

# Springwell Solar Farm

## Preliminary Environmental Information Report

Volume 1  
Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage

Phase 2 consultation  
Springwell Energyfarm Ltd



# Table of Contents

- 8. Cultural Heritage ..... 2**
- 8.1. Introduction 2
- 8.2. Consultation, scope and study area 2
- 8.3. Legislative framework, planning policy and guidance 37
- 8.4. Methodology 40
- 8.5. Summary of baseline conditions 45
- 8.6. Likely effects, additional mitigation and residual effects 46
- 8.7. Opportunities for environmental enhancement 51
- 8.8. Intra-project combined effects 51
- 8.9. Difficulties and uncertainties 51
- 8.10. Further work to inform the ES 52

## 8. Cultural Heritage

### 8.1. Introduction

- 8.1.1. This chapter presents the preliminary environmental information and a preliminary assessment of the likely significant environmental effects arising from the construction and operation (including maintenance) of the Proposed Development upon cultural heritage.
- 8.1.2. As proposed in the EIA Scoping Report and agreed through the Scoping Opinion received, impacts during decommissioning have not been considered within this preliminary assessment. Refer to **Section 8.2** below for further detail.
- 8.1.3. This chapter is intended to be read as part of the wider Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) with particular reference to the following appendices presented in **Volume 3**:
- **Appendix 8.1** – Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (DBA);
  - **Appendix 8.2** – Aerial Investigation Report;
  - **Appendix 8.3** – Geophysical Report;
  - **Appendix 8.4** – Listed Building Visibility; and
  - **Appendix 8.5** – Listed dwellings in settlements over 1km from the Site.
- 8.1.4. **Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual** considers cultural heritage assets in so much as they contribute to landscape character and its perceived value.

### 8.2. Consultation, scope and study area

#### *Consultation undertaken to date*

- 8.2.1. An EIA Scoping Report, as provided in **Appendix 4.1**, setting out the proposed cultural heritage assessment scope and methodology for the Proposed Development, was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in March 2023. A Scoping Opinion, as provided in **Appendix 4.2**, was issued by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State in May 2023. **Appendix 4.3** provides responses to comments relating to cultural heritage in the Scoping Opinion and details how these have been addressed in this preliminary assessment.
- 8.2.2. **Table 8.1** provides a summary of the consultation activities undertaken in support of the preparation of this preliminary assessment, out with the EIA Scoping process.

**Table 8.1 Summary of consultation undertaken**

Consultee	Key matters raised	Actions in response to consultee comments
Lincolnshire County Council Heritage Team – email correspondence 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2022	Consulted on written scheme of investigation (WSI) for geophysical survey.	WSI for geophysical survey agreed.
Lincolnshire County Council Heritage Team – email correspondence and virtual meeting 15 <sup>th</sup> September 2023	Emailed the proposed evaluation strategy along with the Archaeological DBA ( <b>Appendix 8.1</b> ), aerial investigation and mapping report and geophysical survey results. Initial response reiterated need for trenching to include apparently blank areas and across the full impact zone.	A detailed proposal for further evaluation will be discussed with Lincolnshire County Council’s and North Kesteven District Council’s heritage advisors.
Historic England – virtual meeting held on 20 <sup>th</sup> June 2023	Introduced project, work carried out so far including summary geophysical survey results. Historic England recommended producing a deposit model to map the distribution of buried deposits of archaeological interest across the Site and investigate the reasons for differences in the distribution of geophysical anomalies of likely archaeological origin across the Site.	Deposit modelling of the Site is in progress and will inform further discussions on the scope of evaluation.

**Scope of the assessment**

- 8.2.3. This section updates the scope of assessment and confirms, and where necessary updates, the evidence base for scoping out receptors/matters following further iterative assessment and consideration of the Scoping Opinion.
- 8.2.4. Subsequent to the submission of the EIA Scoping Report, a Stage 1 Setting assessment has been completed for the designated heritage assets within 5km of the Site and non-designated assets within 2km of the Site. This is presented in **Appendix 8.1** and has informed the selection of assets for inclusion in this preliminary assessment where they may experience likely significant effects as

a result of change within their setting. This has resulted in a shorter list of receptors (assets) for inclusion in the assessment than was proposed in the EIA Scoping Report due to there now being a greater understanding of how setting contributes to the significance of the assets. Assets that lie outside the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) for the Proposed Development (**Figures 9.5 - 9.9**) have been scoped out following this Stage 1 Setting assessment.

- 8.2.5. The geophysical survey results have informed the design parameters for the Proposed Development, avoiding impacts on a number of non-designated heritage assets (some previously recorded, and others identified through this survey). The archaeological assets which lie outside areas where ground disturbance as a result of the Proposed Development will occur have also been scoped out of this preliminary assessment as they will not experience construction phase effects.

#### **Receptors/matters scoped out of further assessment**

- 8.2.6. **Table 8.2** presents the receptors/matters that are scoped out of further assessment, together with appropriate justification. Where a change has occurred to the approach proposed within the EIA Scoping Report, this is clearly stated and justified.

**Table 8.2 Receptor/matters scoped out of further assessment**

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Effects of operational lighting on heritage assets	Operation	<p>CCTV lighting will be infrared (not visible) and lighting for the Springwell Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds will be manually operated, directional and only operated in case of emergency or when maintenance is required to be undertaken during hours of darkness. There will be no permanent or movement activated lighting at night. No assets have been identified for which such temporary increases in nighttime illumination would affect the contribution of setting to their significance.</p>	<p>Change - this matter was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this matter has been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this matter does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Listed K6 telephone kiosks	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts to the K6 telephone kiosks is predicted due to their distance from the Site.</p> <p>The K6 telephone kiosks are listed for their architectural interest which is appreciated in close proximity. Their surroundings make a neutral contribution to their significance as they are found in a variety of contexts throughout the UK. No significant effects are predicted as a result of visual change within their wider surroundings.</p>	<p>No change – this receptor was proposed to be scoped out of further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Findspots recorded by Lincolnshire County Council HER (see <b>Table A8.3</b> in <b>Appendix 8.4</b> for details)	Construction and operation	As findspots, these have been removed from the Site and the heritage significance of their former locations will not be harmed by the Proposed Development.	No change – these receptors were proposed to be scoped out of further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.
Milepost 20 metres south of Ashby Lodge Farm, Grade II Listed Building (NHLE Ref: 1061824)	Operation	The positive contribution made by setting to the significance of the milepost derives from its relationship with the road network, and this would not be altered by the Proposed Development during operation	No change – this receptor was proposed to be scoped out of further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.
Avro Lancaster crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25416)	Operation	The significance of this asset does not draw on its wider surroundings	No change – this receptor was proposed to be scoped out of further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.
Hawker Hurricane crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25417)	Operation	The significance of this asset does not draw on its wider surroundings	No change – this receptor was proposed to be scoped out of further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.
Sites of former extractive pits in Ashby de la Launde and Bloxholm,	Construction and operation	The Archaeological DBA ( <b>Appendix 8.1</b> ) has concluded that the archaeological interest of these former extractive pits (recorded on superseded OS mapping) is	No change – these receptors were proposed to be scoped out of further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report but the Scoping Opinion has

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
and Rowston		low <sup>1</sup> . The effects of the Proposed Development on the significance of these assets would be minor and not significant.	requested they be scoped in. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors should remain scoped out of further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
Car dyke Scheduled Monument (four sections designated individually: NHLE 1004925, 1004926, 1004960 and 1005484)	Construction and operation	No physical impacts predicted as the asset is outside the Site. Only two of the sections are predicted to have any visibility of the Proposed Development and the positive contribution of setting to the significance of the monument will not be altered.	Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
Scheduled and listed village crosses in Wellingore, Dorrington and Cranwell (NHLE 1009214/1061856,	Construction and operation	No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site. The contribution of setting to the significance of these assets will be unaffected by the Proposed Development, and they are sufficiently removed from the	Change – these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, these receptors have now been considered. However, the

<sup>1</sup> Appendix 8.1 Annex 1



Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
1254204, 1009224/1254082)		Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.	Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
Scheduled and listed village crosses in Metherringham, Digby and Rowston (NHLE 1005022, 1009229/1254084, 1009230/1359364)	Construction and operation	No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site. No change to the setting of these assets is predicted (no elements of the Proposed Development will be visible from the assets or from areas where they are appreciated and they are sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects).	Change – these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, these receptors have now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
Remains of preceptory church, Temple Bruer (NHLE 1007686)	Construction and operation	No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site. The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.	Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Catley Priory (NHLE 1017524)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>No change to the setting of this asset is predicted (no elements of the Proposed Development will be visible from the asset or from areas where it is appreciated and the asset is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects).</p>	<p>for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p> <p>Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Nocton Park Priory (NHLE 1018898)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>No change to the setting of this asset is predicted (no elements of the Proposed Development will be visible from the asset or from areas where it is appreciated and the asset is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects).</p>	<p>Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Castle Hill Ringwork (NHLE 1020436)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>No change to the setting of this asset is predicted (no elements of the Proposed Development will be visible from the asset or from areas where it is appreciated and the asset is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects).</p>	<p>Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the ‘Justification’ column.</p>
Neolithic long barrow (NHLE 1013916)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this monument will not be affected.</p>	<p>Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the ‘Justification’ column.</p>
Boothby Graffoe, Navenby, Metheringham, Martin	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site.</p>	<p>Change – these receptors were considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
and Wellingore Conservation Areas		No change to the setting of these assets is predicted and the assets are sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.	information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, these receptors have now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
147 Listed Buildings not predicted to have visibility of the Proposed Development (see <b>Appendix 8.4</b> for details)	Construction and operation	No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site. No change to the setting of these assets is predicted and the assets are sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.	Change – these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, these receptors have now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
Listed Churches: Church of St Oswald (NHLE 1061750), Church of St Andrew (NHLE 1061976), Church of St Clement	Construction and operation	No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site. No change to the setting of these assets is predicted and the assets are sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc.	Change – these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, these receptors have now

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
<p>(NHLE 1064293), Church of the Holy Cross (NHLE 1064299), Church of St Thomas A Becket (NHLE 1254176), Church Tower to the north of Temple Farmhouse (NHLE 1254328), Church of St Mary (NHLE 1261473), Church of All Saints (NHLE 1308424), Church of the Holy Cross (NHLE 1359365).</p>		<p>during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>College Hall at Royal Air Force Cranwell (NHLE 1254079) and gates and gate lodges to College Hall at RAF Cranwell (NHLE 1254080)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site.  The contribution of setting to the significance of these assets will be unaffected by the Proposed Development, and they are sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change – these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, these receptors have now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Walcote War Memorial (NHLE 1455118)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development, and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the ‘Justification’ column.</p>
J R Scott’s Almshouses (NHLE 1254327)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development, and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the ‘Justification’ column.</p>
Wellingore Hall and attached RC Church of St Augustine (NHLE	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site.</p>	<p>Change – these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
1147738) and Gates and wall to Wellingore Hall (NHLE 1360572)		The contribution of setting to the significance of these assets will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and they are sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.	information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, these receptors have now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
Farmhouses and agricultural buildings over 1km from the Site (see <b>Table A8.4</b> in <b>Appendix 8.4</b> for details)	Construction and operation	No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site. The contribution of setting to the significance of these assets will be unaffected by the Proposed Development, and they are sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.	Change – these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, these receptors have now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
Stable block with attached cottage at Thorpe Tilney Hall (NHLE 1064304) & orangery and attached garden wall at Thorpe	Construction and operation	No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site. The contribution of setting to the significance of these assets will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and they are sufficiently removed from the	Change – these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, these receptors have now

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Tilney Hall (NHLE 1280630)		Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.	been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
The Old Workhouse Cottages and attached outbuilding (NHLE 1147685)	Construction and operation	No physical impacts are predicted as these assets are outside the Site. The contribution of setting to the significance of these assets will be unaffected by the Proposed Development, and they are sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.	Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.
Wellingore Garage (NHLE 1406722)	Construction and operation	No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site. The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.	Change – this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be



Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Listed dwellings within settlements over 1km from the Site (see <b>Appendix 8.5</b> for details)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted due to the distance of the assets to the Site.</p> <p>The positive contribution made by setting to the significance of residential listed buildings within settlements is confined to their immediate street scene and does not draw on views of the wider surroundings. No significant effects are therefore predicted. Most of these assets also lie outside the ZTV for the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p> <p>No change – these receptors were proposed to be scoped out of further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report but the Scoping Opinion has requested they be scoped in. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors should remain scoped out of further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Village Lock Up (NHLE 1254194)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Pair of outbuildings to rear of no's 17-23 (NHLE 1254081)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Pigeoncote to rear of no 7 (NHLE 1254408)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
The Marquis Of Granby (NHLE 1147781)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Pump south of no 24 (NHLE 1061826)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Kirkby Green Mill (NHLE 1064295)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Wellingore Mill (NHLE 1147665)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.  The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Scopwick Mill (NHLE 1280676)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.  The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to changes in the design of the Proposed Development and additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
<p>Obelisk 4 metres south east of number 4 Rookery Lane (NHLE 1254209)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.  The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p> <p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Horse Monument 10 metres north west of April Cottage (NHLE 1261367)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.  The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
The Old School (NHLE 1205521)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p> <p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Sundial 3 metres east of The Close (NHLE 1308375)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Ashby Hall (NHLE 1061827)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Home Farmhouse (NHLE 1061825)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Farmyard north of The Firs (NHLE 1280661)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Farmyard to the north of Number 10 (NHLE 1064296)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Beckside Farmhouse (NHLE 1205530)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now</p>



Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Gates to Blankney Hall (NHLE 1359358)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.  Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>The Old Rectory (NHLE 1254208)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.  The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Brauncewell Lodge (NHLE 1261461)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p> <p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Gresham (NHLE 1280651)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Kirkby Green Millhouse (NHLE 1280667)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
2 and 4 Main Street (NHLE 1360598)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
26 and 28 Main Street (NHLE 1360599)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>25 Beckside (NHLE 1064294)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>37 and 39 Main Street (NHLE 1064297)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>15 Main Street (NHLE 1064298)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.  Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>97-103 Main Street (NHLE 1064300)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.  Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
High House (NHLE 1064301)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p> <p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Cottage to West of Kirkby Green Mill (NHLE 1205538)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
47 Main Street (NHLE 1205570)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the offsetting of panels the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Archway 20 metres south of the vicarage (NHLE 1064302)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>The contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
Church of St Oswald (NHLE 1064285)	Construction and operation	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>Due to the design of the Proposed Development to site panels and other above ground infrastructure so that they will not affect views in which the church is appreciated, the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Church of All Saints (NHLE 1254135)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the design of the Proposed Development to site panels and other above ground infrastructure so that they will not affect views in which the church is appreciated, the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Blankney Park (non-designated park and garden Lincs HER reference MLI82759)</p>	<p>Construction and operation</p>	<p>No physical impacts are predicted as this asset is outside the Site.</p> <p>Due to the design of the Proposed Development to site panels and other above ground infrastructure so that they</p>	<p>Change - this receptor was not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was</p>



Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>will not affect views in which former park is appreciated, the contribution of setting to the significance of this asset will be unaffected by the Proposed Development and it is sufficiently removed from the Site that noise, dust etc. during construction will not lead to significant effects.</p>	<p>submitted, this receptor has now been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this receptor does not need to be considered for further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>The setting of all heritage assets</p>	<p>Decommissioning</p>	<p>The effects of decommissioning activities on the setting of heritage assets will be similar to those during construction and will reverse the operational phase setting effects. Any negative effects are therefore considered to be not significant.</p>	<p>No change – this matter was proposed to be scoped out of further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report but the Scoping Opinion has requested that decommissioning effects be scoped in on the basis that assets avoided or protected in situ during construction may be under threat from disturbance or destruction during decommissioning. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that this matter should remain scoped out of further assessment for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>
<p>Below ground archaeological remains</p>	<p>Decommissioning</p>	<p>Measures documented within and secured by the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will ensure that ground disturbance as a result of decommissioning activities will not be</p>	<p>No change – this matter was proposed to be scoped out of further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report but the Scoping Opinion has requested it be scoped in. However,</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>materially more than the construction phase. As the embedded and additional mitigation for below ground archaeological remains will ensure that no significant effects to below ground remains will occur during construction, there will not be significant decommissioning effects.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not anticipated to result in significant soil compaction or changes to hydrology during decommissioning (refer to <b>Chapter 10: Land, Soils and Groundwater</b> and <b>Chapter 13: Water</b>).</p>	<p>the Applicant is of the opinion that this matter should remain scoped out of further assessment for the reasons outlined in the ‘Justification’ column.</p>
<p>Scheduled remains of former villages of Brauncewell (NHLE 1018397) and Dunsby (NHLE 1013895)</p>	<p>Construction</p>	<p>The remains of Dunsby lie sufficiently far from the Site that construction phase effects will not occur.</p> <p>The masterplan has avoided siting infrastructure in proximity to the scheduled monument of Brauncewell, avoiding the potential for significant construction phase effects.</p>	<p>Change - these receptors were proposed to be scoped into further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to changes in the design of the Proposed Development since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, they are now scoped out of further assessment (for the construction phase only) for the reasons outlined in the ‘Justification’ column.</p>
<p>Scopwick and Blankney Conservation Areas</p>	<p>Construction</p>	<p>Mitigation measures documented within and secured by the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan and the Outline</p>	<p>Change – these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but due to changes in the</p>

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
		<p>Construction Environmental Management Plan will ensure that construction phase impacts on the conservation areas will be avoided.</p>	<p>design of the Proposed Development and/or additional information having been obtained since the EIA Scoping Report was submitted, they have been considered. However, the Applicant is of the opinion that these receptors do not need to be considered for further assessment (for the construction phase only) for the reasons outlined in the 'Justification' column.</p>

**Receptors/matters scoped into further assessment**

8.2.7. **Table 8.3** presents the receptors/matters that are scoped into further assessment, together with appropriate justification. Where a change has occurred to the approach proposed within the EIA Scoping Report, this is clearly stated and justified.

**Table 8.3 Receptor/matters scoped into further assessment**

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Milepost 20 metres south of Ashby Lodge Farm, Grade II Listed Building (NHLE Ref: 1061824)	Construction	The mile post is located within the Site. Construction activity will therefore directly impact on this asset, with potential for significant effects to occur.	No change – this receptor was proposed to be scoped into further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.
Avro Lancaster crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25416)	Construction	Although a non-designated heritage asset, military crash sites are protected by legislation. The crash site is recorded within the Site. Construction activity would directly impact on this asset, with potential for significant effects to occur.	No change – this receptor was proposed to be scoped into further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.
Hawker Hurricane crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25417)	Construction	Although a non-designated heritage asset, military crash sites are protected by legislation. The crash site is recorded within the Site. Construction activity would directly impact on this asset, with potential for significant effects to occur.	No change – this receptor was proposed to be scoped into further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification	Change to the approach proposed in the EIA Scoping Report
Scheduled remains of former villages of Brauncewell (NHLE 1018397) and Dunsby (NHLE 1013895)	Operation	The rural setting of these assets contributes to their significance and the character of this setting could be altered by the presence of the solar farm within the wider surroundings.	No change – these receptors were proposed to be scoped into further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.
Scopwick and Blankney Conservation Areas	Operation	The positive contribution of setting to the significance of these conservation areas could be affected by the Proposed Development	Change - these receptors were not considered within the EIA Scoping Report, but the Scoping Opinion has requested they be considered. Following further consideration, the Applicant agrees with this opinion.
Currently unknown below ground archaeological remains within the Site	Construction and operation	There remains potential for currently unknown remains to be present within the Site which could be impacted by the construction of the Proposed Development. The contribution of setting to the heritage significance of these assets could be impacted by the presence of the Proposed Development over or in proximity to them.	No change – this receptor was proposed to be scoped into further assessment within the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion has agreed with this approach.

### **Extent of the study area**

- 8.2.8. Following the guidance from Lincolnshire County Council<sup>2</sup>, the following study areas have been used for this preliminary assessment of effects on cultural heritage assets:
- a 2km buffer from the Site boundary has been used to gather information on non-designated historic assets; and
  - a buffer of up to 5km from the Site boundary, informed by the ZTV, has been used to identify designated historic assets with potential for visual change to their setting to result in harm to their significance.
- 8.2.9. Assets within these study areas are shown on **Figure 8.1** and **Figure 8.2**.

### **8.3. Legislative framework, planning policy and guidance**

#### **Relevant legislation**

- 8.3.1. The legislative framework for the Proposed Development as a whole is detailed in **Section 1.2** of **Chapter 1**. The legislation relevant to cultural heritage comprises the following:
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (excluding normal planning procedures, which are disapplied by the Development Consent Order (DCO) and the related authorisation process, which if granted, would encompass all of the normal consents required to authorise a project).
  - Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended) (excluding normal planning procedures, which are disapplied by the DCO and the related authorisation process which, if granted, would encompass all of the normal consents required to authorise a project).
  - Protection of Military Remains Act 1986.
  - The Hedgerows Regulations 1997.
- 8.3.2. Other heritage legislation that may be relevant to the potential for undiscovered remains comprises:
- Treasure Act 1996; and
  - Burial Act 1857.

#### **Relevant planning policy**

- 8.3.3. Planning policy relevant to cultural heritage comprises the following:

---

<sup>2</sup> Lincolnshire County Council "Guidance for large schemes including NSIPs and EIAs, General Scoping Opinion for the Historic Environment" supplied by Jan Allen via email 07/10/2022

- Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) (2011)<sup>3</sup> provides the basis for decisions regarding nationally significant energy infrastructure. Section 5.8 refers to the significance, impact and recording of the historic environment.
- Draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) (2023)<sup>4</sup> - Section 5.9 refers to the significance, impact and recording of the historic environment. - paragraph 3.10.101 refers to the positive impacts that solar developments can have on the historic environment by removing areas from regular ploughing; paragraph 3.10.106 notes that evaluation should be proportionate to the sensitivity and extent of proposed ground disturbance.
- National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3) (2011)<sup>5</sup> which makes reference to the need to consider whether the substantial public benefits of large-scale renewable projects would outweigh any loss or harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset.
- Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3) (2023)<sup>6</sup> - Section 3.10 gives specific consideration to solar development including assessment of heritage impacts.
- National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (NPS EN-5) (2011)<sup>7</sup>. Paragraph 2.8.9 refers to the environmental and archaeological consequences of underground cabling and paragraph 1.7.5 considers effects on archaeology.
- Draft National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (NPS EN-5) (2023)<sup>8</sup>. Paragraph 2.9.25 makes reference to consideration of designated heritage assets and disruptive effects of undergrounding on archaeological and heritage sites.
- Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2018-2040<sup>9</sup>, comprises Policy S14: Renewable Energy (in so far as it includes

---

<sup>3</sup> Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (2011). Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statements-for-energy-infrastructure>

<sup>4</sup> Draft National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (2023). Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-new-energy-infrastructure-revisions-to-national-policy-statements>

<sup>5</sup> National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (2011). Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statements-for-energy-infrastructure>

<sup>6</sup> Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (2023). Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-new-energy-infrastructure-revisions-to-national-policy-statements>

<sup>7</sup> National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) (2011). Available online: [1942-national-policy-statement-electricity-networks.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/41422/national-policy-statement-electricity-networks.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Draft National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) (2023). Available online: [EN-5 Electricity Networks National Policy Statement \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/114222/EN-5_Electricity_Networks_National_Policy_Statement.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/planning-building/planning/planning-policy/central-lincolnshire-local-plan-2018-2040>

reference to heritage assets) and Policy S57: The Historic Environment.

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (September 2023)<sup>10</sup>, Paragraphs 189, 194, 200, 202, 203, 206.

### **Applicable guidance**

8.3.4. The following guidance documents have been used during the preparation of this preliminary assessment:

- Lincolnshire County Council’s Guidance for large schemes including NSIPs and EIAs, General Scoping Opinion for the Historic Environment<sup>11</sup>;
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists’ Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment<sup>12</sup>;
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists’ Code of Conduct<sup>13</sup>
- Historic England Guidance on The Setting of Heritage Assets<sup>14</sup> (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning GPA3);
- Historic England Guidance on Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets (Historic England Advice Note 12)<sup>15</sup>;
- Historic England Guidance on Managing Significance in Decision Taking (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning GPA2)<sup>16</sup>;
- Historic England Guidance on Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment (Historic England Advice Note 15)<sup>17</sup>; and
- Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, Institute of Historic Building Conservation and Chartered Institute for Archaeologists’ “Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK”<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

<sup>11</sup> Lincolnshire County Council “Guidance for large schemes including NSIPs and EIAs, General Scoping Opinion for the Historic Environment” supplied by Jan Allen via email 07/10/2022

<sup>12</sup> [ClfAS&GDBA\\_4.pdf \(archaeologists.net\)](#)

<sup>13</sup> [ClfA Code, regulations and standards & guidance | Chartered Institute for Archaeologists](#)

<sup>14</sup> [The Setting of Heritage Assets \(historicengland.org.uk\)](#)

<sup>15</sup> [Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets \(historicengland.org.uk\)](#)

<sup>16</sup> [Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment \(historicengland.org.uk\)](#)

<sup>17</sup> [Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment | Historic England](#)

<sup>18</sup> [j30361\\_ iema\\_principlesofchia\\_v8.pdf \(archaeologists.net\)](#)



## 8.4. Methodology

### *Data sources to inform baseline characterisation*

8.4.1. The following sources of information have been used to inform this preliminary assessment:

- Information on designated heritage assets from the National Heritage List for England, downloaded on 15 June 2023;
- Data on heritage assets and previous archaeological investigations from the Lincolnshire HER, obtained as a digital data extract on 23 August 2022;
- Historical Ordnance Survey mapping;
- Environment Agency LiDAR data;
- Information on designated heritage assets from the National Heritage;
- Aerial photographs held by Historic England Archives, Lincolnshire HER and Cambridge University Collection of Aerial Photography;
- Maps and other relevant primary and secondary sources held in Lincolnshire archives;
- Portable Antiquities Scheme data; and
- Geophysical survey results.

### *Surveys to inform baseline characterisation*

8.4.2. The following surveys have been undertaken to inform this preliminary assessment:

- Field visits to the Site to confirm the condition and location of previously recorded assets, examine potential assets identified through desk-based research and to check for currently unrecorded assets;
- Geophysical survey (refer to **Appendix 8.3**); and
- Baseline setting visits to designated and non-designated assets.

### *Design assumptions*

8.4.3. **Chapter 2: Description of the Proposed Development** details the preliminary design principles of the Proposed Development components as they are currently known. Preliminary parameter plans, which define the broad extents within which development can take place, are presented in the following figures within **Volume 2**:

- **Figure 2.3** – Zonal Masterplan;
- **Figure 2.4** – Indicative Height Parameters Plan;

- **Figure 2.5** – Indicative Green Infrastructure Parameters Plan; and
  - **Figure 2.6** – Indicative Operational Access & Movement Parameters Plan.
- 8.4.4. **Chapter 4: Approach to EIA** sets out those elements of the Proposed Development for which optionality is present within the current design and sets out the scenario assessed for the purpose of this PEIR.
- 8.4.5. For the purposes of this preliminary assessment, a reasonable worst case has also comprised an assumption that where necessary to protect archaeological remains, the mounting structure for solar arrays would be supported by concrete footings and that outside areas of archaeological sensitivity, panels would be supported by drilled cast piles, as these would cause the most ground disturbance of the other support options.
- 8.4.6. For the purposes of filtering assets following the Stage 1 Setting Assessment, a worst case of visibility of the Proposed Development has been based on the ZTV for the transmission towers; as the tallest element of the Proposed Development, this represents the maximum visibility of the Proposed Development and has scoped out the fewest assets from further assessment. The transmission towers have been included as part of the Proposed Development for the purposes of this preliminary assessment.

#### ***Embedded mitigation measures***

- 8.4.7. This preliminary assessment has been based on the principle that measures have been ‘embedded’ into the design of the Proposed Development to remove potential significant effects as far as practicable, for example by the considered placement of infrastructure. Embedded (primary) environmental mitigation measures that are considered to be an inherent part of the Proposed Development are detailed within **Table 4.4 of Chapter 4: Approach to EIA**.
- 8.4.8. Those embedded mitigation measures relevant to this preliminary cultural heritage assessment include project principals 2.4 ‘Conserve the significance of heritage assets including Scopwick Mill and Ashby Walled Gardens’ and 2.5 ‘Protect the setting of the Scopwick and Blankney Conservation Areas’. The masterplan has avoided siting panels and other infrastructure in locations that would impact on the contribution of setting to the significance of these assets.

#### ***Assessment methodology***

- 8.4.9. For this preliminary assessment, the likely significant effects on identified receptors are reported, based on the information available at the time of writing. The final assessment of likely significant effects will be reported in the ES.

### Importance of cultural heritage assets

8.4.10. The importance of a cultural heritage asset is a measure of the degree to which the heritage significance ("the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest"<sup>19</sup>) of that asset is sought<sup>20</sup>. The level of importance will therefore reflect any statutory and non-statutory heritage designation or, in the case of undesignated assets, the professional judgement of the assessor as to the degree of importance that the asset has with reference to regional research frameworks.

8.4.11. The criteria presented in **Table 8.4** have been used to establish the importance of cultural heritage assets. In the absence of directly applicable guidance for England, these criteria have been derived from the guidance produced by Scottish Natural Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland<sup>21</sup>.

**Table 8.4 Criteria for establishing importance of heritage assets**

Importance	Description of receptors
Very High	World heritage sites; assets of acknowledged international importance; assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives; Historic landscapes of international value (designated or not) and extremely well preserved historic landscapes with exceptional coherence, time depth or other critical factor(s).
High	Scheduled monuments and non-designated assets of schedulable quality and importance; Grade I and II* listed buildings and Grade II listed buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or associations; Conservation Areas with exceptional qualities; non-designated structures of clear national importance; designated and non-designated historic landscapes of historic interest; assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives.
Medium	Grade II listed buildings; Non-designated assets that contribute to regional research objectives; Locally listed buildings and other historic unlisted buildings that have exceptional qualities; Conservation Areas.
Low	Non-designated assets of local importance including those compromised by poor preservation; assets of limited value but with the potential to contribute to local research objectives; robust non-designated historic landscapes.

<sup>19</sup> " NPPF 2021 Annex 2: Glossary

<sup>20</sup> IEMA, IHBC and ClfA (2021) Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK

<sup>21</sup> Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (2018) *Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment process in Scotland.*

Importance	Description of receptors
Negligible	Assets with very little surviving archaeological interest; buildings of little architectural or historic note; landscapes with little historic interest

### Magnitude of Impact

- 8.4.12. The magnitude of impact reflects the scale of change which would be caused by the Proposed Development and the effect this would have on the ability to interpret significance and appreciate the historic asset. Impacts can result either from physical changes to a historic asset or through sensory changes within its setting.
- 8.4.13. An impact may be positive where for example, as part of the Proposed Development, an intrusive building or feature is removed or replaced with a more harmonious one; historic features are restored or revealed; a new feature is added which adds to public appreciation; new views are introduced that add to public experience of an asset; or public interpretation or access is improved to an asset or its setting.
- 8.4.14. Impacts may impart major change, for example where groundworks completely destroy important archaeological remains, to minor change to part of a historic asset's setting, leading to a limited impact on our ability to interpret it, or its context.
- 8.4.15. Utilising the key principles for assessing the implications of change outlined above, an assessment of the magnitude of impact has been undertaken using the criteria presented in **Table 8.5** below. As noted above at **paragraph 8.4.11**, due to a lack of directly comparable guidance for England, these criteria have been derived from the guidance produced by Scottish Natural Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland<sup>22</sup>.
- 8.4.16. Conclusions on the assessed magnitude of impact are a product of the consideration of the elements of an asset and its setting that contribute to its heritage significance and the degree to which the Proposed Development would change these contributing elements. The assessment therefore reflects the varying degrees of sensitivity of different assets to change brought about by different types of development.
- 8.4.17. This definition of magnitude and assessment methodology applies to likely significant effects resulting from change in the setting as well as likely physical effects on the fabric of an asset.

---

<sup>22</sup> Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (2018) Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment process in Scotland.

**Table 8.5 Criteria for classifying magnitude of impact**

Impact magnitude	Criteria
Major	Change to key historic building elements so that an asset is totally altered; OR change to most/all key archaeological materials such that the resource is totally altered; OR comprehensive change to the setting such that the significance of the asset is severely compromised
Moderate	Change to many key historic building elements, such that the asset is significantly modified; changes to many key archaeological materials such that the resource is clearly modified; changes to setting of an asset, such that the significance of the asset is compromised
Minor	Change to key historic building elements, such that the asset is slightly different; changes to key archaeological materials such that the asset is slightly altered; changes to setting of an historic building, such that its significance is slightly compromised
Negligible	Very minor changes to historic building elements, archaeological materials or setting that hardly affect them/it
No Change	No change to fabric, archaeological materials or setting

**Significance of Effect**

- 8.4.18. The assessment of effects combines analysis of the data gathered during the desk-based assessment, site visit and ZTVs of the Proposed Development.
- 8.4.19. This preliminary assessment has been carried out using professional judgement, taking into account designations and heritage significance as assessed against national standards. Significance of effect is based on a combination of the importance of the receptor and the magnitude of impact. The significance of effect matrix is presented in **Table 8.6** below and provides a guide to decision-making but is not a substitute for professional judgement and interpretation, particularly where the importance or magnitude of impact are not clear or are borderline between categories. These criteria have been derived from the guidance produced by Scottish Natural Heritage and Historic Environment Scotland<sup>23</sup>.
- 8.4.20. Major and moderate effects are regarded as significant, while minor and negligible effects are regarded as not significant.

---

<sup>23</sup> Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (2018) Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook Guidance for competent authorities, consultation bodies, and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment process in Scotland.

**Table 8.6 Criteria for Assessing the Significance of Effect**

Magnitude of impact	Importance of receptor				
	Negligible	Low	Medium	High	Very High
Major	Minor	Moderate	Moderate	Major	Major
Moderate	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Moderate	Major
Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Minor	Minor	Moderate
Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor	Minor
None	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect

### 8.5. Summary of baseline conditions

- 8.5.1. Full details of the baseline are provided in the Archaeological DBA (**Appendix 8.1**), Aerial Investigation and Mapping Report (**Appendix 8.2**) and the Geophysical Survey Report (**Appendix 8.3**).
- 8.5.2. With the exception of two World War II era aeroplane crash sites (Avro Lancaster crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25416) and Hawker Hurricane crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25417)), which being protected by legislation are considered to be of **high** importance, the non-designated heritage assets within the Site are generally considered to be of **low** importance.
- 8.5.3. The Grade II listed milepost on the A15 in Area A1/A2 (NHLE1061824) is of **medium** importance. The areas of high archaeological interest identified within the geophysical survey may also be of **medium** importance, as the archaeological information contained in this distribution of similar sites could contribute to regional research aims.
- 8.5.4. Potential currently unknown below ground archaeological remains could be of up to **high** importance but are more likely to be of up to **medium** importance if they contribute to regional research aims.
- 8.5.5. Beyond the Site boundary but within the 5km study area, the Scheduled remains of the former villages of Braucewell (NHLE 1018397) and Dunsby (NHLE 1013895) are considered to be of **high** importance and the Scopwick and Blankney Conservation Areas of **medium** importance.

### *Sensitive receptors*

- 8.5.6. The following sensitive receptors have been assessed:

- Milepost 20 metres south of Ashby Lodge Farm, Grade II Listed Building (NHLE Ref: 1061824) – **medium** importance.
- Avro Lancaster crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25416) - **high** importance.
- Hawker Hurricane crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25417) - **high** importance.
- Scheduled remains of former villages of Braucewell (NHLE 1018397) and Dunsby (NHLE 1013895) - **high** importance.
- Scopwick and Blankney Conservation Areas - **medium** importance.
- Currently unknown below ground archaeological remains within the Site - up to **high** importance but more likely up to **medium**.

8.5.7. All key sensitive receptor locations are shown on **Figure 8.3**.

### **Future baseline**

- 8.5.8. Within the Site boundary, the land would continue in arable agricultural use in the future. The types of crops grown would likely change over time depending on the landowner/tenant farmers' preference and market trends.
- 8.5.9. Within the Site and the surrounding area, vegetation patterns (trees, hedgerows etc.) could change as a result of additional planting, growth, disease or climate effects. This could lead to changes in the way that the known heritage assets are experienced.
- 8.5.10. Additional heritage assets could come to light following investigations of other sites in the study area.

## **8.6. Likely effects, additional mitigation and residual effects**

### **Construction phase**

**Table 8.7 Assessment of likely effects, additional mitigation and residual effects during construction**

<b>Receptor/matter</b>	<b>Likely effects/additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation/residual effects</b>	
Milepost 20 metres south of Ashby Lodge Farm, Grade II Listed Building (NHLE Ref: 1061824)	Likely effects	The milepost could be damaged through construction activity.
	Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation	The milepost will be clearly demarcated in advance of construction so that it can be avoided. Tool box talks will be given to ensure that all contractors are aware of the listed structure.

Receptor/matter	Likely effects/additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation/residual effects	
	Likely residual effects	The milepost is an asset of <b>medium</b> importance. The magnitude of impact, following the implementation of additional mitigation measures, is expected to be <b>negligible</b> . Therefore, there is likely to be a <b>negligible adverse</b> residual effect, which is considered to be <b>not significant</b> .
<p>Avro Lancaster crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25416)</p> <p>Hawker Hurricane crash site (Lincolnshire County Council HER Ref: MLI25417)</p>	Likely effects	Disturbance or damage through construction activity – piling for solar array supports; excavation for cables; topsoil stripping for compounds, substations, inverter/transformer stations, battery energy storage systems etc. where any remains are within the footprint of the proposed construction.
	Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation	A programme of metal detecting and/or fieldwalking to identify any remains of the crash will be documented within and secured by the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan, and in accordance with a licence from the Joint Casualty and Compassionate Centre, will ensure that disturbance of any remains can be either avoided through the detailed design of the Proposed Development or the effects offset by archaeological recording and return of remains to the Ministry of Defence.
	Likely residual effects	The Avro Lancaster crash site and the Hawker Hurricane crash site are of <b>high</b> importance. The magnitude of impact, following the implementation of additional mitigation measures, is expected to be <b>minor</b> . Therefore, there is likely to be a <b>minor adverse</b> residual effect, which is considered to be <b>not significant</b> .
Currently unknown below ground	Likely effects	Disturbance or damage through construction activity – piling for solar



Receptor/matter	Likely effects/additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation/residual effects
-----------------	--

archaeological remains within the Site

array supports; excavation for cables; topsoil stripping for compounds, substations, inverter/transformer stations, battery energy storage systems etc. where the archaeological remains are within the footprint of the proposed construction.

Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation

A programme of archaeological investigation will be secured as part of the DCO.

Where the investigation finds that currently unknown archaeological remains are present within the solar array areas and are of such importance as to merit preservation in situ, mitigation will take the form of limiting the ground disturbance in these areas through the construction methods (e.g., use of concrete pad foundations and altering the routes of cables or limiting the depth of excavation for the cables).

Where currently unknown archaeological remains are found to be present within the areas of substations, collector compounds, transformer/inverter stations and these cannot be micro-sited to areas without archaeological remains the effects will be off set through a programme of archaeological investigation, recording and reporting.

Likely residual effects

Currently unknown remains could be of up to **high** importance (though more likely up to **medium**). The magnitude of impact, following the implementation of additional mitigation measures, is expected to be **minor**. Therefore, there is likely to be a **minor adverse** residual effect, which is considered to be **not significant**.

## Operational phase

**Table 8.8 Assessment of potential effects, additional mitigation and residual effects during operation (including maintenance)**

Receptor/matter	Likely effects/additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation/residual effects	
Scheduled remains of former village of Braucewell (NHLE 1018397)	Likely effects	Changes to the setting of this asset could result in harm to its significance.
	Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation	In addition to embedded mitigation through the layout of the Proposed Development, additional hedgerow planting will screen the panels from the scheduled monument.
	Likely residual effects	The importance of the receptor is <b>high</b> and the magnitude of impact, following the implementation of additional mitigation measures, is expected to be <b>minor</b> . Therefore, there is likely to be a <b>minor adverse</b> residual effect, which is considered to be <b>not significant</b> .
Scheduled remains of former village of Dunsby (NHLE 1013895)	Likely effects	Changes to the setting of this asset could result in harm to its significance.
	Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation	In addition to embedded mitigation through the layout of the Proposed Development, additional hedgerow planting will screen the panels from the scheduled monument.
	Likely residual effects	The importance of the receptor is <b>high</b> and the magnitude of impact, following the implementation of additional mitigation measures, is expected to be <b>minor</b> . Therefore, there is likely to be a <b>minor adverse</b> residual effect, which is considered to be <b>not significant</b> .
Scopwick Conservation Area	Likely effects	Changes to the setting of this asset could result in harm to its significance.

Receptor/matter	Likely effects/additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation/residual effects	
	Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation	In addition to embedded mitigation through the layout of the Proposed Development, additional hedgerow planting will screen the panels from the conservation area.
	Likely residual effects	The importance of the receptor is <b>medium</b> and the magnitude of impact, following the implementation of additional mitigation measures, is expected to be <b>minor</b> . Therefore, there is likely to be a <b>minor adverse</b> residual effect, which is considered to be <b>not significant</b> .
Blankney Conservation Area	Likely effects	Changes to the setting of this asset could result in harm to its significance.
	Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation	In addition to embedded mitigation through the layout of the Proposed Development, additional hedgerow planting will screen the panels from the conservation area.
	Likely residual effects	The importance of the receptor is <b>medium</b> and the magnitude of impact, following the implementation of additional mitigation measures, is expected to be <b>minor</b> . Therefore, there is likely to be a <b>minor adverse</b> residual effect, which is considered to be <b>not significant</b> .
Currently unknown below ground archaeological remains within the Site	Likely effects	If these remains exist and derive significance from their setting, then the change of land use within the Site could result in harm to this significance. The effects could be significant if assets are of high importance.
	Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation	Impacts could be reduced or avoided through changes to the layout of the Proposed Development by micro-siting, or use of other mitigation during

Receptor/matter	Likely effects/additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation/residual effects
	construction or could be off set through additional research and interpretation.
Likely residual effects	The importance of these receptors is unknown and could be up to <b>high</b> (though more likely no more than <b>medium</b> ). Following the implementation of additional mitigation, the magnitude of impact is expected to be up to <b>minor</b> . Therefore, there is likely to be at most a <b>minor adverse</b> residual effect which would be <b>not significant</b> .

### Assessment against future baseline

- 8.6.1. As the future baseline setting of assets is unquantifiable, a future baseline has not been assessed.

### 8.7. Opportunities for environmental enhancement

- 8.7.1. Further interpretation of the archaeological resource within the Site could be an enhancement opportunity by increasing public understanding and awareness of the heritage resource.

### 8.8. Intra-project combined effects

- 8.8.1. It is recognised that there is potential for the interaction and combination of different environmental residual effects from within the Proposed Development to affect certain receptors discussed in this preliminary cultural heritage assessment. This could include impacts on listed buildings (for example, pollution or dust may impact on the historic fabric of listed buildings, and listed buildings may be residential properties where residents may be impacted by amenity) and conservation areas (within which residential properties where residents may be impacted by amenity). The intra-project combined effects will be presented within the ES once relevant assessments are further progressed.
- 8.8.2. Inter-project effects are assessed and presented in **Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects**.

### 8.9. Difficulties and uncertainties

- 8.9.1. Geophysical survey cannot detect all below ground archaeological remains. A programme of archaeological deposit modelling will be carried out to further understand the reasons for a large area of apparently blank results in the west of the Site. Following this a

proportionate strategy of further evaluation through trial trenching will be developed to inform the determination of the DCO application.

- 8.9.2. Assessment of the baseline setting of heritage assets has been carried out from publicly accessible locations informed by satellite imagery, historic aerial photographs, historic and current mapping. Where the initial assessment has identified the potential for private views to contribute to the significance of the asset, the desk-based and publicly accessible information has been used to assess a worst case scenario.

## 8.10. Further work to inform the ES

- 8.10.1. Geophysical survey of the Grid Connection Corridor will be undertaken in 2024.
- 8.10.2. A deposit model of the Site will be prepared using existing geotechnical data. If necessary, this will be refined through further fieldwork. The deposit model will inform the understanding of the likelihood of currently unknown archaeological remains within the Site.
- 8.10.3. The results of the deposit model will inform the development of a proportional level of further evaluation through trial trenching to inform the determination of the DCO. It is proposed that this would be focused on the areas of the Proposed Development with the greatest potential to impact on below ground archaeological remains: BESS, Collector Compounds, and Springwell Substation.



[springwellsolarfarm.com](http://springwellsolarfarm.com)