries, and long-range views to the limestone ridge are central to its character. CDC considers that the Proposed Development would irreversibly damage this significance, cannot be adequately mitigated, and therefore Whitestone 1 should be removed entirely from the Order limits. Regarding Clifton Conservation Area:	Further details can be found Section 8.3 and **Table 8.3** for details of SYAS Consultation. <u>Regarding Conisbrough Park:</u> Conisbrough Park (02958/01) is currently designated as a non-designated asset in terms of significance. It's description in the HER record acknowledges that its existence is known primarily through documentary sources and also acknowledges its changing use and form through economic and social changes. Whilst a recently found small ditch supports its historic use as a deer park, its current value as a deer park is low, due to its physical form having undergone many changes. Therefore, whilst the deer park is	Conisbrough Park: The results of this dynamic assessment has been incorporated into the Setting assessment for Conisbrough Castle in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]** Clifton Conservation Area: The results of this dynamic assessment has been incorporated into the Setting assessment for Clifton Conservation Area in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect**

Consultee	Consultee Feedback	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	Clifton is a historic agricultural village on the Magnesian Limestone ridge, designated entirely as a Conservation Area. Its significance lies in its medieval origins, largely intact linear form, traditional limestone buildings, narrow lanes, and strong visual relationship with the surrounding rural landscape and views towards Conisbrough. CDC concludes that *'…the proposed development would significantly harm the setting of the Conservation Area…'* and that minor design changes made to date are *'…negligible and in no way overcome the harm that would arising to the setting of Clifton Village.'*	acknowledged, it is assessed as part of the Conisbrough Castle Setting assessment. <u>Regarding Clifton Conservation Area:</u> Design refinement has removed the parcels to the south of Clifton from the Order Limits, along with reducing the parcels to the west of the Conservation Area.	**Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) 23rd October 2025	Detailed comments were provided by RMBC for Statutory Consultation regarding cultural heritage. These are detailed in full within the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.1]** included in the Application. The relevant comments to the EIA have been summarised and responded to in this table. RMBC provides detailed comments on the impact of the solar farm on designated heritage assets across the Whitestone project areas. Particular	<u>Regarding Blue Man's Bower:</u> In a video call discussion on 26 January 2026, it was clarified with RMBC that the substation option to the west of Blue Man's Bower (named as W2 P1 at Draft ES stage) has since been removed in the design refinement. Further details of this are presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]**. It was further clarified the Long Lane substation to the east is not associated with the Proposed Development but is	<u>Regarding Blue Man's Bower:</u> This is discussed in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].** Regarding Spa House farm: The results of this setting assessment has been incorporated into the Setting assessment for Farm Building at Spa House Farm approximately 35 Metres to North of farmhouse in **ES**

Consultee	Consultee Feedback	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	concern is expressed about substantial harm to listed farm buildings near Spa House Farm and potential substantial harm to the Scheduled Ancient Monument Blue Man's Bower due to proposed substations: RMBC's comments regarding farm buildings around Spa House Farm are as follows: *'Farmbuilding at Spa House Farm Approximately 12 metres to the southwest of Farmhouse Grade II listed. The proposals include a large area of solar arrays close to the east of this Grade II listed building. It is therefore considered this close proximity to the listed building along with the lack of landscape mitigation and enhancement would directly harm its setting, by "industrialising" the wider landscape and removing the rural context of this historic farmstead. The harm due to proximity is substantial and as such significant concerns are raised.* *Farmbuilding at Spa House Farm approximately 35 metres to north of farmhouse Grade II listed. This listed building forms the northwestern boundary of this grouping of agricultural buildings at Spa House Farm. Its visual prominence is greater*	being taken forward by the National Grid. It is featured within the Order Limits due to a cable connection being required to connect to the National Grid. <u>Regarding Spa House Farm:</u> Since the Draft ES, design evolution has taken into account the setting of these buildings, with the Order Limits being pushed back to the north-east further from the asset. Cultural heritage viewpoints and visualisations have been agreed with RMBC, and are provided in **ES Volume 3, Figures 8.4.1 – 8.4.13 [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**. These have been produced in line with LVIA requirements, and therefore the photomontages show Year 1 and Year 15 views. This is deemed to be sufficient to provide a worst-case view (Year 1) when planting has not established, and a realistic view (Year 15) to demonstrate the effect of mitigation planting once it has established. Further details of what will occur in the decommissioning phase, and what is proposed for the mitigation areas is provided in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and the	**Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1].** The change to Order Limits is also discussed within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].** Photomontages were discussed and agreed upon with the LPA and HE and have been utilised in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]** Further details of what will occur in the decommissioning phase, and what is proposed for the mitigation areas is provided in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** and the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, The Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) (presented with the **ES**

Consultee	Consultee Feedback	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	in the public realm due to the presence of a public right of way directly adjacent. The close proximity of the solar farm to this Grade II listed building, and in particular its proximity to public views, would lead to substantial harm to its setting.' RMBC's comments regarding Blue Man's Bower are as follows: *'Blue Man's Bower Scheduled Ancient Monument. This important Scheduled Moated Site is located on flat land to the southeast of Whiston in the Rother valley, the surrounding land is open and exposed. The proposed solar farm and in particular the greater visual impact of the proposed substation adjacent J33 of the M1 and to a lesser extent the potential substation at Brinsworth B, to the west of Long Lane have the potential for substantial harm to the setting of this Scheduled Ancient Monument.* *The immediate setting of Blue Mans Bower remains rural which greatly enhances and preserves it setting. Though the M1 and the A630 harm its wider setting, the presence of the raised A630 screens the existing Brinsworth substation from views from the site. The proposed substation extension to the east of the A630*	**oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]**, which will be secured through a Requirement of the DCO. Decommissioning is expected to involve the dismantling and recycling of the solar PV arrays. Certain components, such as landscape and biodiversity mitigation and site access tracks would be left in place, subject to landowner agreement. An Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) (presented with the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**) has been prepared alongside this Chapter. The APS formalises the strategy by which: • known significant archaeological remains identified for preservation in situ will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning; and • as yet unrecorded significant archaeological remains, such as might be identified during post-consent field investigations, and	**Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**)

Consultee	Consultee Feedback	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	would substantially harm the wider setting of this Scheduled Ancient Monument and coupled with the proposed substation to the east of Long Lane would lead to at worst substantial harm and at best less than substantial harm at the higher end. *Further survey work would need to be carried out to ascertain the full visual impact and harm to this Scheduled Ancient Monument. However, at the present time concern is raised about the visual harm to the setting of this site.'* The Council stresses the need for photomontages agreed with heritage professionals to assess impacts and for plans detailing land use post-decommissioning to safeguard heritage settings: *'Before a full detailed analysis of the impact upon their setting can be made, full photomontages of the development from all affected viewpoints are required. The methodology for these should be agreed with the Council before the work is undertaken and should be prepared by Heritage professionals. It is expected that this work should dovetail with the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).* i	determined to warrant preservation in situ, will be protected during installation, operation, and decommissioning. In summary, the strategy provides for the use of non-intrusive infrastructure and a sensitive installation / decommissioning strategy, the detail of which is described in full. The APS would be maintained, and the measures it contains adhered to, by the Site administrator (the Client), or their successor(s) in title, through to point of decommission.	

Consultee	Consultee Feedback	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	The photomontages would also need to be submitted showing the impact of proposed landscape mitigation and enhancement areas. This will need to be done in phases throughout the lifetime of the development. The first set will need to show the visual impact on year 1 then year 5 then year 10, then year 20, year 30. However, noting that the methodology may already have been agreed for the LVIA. *Further information in the form of plans detailing what would happen to the land after decommissioning and in particular the landscape mitigation and enhancement areas is also required. This is particularly important as the loss of these landscape and enhancement areas could significantly alter the setting of the identified designated heritage assets.'* SYAS highlights that archaeological impact assessments are provisional pending further field evaluation, including geophysical surveys and trenching, and recommends a detailed Archaeology Management Plan.": *'Overall, whilst the methodology utilised is acceptable, further field evaluation is required to adequately inform the assessment of heritage significance. Wider consideration of*		

Consultee	Consultee Feedback	How This is Addressed	Where This is Addressed in the ES
	operational and decommissioning direct impacts is also required to establish the full-lifetime impact of the proposals. Mitigation measures outlined could reduce or avoid significant impacts but will need to be tied to an appropriate outline archaeological management plan to demonstrate the options available and how they will be delivered. *As such, the current assessment of impacts to archaeological remains must be considered provisional. Further archaeological information is required as significant impacts could still occur.'*		

Targeted Consultation

8.3.8 A targeted consultation period was held between 23 February and 25 March 2026 on proposed changes to the Order Limits. This included notifying relevant prescribed consultees. Feedback from this targeted consultation and the Applicant's response is included the **Consultation Report [EN0110020/APP/5.2].** No comments were provided by statutory consultees through the targeted consultation period in relation to Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.

8.3.9 A second Targeted Consultation was held for any individuals that had been identified as land interests after the Statutory Consultation. No comments were provided by statutory consultees through the Targeted Consultation period in relation to Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.

Other Consultation

8.3.10 Engagement has been ongoing with SYAS, to develop a proportionate programme of archaeological fieldwork, intended to further inform the heritage baseline and provide assurance that the magnitude of any impacts, and significance of any corresponding effects, are well understood for submission of this ES. This programme of works has also been used to identify non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest where it may be necessary to mitigate by design, inform the final mitigation strategy of the Proposed Development and guide the need for and scope of further pre-construction archaeological site work which may be required.

8.3.11 Additional engagement has also been undertaken with HE to discuss the programme of fieldwork, and to specifically discuss the potential for sealed below ground remains associated with Early Prehistoric landforms and material.

8.3.12 Further engagement was also undertaken with HE, the host LPA and adjoining LPAs in relation to Indirect Effects to Setting, the need for any additional heritage assets to be considered in this assessment and the scope of any visualisations necessary to inform this ES.

8.3.13 Further details of this consultation can be found in **Table 8.3.**

Table 8.3: Summary of Other Consultation

Consultee	Date	Summary of Discussion	Where is this addressed in the ES
South Yorkshire Archaeological Service (SYAS)	16 January 2025	A discussion was held with SYAS, the ERM Cultural Heritage Team and the Applicant to discuss an approach to fieldwork and the scope of archaeological site works needed to support the ES in accordance with NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3. A programme of geophysical survey across the Proposed Development was considered the starting point for informing the heritage baseline. At this meeting it was agreed that a bespoke programme of archaeological fieldwork was required to supplement the information provided by the geophysical survey, further inform the heritage baseline and the potential for unrecorded heritage assets to survive buried within the Site as well as to assess the value and significance of sub surface archaeological remains. SYAS agreed that a fixed sampling strategy for archaeological trial trenching would not be suitable, and the scope of works required should be focused and targeted, but sufficient to allow the significance of any heritage assets affected to be adequately understood.	A summary of the results of the geophysical survey are provided within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1].** **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**)
CRAG (Conisbrough Research and	23 April 2025	An in-person meeting was held between ERM and CRAG, accompanied by a site visit to discuss the location and research of the Firsby Pottery Site	This meeting contributed to the infrastructure of parcels 31 – 33 (**ES Volume 3,**

Consultee	Date	Summary of Discussion	Where is this addressed in the ES
Archaeology Group)		(HER 02071/01), along with the potential impacts the Proposed Development might have.	**Figure 6.1: Land Parcel References [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**) being pushed back, to prevent disruption to the associated archaeology. Further details of this are discussed in Section 8.6 and in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4].**
SYAS	17 July 2025	A meeting was held with SYAS to present a Scope of Archaeological Works for further investigation of sub surface archaeological remains within the Order Limits. Initial discissions were also held over the Scope of Archaeological Works to be completed within the Cable Corridors ahead of submission of the ES.	Consultation with SYAS is ongoing over the scope of additional archaeological site works as detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**).
SYAS	30 September 2025	A call was had with SYAS to discuss the scheme. It was mentioned that SYAS are moving towards a regional approach for large scale solar developments, and they have put together a preferred package for pre-determination assessment that will be applicable to all such schemes. This will look for a mixture of fixed percentage sampling within high impact areas and limited targeted	Consultation with SYAS is ongoing over the scope of additional archaeological site works as detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and**

Consultee	Date	Summary of Discussion	Where is this addressed in the ES
		trenching in areas for the solar array, to be informed by geophysics results. The archaeological approach that SYAS proposes was discussed, and the next steps for agreeing the Stage 1 archaeological investigations.	**Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**).
SYAS	4 March 2026	A discussion was held with SYAS, the ERM Cultural Heritage Team and the Applicant to discuss the updated Order Limits, ongoing archaeological investigations, and the potential scope of future investigations.	Consultation with SYAS is ongoing over the scope of additional archaeological site works as detailed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**.
Historic England	16 September 2025	An introductory meeting detailing the Proposed Development, the archaeological investigations completed at that time, and details of the information included within the Draft ES. Discussions focussed around consideration of Conisbrough Castle, the Roman Villa Scheduled Monument, and Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden. Historic England stated that comments would be provided once the Draft ES had been reviewed, requested further consultation was completed once more information is available regarding the assessment of potential impacts on Conisbrough Castle, and stated what they would expect to be considered regarding the setting assessment for Barlborough Hall.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**

Consultee	Date	Summary of Discussion	Where is this addressed in the ES
Historic England	28 January 2026	The discussion focussed around responding to Historic England's Statutory Consultation comments, including sharing further information on the assessment of potential impacts to Conisbrough Castle and Barlborough Hall. Details were also provided regarding the changes to the design of the Proposed Development to mitigate potential impacts on designated assets. Historic England requested a dynamic setting assessment for Conisbrough Castle, stated they would be happy to be involved in conversations with SYAS regarding archaeological investigations and were content that the Applicant knew what needed to be completed for the assessment within the Environmental Statement.	The dynamic assessment was undertaken and incorporated into **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]** for the specific assets of Conisbrough Castle and Barlborough Hall.
City of Doncaster Council and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	26 January 2026	A joint meeting was held with the Planning and Heritage Officers at CDC and RMBC to discuss their Statutory Consultation comments and introduce the proposed design changes of the Proposed Development with relevance to heritage features / assets. Focus was given to consideration of Conisbrough Castle, the expectation of a landscape-based approach to mitigation, consideration of cumulative impacts, and the setting of Conservation Areas such as Brampton, Treeton, Harthill, Ulley, and Anston.	**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**
North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC)	3 February 2026	An introductory meeting with NEDDC was held to introduce the key heritage sensitivities and ERM's approach to the heritage assessment. NEDDC were content with the reduction in the Order Limits and are happy with ERM's assessment approach and thought	With regards to St Giles Church, the site visit assessed that the Church would not be impacted by the Proposed Development.

Consultee	Date	Summary of Discussion	Where is this addressed in the ES
		it was sensible. They suggested that St Giles Church should be considered a sensitive receptor to the Proposed Development.	Further details can be found within **ES Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** The reduction of Whitestone 3 is referenced in **ES Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** and in Section 8.6.5 of this Chapter.

Issues Scoped Out

8.3.14 The Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Chapter of the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 2.1: Scoping Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** proposed to Scope Out:

- Indirect Effects (Physical) to heritage assets outside the Order Limits; and
- Indirect Effects to Settings associated with construction of the Cable Corridors.

8.3.15 Following the receipt and review of the issued Scoping Opinion, these aspects are included within the assessment.

8.4 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

8.4.1 This section sets out the scope and methodology for the assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage and archaeology from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.

The Study Area

8.4.2 In order to assess potential direct and indirect physical effects, and indirect effects to setting, two Study Areas have been utilised (**ES Volume 3, Figure 8.1: Location of Study Areas [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**):

- Heritage baseline to inform direct and indirect effects (physical) - 1km Study Area; and
- Indirect effects to setting - 3km Study Area.

8.4.3 These Study Areas are based on the Site, as described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: The Site and Surrounding Area [EN0110020/APP/6.3]**.

8.4.4 These Study Areas have been established based on a contextual review of the Proposed Development and the understanding of potential impacts within the historical and archaeological baseline, as informed through desk-based study and fieldwork.

8.4.5 The 1km Study Area has been used to inform the heritage baseline against which potential Direct Effects and Indirect Effects (Physical) to known and currently unrecorded heritage assets have been assessed. This Study Area takes in the Site (W1 – 3) and the land within 1km of the Site boundary. In relation to the Cable Corridors, the ES reviews assets within the footprint of the Cable Corridors. The wider historic environment has been considered as and when pertinent to the Proposed Development.

8.4.6 The 3km Study Area is used as a starting point for assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting. The Study Area takes in the Site and land up to 3km from the Site. The Study Area was used to identify assets to be include within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**. From this gazetteer a final list of assets considered for detailed assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting was produced. Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting pertaining to the Cable Corridors has utilised the 3km Study Area as a starting point, with assets located in proximity to the route of Cable Corridors considered individually and assessed where their Setting may be altered through localised changes during construction.

8.4.7 The 3km Study Area was not employed as a hard boundary. Assets between 3 - 5km were considered within the Sieving Exercise where they fell within the bare earth ZTV (**Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**) of the Proposed Development, and where long-distance views taking in the Proposed Development might contribute to significance.

8.4.8 Within the 3km Study Area, there are six LPAs:

- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
- City of Doncaster Council
- Sheffield City Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- North East Derbyshire District Council; and
- Bolsover District Council

8.4.9 Three of these, RMBC, CDC and Sheffield City Council utilise the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) for advice and input into archaeological and heritage matters pertaining to developments, whilst Derbyshire County Council have their own in-house archaeology and planning team.

Identifying Receptors and Receptor Value (Significance)

8.4.10 The value of a heritage asset (its heritage significance) is guided by its designated status but is also derived from its heritage 'interest', which may be characterised as archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic (NPPF Annex 2, Glossary and NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.9.3)[17].

8.4.11 Advice Note 12, published by Historic England[18], offers an interpretation of the various heritage interests that an asset can possess, based on terms provided in the NPS-EN1 and NPPF Glossary:

- Archaeological interest: *"there will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point*
- Architectural and artistic interest: *"These are interests in the design and general aesthetics of a place. They can arise from conscious design or fortuitously from the way the heritage asset has evolved. More specifically, architectural interest is an interest in the art or science of the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures of all types. Artistic interest is an interest in other human creative skills, like sculpture."*; and
- Historic interest: *"An interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material record of our nation's history but can also provide meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity."*

8.4.12 Following assessment of heritage interests, each asset was assigned a value in accordance to criteria set out in **Table 8.4**.

8.4.13 Informed by the NPPF and NPS EN-1, the three-point scale presented in **Table 8.4**, has been employed as a guide for assigning value to heritage assets in this assessment. It is also recognised, however, that assigning value to a heritage

asset is not as straightforward as matching a designation or asset type to tabulated criteria. Professional judgement has, therefore, also been applied in all cases to discern the level of value, considering all the varied components of archaeological, historical, architectural and artistic interest that can contribute to an asset's heritage value.

8.4.14 Historic England's 'Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets', Historic England Advice Note 12 (2019), also promotes the use of this terminology and methodology, both of which are therefore adopted for the purposes of this ES. This approach allows for a detailed and justifiable determination of heritage significance and the interests from which that significance derives.

8.4.15 The nature and character of conservation areas varies greatly; from urban areas to houses set in country parks. The special character of these areas is derived from the quality of their buildings and elements that contribute value and character to the wider landscape. In consideration of this variation, conservation areas feature in both the High and Moderate value categories. Professional judgement has been applied on a case-by-case basis to determine the appropriate value category for each conservation area.

8.4.16 Setting can also contribute to the value of a heritage asset. The contribution of Setting to heritage value and significance is discussed within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**.

Table 8.4: Criteria for Assigning Value

Value	Description	Includes[i]
The highest	• Designated heritage assets of the highest significance (5.9.31 of EN-1); and • Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest of demonstrably equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments (EN-1, 5.9.7).	• World Heritage Sites • Scheduled Monuments • Grade I/II* Listed buildings • Grade I/II* RPGs • Protected Wreck Sites • Registered Battlefields • Certain Conservation Areas; and • Some non-designated assets
Less than the highest	• Designated heritage assets of less than the highest significance (EN-1, 5.9.30).	• Grade II Listed buildings • Grade II RPGs • All other Conservation Areas
Lower	• As identified either through the development plan making process by	• Non-designated buried archaeological remains

[i] Inclusive of but not limited to

	plan-making bodies, including 'local listing', or through the application, examination and decision-making process (EN-1, 5.9.9).[ii]; and • Non-designated remains considered to retain archaeological, architectural/artistic and/or historic interest, and therefore to be of significance.	• Non-designated above ground archaeological remains (e.g., earthworks, ruins, standing stones) • Non-designated historic buildings (including locally listed buildings); and • Non-designated historic landscape features

Methodology for the Assessment of Effects

8.4.17 The impact assessment presented in this Chapter involved six key stages:

- Identify known and potential heritage assets within the Study Area
- Assess the heritage significance of those assets and identify from what their significance derives
- Define the magnitude of impact of the Proposed Development upon the significance of susceptible heritage assets
- Determine whether any identified impacts resulting from construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Proposed Development would comprise a significant effect, for purposes of the EIA Regulations
- Identify, where possible and within the constraints of the Proposed Development, mitigation measures to negate or minimise any anticipated adverse impacts; and
- Identify the likely residual effects following the implementation of the mitigation measures.

8.4.18 The impact assessment methodology is broadly aligned with the general framework set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2.1].**

8.4.19 Once the value of a heritage asset has been defined (with reference to **Table 8.4**) and the level of harm to its significance has been determined (with reference to **Table 8.5**, a statement has been made, informed by professional judgment, as to whether the effect would be **Significant** or **Not Significant** for purposes of EIA. That is the requirement under the EIA Regulations (2017).

8.4.20 Detailed qualification has been provided to support these findings. Each finding is bespoke and not constrained by a pre-defined matrix and/or any quantifying terminology such as High, Medium, Low, Negligible etc., which can be overly

[ii] Para 5.9.7 of EN-1, requires 'clear evidence that such heritage assets have a significance that merits consideration in that process'.

reductive in relation to historic environment impacts (harm to heritage significance).

8.4.21 This is particularly true when considering potential Indirect Effects resulting from a change to setting and the contribution that setting makes to heritage significance. A varied and complex number of attributes may be considered to contribute to Setting. These may include but are not limited to:

- The asset's physical surroundings, inclusive of: Topography, aspect, other heritage assets, definition, scale and grain of surrounding space, formal design, orientation and aspect, historic materials and surface, green space, trees and vegetation, openness, enclosure and boundaries, functional relationships and communications, and history and degree of change over time; and
- The ability to appreciate the significance of an asset inclusive of: Surrounding landscape or townscape character, views from, towards, through or across the asset, intentional intervisibility with other assets or natural features, visual dominance, prominence or role as a focal point, noise, vibration and other nuisance, tranquillity, remoteness, wildness, busyness, bustle, movement and activity, odours, diurnal changes, sense of enclosure, seclusion, intimacy or privacy, land use, accessibility, permeability and patterns of movement, degree of interpretation or promotion to the public, rarity of comparable survivals of setting, cultural associations, celebrated artistic representations, and traditions.

8.4.22 Assessment of the level of overall significance of effects on heritage assets is determined by considering the value of the heritage asset and the magnitude of impact on it. Assessment of the significance of any effects considers any mitigation measures committed to by the Applicant for the Proposed Development.

8.4.23 Proposed mitigation measures are presented in Section 8.6.

Magnitude of Impact

8.4.24 **Table 8.5** below presents factors influencing the assessment of magnitude of impact on the basis of four ratings.

Table 8.5: Criteria for Assessing of Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Definition
Large	Total loss of, major damage to, or major alteration to a site, building or other feature. Extensive change to the setting of a feature (e.g. blocking or severance of key visual or other relationships, loss of dominance, intrusion on key views or sightlines).
Medium	Damage or alteration to a site, building or other feature. Change in the setting of a feature, e.g. intrusion on designed sight-lines and vistas.
Small	Minor damage or alteration to a site, building or other feature. Minor change in the setting of a feature (e.g. above historic skylines or in designed vistas).

None	No neutral, beneficial or adverse alteration to the asset or its ability to be experienced or understood.

Assessing Harm to Heritage Value

8.4.25 Effects are discussed in terms of harm to heritage significance (value) with reference to NPS EN-1, paras 5.9.21 – 5.9.34 as follows:

- Total loss
- Substantial harm
- Less than substantial harm; or
- No harm.

8.4.26 'Substantial harm or total loss' is defined as a level of harm that, as confirmed in 2013 case law,[iii] would *"have such a serious impact on the significance [value] of the asset that its significance [value] was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced"*. As such, 'substantial harm' is considered to be a high test in legal and policy terms, and it is further supported by NPPF National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) paragraph 018 and the finding of the Holocaust Memorial Inquiry, as called in by the Secretary of State and consented in 2021[iv].

8.4.27 'Less than substantial harm' is defined as being any lesser level of harm than that defined by 'substantial harm or total loss'. Recent case law has confirmed that this includes any level of harm (not considered substantial) regardless of its quantification, e.g. the finding of a 'negligible' level of harm must still be treated as less than substantial harm and be weighed in the balance under paragraph 5.9.33 of NPS EN-1[19].

8.4.28 PPG paragraph 018 provides that the category of harm identified for any given asset be 'explicitly identified', and that the extent of that harm be 'clearly articulated'. For purposes of this assessment, this is done with reference to a 'scale', e.g. at the lower/upper end of the scale of less than substantial.

8.4.29 NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.9.34 does not provide that harm to non-designated heritage assets be categorised as 'substantial' or 'less than substantial', only that a 'balanced judgement' be required, 'having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.

8.4.30 The High Court has clarified that preservation of significance does not mean no change; it specifically means no harm. This is echoed in Historic England's Good Practice Advice (GPA) 2, which states that *"Change to heritage assets is inevitable but it is only harmful when significance [value] is damaged"*.

Significance of Effects

8.4.31 Assessment of the significance of effects on heritage assets considers the embedded mitigation measures committed to by the Applicant presented in Section 8.6.

[iii] Bedford BC v SSCLG38, often referred to as the 'Bedford Ruling'.

[iv] APP/XF990/V/19/3240661.

8.4.32 Assessment of the level of overall significance of the effect is determined by cross-referencing the value of the heritage asset and the magnitude of impact upon it as shown in **Table 8.6**.

8.4.33 **Major** and **Moderate** effects are generally considered to be **Significant** in EIA terms, although professional judgment has been applied. Effects can be Adverse, Neutral or Beneficial.

Table 8.6: Matrix for Establishing Significance of Effect

Value	Magnitude of Impact			
	Large	**Medium**	**Small**	**None**
The highest	Major	Major	Moderate	None
Less than the highest	Major	Moderate	Minor	None
Lower	Moderate	Minor	None	None

Basis of Assessment

8.4.34 This section of the Chapter identifies the predicted drivers of impacts to heritage assets at construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning, against which the assessment of impacts and effects are measured. This section also rationalises the level of ground disturbance against which impacts and effects are measured.

Construction

8.4.35 The construction phase of the Proposed Development has the potential to introduce Direct Effects, Indirect Effects (Physical) and Indirect Effects to Setting:

- Direct Effects: resulting from ground disturbance during the construction phase e.g., truncation/removal of heritage assets. The effects would be permanent and irreversible. Construction activity and associated ground disturbance would only typically impact assets within the Order Limits itself, and within the footprint of construction activity
- Indirect Effects (Physical): resulting from construction activity, with effects extending beyond the footprint of any groundworks. Indirect Effects (Physical) would typically take the form of ground vibration associated with heavy plant movements, but might also include the effects of ground saturation/desiccation, changes to soil chemistry etc; and
- Indirect Effects to setting: This includes visual, dust and audio intrusions or changes to the wider historic landscape that may harm the significance of any assets or the ability to appreciate their significance. Changes to setting during the construction phase would typically be short lived, lasting only a matter of days, weeks or months.

8.4.36 **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: The Proposed Development [EN0110020/APP/6.5]** describes the physical characteristics of the Proposed Development, and the associated activities proposed during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.

8.4.37 In summary, at the construction phase, it is anticipated that Direct Effects and Indirect Effects (Physical) would be limited to the following components:

Solar Mounting Infrastructure and Perimeter Fencing

8.4.38 The anchoring of the solar array will require the securing of mounting structures though piling or helical screws. The use of piling or helical screws would be to a depth that could impact below ground archaeological remains beneath the topsoil/subsoil horizon or plough soil. In areas of the Site containing low density, low value assets such as former field boundaries or agricultural enclosures, impacts from piles or screws are unlikely to remove archaeological assets entirely, but would impact sections of these features. However, it is considered unlikely that impacts would hinder future excavation and interpretation of these features. In areas of the Site, containing complex, high value or densely concentrated below ground remains, the use of piles or screws has the potential to truncate key features and relationships between features, reducing their archaeological interest (the quantum/quality of information that could be recovered from them via future professional excavation). The extent of any such impact would be comparable to that from the insertion of timber boundary fenceposts.

Power Conversion Stations/BESS/Substations/Satellite substations

8.4.39 The foundation excavations required in advance of the construction of such infrastructure has the potential to substantively truncate/remove any buried archaeological remains within their footprint.

Ancillary Works

8.4.40 These include the installation of low voltage cabling, on site access tracks, drainage works, fencing and CCTV, and ancillary buildings. In areas of the Proposed Development containing low density, low value assets such as former field boundaries or agricultural enclosures, impacts are unlikely to remove archaeological assets entirely, though they would impact sections of those features. However, it is considered unlikely that such impacts would hinder future excavation and interpretation of those features. In areas of the Site, containing complex, high value or densely concentrated below ground remains, there is the potential for key features and relationships between features to be truncated, reducing their archaeological interest (the quantum/quality of information that could be recovered from them via future professional excavation). The extent of any such impact would be comparable to that from the insertion of timber boundary fenceposts.

Primary Construction Compounds

8.4.41 It is assumed that construction depths would not extend beyond the depth of the current topsoil/subsoil/plough soil or impact the archaeological horizon.

Landscaping / Green Infrastructure

8.4.42 It is anticipated that the Proposed Development would include management of existing planting, new native planting, hedgerow enhancement, and planting of suitable seed mixes amongst the solar PV arrays. Indigenous planting would also be used to provide natural screening of the Proposed Development. For the purposes of this assessment, it is assumed that the planting of any trees or hedgerows would be sympathetic to the location of known archaeology, and ensure that, where practicable within the limits of key constraints, bioturbation would not occur in areas with substantive subsurface remains.

Cable Corridors

8.4.43 Stripping of overburden within the Cable Corridor working area, and the excavation of any cable trenches would be likely to truncate any buried archaeological remains within the footprint of groundworks. Within each Cable Corridor multiple cable trenches would be excavated to a depth that could impact below ground archaeological remains beneath the topsoil/subsoil horizon or plough soil. In terms of Cable Corridors, all cables will be buried underground up to a depth of 3m deep in a trench typically 1m-2m in width but up to a maximum 10m in width where there are multiple circuits. Access Tracks and Spoil storage areas would be included within the working area for each Cable Corridor.

8.4.44 In addition, all direct current cables, within solar arrays, will be either secured to the solar PV frames or buried underground up to a depth of 1.2m deep in a trench typically measuring 0.3m to 1.5m in width.

Indirect Effects to Setting

8.4.45 At the construction phase, Indirect Effects to Setting from Whitestone 1-3 would be established during the construction phase, but would peak during the operation and maintenance phase, once all above ground infrastructure was in place. Indirect Effects to Setting will therefore be assessed as part of the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development, as is standard sector practice in order to simplify the assessment findings and avoid replication of identified impacts.

8.4.46 In relation to the Cable Corridors, with no above ground infrastructure planned for the operation and maintenance phase, impacts would be limited to the construction phase, and groundworks associated with the below ground cable. Indirect Effects to Setting are therefore assessed as part of the construction phase.

Operation and Maintenance

8.4.47 During the operation and maintenance phase, Significant Direct Effects and Indirect Effects (Physical) are not predicted, as there would be no groundworks and associated disturbance through the Proposed Development's operational lifetime.

8.4.48 Targeted maintenance of the infrastructure, might require some level of additional groundworks, though these would be highly targeted, localised to the infrastructure and minimal in extent; it is highly unlikely that such works would extend beyond the original construction footprint, and it is not anticipated that any additional significant effects would be generated as a result of maintenance activity.

8.4.49 Impacts resulting from the operation and maintenance phase would typically relate to Setting and long-term impacts resulting from the placement of above ground infrastructure throughout the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development.

8.4.50 In relation to this Chapter operational developments are considered part of the landscape baseline against which impacts are measured. This is of particular note for Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting.

Decommissioning

8.4.51 Decommissioning activity would take place within the construction activity footprint. As such, Significant Direct Effects are not anticipated, as any below ground heritage assets would already have been affected. Indirect Effects (Physical) may still be generated but would be no greater than those predicted during construction.

8.4.52 Indirect Effects to Setting would be of a lower order of magnitude than those during the operation and maintenance phase, with above ground infrastructure being removed and areas reinstated.

Assumptions, Exclusions and Limitations

8.4.53 This Chapter has been written based on the assumptions listed below.

8.4.54 With regard to the Site layout across Whitestone 1-3 at the time of writing:

- A worst-case scenario for the placement and scale of infrastructure is assumed (**ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**). In relation to Direct Effects, all subsurface remains within the footprint of infrastructure are assumed to be impacted
- In relation to the Solar Mounting Infrastructure and Perimeter Fencing, Direct Effects are limited to the driving of piles, drilling of helical screws or the cutting of postholes. The solar PV array would be mounted using piles or helical screws , with the exception of areas identified within Section 8.6 dealing with matters relating to mitigation. The overburden above the archaeological horizon is assumed to be of sufficient depth to protect buried remains from compression, wheel rutting and any levelling of round surfaces resulting from the use of plant/vehicles during construction installation
- In relation to Ancillary Works, temporary lay down areas and construction compounds, Direct Effects are limited to the footprint of said works. The overburden above the archaeological horizon is assumed to be of sufficient depth to protect buried remains from compression, wheel rutting and any levelling of ground surfaces resulting from the use plant/vehicles during construction/installation
- Where infrastructure overlies archaeology it is assumed that the infrastructure would be of sufficient depth to physically impact below ground archaeological remains
- With regard to Indirect Effects (Physical) derived from construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activity, there is a presumption that impacts derived from ground vibration would not extend beyond 100m from infrastructure
- Areas identified for potential landscape mitigation will not be subject to any construction or ground disturbance, beyond the requirements of BNG; and
- For areas of landscaping – there is an assumption that tree planting and hedgerow planting will form the planting regime. In areas of tree planting and hedgerows root action may reach the archaeological horizon and result in long term impacts to sub surface remains. Outside of areas of tree and hedgerow planting, the planting strategy is assumed to not impact below topsoil/subsoil/ploughsoil and would not impact below ground archaeology.

8.4.55 With regard to the Cable Corridors:

- A worst-case scenario for construction is assumed with open cut cable trenches excavated along the route, with the exception of areas identified within Section 8.6 dealing with matters relating to embedded mitigation
- With regard to Direct Effects, there is an assumption that multiple cable trenches would be cut within each Cable Corridor along with stripping of overburden to accommodate haulage roads and storage areas
- Ground disturbance within the Cable Corridors and cutting of the cable trenches are assumed to be of sufficient depth to physically impact below ground archaeological remains
- With regard to Indirect Effects to Setting there is an assumption that construction of each section will involve temporary groundworks, with short duration Setting Impacts. Cable Corridors will not be stripped and left open beyond the minimum requirements of construction; and
- With regard to Indirect Effects to Setting there is an assumption that dust suppression measures would be put in place to limit such disturbance, with dampening of soil to prevent avoidable dust clouds.

8.4.56 With regard to other matters;

- Based on the evidence available to date (see **ES Volume 3, Technical Appendix 8.2 Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**), there is an assumption of no/very little potential for sealed Early Prehistoric land surfaces/remains at depth within the Proposed Development
- The heritage baseline has been compiled with the results of Phase I surveys undertaken to date. These surveys include the walkover survey, the setting site visits and the Site geophysical survey (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.6: Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**). In addition, as detailed in **Section 8.5**, as part of Phase I investigations, a geophysical survey report of the Cable Corridor is provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.8: Cable Corridor Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and Phase I trial trenching survey results are provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.9: Phase I Trial Trenching Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**
- Based on the extensive survey work undertaken, it is considered that sufficient baseline has been recorded to base the assessment on and inform the design. In particular, this assessment has ensured that a reasonable worst-case scenario has been assessed through the use of public information, assumptions, and embedded mitigation (including requirements relating to avoidance measures, and requirements for pre-construction surveys which will inform post-consent activities). The Applicant's approach has sought to survey land where there are no access constraints. Where surveys have not been completed, this assessment has used assumptions, embedded. Nonetheless, the Applicant is, as part of its readiness to implement the project and validate its findings, completing Phase I investigations which will be submitted prior to the start of or during the examination to ensure interested parties are able to comment on that information. The Applicant is confident that the approach above meets the requirements of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 in providing information reasonably required to reach a reasoned conclusion based on a reasonable worst case scenario, is consistent with established precedent and practice of accepted DCO applications, and relevant case law (in particular, R (Jones) v Mansfield

District Council [2003] EWCA Civ 1408 at [39], and National Trusts' Application [2013] NIQB 60 at [70])

- It has been assumed that all features interpreted as possible or likely archaeology by either interpretation of geophysical, crop mark or other desk based data have been given asset numbers and assessed within Section 8.7 as if they are confirmed buried archaeological sites
- **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological and Investigation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** outlines how the results of Phase II investigations will lead to an updated version of the strategy and subsequent stages of investigation including trial trench evaluation and any mitigation measures that may be required
- Databases from which this assessment derived its data also suffer variant human error within their own compilation process. Consequently, levels of uncertainty, bias, overlap and discrepancy must be considered a possible source of error
- Although below ground impacts can be predicted, there is always potential for encountering previously unknown and unexpected remains
- Geophysical surveys record variation in the form and nature of sub-surface deposits, based on their magnetic response and resistance to electricity. They cannot always accurately identify buried archaeological features or distinguish between geogenic and anthropogenic anomalies. They are also not well suited to identifying more ephemeral archaeological features or deposits from earlier periods of prehistory; and
- Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting is solely based upon site visits, the results of the bare earth ZTV and Site Layout within the Illustrative Masterplan (**Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**). Bespoke photomontages/visualisations have also been used within this Chapter and its associated appendices, following consultation with key heritage stakeholders over the number and location of visualisations.

8.5 Baseline

Data Sources

Existing Baseline Date Sources

8.5.1 Both designated assets (statutory and non-statutory, including Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, World Heritage Sites, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields) and non-designated heritage assets are considered in this Chapter and supporting appendices.

8.5.2 Existing cultural heritage conditions within the identified Study Areas have been assessed using a number of sources. The following secondary data sources have been consulted:

- Historic England (National Heritage List) for information on World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, and Historic Battlefields
- South Yorkshire Historic Environmental Record (HER)
- Derbyshire Historic Environment Record (MDR)

- British Geological Survey BGS Index
- National Library of Scotland Maps
- Rotherham Archives and Local Studies Service
- Clifton Park and Museum Archives and Local Studies
- City of Doncaster Archives
- Derbyshire Record Office
- East Riding Archives
- South Yorkshire Local Environment Characterisation Report
- Local Heritage Lists
- Readily accessible published sources and grey literature (e.g., results from previous studies)
- Relevant academic papers and thesis
- Regional historic environment research frameworks
- Unpublished site reports and surveys produced by the University of Sheffield and its students
- Unpublished site reports and survey results held by Conisbrough Archaeology and Research Group (CRAG)
- Relevant published and grey literature historic environment reports; and
- Results of non-intrusive and intrusive surveys.

8.5.3 A desk-based geoarchaeological assessment of the Site (see **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.5: Geoarchaeological Desk Based Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**) has also been produced in order to:

- Further assess the geoarchaeological potential of the Order Limits insofar as it relates to sealed Early Prehistoric deposits; and
- Inform the need for and scope of any further geoarchaeological survey/investigations, such as borehole/window sampling.

Current Status of Baseline Surveys

8.5.4 Phase I surveys, those completed before Application submission or prior to the start of or during examination are:

- Geophysical survey of W1, W2 and W3, results of which are provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.6: Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**
- Trial trenching of high impact zones within the Site comprising the substation and BESS components of the Proposed Development. Results of trial trenching completed to date are presented in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.9: Phase I Trial Trenching Report [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1];** and
- Geophysical survey of the Cable Corridor, results of which are provided in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.8: Cable Corridor Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20].**

8.5.5 Due to land access restrictions, some land parcels along the Cable Corridor were not able to be completed at the time of writing. In addition, some Phase I trench

locations were not able to be completed at the time of writing, due to land access and weather/ground conditions. Completion of these Phase I investigations is ongoing and outputs will be provided prior to or during examination to ensure interested parties are able to comment on the information.

8.5.6 Based on the extensive survey work undertaken, it is considered that sufficient baseline has been recorded to base the assessment on and inform the design. In particular, this assessment has ensured that a reasonable worst-case scenario has been assessed through the use of public information, assumptions, and embedded mitigation (including requirements relating to avoidance measures, and requirements for pre-construction surveys which will inform post-consent activities). The Applicant's approach has sought to survey land where there are no access constraints. Where surveys have not been completed, this assessment has used assumptions, embedded. Nonetheless, the Applicant is, as part of its readiness to implement the project and validate its findings, completing the Phase I investigations with information submitted prior to the start of or during the examination to ensure interested parties are able to comment on that information. The Applicant is confident that the approach above meets the requirements of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 in providing information reasonably required to reach a reasoned conclusion based on a reasonable worst case scenario, is consistent with established precedent and practice of accepted DCO applications, and relevant case law (in particular, R (Jones) v Mansfield District Council [2003] EWCA Civ 1408 at [39], and National Trusts' Application [2013] NIQB 60 at [70]).

Data Sources for Future Baseline

8.5.7 In a scenario where the Proposed Development does not proceed, there is a presumption that the land use will continue under the current regime for the foreseeable future, with land primarily used for agriculture. In this scenario, there would be continuing impacts to subsurface archaeological remains within the Proposed Development resulting from ploughing.

8.5.8 In a no-development scenario, the effects of climate change may impact below ground remains adversely. Warmer and wetter winters resulting in storms and more frequent flooding of farmland may result in changes to subsurface conditions and the degradation of archaeological remains. This, combined with a greater chance of hotter, more arid summers, resulting in weathering of topsoil and the cracking and separating of overburden may also change subsurface conditions.

Further Baseline Surveys

8.5.9 A programme of additional archaeological fieldwork (Phase II surveys) is secured within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**) and **outline Written Scheme of Investigation (oWSI) [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**.

8.5.10 The strategy includes an overarching iterative framework explaining how the different surveys including Phase I and Phase II surveys fit together and the mechanism for determining the scope of subsequent stages including mitigation.

8.5.11 It includes a communication plan with delineated roles and responsibilities for implementation.

8.5.12 The methodology for the Phase II surveys, agreed in consultation with SYAS, consists of:

- Additional non-intrusive surveys in selected portions of the low impact zone (the solar PV array and Cable Corridors); and
- Targeted trial trench evaluation across the solar PV array and Cable Corridors, aimed at defining extent and character of known assets and in areas where potential is not yet understood.

8.5.13 The strategy and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** also cover the mitigation phase of works and include an Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) (presented with the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**). These aspects are described in Section 8.6.

Existing Baseline Conditions

8.5.14 **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]** sets out the baseline, which is based upon desk-based assessment of secondary data sources, as well as primary survey in the form of walkover survey, setting assessment site visits and geophysical (magnetometer) survey of the Site.

8.6 Embedded Mitigation

Overview

8.6.1 The following embedded mitigation measures relevant to cultural heritage have been identified and have been considered as part of the assessment. A Commitments Register has been included within this ES (see **ES Appendix 2.3: Commitments Register [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**).

Changes to Order Limits

8.6.2 Since submission of the Draft ES in September 2025, several changes have been made to the Order Limits as part of the design evolution of the Proposed Development (for further details see **Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 4.2: Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**). The following changes have been made to reduce the potential significance of effect to heritage assets:

- Order Limit boundary has been pulled back from Clifton Conservation Area after concerns were raised over its proximity and setting
- Order Limit boundary pulled back from Ravenfield Conservation Area
- Conisbrough Parks Roman Villa has been removed from the Order Limits, as requested in Statutory Consultation responses
- A large portion of the eastern side of W1, east of Conisbrough Park Farm (HM11) has also been removed, also mentioned in councils' response; and
- Infrastructure pulled back within the Order Limits to reduce direct impacts to the Firsby Pottery works (HER 02071/01).

8.6.3 Whitestone 2 Blue Mans Bower:

- Order Limits to the west of the Scheduled Monument of Blue Mans Bower (SM1012201) have been removed, after concerns were raised over its proximity and setting.

8.6.4 Whitestone 2 Ulley Conservation Area and Brampton en le Morthen Conservation Area:

- Order Limits to the north of Ulley Conservation Area have been reduced; and
- Order Limits to the south-east of Brampton en le Morthen have been reduced, after concerns were raised over the proximity and setting to these assets.

8.6.5 Whitestone 3 Harthill Conservation Area:

- Parcels to the west of Harthill Conservation Area have been removed to be more in line with the current bridleway which cuts across the field, after concerns were raised over its proximity and setting.

Construction

8.6.6 Direct Effects derived from physical disturbance of heritage assets within the construction footprint of infrastructure (**Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**) are predicted during the construction phase.

8.6.7 Where possible and practicable, within the confines imposed by other site constraints, there is a preference to avoid disturbing subsurface archaeological remains unnecessarily. Preservation in situ by implementing the Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy (AIPS) (presented with the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]),** is proposed for areas of 'heightened archaeological sensitivity' (HAS), which are defined as heritage assets of known regional research value, or with the potential to be of regional research value.

8.6.8 **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** is referenced within the **Outline WSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** as the mechanism for delivering the mitigation measures outlined in the APS. The **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** is submitted with the Application and secures the commitment to deliver the measures presented in the AIPS.

8.6.9 Areas of heightened archaeological sensitivity are likely to take the form of settlement sites, industrial activity, burial sites or areas of high-density archaeological remains.

8.6.10 The HAS areas and the requirement for implementation of avoidance is secured within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. This mitigation can take the form of:

- Creation of Exclusion Zones within which no infrastructure is placed and no ground disturbance allowed, with the exception of planting associated with BNG
- Micro siting and avoidance; and
- The use of alternate construction methods, which allow for the placement of infrastructure above heritage assets, or below in the case of the Cable Corridors, without causing physical disturbance or truncation of those assets.

Exclusion Zones

8.6.11 The Proposed Development takes into account the location (**ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**) of two heritage assets of regional/national value within or adjacent to W1, namely:

- Scheduled Monument SM1491751 Roman Villa located to the north of land parcel 36; and
- Non-designated asset 02070/01 Firsby Medieval Pottery Works south of Land Parcels 29, 31, 33 and 34.

8.6.12 All land parcels are shown in **ES, Volume 3, Figure 6.1: Land Parcel References [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**.

8.6.13 With regard to SM1491751 Roman Villa, the Proposed Development will avoid the scheduled monument. There will therefore be no physical impacts on the monument as a result of the Proposed Development.

8.6.14 With regard to 02070/01 Firsby Medieval Pottery Works, the main pottery production centre is presumed to be located south of the Site, in fields south of the Firsby Brook, adjacent to the nearby farm. However, the location of the kilns is not well understood and kiln lining material as well as large quantities of C12th to C14th pottery has been recovered from adjoining fields to the north. The Proposed Development has avoided placing infrastructure within 270m of the recorded HER point. This is considered to be sufficiently removed to avoid disturbing any in situ kilns.

8.6.15 As noted above, further HAS areas, may also be included as exclusion zones following further assessment during their investigation as part of the Phase II evaluation.

Micro Siting and Avoidance

8.6.16 Where possible, within the limits of other Site constraints, infrastructure would be repositioned to avoid Direct Effects through construction. For design elements such as Power Conversion Stations/ BESS/ Substations, Satellite substations and the Solar Array, the ability of the Proposed Development to accommodate such changes may be limited. This method may be more applicable to Cable Corridors and the final placement of cable trenches.

Alternate Construction Methods

8.6.17 The Archaeological Preservation Strategy (APS) detailing the non-intrusive installation techniques is secured within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**. Key aspects are summarised below.

8.6.18 Within areas of Site covered by the solar array, Direct Effects could be mitigated through one or more of:

- The use of non-intrusive foundations, such as concrete or ballast bases
- The use of suspended cabling / above ground cable trays, as opposed to buried cabling, negating the need for cable trenching

- Re-routing of any access tracks or other infrastructure to avoid these areas; and
- The installation of the above non-intrusive infrastructure, and (at point of decommission) its removal, in accordance with a sensitive installation and decommissioning strategy.

8.6.19 Along the Cable Corridors, where cable trenches cannot be micro sited to avoid heritage assets, Direct Effects could be mitigated through the use of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) or another trenchless method, whereby the cable would be drilled below any areas of heightened archaeological sensitivity, avoiding disturbance of heritage assets.

8.6.20 The HAS areas within the Site where alternative construction methods may be used are detailed within **Table 8.7** and shown in **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic or Scheduled Monument Sites [EN01100020/APP/2.12]**, noting that Phase II surveys (Section 8.5) may further refine the extent of the HAS.

8.6.21 If it is demonstrated during the Phase II archaeological investigation works that any identified HAS areas are in fact not archaeologically sensitive, then it would be disproportionate to still apply the engineering/construction techniques proposed to mitigate any impact within those areas. In liaison with the LPA's archaeological advisor, the use of standard installation/construction methods in those areas would therefore be appropriate.

Table 8.7: Areas of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity (HAS)

Location within Site/Land Parcel	HAS	Description	Data Source	Area (ha)	Infrastructure
W1/34	HAS2	Likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement enclosure	HER data/ Geophysics anomaly HER 02005/01	1.6ha	Solar PV array
W1/162	HAS3	C19th brickworks	HER data/historic mapping HER 02349/01	1.6ha	Substation
W2/58	HAS4	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	HER data/Geophysics anomaly HER 02349/01	Entirety of land parcel	Solar PV array
W2/59	HAS4	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Geophysics anomaly	Entirety of land parcel	Solar PV array
W2/85	HAS5	A series of likely Iron Age or	Geophysics anomaly	1ha	Substation / BESS

Location within Site/Land Parcel	HAS	Description	Data Source	Area (ha)	Infrastructure
		Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures			
W2/90	HAS14	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement enclosures	Geophysics anomaly	1ha	Solar PV array
W2/112	HAS6	Likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement enclosure	Geophysics anomaly	0.8ha	Solar PV array
W2/112	HAS7	WWII defences	HER data/Cropmark data HER 04712	1ha	Solar PV array
W2/128	HAS8	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement enclosures	Geophysics anomaly	2.3ha	Solar PV array
W2/141	HAS9	Enclosure of probable late prehistoric or Romano-British date, Todwick	HER data/ Geophysics anomaly HER 06163	3.5ha	Solar PV array
W2/141	HAS10	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement enclosures	Geophysics anomaly	1ha	Solar PV array
W2/113	HAS15	Potential Iron Age or Romano-British settlement enclosures	Geophysics anomaly	7.5ha	Solar PV array
W3/177	HAS11	Likely Iron Age or Romano-British enclosure	HER data and geophysics anomalies	4ha	Solar PV array
CRL/n/a	HAS12	Probable Bronze Age barrow cemetery, Manor Road, Harthill	HER HER 05833	1ha	Cable Corridor

8.6.22 The Applicant has committed to implementing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in advance of construction activities for the Proposed Development. An Outline CEMP is submitted with the Application. Impacts from ground contamination would be mitigated through CDM regulations and standard construction procedures relating to the use of plant and COSHH materials on Site. Spill kits would be kept on site during any construction works. Any spills or leaks would be dealt with and reported in line with CDM regulations and national legislation, guidance and policy.

Pre-construction Archaeological Investigation

8.6.23 Where avoidance is not practicable, controlled archaeological excavations and close archaeological monitoring can be undertaken to offset harm caused by direct effects to buried archaeology. At the time of submission, the HAS5/G02 asset has been identified as requiring pre-construction archaeological investigation. These measures are secured within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**.

8.6.24 Following the completion of the Phase I and Phase II trial trench evaluations, further assets may be identified that require controlled investigation. The mechanism by which results from these surveys will be fed into an updated WSI is set out in the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**.

Construction Phase Monitoring

8.6.25 The **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** also sets out the requirements for archaeological monitoring of soil stripping during the construction phase.

Operation and Maintenance

Indirect Effects to Setting

8.6.26 Impacts will primarily derive from the siting of above ground infrastructure within areas of the landscape that could change the Setting of a heritage asset. As such, the Site layout for the Proposed Development, where practicable, have been established on the basis of locating above ground infrastructure outside of the Setting of sensitive receptors, or within areas of the landscape where Setting Impacts would be minimised.

8.6.27 Mitigation by design is outlined in Sections 8.6, as well as in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN0110020/APP/6.4]** and the **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]**.

Decommissioning

8.6.28 The overarching mitigation protocols to be applied during decommissioning will be formalised within the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) secured by the DCO. In addition, assuming adoption of the archaeological preservation strategy (APS) (presented with **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7 Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**) the measures within that strategy will also be applied

during decommissioning. An **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** is submitted with the Application.

8.6.29 No specific mitigation is currently proposed regarding cultural heritage and archaeology for the decommissioning phase of the Proposed Development. This assumes the sensitive decommissioning strategy as set out in the **oDEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.11]** is implemented within areas of heightened archaeological sensitivity, whereby plant and vehicle operations avoid impacts to subsurface remains through ground disturbance, rutting or ground contamination.

8.7 Assessment of Effects

Construction

Direct Effects

8.7.1 Direct Effects from construction activity are limited to land parcels containing solar PV infrastructure, BESS, Substations, Ancillary Works, Construction Compounds and ground disturbance within the Cable Corridors, as detailed within **ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**. Areas of the Proposed Development set aside for 'mitigation', be that areas of landscaping or exclusion zones are assessed as being unaffected by construction activity, with impacts of any activity in this area being shallow and not extending below plough soil or topsoil and subsoil.

8.7.2 A total of 71 assets have been identified within the Site of W1-3. Of these, 57 are located within land parcels containing infrastructure.

8.7.3 A further 13 assets are located within the Cable Corridor.

8.7.4 Of these assets, 19 are either findspots or records relating to ridge and furrow. Though both asset types can inform on the general level of archaeological potential for an area, they have little inherent historical interest or research potential and therefore not considered further in this impact assessment. The remaining 51 assets are detailed within **Table 8.8** below.

Table 8.8: Known Heritage Assets

* Areas of heightened archaeological sensitivity are highlighted in grey (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**)

Location	Area of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity	Land Parcel	Asset Ref	Description	Period	Infrastructure
W1	n/a	31	1435779	Ditch	Unknown	Solar Array
W1	HAS2	34	02005/01 G07	Large Iron Age or Romano-British Rectangular Enclosure and Ditches, Conisbrough Parks	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar Array
W1	n/a	34	04365/01	Large Rectangular Cropmark Enclosure of Unknown Date, Conisbrough Parks	Unknown	Solar Array
W1	n/a	34	HM2	Air shafts	Post - Medieval	Solar Array
W1	n/a	34	HM3	Air shafts	Post - Medieval	Solar Array
W1	n/a	34	HM4	Air shafts	Post - Medieval	Substation
W1	n/a	34	HM5	Air shafts	Post - Medieval	Substation
W1	n/a	35	03362/02	Medieval or earlier earthworks, Conisbrough Parks	Bronze Age - Medieval	Solar Array
W1	n/a	36	02566/01	Roman Drain near Clifton Villa, Conisbrough Parks	Romano British	Solar Array
W1	n/a	162	02958/01	Conisbrough Deer Park	Medieval	Solar Array/ Substation

Location	Area of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity	Land Parcel	Asset Ref	Description	Period	Infrastructure
W1	n/a	35	03362/03	Post medieval extractive pits, Conisbrough Parks	Post - Medieval	Solar Array
W1	n/a	35	HM8	Old shaft	Post - Medieval	Solar Array
W1	n/a	35	HM9	Old shaft	Post - Medieval	Solar Array
W1	HAS3	162	04367/01	Post-Medieval to Industrial Period Brickyard, Conisbrough Parks	Post - Medieval	Substation
W1	n/a	162	HM6	Air shafts	Post - Medieval	Solar Array
W1	n/a	162	HM7	Air shafts	Post - Medieval	Solar Array
W1	n/a	162	HM10	Old Shaft	Post - Medieval	Solar Array
W1	n/a	34	G08	Possible enclosures and field system of likely Iron Age or Romano-British date	Iron Age to Romano-British	Solar Array
W2	HAS4	58	02349/01	Iron Age or Romano-British Enclosure and Field System, Slacks Farm, Bramley	Iron Age to Romano-British	Solar Array
W2	HAS4	59	G01	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Iron Age to Romano-British	Solar Array
W2	n/a	60	G09	Possible enclosure. Only northern edge recorded as majority of feature extends outside of Order limits.	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar Array

Location	Area of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity	Land Parcel	Asset Ref	Description	Period	Infrastructure
W2	n/a	82D	G10	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar Array
W2	n/a	90	G11	A series of circular anomalies with a possible associated trackway.	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar Array
W2	n/a	111A	G13	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar Array
W2	HAS15	113	G14	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar Array
W2	n/a	232A	G15	A likely Iron Age or Romano-British field system	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar Array
W2	n/a	165	G16	A likely Iron Age or Romano-British field system	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar Array
W2	n/a	141	G17	A likely Iron Age or Romano-British field system	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar Array
W2	n/a	60	1433052	Rectilinear Enclosure	Iron - Age to Romano British	Solar Array

Location	Area of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity	Land Parcel	Asset Ref	Description	Period	Infrastructure
W2	n/a	82, 89, 90	04916	Roman Road; Catcliffe to Oldcotes	Romano British	Solar Array
W2	HAS5	85	G02	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Iron Age to Romano-British	Substation/BESS
W2	HAS14	90	G03	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Iron Age to Romano-British	Solar Array
W2	HAS6	112	G04	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Iron Age to Romano-British	Solar Array
W2	HAS7	112	04712	'H25 Heavy Anti-Aircraft Battery, Ulley	Modern	Solar Array
W2	HAS8	128	G05	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Iron Age to Romano-British	Solar Array
W3	n/a	177	G20	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British settlement and agricultural enclosures	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar
W3	n/a	191	G21	A series of likely Iron Age or Romano-British	Iron Age to Romano British	Solar

Location	Area of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity	Land Parcel	Asset Ref	Description	Period	Infrastructure
				settlement and agricultural enclosures		
Cable Corridor	HAS9	141	6163	Enclosure of probable late prehistoric or Romano-British date, Todwick	Iron Age to Romano-British	Solar Array
Cable Corridor	HAS15	113		Potential Iron Age or Romano-British settlement enclosures	Iron Age to Romano-British	Solar Array
Cable Corridor	HAS11	177	5836	Possible Iron Age to Romano-British ditch, Hard Lane, Harthill	Iron Age to Roman	Solar Array
Cable Corridor	n/a	177	5838	Site of a mill on Broad Bridge Dike, Harthill	Post - Medieval	Solar Array
Cable Corridor	n/a	n/a	00088/01	Iron Age or Romano-British Field System, Sandy Lane, Bramley	Iron Age to Romano-British	Cable easement and trench
Cable Corridor	n/a	n/a	02141/01	Iron Age or Romano-British Sub-rectangular Enclosure, Whiston	Iron Age to Romano-British	Cable easement and trench
Cable Corridor	n/a	n/a	4918	Roman Road; Chesterfield to Templeborough	Romano-British	Cable easement and trench
Cable Corridor	n/a	n/a	4918	Roman Road; Chesterfield to Templeborough	Roman	Cable easement and trench
Cable Corridor	n/a	n/a	4916	Roman Road; Catcliffe to Oldcotes	Roman	Cable easement and trench

Location	Area of Heightened Archaeological Sensitivity	Land Parcel	Asset Ref	Description	Period	Infrastructure
Cable Corridor	n/a	n/a	02660/01	Unclassified Cropmark of Unknown Date, Ulley	Undated	Cable easement and trench
Cable Corridor	n/a	n/a	5834	Iron Age to Romano-British field system, Manor Road, Harthill	Iron Age	Cable easement and trench
Cable Corridor	n/a	n/a	02451/01	Chesterfield Canal and associated water management features	Post-Medieval	Cable easement and trench
Cable Corridor	n/a	n/a	4916	Roman Road; Catcliffe to Oldcotes	Roman	Cable easement and trench

8.7.5 As detailed within Section 8.4, the anticipated magnitude of construction phase impacts vary for key components of the Proposed Development. This variation is summarised below. Further information of these sensitivity zones is discussed in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.6: Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20].**

Impact Areas

8.7.6 Construction impacts associated with the Power Conversion Stations/ BESS/ Substations/ Satellite substations would be of sufficient magnitude to truncate and likely remove all sub-surface remains within their footprint. These are considered high impact zones.

8.7.7 Construction impacts associated with installation of the cabling along the Cable Corridors, would truncate and likely remove all sub surface remains within the footprint of cable trenches and within areas of soil stripping for the construction corridor. Cable Corridors will however be sited to avoid buried archaeology and are therefore considered low impact zones. If further surveys identify an area of heightened sensitivity across a large portion, or across the entire width, of the construction corridor, a programme of controlled archaeological excavation will be designed alongside the LPA's archaeological advisor. This work would be undertaken at the pre-construction phase as described in Section 8.6.23-8.6.24.

8.7.8 Construction impacts associated with the installation of the solar PV array – insertion of piling – would be of a lesser magnitude. When considered against the surface area of the Site as a whole, the piling footprint would represent a fraction of a percent of the Site's surface area, and the probability of the piles having a material impact on the archaeological interest of any subsurface archaeological remains is very low. There remains some potential for certain piles to pass through smaller discrete features, e.g. post holes, and/or to affect the interface between archaeological features. Again, however, taking into account the very low proportion of the Site that would be physically affected by the piling, the probability of any such material loss of archaeological interest/heritage significance is very low overall.

High Impact / High Sensitivity Zones

8.7.9 The high impact zone within LP85 (the parcel which would contain the primary substation, see **ES Volume 3, Figure 6.1: Land Parcel Reference [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**) contains one HAS area, consisting of a possible Iron Age or Romano-British settlement site (HAS5/G02).

Possible Iron Age or Romano-British Settlement Site (HAS5/G02)

8.7.10 HAS5 located in LP85 consists of the southern section of a large double ditched sub-rectangular enclosure identified by geophysical survey undertaken as part of the current assessment. The geophysical survey also showed that the enclosure included internal features and a likely associated field system extending out in all directions from the enclosure. The Phase 1 trial trench investigation in early 2026 showed the external enclosure ditches to be ephemeral features but confirmed the presence of smaller internal features and the field system. No finds were retrieved from the evaluation but further investigation in the form of a strip map and sample exercise is required as part of the pre-construction mitigation outlined in Section 8.6.23.

8.7.11 The heritage value of a possible settlement such as this lies in its future academic research potential. At present, however, the lack of artefactual material and ephemeral nature of the features suggest that it may, alternatively, represent a stock enclosure or field system boundary with limited potential to contribute to regional or national research agendas.

8.7.12 Development proposals in this area consist of the soil stripping across the full extent of HAS5 that will result in complete removal of the enclosure and its internal features, resulting in a large magnitude of impact and a **Moderate Adverse** effect. The effects of this impact can, in part, be offset by a programme of proportionate archaeological investigation to be undertaken at the pre-construction phase, secured within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** (and summarised in Section 8.6 of this Chapter). In conclusion, upon the completion of the investigation and analysis, and appropriate dissemination of the results, the overall effect is predicted to be **Not Significant**.

High Impact / Low Sensitivity Zones

8.7.13 Geophysical survey (summarised in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]** and **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.6: Geophysical Survey [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**) did not identify any further likely assets within the high impact zone.

8.7.14 A number of post-medieval air shafts associated with mineral extraction were identified through historic map analysis (HM4 and HM5). These assets retain a limited level of historic interest as monuments and there is limited potential to research these features beyond mapping exercises. Development proposals in this area consist of the soil stripping across the full extent of the two assets that and the removal of their surface structure, resulting in a large magnitude of impact and therefore a **Moderate** effect. Noting the low level of historic and archaeological interest, in this case, the overall effect is predicted to be **Not Significant**.

Low Impact / High Sensitivity Zones

8.7.15 Within the low impact zones (the solar PV array and Cable Corridors), there are seven HAS areas that comprise possible Iron Age to Romano-British settlements (HAS2, HAS4, HAS6, HAS8, HAS9, HAS10 and HAS15) and one ditch (HAS11).

8.7.16 The Phase II trial trench evaluation will be undertaken to better understand the extent, character and heritage significance of these eight areas. For the purposes of this assessment, they are assumed to be of considerable archaeological significance because of the potential they hold to contribute to regional and national research agendas. In particular, their study through excavation and analysis has the potential to contribute to our understanding of Iron Age and Romano-British society.

8.7.17 The archaeological importance of other assets identified through geophysical (G08-G21) will be further investigated through the Phase II trial trench evaluation.

8.7.18 Within the defined HAS areas, the embedded mitigation measures pertaining to the APS that are secured within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** (and summarised in Section 8.6 of this Chapter), will be implemented to avoid impact.

8.7.19 There will therefore be **no impact** on these eight HAS areas resulting in no effect. This is **Not Significant**.

Low Impact / Unknown Sensitivity Zones

8.7.20 Within the low impact zones (the solar PV array), there are a number of likely and possible Iron Age to Romano-British enclosures identified by geophysical survey and desk-based research that will be the focus of the Phase II trial trench evaluation (G08-G13, G20-G21, HER 1433052) and other enclosures, ditches and earthworks for which a possible age is difficult to predict (HER 1435779, HER 04365, HER 03362/02). For the purposes of this assessment, it is assumed that these possible settlements hold the potential to contribute to regional research agendas and are therefore of higher relative archaeological value compared to those assets that only contain evidence for field systems.

8.7.21 If trial trench evaluation demonstrates an asset is of archaeological importance and that it retains sufficient research potential to be classed as a HAS, then the embedded mitigation measures pertaining to the APS that are secured within **ES Volume 3. Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** (and summarised in Section 8.6 of this Chapter), will be implemented to avoid impact. There will therefore be no impact on such assets resulting in **no effect**. This is **Not Significant**.

8.7.22 There are also a number of likely and possible Iron Age to Romano-British field systems (G14-G19, HER 00088/01, HER 5834) and other unknown crop marks (HER 02660/01) located within the low impact zone (the solar PV array and Cable Corridors) that will be the focus of the Phase II trial trench evaluation. For the purposes of this assessment, it is assumed that these assets only limited potential to contribute to regional research agendas and are therefore of lower relative archaeological value compared to those assets that also contain evidence for settlement.

8.7.23 If trial trench evaluation confirms an asset as a field system with no evidence of settlement or other complex activities, consultation will be undertaken with SYAS to determine next steps and a proportionate approach to offsetting any potential impacts through archaeological excavation or monitoring discussed. However, as noted above, the area of ground disturbance for the solar installation would be minimal and therefore the magnitude of impact is considered to be small. There is therefore predicted to be **no effect** on these assets. This is **Not Significant**.

Low Impact / Low Sensitivity Zones

8.7.24 Within the low impact zones (the solar PV array and Cable Corridors), there are a number of assets that have limited heritage value as they do not hold much if any historical, architectural or archaeological interest.

8.7.25 This group includes non-settlement features associated to the Roman period such as the Roman drain (HER 02566/01) and possible Roman Road alignment (HER 4916, HER 4918), where limited above or below ground remains are thought to be present.

8.7.26 The likely medieval Deer Park (HER 02958/01) and location of a medieval Assembly/Moot (HER 03742/01) are also part of this group, as again, apart from some possible field boundaries, there is likely to be limited above or below ground evidence surviving at either location.

8.7.27 Assets associated with post-medieval extractive industries comprising air shafts (HM2 and HM3, HM6, HM7) and other extraction sites (HM8, HM9, HM10, HER 03362/03) are included here as they hold very limited heritage interest as historical monuments or archaeological features.

8.7.28 The location of a Second World War anti-aircraft battery (HRR 4712) is included in the low sensitivity zone as it is likely that only rubble survives below ground.

8.7.29 If trial trench evaluation confirms that there are no remains that hold historical, architectural or archaeological interest, no further mitigation steps will be taken. As noted above the area of ground disturbance for the solar installation would be minimal and therefore the magnitude of impact is considered to be small. There is therefore predicted to be **no effect** on these assets. This is **Not Significant**.

Indirect Effects (Physical)

8.7.30 Indirect Effects resulting from construction and ground works are assumed to not extend beyond 100m from infrastructure.

8.7.31 Indirect Effects at construction would result from ground vibration and/or contamination to sub surface heritage assets.

8.7.32 In relation to ground vibration, any impacts to sub surface remains, would be of a lower magnitude than Direct Effects from construction and no greater than those already experienced by sub surface remains in close proximity to the Order Limits. As identified within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**, the geology within the Site is largely derived from the Coal Measure Formation with superficial geology made up of a firm ploughsoil of mudstone/silty clay. Land use within the Order Limits is primarily agricultural with repeated cycles of ploughing and turning of ploughsoil using heavy farming equipment.

8.7.33 Sub surface assets within 100m of the infrastructure are typically low value remains of local importance. The only exception to this is the sub surface remains of a Scheduled Roman Villa (SM1491751), located c. 30m south of land parcel 35 of W1, which is a scheduled monument and high value asset. Despite being located within 100m of infrastructure, the installation of nearby solar panels in not expected to impact the subsurface remains of the villa. Impacts from ground contamination would be mitigated through CDM regulations and standard construction procedures relating to the use of plant and COSHHH materials on Site. Spill kits would be kept on site during any construction works. Any spills or leaks would be dealt with and reported in line with CDM regulations and national legislation, guidance and policy. Details of these measures are provided in the **oCEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.9]**.

8.7.34 In summary, no Indirect Effects from pollutants, such as oil, fuel or hydraulic leaks, are predicted to either designated or non-designated assets. As no impact is predicted, the effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

8.7.35 Impacts from vibration are a potential risk to upstanding fabric and buildings. However, there are no designated or non-designated standing structures or buildings within 100m of infrastructure. As such, no impacts are predicted, resulting in no adverse effects. As no impact is predicted, the effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Indirect Effects to Setting

8.7.36 Construction along the Cable Corridors might generate temporary, short-term impacts to the setting of assets within proximity to groundworks, e.g., plant engine noise during the stripping of overburden.

8.7.37 Any construction phase indirect (Setting) impacts would be entirely **Short Term** and **Temporary** in nature – consistent with the periodic operation of heavy farm machinery and other mechanised farming activity – and the effect would be **Not Significant**.

Operation and Maintenance

Direct Effects

8.7.38 No Direct Effects would occur during the operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development. Any ground disturbance would be limited to ongoing maintenance within areas already impacted at construction. No additional heritage assets would be impacted.

Indirect Effects (Physical)

8.7.39 No Indirect Effects (Physical) would occur during the operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development. Ground vibration (if any) would be of a substantially lower order of magnitude than during construction. Low-level vibration of operational equipment would not be anticipated to result in any impact. No ground contamination, e.g., as a result of equipment leakage, would be anticipated. No additional heritage assets would be impacted.

Indirect Effects to Setting

8.7.40 A sieving exercise (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.3: Sieving Exercise [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**) identified a total of a total of 143 designated assets, of which the majority comprise Grade II Listed buildings, and one non-designated assets for further detailed assessment within the ES. These are shown in **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**.

8.7.41 The settings assessment (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**) has identified the potential for a Moderate Adverse effect upon the following heritage assets:

- 1010828 Conisbrough Castle, Scheduled Monument
- 1491751 Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa, Scheduled Monument
- Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden; and
- Barlborough Conservation Area.

8.7.42 However, all of these **Moderate Adverse** effects would be considered **Not Significant**. This is discussed in greater detail in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1].**

8.7.43 The settings assessment has identified the potential for a **Minor Adverse** effect upon the following heritage assets:

- Ulley Conservation Area

- 1314636 Hardwick Hall, Grade II Listed building; and
- 1151523 Manor House, Grade II Listed building.

8.7.44 However, all of these **Minor Adverse** effects would be considered **Not Significant**. This is discussed in greater detail in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1].**

8.7.45 The settings assessment has identified that there would be no adverse effects (no harm to heritage significance) upon any other heritage assets as a result of change to setting.

8.7.46 In relation to NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.9.33, the Proposed Development would result in less than substantial harm to those designated heritage assets identified above, with the level of harm being at the lower end of the scale of less than substantial harm in each instance. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals.

8.7.47 Extracts from **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.4: Assessment of Indirect Effects to Setting [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]** are provided below for those assets anticipated to be subject to either a **Minor or Moderate Adverse** effect.

Scheduled Monument 1010828/LB1192747 Conisbrough Castle

Summary of the Asset

8.7.48 The settlement of Conisbrough dates to the Anglo-Saxon period and it almost certainly had a defensive fort within the settlement, likely on the site of the later Norman castle. In 1086 AD Domesday Book recorded that the estate included 28 townships, stretching east to the Lincolnshire border and south to Harthill, and so covering most of the south-east corner of the West Riding. Before the Norman Conquest the estates were in the hands of King Harold. After the Norman Conquest, the honour of Conisbrough was given to William de Warenne, who took his name from his ancestral estates in the valley of the Varenne in Normandy, south of Dieppe.

8.7.49 Scheduled Monument1010828 Conisbrough Castle (**Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**) is a tower keep castle, whose main component is a 27m high cylindrical keep with six solid wedge-shaped buttresses. Surrounding the tower to the north, west and south is a curtain wall enclosing a grassed-over bailey containing well-shafts, a blocked sally-port and the wall-footings of ancillary buildings. Surrounding the internal features is a ditch c.10m deep and c.20m wide and a steeply scarped rampart. The castle earthworks pre-date the C12th stone castle, although whether they formed part of the Anglo-Saxon ‘Cyninges burh’, or were built by William de Warenne shortly after the Norman Conquest, is not known. The scheduled area takes in the physical remains of the castle and its associated earthworks.

8.7.50 The Grade I Listed Building 1192747 records the upstanding fabric of the castle, inclusive of: ashlar magnesian limestone keep, curtain walls of coursed rubble. The Keep is c.27 metres in height with strongly splayed base and prominent semi-hexagonal buttresses. Entrance in south side, reached by C20 concrete steps, has joggled lintel and relieving arch as does twin window above; quatrefoil chapel windows, in buttress above on right, have pelleted surrounds; round-arched, upper-floor window beyond buttress on left.

8.7.51 **Historic interest:** The castle has been a regional seat of power since the Anglo-Saxon period has played a significant role in the wealth and prominence of a

series of wealthy and politically important families between the C10th and 16th, inclusive of the late Saxon Godwin family, the Norman Warrene's, the Langley family and the House of York, as well as owners of castle and estates after its ruin and abandonment. The castle has featured in a series of conflicts, most notably the siege of the castle itself during the early 14th century, the garrisoning of the castle in the mid-15th century, and the Wars of the Roses.

8.7.52 **Archaeological interest:** The first history of Conisbrough was published in 1828 and the first architectural study of the castle in the mid-19th century. The first major excavations took place in the late 1960s at the footings of the inner bailey buildings and the collapsed remains of the gatehouse. This work was taken forward from 1973 by Dr Stephen Johnson in four more seasons of excavations which resulted in a detailed understanding of the archaeology of the inner bailey and its buildings. Among other things:

- The profile of the original earth bank surrounding the bailey was observed
- Timber stake holes were found in the top of the earth bank, suggesting that the C11th castle was surrounded by timber defences; and
- Pottery sherds from the fill helped to date the curtain walls to around AD1200.

8.7.53 In 2009 English Heritage commissioned a full conservation and development strategy document, an analytical survey of the earthworks around the castle, and a geophysical survey of part of the site. The latter produced several anomalies that may represent the footings of buildings in and to the south of the outer bailey area.

8.7.54 In the last decade, Historic England and Conisbrough Archaeology and Research Group (CRAG) have undertaken additional survey and excavation work within the scheduled area.

8.7.55 The archaeological potential of the site remains, specifically through further landscape and remote survey to identify additional associated structures and the development of the town of Conisbrough around the castle in the late Middle Ages and onwards. Investigation of the asset under professional conditions would have the potential to make a substantive contribution to understanding of its origins, establishment, use and abandonment, as well as of the changing socio-economic circumstances of its successive inhabitants.

8.7.56 **Architectural interest:** The castle represents one of the best surviving examples of medieval military architecture in South Yorkshire. The remarkably well-preserved keep is one of the finest examples of a late 12th century 'great tower', incorporating the highest architectural refinement and a design that is unique in England. In its architecture it reflects the power and wealth of the Angevin ruling dynasty. The keep at Conisbrough is remarkable for its lack of English comparison: it is only loosely similar in design to Henry II's polygonal keeps at Orford (1165 AD – 72), Chilham (1171 AD – 74) and Tickhill (c 1178 AD – 80). Conisbrough's keep has many peculiarities, but two are of specific note:

- The lowest two storeys were deliberately made more or less uninhabitable: the room at entrance level has no windows and no fireplace, while the vault below it is completely dark with the only access through an opening in the centre of its vault; and
- The floors are reached from a series of disconnected mural stairs, with access to each successive floor only through the rooms above or below. There is no spiral stair to give a common access to all floors and to the roof level, and there is no stair access to the basement at all.

8.7.57 It seems to have been designed for private occupation by a few privileged people (it could be described as a very grand chamber block), and so is of particular interest as a well-preserved C12th domestic space. The second-floor chamber, with its attendant chapel, in particular, may be interpreted as private women's space, for Countess Isabel de Warenne and the ladies of her chamber.

8.7.58 **Artistic interest:** The castle and the surrounding landscape has appeared in numerous paintings and etchings. The castle was the subject of early antiquarian interest and featured in Sir Walter Scott's novel Ivanhoe, published in 1819 AD.

Setting

8.7.59 The setting of the castle can be defined by its prominent position on a high spot in the local landscape overlooking the Don Vally, River Don, and approaches to the town on its road network connecting Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield via the River Don Gorge. The prominent hilltop location would have afforded extensive local views over the settlement of Conisbrough, the nearby St Peter's Church (1192787) and the rural periphery of the town, made of associated estate lands of the castle.

8.7.60 Historic key views associated with the settlement of Conisbrough would have been to the south-west towards the nearby St Peter's Church and the historic core of the town. Views to the north-east, north and north-west would have been of strategic importance, taking in the Don Valley forge and the historic main roads connecting major Medieval settlements. Views to the south would have taken in the rural, periphery of the castle and its estate lands, inclusive of the Medieval Deer Park located within the Site (W1).

Change and Summary of Effects

8.7.61 The existing landscape baseline around the castle takes in all of the anticipated modern development associated with a small town, inclusive of major transport infrastructure, residential and commercial buildings. Long distance landscape views from the upper levels of the Keep take in associated smaller scale rural settlement, surrounding fields and limited electrical infrastructure in the form of pylon towers and turbines. The Proposed Development (W1) would be visible in views south west from the upper levels of the Keep, with the panels of W1 visible in views beyond the town when looking along the length of the A630 Sheffield Road. The Proposed Development would not be visible from the lower, ground floor levels of the castle (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**).

8.7.62 In relation to its modern setting, only views south-west would be altered. These views, which take in some of the rural periphery of the town and lands associated with the Medieval Estate, would be changed, with the Proposed Development bringing additional infrastructure into views and resulting in further change to the character of the town's periphery. The Proposed Development would only be visible from the upper levels of the Keep, with views unchanged for visitors to the castle at ground level. Any contribution to significance in views south-west lies with the Castle's association with the former Medieval Deer Park, which is located within the Site at W1.

8.7.63 A Small magnitude of impact is predicted to the Scheduled Monument, resulting in a Moderate Adverse effect. In the case of this specific monument, a **Moderate Adverse** effect is considered to be **Not Significant**. The ability to appreciate the significance of the castle through its architectural, archaeological, historic and

artistic interest would remain unaffected. Some elements of its setting, which makes only a limited contribution to significance would however be adversely altered. Key historic views of Conisbrough's historic core would be unchanged. Key historic views north of the strategically important River Don Gorge would be unchanged. Setting Impacts would derive from the change to views south west, which take in some of the town's periphery and lands associated with the Deer Park and Medieval Estate.

Scheduled Monument 1491751 Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa

Summary of the Asset

8.7.64 The scheduled zone records second to fourth century Roman Villa within W1 (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**). The villa is located to the north of land parcel 36, buried on agricultural fields, west of Clifton.

8.7.65 The monument represents the core of a Romano-British villa with some evidence that the site continued in use into the early post-Roman period. The monument mainly survives as buried archaeological remains of buildings, including a bathhouse suite, mostly arranged around a courtyard, but with additional structures outside. Geophysical survey indicates that the villa complex is arranged around a courtyard some 30m by 20m, extending to the east of the bath house with aisled buildings enclosing the north and south sides of the courtyard.

8.7.66 The heritage significance of the villa is primarily derived from the historical and archaeological interest, being a well preserved, rare example of a high-status villa site in the region. The well-preserved structural elements of the villa have the potential to inform regional construction of high-status buildings during the Romano-British period, as well as to inform the distribution of such sites in relation to known rural settlement, the known Romano-British road network as well as known forts in the area.

Setting

8.7.67 The setting of the villa, in relation to its immediate rural periphery makes a limited contribution to its significance.

8.7.68 The historic setting of the villa is defined by its relationship to nearby Roman transport networks and nearby contemporary rural settlement and farmsteads. The distribution of local rural settlement is not well understood or mapped, with the same being true of the exact position of nearby Roman roads. As such, the historic setting of the villa cannot be adequately defined to be of use. Its modern setting is defined by its position in farmland, and its relationship to fields on its periphery, within c. 400m. This local rural landscape can act as a proxy for the low density, rural occupation of the period.

8.7.69 Local views from the villa site over the associated farmstead and immediate rural periphery inform our understanding of the villa's role as a country dwelling and likely farmstead, taking an active role and contributing to the local economy and place the villa in its historic rural landscape. Middle and long-distance views from the villa beyond the immediate rural periphery make very little contribution to significance. External views towards the villa make little contribution to significance.

Change and Summary of Effects

8.7.70 The existing landscape baseline around the farmstead is rural in character, with the nearest settlement of note, Conisbrough, with its southern extent located 1.6km north of the villa site. There is no large-scale electrical infrastructure in the immediate landscape around the asset. The Proposed Development (W1) would place infrastructure, in the form of solar panels in fields to the south, albeit some 260m removed from the villa site. Solar panels would also be located in fields 80m west of the villa site.

8.7.71 The Proposed Development is sited in fields south and west of the villa within its immediate rural periphery. Infrastructure will avoid physical disturbance of the asset thus preserving core aspects of its historic and archaeological interest.

8.7.72 Indirect Effects relating to setting would arise as a result of change to the former rural character around the asset, and the introduction of the infrastructure into what is a proxy for the historic rural character of the villa site. This character would be maintained in views to the north, east and south-east which do not contain solar panels. However, the rural character in the immediate vicinity of the villa would be altered as a result of the Proposed Development.

8.7.73 A Small magnitude of impact is predicted to the Scheduled Monument, resulting in a **Moderate Adverse** effect. In the context of this monument, this is considered **Not Significant**. Core aspects of significance, namely the surviving subsurface remains would be unaffected. Setting Impacts would not be of sufficient magnitude to alter the legibility of the monument or introduce a significant adverse effect.

RPG1001365 Barlborough Hall

Summary of the Asset

8.7.74 RPG1001365 comprises the designed landscape around the Grade I listed Barlborough Hall (1108972), its associated architectural elements, estate buildings and landscaping (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**). Barlborough Hall was built between AD1583 and 1584 for Francis Rodes, a prominent lawyer whose patron was the Earl of Shrewsbury. Much of the visible standing fabric of the hall and its associated buildings, along with the formal gardens and woodlands date from the 18th and 19th centuries. The estate remained in the family until 1938. Subsequent sales have split the estate across several different private ownerships, with the Grade I hall and surrounding land having been used as a school since 1938. The school was until recently the Preparatory school for Mount St Mary's College.

8.7.75 **Barlborough Hall**: The Grade I listed Barlborough Hall is discussed in greater detail elsewhere in this Chapter and is assessed separately for Indirect Effects relating to Setting. In brief, the hall is a late 16th century hall of sandstone ashlar and render with roofs hidden behind battlemented parapets. Its principal elevation faces south over the formal gardens and tree lined avenue leading south to the village and Conservation Area of Barlborough. Its exterior and interior underwent extensive renovation in the 19th century.

8.7.76 **Gate Piers, Stable, Lodge and Gazebo:** Grade II listed gate piers (1054694) are dated from the 18th Century with 19th-century alterations and are located immediately east of the hall and provide access through the formal gardens around the hall. The Grade II listed stable block (1335417) is located west of the

hall, and dates from the 17th century, with 18th - and 19th-century amendments. The stable block is constructed in brick, rubblestone and ashlar with coped gables and plain kneelers with machine tile roofs. The stables are made up of three ranges around a courtyard and are two storeys high. The stables have been converted into accommodation. The Grade II listed lodge (1108971) is located at the commencement of the southern avenue, leading between Barlborough village and the Conservation Area and the hall. The lodge is a mid-19th-century Tudor-style building constructed in sandstone ashlar with a slate roof. The Grade II* gazebo (1367143) is located to the west of the hall and is attached to a range of outbuildings. The building dates from the 17th century with later alterations. It is two storeys, made from rubblestone and ashlar with pantile roofs and coped gables.

8.7.77 **Formal Gardens and Avenues**: There are two formal entrances to the estate:

8.7.78 The southern entrance and associated lodge are accessed via Barlborough village, with the tree lined avenue leading through parkland to the main southern elevation and frontage of Barlborough Hall. This is now the main approach into the estate. The second historic approach is from the north via a lodge located on the A618 Rotherham Road, west of the Pebley Inn. This tree lined avenue led from the northern lodge into parkland whereby a footpath leads to the hall and stable buildings. The northern approach is no longer used except for dog walkers and ramblers. Of note is a second tree lined avenue running north-east from the lodge through the parkland, towards the Pebley Inn, but terminating in fields south of the Rotherham Road. The First Edition OS depicts a third tree lined avenue, leading from the hall eastward to kennels, a pond and boat house and woodland.

8.7.79 The Hall is surrounded by walled enclosures. On the south side of the building there is a range of three enclosures. Aligned with the Hall's southern elevation, a lawned garden bounded by low stone walls has a central path leading to a staircase which ascends to the first floor of the Hall. On the north side of the Hall there are playing fields which have brick walls with stone piers forming the east and west sides of an enclosure shown on both the 1839 Tithe map and 1923 OS map, when the north side was closed by a wall. West of the enclosure there are 20th century tennis courts sheltered by low banks to the west. On the west side of the Hall a brick-walled enclosure has an entrance in the west wall with a set of stone gate piers flanking gates with a wrought-iron overthrow.

8.7.80 **Parkland:** South Park, to the south and south-east of the Hall, consists largely of pasture with scattered trees. The parkland to the west and north of the Hall is now largely under arable cultivation. A patch of woodland called Garden Plantation shelters the north-east side of the kitchen garden. The First Edition OS Map depicts the hall and estate surrounded by a landscape of mixed agriculture and plantation forest. The closest settlements are Barlborough village to the south of the estate and the village of Spinkhill to the west. The modern estate is truncated and bounded by the M1 motorway along its western edge. There is 20th-century residential development around Barlborough, Clowne, Spinkhill and Renishaw, and agricultural land to the north and east.

8.7.81 The heritage significance of the Registered Park derives largely from its historic and architectural interest; in particular, it derives from the spatial, historical and visual inter-relationships between its inherent elements, including Barlborough Hall and its designated and non-designated historic outbuildings, the avenues and walkways, gardens, pleasure grounds and woodland, and the coherence of those elements as a historic designed landscape. The asset comprises a good surviving example of the evolution of early-Post-Medieval estates through the 18th to 20th

centuries, and particularly of the emphasis on improvements to both architecture and landscaping during the 19th century.

8.7.82 In addition to the above, the setting of the designed landscape makes a contribution to its significance.

Setting

8.7.83 The setting of the Registered Park and Garden can be defined by its relationship with the nearby village of Barlborough and the immediate rural periphery around the registered park and village, which place the park in its historic rural context. To the north, in which the Proposed Development is located, the rural periphery of the asset can be defined by the neighbouring fields extending from the edge of the Registered Park and Garden, east of the M1, as far as the southern limits of neighbouring settlements at Harthill and Woodall, some 1km north of the Proposed Development.

8.7.84 Principal views from the hall are south over the formal gardens, the southern parklands and the main southern avenue leading to Barlborough. Secondary views from the hall are northwards, towards the northern avenue, across its parklands and towards the kitchen gardens. Views north from the hall, particular from its upper storeys take in the northern avenue stretching north from the hall to Rotherham Road. These views take in the avenue and surrounding parkland, as well as agricultural fields at the northern limit of the policy and those outside of the policy, north of Rotherham Road.

8.7.85 Key views from the formal avenues are internal, framing the approach to the hall through its parklands. On the approach to the hall along the southern avenue views take in the tree lined avenue, copse woodland and open fields of the parkland. East and west agricultural fields are visible. When travelling along the avenue views north to the hall are largely screened in summer months with full vegetation on the trees. In winter, these views north would be more open and the hall may be visible.

8.7.86 On the final approach to the hall, within 150m of its southern elevation, views open up as the trees lining the avenue terminate and travellers pass through the copse woodland south of the hall. These are local and middle-distance views, with long distance views making no contribution to significance. External views into the park and garden make only a very limited contribution to significance. Much of its curtilage is wooded or hedged, screening views into the core of the estate or limiting views to agricultural fields along its edge. From the surrounding country roads, views of the hall are only possible from its eastern edge. No views are possible from the M1.

Change and Summary of Effects

8.7.87 The landscape baseline around the asset takes in the M1 motorway, which provides the westerly limit to the registered park and garden. Modern infrastructure to the north, east and south of the asset is largely confined to low level electrical and telecommunication infrastructure cutting across rural fields and lining country roads. The Proposed Development (W3) would introduce new solar panels into fields north and north-west of the A618 Rotherham Road, east and west of the M1. The Proposed Development would be located 150m north of the northern lodge and entrance on Rotherham Road and some 1.25km north of the Grade I hall.

8.7.88 Indirect Effects related to Setting are predicted to result from a change to the character of the outward views from within the registered park and garden. Designed views facing south towards Barlborough village would not be affected, namely views from the main southern elevation of the Grade I hall or from views south proceeding along the formal avenue south towards the village. Designed views from the hall east and west, over the formal gardens, stables and towards the gazebo would also not be affected. Designed views north, facing towards the northern avenue have the potential to be eroded. At ground floor level, the Proposed Development is not predicted to be visible from the hall, with topography, and vegetation providing screening.

8.7.89 The Proposed Development may be visible from the southern section of the southern avenue when travelling north, however, would disappear from view when within 200m of the hall. The Proposed Development may be intermittently visible when travelling north from the hall along its northern avenues, however, topography and planting is expected to screen views for the bulk of this area.

8.7.90 Parts of the infrastructure are likely to be partially visible in views from the upper storeys of Barlborough Hall, when taking in the northern avenues and parklands from the first and second storeys. Principal views from the hall are south. However, designed views north from the hall take in the northern formal avenues and northern parklands, inclusive of agricultural land within the park. The Proposed Development would not change key internal designed views. The Proposed Development would change views over the rural periphery north of the park, which contributes to a sense of the park's historic rural context. A small magnitude of impact is predicted to Barlborough Hall, resulting in a **Moderate Adverse** effect. In the case of this specific asset, this is considered to be **Not Significant**.

8.7.91 The ability to appreciate the significance of monument through its archaeological and historic interest would remain largely unaffected. Core aspects of its historic and architectural interest would remain unchanged. Key views south, which form the principal elevation of the hall would not be affected. Key designed views over the internal features of the park and garden, in views north would also remain legible. Any impacts relating to Setting, would result from the change to certain views north over adjoining farmland, notwithstanding the fact that much of the surrounding landscape to the east and south would remain unchanged.

Barlborough Conservation Area

Summary of the Asset

8.7.92 The Barlborough Conservation Area is comprised of three main components:

- The historic core of the village of Barlborough, as defined by the First Edition OS
- Barlborough Hall and its policies; and
- Nitticarhill Wood and the Pebley Pond.

8.7.93 Barlborough village is located at the southern limit of the Conservation Area (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**). The Conservation Area takes in its historic core, namely land north-west of Chesterfield Road, west of the M1 motorway and south of the Barlborough Estate. The Conservation Area takes in Church Street, High Street, Park View, Park Street and Ward Lane, its historic and listed buildings. Its principal buildings are

the Grade II* listed Church of St James, Barlborough Old Hall and Village Cross. The village is medieval in date, with the church and village cross dating to this period, the Old Hall being early 17th century in date.

8.7.94 The Barlborough estate and policies (a Registered Park and Garden) takes in the designed landscape around the Grade I listed Barlborough Hall (1108972), its associated architectural elements, estate buildings and landscaping. Barlborough Hall was built between AD1583 and 1584 for Francis Rodes, a prominent lawyer whose patron was the Earl of Shrewsbury, after he purchased the estate. Much of the visible standing fabric of the hall and its associated buildings, along with the formal gardens and woodlands date from the 18th and 19th centuries.

8.7.95 The heritage significance of the Conservation Area is derived from its historic, architectural and scenic interest, informing the evolution of a medieval hall and manor and the associated village that serviced the estate. Its architectural components further inform this development through the Medieval and Early Post-Medieval period and record 18th and 19th century improvements, aggrandization and growing wealth of the estate and nearby settlement. The Barlborough Estate, its parklands and the nearby Nitticarhill Wood/Pebley Pond contribute to the scenic value of the Conservation Area, with designed and scenic views located from within the estate and towards the estate from its immediate rural periphery. Views within and across the surrounding rolling countryside around the Conservation Area, also contribute to significance, reflecting the historic rural character of the hall, estate and village.

Setting

8.7.96 The setting of Barlborough village can be defined by the relationship of its historic core to the 20th and 21st century settlement, the relationship between the historic village and the Barlborough Estate, and the relationship between the historic core and its rural periphery. In relation to this asset, its rural periphery can be defined as the fields abutting its main approach along Worksop Road and the immediate fields abutting the village within 500m of its eastern edge. Views of note are between the main architectural elements of the Conservation Area, views north from the village towards the Barlborough Estate and views across the farmland surrounding the village.

8.7.97 The setting of Barlborough Estate can be defined by its relationship with the nearby village of Barlborough and the immediate rural periphery around the registered policy and village, which place the policy in its historic rural context. To the north, in which the Proposed Development is located, the rural periphery of the asset can be defined by the neighbouring fields extending from the edge of the Registered Park and Garden, east of the M1, as far as the southern limits of neighbouring settlements at Harthill and Woodall, some 1km north of the Proposed Development.

8.7.98 Principal views from the hall are south over the formal gardens, the southern parklands and the main southern avenue leading to Barlborough. Secondary views from the hall are northwards, towards the northern avenue, across its parklands and towards the kitchen gardens. Views north from the hall, particular from its upper storeys take in the northern avenue stretching north from the hall to Rotherham Road. These views take in the avenue and surrounding parkland, as well as agricultural fields at the northern limit of the policy and those outside of the policy, north of Rotherham Road.

8.7.99 The Setting of Nitticarhill Wood/Pebley Pond can be defined by their relationship to the nearby Barlborough estate and the surrounding rolling countryside, with the assets providing elements of screening and privacy for Barlborough Hall and also a buffer between the surrounding farmland and parklands of the estate, extending elements of parkland beyond the limits of the designed landscape.

Change and Summary of Effects

8.7.100 The landscape baseline around the Conservation area is semi-rural in character. The village of Barlborough has undergone substantial expansion and residential development in the 20th century and much of its rural character is gone. To the west of the Conservation Area is the M1 motorway. The northern and eastern edge of the Conservation Area is however, still abutted by farmland and is rural in character, with little in the way of electrical infrastructure or other development.

8.7.101 The Proposed Development would be located in fields 95m north of the northern edge of the Conservation Area (**ES Volume 3, Figure 5.1: Illustrative Masterplan [EN0110020/APP/6.19]**) with solar panels introduced into farmland east and west of the M1 and north of the A618 Rotherham Road. The nearest infrastructure would be 95m north of the northern avenue into the Barlborough Estate and some 330m north-west of the Pebley Pond.

8.7.102 Overall, a small magnitude of impact is predicted to the Conservation Area as a whole, resulting in a **Moderate Adverse** effect. In the case of this specific asset, this is considered to be **Not Significant**

8.7.103 Core aspects of its historic and architectural interest would remain unchanged. Changes to Setting are limited to one component of the Conservation Area, the Barlborough Estate and its designed landscape. Key views south, which forms the principal elevation of the hall would not be affected. Key designed views over the internal features of the park and garden, in views north would also remain legible. Impacts would result from a change to the views north over surrounding modern fields, which provide some sense of the park's former historic context. The legibility of the asset as a country estate would be maintained.

Ulley Conservation Area

Summary of the Asset

8.7.104 The village of Ulley is located in a rural landscape, between the M1 and the A618 to the east and west respectively (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**). The settlements of Aston and Aughton are located at some distance to the south-west, with the village of Brampton en le Morthen located at some distance east, east of the M1. The major town of Rotherham is located 3.5km to the north. The village is Medieval in origin, being named in the Domesday Book. Its principal buildings however, the Hall and Grange date from the early 18th century.

8.7.105 The Ulley Conservation area takes in the historic core of the settlement, its associated housing plots and nearby farmsteads, as detailed on the First Edition OS. The Conservation Area takes in properties on Main Street and Turnshaw Road. Main Street is characterised by widely spaced residential plots, with large gardens. The street is tree lined with few external views beyond the village. Turnshaw Road is less densely settled, with farmsteads and the Hall located along its length. There is less planting with more open views over the surrounding countryside.

8.7.106 The principal approaches to the village are from the west along Ulley Lane and Reservoir Road, from the south via Turnshaw Road and from the east along Penny Hill Lane. The approach along Turnshaw Road is along a narrow country lane lined with high hedgerows. The approach to the Conservation Area is on steady incline until within 200m of the village, where the topography flattens out, hedges shorten and views over the surrounding fields abutting the road are possible.

8.7.107 The topography to the west slopes down towards the Ulley Reseroir, with middle- and long-distance views possible. A rise exists to the east, limiting views in that direction beyond 100m from the lane. The approach from Penny Hill Lane, takes in neighbouring farmland, separated from the road by low hedges and occasional trees lining the road. The topography on this approach is relatively flat with views over adjoining fields.

8.7.108 The heritage significance of the Conservation Area derives primarily from its historic and architectural interests, informing the village's development from a medieval manor to a 19th century village on the outskirts of Rotherham.

Setting

8.7.109 The setting of Ulley can be defined by its historical associations with Ulley Hall and Grange, and the rural periphery which formed the lands associated with the Medieval manor. For discussions of this asset, its rural periphery can be defined as the fields abutting its main approaches and the field parcels within 250m of the village. Internal views of note are along Main Street, which is tree lined with limited views beyond the village.

8.7.110 Properties north of Main Street, inclusive of the church and grange overlook fields and farmland. Walking south along Turnshaw Road key views are to the village pub and Ulley Hall beyond. Views east take in open fields. Walking beyond Ulley Hall there are farmsteads before emerging into open countryside. The eastern and western approaches to the village are through open countryside as described above.

Change and Summary of Effects

8.7.111 The existing landscape baseline around the village is rural in character, with local views taking in fields and limited electrical infrastructure in the form of wooden power and telecommunication poles. In external views form the village, wind turbines are captured in middle distance views from Turnshaw Lane, when facing east. These same turbines are visible when approaching and leaving the village from the east along Penny Hill Lane. The Proposed Development would introduce electrical infrastructure in the form of solar panels into fields east of Turnshaw Lane, at a distance of some 250m. Solar panels would also be located in fields east and west of Turnshaw Lane, south of the Conservation Area. To the north, solar panels would be offset by 650m with a substation beyond.

8.7.112 There would be some change to outward views beyond the immediate periphery of the village, most notably in views east from Turnshaw Road between the village pub and Ulley Hall. In addition, views south from Ulley Hall Farm may also be eroded, with solar panels in close proximity to the southern edge of the Conservation Area. Beyond those, Indirect Effects to Setting are limited to a change to the views along the main approaches from the east and south. Solar panels would be visible in fields adjoining Penny Hill Lane up until the final 120m approach to the Conservation Area. Beyond this, views would open up to take in

farmland immediately adjacent to the village. Solar panels would also be visible (CHVP8) on the southern approach along Turnshaw Road, with panels becoming visible 250m south of the village, before becoming obscured by topography and vegetation on the final approach and entrance.

8.7.113 The placing of electrical infrastructure within the rural periphery of the village, and in fields just beyond this rural periphery, would mean that this infrastructure is visible from isolated locations within the village and on the main southern and eastern approaches. The western approach would be unaffected. Infrastructure is confined to fields south and east of the village. As such, there is considered to be some reduction in the legibility of the Conservation Area as a historic medieval settlement within an agricultural landscape. A small magnitude of impact is predicted to the Conservation Area resulting in a **Minor Adverse** effect. This is **Not Significant**.

Listed Building 1151524 Manor House, 16, Greaves Sike Lane, Micklebring

Summary of the Asset

8.7.114 This early Post-Medieval manor house is located within the rural hamlet of Micklebring, to the north of Greaves Sike Lane (see **Statutory and Non-Statutory Historic Assets [EN01100020/APP/2.7]**). The houses is north to south aligned with its principal elevation on its southern face, and fronting on to the lane. The house is recorded on the First Edition OS to the north of Greaves Sike Lane, with formal gardens to the north and beyond that fields. The bulk of houses associated with the village are to the south of the lane. The village itself is surrounded by open fields. The modern village has changed little since the First Edition OS.

8.7.115 The heritage significance of the house is primarily derived from the historical and architectural interest, being a well preserved Early Post-Medieval building in the region.

8.7.116 **Architectural interest:** The house is dated to c. l677 AD; with some later alterations. It is constructed in Magnesian limestone rubble, with a concrete pantile and Welsh slate roof. 2 storeys with partial cellar and attics; 3 windows to 1st floor; wing to rear left. Large quoins. Central C20 part-glazed door in moulded, quoined surround with deep lintel decorated by line carving of plumes about a shield with date and initials; dripstone.

8.7.117 Flanking bays have chamfered 3-light mullioned windows with concrete surrounds. 1st floor: original 2-light double-chamfered window with dripstone flanked by 2-light windows with concrete surrounds and mullions. Later attic windows over outer bays have projecting sills and wooden casements. Ashlar gable copings; brick end stacks. Gabled wing set back on left has C20 porch in angle beneath an original 2-light double-chamfered, mullioned window with dripstone.

8.7.118 To the rear is a basement to the left, originally lit by two 3-light double-chamfered, mullioned windows under dripstones (a doorway now inserted through the left-hand window); windows in same style and of 2, 1 and 2 lights to ground and 1st floors (that to ground-floor left altered). Side windows of wing all altered. Interior: chamfered, segmentally-arched ashlar fireplace backing onto left gable; another small ashlar fireplace to 1st-floor right. Old stud partitioning around the staircase. Altered roof with renewed principal rafters on older tie beans.'

8.7.119 **Historic interest:** the asset represents a well-preserved example of a C17th house in a rural location.

Setting

8.7.120 The setting of the building, in relation to the village and its immediate rural periphery make a limited contribution to significance.

8.7.121 The historic setting of the house is defined by its relationship to the adjoining village and its immediate rural periphery, which speaks to its role as a rural dwelling. Facing north, in which direction the Proposed Development is located, the rural periphery can be defined as the fields north of the village between the settlement and the M18. Local views from the house over the hamlet and the surrounding fields make a contribution to setting. Middle - and long-distance views beyond the immediate rural periphery of the house and hamlet do not contribute notably to significance.

Change and Summary of Effects

8.7.122 The existing landscape baseline around the house and village is semi-rural in character, with little in the way of large-scale electrical infrastructure. The nearest large-scale infrastructure is the M18 motorway, located just north of the village. The Proposed Development is located 750m north of the house in fields north of the village and north of the M18. The fields within the Proposed Development are outside of the immediate rural periphery of the house, however, its elevated position relative to landform to the north affords it views over some distance in that direction. The Proposed Development would be visible from the house, even taking into account surrounding vegetation and buildings.

8.7.123 The Proposed Development would be visible from the house in fields to the north. W1 is located beyond the rural periphery of the village and would be visible in middle- and long-distance views north. The ability to appreciate the significance of building through its historic and architectural interest would largely be unaffected, with the relationship between the house, village and immediate rural periphery unchanged.

8.7.124 Any Indirect Effects to Setting would arise from the presence of infrastructure in wider landscape views, changing middle-and long-distance views just beyond the rural periphery, south of the M18. The degree to which electrical infrastructure located adjacent to an existing motorway would detract change the character of those views, however, is modest, particularly given that those views already include the motorway and are also largely incidental overall.

8.7.125 A small magnitude of impact is predicted to Manor House, resulting in a **Minor Adverse** effect. This is **Not Significant**.

Listed Building 1314636 Hardwick Hall Farmhouse

Summary of the Asset

8.7.126 This Late C18th farmhouse is located to the terminus of Hardwick Lane and to the south of an adjoining farmstead. The house and farmstead are positioned in countryside north-east of the village of Aston and 750m east of the M1 motorway. The farmhouse is east to west aligned with its frontage facing east Hardwick Lane. The farmhouse is located within the farmstead with farm buildings to the north and north-east. A thin copse of trees is located to the south-east at the

terminus of Hardwick Lane. The farmhouse and farmstead are recorded on the First Edition OS. Both are depicted, as today, but with no tree planting to the south-east.

8.7.127 The heritage significance of the farmhouse is primarily derived from the historical and architectural interest, being a well preserved C18th example of a farmhouse from the period.

8.7.128 **Architectural interest:** The house was built in the Late C18th, altered and extended in the early C19th. A brief description details *'Coursed, squared sandstone, Welsh slate and pantile roof. Original L-shaped plan having wing to rear left, later wing infills rear-right angle. Two storeys and attic, three windows to first floor. Ashlar plinth, large quoins. Central door in raised ashlar surround flanked by C20 casements with projecting stone sills and lintels tooled as voussoirs. First floor: sashes with glazing bars, flush wood frames and similar sills and lintels. Damaged kneelers, ashlar gable copings; stone end stacks with bands. Left return: stair window.'*[20]

8.7.129 **Historic interest:** the asset represents a well-preserved example of an C18th farmhouse within its historic rural landscape.

Setting

8.7.130 The setting of the farmhouse, in relation to the farmstead and immediate rural periphery make a notable contribution to its setting and significance. The historic setting of the farmhouse is defined by its relationship to the adjoining farmstead, and its immediate rural periphery, which contribute to our understanding of rural settlement and the local economy of the period. In relation to this asset, its rural periphery can be defined as the fields immediately adjoining the farmhouse, within 500m of the building. Middle and long-distance views beyond the farmstead and immediate rural periphery make very little contribution to significance.

Change and Summary of Effects

8.7.131 The existing landscape baseline around the farmstead is rural in character, with fields on all sides. The nearest sections of the Proposed Development (W2) with infrastructure are located in fields 120m north of the asset. Additional infrastructure in the form of solar panels and substation/BESS is located in fields 305m east of the farmhouse.

8.7.132 The Proposed Development is sited in fields immediately north of the farmstead. The presence of this infrastructure is predicted to erode aspects of the assets historic interest, which are derived from its association with nearby fields owned and worked by the farm. Its association with adjoining fields, contribute to our understanding of the farm's role in the rural economy and place the farm in its historic rural landscape. Its architectural interest would be unchanged as would its association with the farmstead. Fields to the north of the farmstead would contain solar panels and may be visible from the upper elevations of the farmhouse, which whilst facing east to west may capture views of these fields.

8.7.133 Solar panels to the north are not expected to be visible from ground floor levels due to the number of farm buildings located north and north-east of the farmhouse. Fields to the east would contain solar panels and substation infrastructure and may be visible from the upper principal elevation of the farmhouse, which faces east and may capture views of these fields. Even if visible, this infrastructure to the east is beyond the immediate rural periphery of

the farmhouse and would not change local views. The Proposed Development would occupy fields immediately north of the farmstead, and more distantly, fields to the east. Fields to the north-west, west, south and south-east would be unaffected and remain undeveloped, and continue to be worked as farmland.

8.7.134 Despite the partial change in character of some of the fields to the north and east, the ability to appreciate the significance of the asset through its historic and architectural interest would largely be unaffected.

8.7.135 A Small impact is predicted to Hardwick Hall, resulting in a **Minor Adverse** effect. This is **Not Significant**.

Decommissioning

Direct Effects

8.7.136 Ground disturbance would be limited to areas already impacted at construction. No additional heritage assets would be impacted beyond those discussed during construction. No Direct Effects would be introduced during decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

Indirect Effects (Physical)

8.7.137 Indirect Effects relating to ground vibration would be of a similar or lower order of magnitude than during construction. No additional assets would be impacted beyond those discussed during construction.

8.7.138 Indirect Effects relating to ground contamination would be of a substantially lower order of magnitude than during construction. Any impacts could only result from maintenance activity or through leaks from operational equipment. No additional assets would be impacted beyond those discussed during construction.

Indirect Effects to Setting

8.7.139 Indirect Effects to Setting would be of a similar or lower order of magnitude than during construction. No additional assets would be impacted beyond those discussed during construction and operation and maintenance phases.

8.7.140 At the conclusion of the decommissioning phase, setting impacts would be reversed.

8.8 Additional Mitigation and Residual Effects

Additional Mitigation

8.8.1 No additional mitigation is proposed for Cultural Heritage and Archaeology effects.

Residual Effects

8.8.2 A summary of the potential Cultural Heritage and Archaeology effects is presented in **Table 8.9**.

Table 8.9 Summary of Residual Effects

Activity and Impact	Embedded Mitigation	Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Significance of Residual Effect
Construction – Direct (Physical)	Exclusion zones and micro siting of infrastructure (Further details to be found **outline Written Scheme of Investigation (oWSI) [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)	All Designated Assets	The highest	None	**Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**
Construction – Direct (Physical)	Micro siting of infrastructure where possible within the limits of other Site constraints and preservation in situ. Alternate construction methodology in HAS areas within the solar PV array and Cable Corridors to ensure preservation by record. Where this is not possible, a programme of archaeological fieldwork would be undertaken to ensure preservation by record. (Further details to be found in the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)	Non-designated assets	Lower	Small to large	**Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**

Activity and Impact	Embedded Mitigation	Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Significance of Residual Effect
Construction – Indirect (Physical)	None	All Designated Assets	The highest	None	**Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**
Construction – Indirect (Physical)	Watching brief during construction to ensure no indirect physical effects will occur (Further details to be found in the **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)	Non-designated assets	Lower	None	**Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**
Construction – Indirect (Setting)	None	All Assets	The highest - Lower	None	**Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**
Operation; Indirect (Setting)	Screening, Exclusion Zones and micro siting of infrastructure. (Further details to be found in **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)	Conisbrough Castle SM1010828	The highest	Small	**Moderate Adverse, Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**
Operation; Indirect (Setting)	Screening, Exclusion Zones and micro siting of infrastructure. (Further details to be found in **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)	Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa SM1491751	The highest	Small	**Moderate Adverse, Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**

Activity and Impact	Embedded Mitigation	Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Significance of Residual Effect
Operation; Indirect (Setting)	Screening, Exclusion Zones and micro siting of infrastructure. (Further details to be found in **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)	Barlborough Hall Registered Park and Garden	Less than the highest	Small	**Moderate Adverse, Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**
Operation; Indirect (Setting)	Screening, Exclusion Zones and micro siting of infrastructure. (Further details to be found in **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)	Barlborough Conservation Area	Less than the highest	Small	**Moderate Adverse, Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**
Operation; Indirect (Setting)	Screening, Exclusion Zones and micro siting of infrastructure. (Further details to be found in **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)	Ulley Conservation Area	Less than the highest	Small	**Minor Adverse, Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**
Operation; Indirect (Setting)	Screening, Exclusion Zones and micro siting of infrastructure. (Further details to be found in **oLEMP**	Hardwick Hall Farmhouse LB1314636	Less than the highest	Small	**Minor Adverse, Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**

Activity and Impact	Embedded Mitigation	Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Significance of Residual Effect
	[EN0110020/APP/5.13] and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)						
Operation; Indirect (Setting)	Screening, Exclusion Zones and micro siting of infrastructure. (Further details to be found in **oLEMP [EN0110020/APP/5.13]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]**)	Manor House LB1151523	Less than the highest	Small	**Minor Adverse, Not Significant**	N/A	**Not Significant**

8.9 Cumulative Effects

8.9.1 This section assesses the potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Development upon Cultural Heritage assets. The methodology used in this assessment is presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: EIA Methodology [EN0110020/APP/6.2.1]**.

8.9.2 The assessment undertaken has not identified any significant cumulative effects.

Intra-Cumulative Effects

8.9.3 Intra- cumulative impacts can be defined as those that occur where a single receptor is affected by more than one source of effect arising from different aspects of the Proposed Development. With the implementation of the embedded mitigation detailed in Section 8.6, no significant intra- cumulative effects have been anticipated in relation to Cultural Heritage and Archaeology during any phase of the Proposed Development. Intra-cumulative effects, including those relating to Human Health impacts, are presented in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment [EN0110020/APP/6.17]**.

Inter-Cumulative Effects

8.9.4 Inter-project effects refer to the impacts that arise from other existing and, or approved development within reasonable proximity to the Proposed Development, which individually might not be significant, but when considered together could create a significant cumulative effect on a shared receptor.

Direct (Physical) Impacts

8.9.5 A review of the potential for Direct (Physical) effects was undertaken of the Cumulative Project list shown in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.2: Long List of Cumulative Developments [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, with each project being individually assessed against heritage assets identified within the Proposed Development.

8.9.6 Based on the current baseline information, no other projects were found to overlap with any known heritage assets within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. There will therefore be no cumulative effects as a result of Direct Physical Impacts.

Indirect (Physical) Impacts

8.9.7 A review of the potential for Indirect (Physical) effects was undertaken of the Cumulative Project list shown in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.2: Long List of Cumulative Developments [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, with each project being individually assessed against heritage assets identified within the Proposed Development.

8.9.8 Based on the current baseline information, no other projects were found to overlap with any known heritage assets within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. There will therefore be no cumulative effects as a result of Indirect (Physical) Impacts.

Indirect (Settings) Impacts

8.9.9 All heritage assets with a predicted minor adverse effect, or greater, resulting from Indirect (Settings) Impacts associated with the Proposed Development, were considered for inter – cumulative effects with other schemes. Heritage assets with no or negligible adverse effects resulting from Setting Impacts associated with the Proposed Development were not considered.

8.9.10 From the baseline list shown in **ES Volume 3, Appendix 17.2: Long List of Cumulative Developments [EN0110020/APP/6.20]**, a total of eight projects were considered to have potential to generate inter – cumulative indirect (settings) effects due to their proximity and presence within the setting of specific Designated Heritage Assets. The projects with the potential for inter – cumulative effects with the Proposed Development are listed below:

Table 8.10: Cumulative Projects with Potential for Inter – Cumulative Indirect Effects

Address	Project / Planning Reference
Land off Carr Lane Ulley	RB2025/0029
Land south of West Bawtry Road Whiston	RB2025/1420
Land at Long Lane Whiston	RB2025/1468
Land South East Of Old Road Conisbrough Doncaster DN12 3LR	24/01404/FULM
Rowena House Old Road Conisbrough Doncaster DN12 3LX	25/02346/FULM
Land Off Moor Lane Micklebring Rotherham S66 7RN	22/00840/SCRE
Common Farm, Bookers Lane, Dinnington	RB2022/1203
Land north of Woodall Services Killamarsh Lane Woodall	RB2026/0228

8.9.11 The potential inter – cumulative indirect (setting) effects are assessed in the below tables:

Table 8.11 Scheduled Monument 1010828 Conisbrough Castle

Receptor		
SM1010828 Conisbrough Castle 1192747 Conisbrough Castle	1 x Scheduled Monument 1 x Grade I Listed Building	
Predicted Effect in Isolation: Moderate (adverse)		
Predicted Inter – Cumulative Effect: None		
Related project:		
Address: Rowena House Old Road Conisbrough Doncaster DN12 3LX	Planning Reference: 25/02346/FULM	Location: 0.75km north of W1.
Summary of Project	Redevelopment of Rowena House to provide a new 65 bedroom two storey care home.	
Summary of Potential Inter-Cumulative Impact	No setting impacts will be generated from this development. It is a residential redevelopment, within a residential suburb of Conisbrough. This development will result in no change to the setting of Conisbrough Castle.	
Related project:		
Address: Land South East Of Old Road Conisbrough Doncaster DN12 3LR	Planning Reference: 24/01404/FULM	Location: Adjacent to the Site - Whitestone 1
Summary of Project	Proposed residential development with public open space, access, landscaping and associated infrastructure.	
Summary of Potential Inter-Cumulative Impact	This project, located 1.6km from the castle, will extend the current residential area of Conisbrough to the south west and may be visible from the upper keep alongside the Proposed Development. Key views south, would not, however, be affected.	

Receptor	
Summary of Effects	It is considered that the residential development will not generate different effects to that reported for the Proposed Development alone. The ability to appreciate the significance of monument through its archaeological and historic interest would remain largely unaffected. Core aspects of its historic and architectural interest would remain unchanged. Key views south, would not be affected. In the context of this specific asset, this is considered to be **Not Significant** in term of EIA regulations.
Statement of Compliance	The Cumulative effect remains **Not Significant.** In relation to the NPS-EN1, the two Proposed Developments would result in no harm to the asset. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Table 8.12 Scheduled Monument 1491715 Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa

Receptor		
1491715 Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa	1 x Scheduled Monument	
Predicted Effect in Isolation: Moderate (adverse)		
Predicted Inter – Cumulative Effect: None		
Related project:		
Address: Land South East Of Old Road Conisbrough Doncaster DN12 3LR	Planning Reference: 24/01404/FULM	Location: Adjacent to the Site - Whitestone 1
Summary of Project	Proposed residential development with public open space, access, landscaping and associated infrastructure.	
Summary of Potential Inter-Cumulative Impact	This project, located 1.6km north-west of the villa, extends the current residential area of Conisbrough to the south west. Only partial views are possible between proposed residential development and the villa because of existing vegetation and Conisbrough Parks Farm.	

Receptor	
Summary of Effects	It is considered that the residential development will not generate different effects to that reported for the Proposed Development alone. The ability to appreciate the significance of the monument through its archaeological and historic interest would remain largely unaffected. Any impacts relating to setting, would result from the change to certain views north-west over adjoining farmland, notwithstanding the fact that much of the surrounding landscape to the east remain unchanged. In the context of this specific asset, this is considered to be **Not Significant** in term of EIA regulations.
Statement of Compliance	The Cumulative effect remains **Not Significant.** In relation to the NPS-EN1, the two Proposed Developments would result in no harm to the asset. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Table 8.13 Registered Park and Garden 1001365 Barlborough Hall and associated Listed Buildings

Receptor	
RPG1001365 – Barlborough Hall Associated Grade I Listed Buildings: 1108972 Barlborough Hall Associated Grade II * Listed Buildings: 1367143 Gazebo at Barlborough Hall Associated Grade II Listed Buildings:	1 x Registered Park and Garden 1 x Grade I Listed Building 1 x Grade II* Listed Building 3 x Grade II Listed Buildings

Receptor			
1054694 Gate piers to east of Barlborough Hall; 1108971 Lodge to Barlborough Hall; and 1335417 Stable block at Barlborough Hall.			
Predicted Effect in Isolation: Moderate (adverse)			
Predicted Inter – Cumulative Effect: None			
Related project:			
Address: Land north of Woodaall Services Killamarsh Lane Woodall	Planning Reference: RB2026/0228	Location: Adjacent to RLB for W3.	
Summary of Project	Erection of new substation, associated infrastructure including access, parking, landscaping and temporary construction access		
Summary of Potential Inter-Cumulative Impact	Potential setting impacts generated as a result of this project are limited to the construction and operational effects of the above ground substation and its associated upstanding infrastructure. The Proposed Development of RB2026/0228 is over 1km away from the assets and there is no visibility between the two due to the current vegetation and topography. The modern motorway services of Woodhall also interrupts the landscape between the assets and the two Proposed Developments of Whitestone Solar Farm and RB2026/0228, erasing any historic connection between the land parcels. Key views from the higher stories of Barlborough Hall will also be unaffected, due to the Proposed Development of Whitestone Solar Farm most likely blocking views to the Proposed Development of RB2026/0228.		

Receptor	
Summary of Effects	It is considered that the presence of these the substation and the Proposed Development will not generate different effects to that reported for the Proposed Development alone. The ability to appreciate the significance of monument through its archaeological and historic interest would remain largely unaffected. Core aspects of its historic and architectural interest would remain unchanged. Key views south, which forms the principal elevation of the hall would not be affected. Key designed views over the internal features of the park and garden, in views north would also remain legible. Any impacts relating to Setting, would result from the change to certain views north over adjoining farmland, notwithstanding the fact that much of the surrounding landscape to the east and south would remain unchanged. In the context of this specific asset, this is considered to be **Not Significant** in term of EIA regulations.
Statement of Compliance	The Cumulative effect remains **Not Significant**. In relation to the NPS-EN1, the two Proposed Developments would result in no harm to the asset. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Table 8.14 Grade II Listed Building 1151523 Manor House

Receptor		
Grade II Listed Building 1151523 Manor House	1 x Grade I Listed Building	
Predicted Effect in Isolation: Minor (adverse)		
Predicted Inter – Cumulative Effect: None		
Related project:		
Address: Land Off Moor Lane Micklebring Rotherham S66 7RN	Planning Reference: 22/00840/SCRE	Location: Adjacent to Cable Corridor CRB
Summary of Project	Request for an EIA screening opinion for the Proposed Mere Flats Solar Energy Supply Project	
Summary of Potential Inter-Cumulative Impact	Potential Setting Impacts generated as a result of this project are limited to the construction and operational effects of the above ground solar farm and associated infrastructure. The setting of the house is defined by its relationship to the adjoining village edge. The project of 22/00840/SCRE is located to the south of this asset, located c. 600m south. Visibility between this building and the project of 22/00840/SCRE is blocked by its surrounding residential buildings, and its immediate rural periphery will remain unchanged to the south.	
Summary of Effects	It is considered that the presence of this project will not generate different effects to that reported for the Proposed Development alone. The ability to appreciate the significance of building through its historic and architectural interest would largely be unaffected, with the relationship between the house, village and immediate rural periphery unchanged. In the context of this specific asset, this is considered to be **Not Significant** in term of EIA regulations.	
Statement of Compliance	The Cumulative effect remains **Not Significant**. In relation to the NPS-EN1, the two Proposed Developments would result in no harm to the asset. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.	

Table 8.15 Grade II Listed Building 1314636 Hardwick Hall Farmhouse

Receptor			
Grade II Listed Building 1314636 Hardwick Hall Farmhouse	1 x Grade I Listed Building		
Predicted Effect in Isolation: Minor (adverse)			
Predicted Inter – Cumulative Effect: None			
Related project:			
Address: Common Farm, Bookers Lane, Dinnington	Planning Reference: RB2022/1203	Location: Adjacent to Site - Whitestone 2.	
Summary of Project	Installation and operation of a solar energy park and associated infrastructure.		
Summary of Potential Inter-Cumulative Impact	Potential Setting Impacts generated as a result of this project are limited to the construction and operational effects of the above ground solar farm and associated infrastructure. The addition of another solar farm to the east of this Listed Building, together with the Proposed Development is predicted to increase the magnitude of impact on this Listed Building by a small degree. Both solar farms would be visible from the upper stories of the house. However, the ability to appreciate the significance of the asset through its historic and architectural interest would largely be unaffected.		
Summary of Effects	It is considered that the presence of an additional solar farm to the east of Hardwick Hall will not generate notably different effects to that reported for the Proposed Development alone. This is **Not Significant**.		
Statement of Compliance	The Cumulative effect remains **Not Significant**. In relation to the NPS-EN1, the Proposed Development would result in less than substantial harm to the asset, with the level of harm at the lower end of less than substantial harm. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.		

Table 8.16 Ulley Conservation Area

Receptor			
Ulley Conservation Area LB1151848 23, Main Street; LB1151849 Ulley Hall; LB1193449 Ulley Grange; LB1286131 Dovecote and Attached Outbuilding to South West of Ulley Hall; and LB1314679 Garden Wall with Gateway At Ulley Hall.	1 x Conservation Area 5 x Grade II Listed Buildings		
Predicted Effect in Isolation: Minor (adverse)			
Predicted Inter – Cumulative Effect: Minor (adverse)			
Related project:			
Address: Land off Carr Lane Ulley		Planning Reference: RB2025/0029	Location: Within the Site - Whitestone 2.
Summary of Project	Proposed ground-mounted solar PV arrays, supporting energy infrastructure (including battery storage (BESS), access improvements and ancillary development including, landscaping and biodiversity enhancements and continued shared agricultural use.		
Summary of Potential Inter-Cumulative Impact	Potential Setting Impacts generated as a result of this project are limited to the construction and operational effects of the above ground solar farm and associated infrastructure. The addition of another solar farm, together with the Proposed Development, located to the south-east of Ulley Conservation Area and its associated Listed Buildings is predicted to increase the magnitude of impact on these designated assets further by a small degree and contribute further to a reduction in legibility of the designated area.		
Summary of Effects	Though it is considered that the presence of an additional solar farm to the south-east of Ulley will lead to a slight further reduction in the legibility of the Conservation Area and its associated Listed Buildings. It is considered that their cumulative effect will not generate notably different effects to that reported for the Proposed Development alone. This is **Not Significant**.		

Receptor	
Statement of Compliance	The Cumulative effect remains **Not Significant.** In relation to the NPS-EN1, the Proposed Development would result in less than substantial harm to the asset, with the level of harm at the lower end of less than substantial harm. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

8.10 Summary

Statement of Significance

Direct Effects

8.10.1 With the implementation of embedded mitigation measures, as outlined within Section 8.6 of this Chapter, no significant effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. Through embedded mitigation measures, namely the avoidance of ground disturbance through repositioning of infrastructure or use of alternate construction designs, to allow the preservation in situ of subsurface archaeological features and a programme of further archaeological works, resulting in preservation by record, adverse effects would be reduced to **Not Significant** in the context of EIA regulations.

Indirect Effects (Physical)

8.10.2 **No Significant Adverse** effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. Despite being located within 100m of infrastructure, the installation of nearby solar panels in not expected to impact the subsurface remains of Scheduled Roman Villa SM1491751. No impact is predicted to either designated or non-designated assets, resulting in no effect to significance.

Indirect Effects to Setting

8.10.3 **No Significant Adverse** effects are predicted at construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning. However, **Moderate Adverse** effects to two Scheduled Monuments are predicted: 1010828 Conisbrough Castle and 1491751 Conisbrough Parks Romano-British Villa. These effects are considered to be **Not Significant** in terms of EIA regulations. **Moderate Adverse** effects have been predicted to Barlborough Registered Park and Garden and Barlborough Conservation Area. These effects are considered as **Not Significant** in the context of EIA regulations. Minor Adverse effects have been identified at Ulley Conservation Area. Minor Adverse effects to two Grade II Listed Buildings have also been predicted; 1314636 Hardwick Hall and 1151523 Manor House. As they are **Minor Adverse** effects they are, therefore, considered as **Not Significant** in the context of EIA regulations.

8.11 Opportunities for Offsetting and Public Benefit

8.11.1 The NPPF, with which NPS EN-1 is consistent in principle, states within Section 16, para 202 that heritage assets are *'an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations'.*

8.11.2 Paragraph 203 of the NPPF goes on to state that a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment should be put in place and that this strategy should take into account:

- ‘the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place’.

8.11.3 Public engagement with the local heritage resource and the dissemination of knowledge and understanding about its character and distinctiveness can all add to the significance of said assets to local communities and contribute wider social benefits.

8.11.4 Where impacts to the heritage resource cannot be avoided there is desirability that some public benefit would be generated through development:

8.11.5 Where it has been demonstrated that avoidance or retention is not possible, excavation, recording, analysis, archiving, publication and activities to provide public benefit may be required through the use of conditions or legal/planning obligations.

8.11.6 Guidance issued by the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers (ALGAO) for Scotland, which is more comprehensive than Guidance in England, around the delivery of public benefits relating to cultural heritage and archaeology advises that:

‘Applicants/Developers and their Archaeological Contractors are expected to include public engagement and social value opportunities, as appropriate, in each of their developments, where archaeological works to mitigate and offset harm to heritage assets is required. The emphasis is to be proportionate and reasonable at all times….’

8.11.7 The proposed mitigation works outlined within Section 8.6 and the associated curation of the associated written reports and physical archive go some way to achieving the desired outcome of public engagement and social value, with information becoming publicly available through the records within the HER and grey literature reports available through the Archaeology Data Service (ADS).

8.11.8 This information will enhance the knowledge and understanding of below ground archaeological remains within the Order Limits. The results of the geophysical survey, combined with the results of upcoming archaeological site investigation will greatly enhance the understanding of Late Prehistoric and Romano-British settlement in the region. Additionally, future, targeted works around the Medieval Conisbrough Deer Park, the borders of which are not well understood, may be better understood. Such work may take the form of geophysical survey and targeted excavation.

8.11.9 Beyond this, further public benefit resulting from the Proposed Development may be achieved through a programme of public engagement and community involvement in archaeological fieldwork and post-consent archaeological works secured within **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** (and summarised in Section 8.6 of this Chapter), that may contribute to understanding and local character.

8.11.10 As part of the baseline data collection (**ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.2: Heritage Baseline [EN0110020/APP/6.20.1]**) for the production of this Chapter, discussions were held between the Applicant and CRAG, who have worked extensively in the area around Conisbrough, and in particularly, have carried out extensive research on the Firsby Medieval Pottery Works, located south and adjacent to Whitestone 1.

8.11.11 The Applicant would look to work alongside CRAG (and other interested local parties) during the forthcoming programme of archaeological fieldwork around Whitestone 1, and in particular within the fields abutting the Firsby Medieval Pottery Works. The Applicant would encourage the archaeological contractor undertaking said works on behalf of the Proposed Development to engage with CRAG and seek active involvement in archaeological fieldwork, where health and safety considerations allow.

8.11.12 Beyond the ongoing archaeological investigations and any works that may be required to be undertaken post-consent, as secured within the **ES Volume 3, Appendix 8.7: Archaeological Investigation and Preservation Strategy [EN0110020/APP/6.20]** and **oWSI [EN0110020/APP/5.16]** (and summarised in Section 8.6 of this Chapter), the Applicant would look to support CRAG with their future investigations around the Firsby Pottery Works. The Applicant would provide some funding for the further investigation of the pottery site, with field work to be undertaken within the Site, close to the location of the pottery works and, if landowners are amenable, to fund works in adjoining land parcels outside of the Site.

8.11.13 Work to date by CRAG, whilst invaluable to our understanding of the pottery site as a regional centre of production, has been limited by constraints of money, time and limited staffing. With the Applicant's support, it is proposed that a programme of works could be undertaken to further inform the location, extent and character of the pottery site, with archaeological works likely to take the form of a mixed programme of bespoke geophysical survey to identify kiln structures, field walking, test pitting and evaluation trenching. These works would be designed and led by CRAG, who would remain at the forefront of any future investigation of this site.

References

1 UK Government (1990) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents [Accessed 10/08/2023]

2 UK Government (1979) Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act. Available at www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46 [Accessed 10/08/2023]

[3] Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2025). Overarching National Policy Statement for energy (EN-1) [online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1-2025 [Accessed April 2026]

[4] Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2025). National Policy Statement for renewable energy infrastructure (EN-3). [Online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en-3-2025. [Accessed: April 2026]

[5] Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2025) National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) [Online] Available at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-electricity-networks-infrastructure-en-5-2025 [Accessed: July 2025]

[6] UK Government (2023) National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph 199. Available at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2 [Accessed 13/09/2023]

[7] City of Doncaster (2025) *Doncaster Local Plan 2015 – 2035.* Available at: https://www.doncaster.gov.uk/services/planning/local-plan [Accessed 13/09/2023]

[8] Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (2014) *Rotherham Local Plan: Core Strategy 2013 – 2018*. Available at: https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/307/adopted-rotherham-core-strategy [Accessed 13/09/2023]

[9] Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (2018) *Rotherham Local Plan: Sites and Policies.* Available at: https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/478/sites-and-policies-document [Accessed 13/09/2023]

[10] North East Derbyshire District Council (2025) *Adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2014 – 2034.* Available at: https://www.ne-derbyshire.gov.uk/planning-and-local-plan/planning-policy-and-local-plan/development-plan#ANE (Accessed 13/09/2023)

[11] Sheffield City Council (2025) *The Sheffield Core Strategy: Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy.* Available at: https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning-development/sheffield-plan (Accessed 13/09/2023)

[12] Bolsover District Council (2025) *Development Plan: Local Plan for Bolsover District.* Available at: https://www.bolsover.gov.uk/services/p/planning-policy/planning-policy-documents/development-plan (Accessed 13/09/2023)

[13] Rotherham Metropolitan Council (2025) *Neighbourhood Plans: Dinnington St John's Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2028.* Available at: https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/planning-development/neighbourhood-plan (Accessed 13/09/2023)

[14] Rotherham Metropolitan Council (2025) *Neighbourhood Plans: Maltby Neighbourhood Plan.* Available at: https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/planning-development/neighbourhood-plan/3 (Accessed 13/09/2023)

[15] Rotherham Metropolitan Council (2025) *Neighbourhood Plans: Wickersley Neighbourhood Plan.* Available at: https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/planning-development/neighbourhood-plan/2 (Accessed 13/09/2023)

[16] Archaeology Data Service (2013) *South Yorkshire Historic Environment Characterisation Project* [Online] Available at: [redacted]m (Accessed 13/09/2023)

[17] Gov.UK (2025) *National Planning Policy Framework: Annex 2: Glossary* Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/annex-2-glossary (Accessed 13/09/2023)

[18] Historic England (2019) *Historic England Advice Note 12: Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets [Online]* Available at: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/statements-heritage-significance-advice-note-12/ (Accessed 25th August 2025)

[19] Braintree District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2018).

[20] Historic England (2026) *Hardwick Hall Farmhouse* [Online] Available at: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1314636?section=official-list-entry (Accessed 2nd April 2026) Historic England (2026) *Hardwick Hall Farmhouse* [Online] Available at: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1314636?section=official-list-entry (Accessed 2nd April 2026)

WHITESTONE
solar farm

Contact

Whitestone Net Zero Ltd
info@whitestonesolarfarm.co.uk
0800 688 9936