
**THREE OAKS RENEWABLE
ENERGY PARK
EXTENSION**

**Environmental
Statement Chapter 6: Historic
Environment**

MAY 2026



Contents

6	Historic Environment	6-2
	Introduction	6-2
	Consultation	6-2
	Legislation, Policy, Guidance and Standards	6-4
	Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria	6-5
	Assumptions and Limitations	6-8
	Baseline Conditions and Receptors	6-9
	Baseline Evolution	6-22
	Primary & Tertiary Mitigation.....	6-22
	Assessment of Effects	6-23
	Secondary Mitigation	6-25
	Assessment of Residual Effects	6-25
	Cumulative Effects.....	6-29
	Summary and Conclusions.....	6-30

6 Historic Environment

Introduction

- 6.1 This chapter presents the assessment of likely significant effects of the proposed Three Oaks Renewable Energy Park Extension ('the Proposed Development') relating to the Historic Environment. It considers impacts to archaeology and built heritage assets, both designated and non-designated, in relation to the proposed construction, operation and decommissioning processes.
- 6.2 The assessment sets out the baseline archaeological and built heritage resource within the Site Boundary and a defined study area around it. The described methodology is applied to establish likely significant effects on cultural heritage receptors. Archaeological receptors could be impacted by intrusive groundworks and excavations during the construction phase. Designated assets and built heritage receptors could be impacted through visual impact resulting in changes to their setting during construction, operation and decommissioning, which in turn could impact their significance. Where relevant, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the impacts. Any anticipated residual effects of the Proposed Development are then stated assuming that the mitigation has been applied.
- 6.3 This chapter has been prepared by Lorraine Horsley (Project Manager) of York Archaeology and internal review has been undertaken by Fiona Moore (Regional Manager). In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (hereafter referred to as the 'EIA Regulations'), a statement outlining the relevant expertise and qualifications of competent experts appointed to prepare this Environmental Statement (ES) is provided in Appendix 1.1 – Volume 4.

Consultation

- 6.4 Table 6.1 below summarises relevant consultation undertaken, the relevant points made and responses to each along with a signpost to where relevant information can be found within this Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.5 A Pre-Application Request was submitted to East Riding of Yorkshire Council ('the Council') in August 2025. Responses pertaining to the Historic Environment were received from Humber Historic Environment Record (HER) and the Council's Conservation Team. Additional guidance was obtained from the Council's Development Management Archaeologist after the completion of the archaeological desk-based assessment and geophysical survey. Table 6.1 contains a summary of these responses.

Table 6.1 – Consultee Responses

Reference	Comment	Response
East Riding of Yorkshire Council – Humber Historic Environment Record		
Letter reference HER / DE/CONS/31145 dated 3 September 2025 from James Goodyear,	The site lies within an extremely important archaeological landscape with extensive remains of prehistoric and Romano-British date recorded within the proposed development	An archaeological desk-based assessment has been produced and is included in

Reference	Comment	Response
Development Management Archaeologist	area. A staged scheme should include: • An initial desk-based assessment • A staged scheme of investigations beginning with geophysical survey and followed by trial trenching if required. • Agreement of suitable mitigation strategies once the archaeological potential of the site has been adequately assessed.	Appendix 6.1 – Volume 4. This includes the results of a geophysical survey and the full geophysical survey report is included in Appendix 6.2 – Volume 4. Through liaison with the Council's Development Management Archaeologist, Three Oaks REP Extension Ltd ('the Applicant') accepts trial trenching would be undertaken in accordance with a pre-commencement condition.
Email dated 17 December 2025 from James Goodyear, Development Management Archaeologist	Having read through the Archaeological Desk-based Assessment and Geophysical Survey reports, trial trenching will need to be undertaken. This could take place pre-determination or secured with a pre-commencement condition as for the adjacent solar farm.	The Applicant accepts trial trenching would be undertaken in accordance with a pre-commencement condition.
East Riding of Yorkshire Council – Conservation Team		
Response dated 4 September 2025, sent by email, from Megan O'Mara, Principal Conservation Officer.	Open agricultural fields and the natural environment play an important role in the significance of the Burton Agnes Conservation Area. The Grade I listed Burton Agnes Hall also contributes to the significance of the Conservation Area. It is possible that views of the turbines would reach the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings. However, it is not anticipated that they would interrupt any intentional intervisibility between heritage assets and the surrounding landscape. We recommend that a thorough assessment of the impact on the significance of nearby heritage assets is submitted and this would be informed by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	A setting study has been produced and is included in Appendix 6.3 – Volume 4. Ongoing consultation has taken place with the LVIA team and key viewpoints identified. Photography and Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis has been provided by LVIA and has been used to inform the assessment of indirect impacts on designated heritage assets.

Reference	Comment	Response
East Riding of Yorkshire Council – Pre-application Response		
Pre-application response letter from Stephen Hunt, Director of Planning and Development Management, dated 24 December 2025	The Council's Conservation Officer has highlighted the importance of a comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment being submitted alongside any formal application, which should take account of the interrelationship of the existing historic environment and the proposed modern development, which the SoS cited as being 'a distracting modern, discordant presence' in views from Burton Agnes Hall. The Conservation Officer highlights that the development would not be visible in views from within the gardens, above the ha-ha or from the first floor library windows of the Hall, however in the absence of detailed supporting information including an LVIA to demonstrate this, this would need to be verified by way of a site visit at Burton Agnes Hall itself, ideally alongside the pre-arrangement of height markers such as a balloon or crane, as suggested, to aid appreciation of the impact of the turbines, however it should be noted that visibility from the Hall would not represent the only source of historic harm.	In response to the pre-application letter, views from the garden, the wall above the ha-ha and from within the walled garden were added to the list of key views for LVIA visualisations to inform the assessment of heritage impacts. The view from the library had already been included.

Legislation, Policy, Guidance and Standards

Legislation

6.6 The key pieces of legislation governing the treatment of the historic environment within the planning context are:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979; and
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Policy

6.7 The following policies have been taken into account in this assessment:

- Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1, section 5.9 Historic Environment;
- National Policy Statement for Energy EN-3, paragraphs 2.3.6 – 2.3.8 and 2.12.81 – 2.12.93;
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Chapter 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment; and

- East Riding Local Plan 2020 – 2039, adopted 2nd April 2025, Policy ENV3 Valuing our Heritage.

Guidance and Standards

6.8 The technical appendices and this chapter have been informed by guidance contained within the following:

- Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessment (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2020a);
- Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England 2017);
- Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets (Historic England 2019);
- Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Geophysical Survey (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2020b); and
- Guidelines for the use of Geophysics in Archaeology: Questions to ask and Points to Consider. EAC Guidelines 2 (European Archaeological Council 2015).

Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

6.9 The assessment of development impacts has been informed by an appraisal of the baseline conditions to identify heritage receptors. Information on recorded heritage assets and land use of the Site and the Study Area was collated from the following sources; the Humber Historic Environment Record, the National Heritage List for England curated by Historic England, historic mapping and “grey literature” deposited with the Archaeology Data Service. Two walkover surveys were conducted to identify any archaeological features within the Site Boundary and to assess the potential setting impacts on designated heritage assets. A geophysical survey was conducted in September 2025 (Appendix 6.2 Geophysical Survey Report – Volume 4). Archaeological receptors within the Site Boundary could be subject to direct impact such as total or partial removal from groundworks during construction. Designated assets within the wider Study Area could be subject to indirect impacts through changes to their setting which in turn affects their heritage significance. As per Chapter 2 (Project and Site Description) – Volume 2 of the ES, a micro-siting allowance of 25 m for turbines 1 – 5, and 10 m for turbine 6 is sought. The assessment as reported in this chapter has accounted for such an allowance in its conclusions.

Study Area

6.10 For the archaeological desk-based assessment, a study area of 2 km from the centre of the Site was used to collate data on designated and non-designated heritage assets (Appendix 6.1 Archaeological Desk-based Assessment – Volume 4). For the setting study a study area of 5 km from the site boundary was used to collate data on designated heritage assets. The 5 km distance was considered acceptable as the ZTV analysis has shown that assets at a greater distance would not be subject to setting impact through changes in visual amenity. The 5 km Study Area was based on a previous iteration of the site boundary provided in 2025. As this was larger than the current application boundary, this would have been sufficient to identify assets within 5 km of the Proposed Development (Appendix 6.3 Setting Assessment – Volume 4).

Receptor Sensitivity

- 6.11 The importance of a heritage asset is usually described in terms of its heritage significance. The heritage significance of the receptor and the criteria outlined in Table 6.2 have been used to assign a rating of sensitivity for the purposes of this assessment.

Table 6.2 – Receptor Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Example of Receptor
Very High	World Heritage Sites: assets, buildings and historic landscapes of acknowledged international significance and can contribute to acknowledged international research objectives; extremely well-preserved historic landscapes with exceptional coherence, time-depth or other critical factors.
High	Sites and buildings of national significance (i.e. that can contribute to national research objectives), including Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks & Gardens; designated landscapes of outstanding interest; assets and buildings (either designated or non-designated) that are shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations not adequately reflected in the listing grade; undesignated historic landscapes of high quality and importance, and of demonstrable national value; well-preserved landscapes exhibiting considerable coherence, time-depth or other critical factors.
Medium	Sites and landscapes of regional significance (i.e. that can contribute to regional research objectives), Conservation Areas, designated special historic landscapes; non-designated historic landscapes that would justify special historic landscape designation; averagely well-preserved landscapes with reasonable coherence, time-depth or other critical factors; historic townscape or built-up areas with important historic integrity in their buildings or built settings; non-designated historic buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations.
Low	Sites of local significance (designated and non-designated, that can contribute to local research objectives); non-designated heritage assets; assets compromised by poor preservation and / or poor survival or contextual associations; locally listed buildings; unlisted buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association; historic townscape or built-up areas of limited historic integrity in their built settings; robust undesignated historic landscapes or those of importance to local interest groups; historic landscapes whose value is limited by poor preservation and / or poor survival of contextual associations.
Negligible	Assets with very little or no surviving cultural heritage interest; buildings of no architectural or historical note; buildings of an intrusive character; landscapes with little or no significant historical interest.

Determining Impact Magnitude

- 6.12 The criteria for assessing magnitude of impact are outlined in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3 – Magnitude of Impact

Impact Magnitude	Description of Criteria
Major	Changes to all or most key archaeological materials or historic buildings and / or settings, such that the resource is completely altered or lost; changes to most or all key historic town and landscape elements, parcels or components, extreme visual effects, major changes in sound or noise quality, fundamental changes to use or access, resulting in major change or complete loss of historic character or significance.
Moderate	Changes to many key elements or considerable changes to the setting of an archaeological asset or historic building, such that the historic character of same is significantly modified; changes to many key historic town or landscape elements, parcels or components, noticeable visual effects, differences in sound or noise quality and / or considerable changes to use or access, resulting in moderate changes to historic character or significance.
Minor	Changes to key materials or settings of an archaeological asset, historic building, historic townscape or historic landscape such that an asset / building / town or landscape or its setting is slightly altered, limited changes to visual effects, sound or noise quality, use or access resulting in slight changes to its historic character and significance.
Negligible	Very minor changes to archaeological materials or setting; very minor changes to historic building elements or setting; very minor changes to key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, virtually unchanged visual effects, very minor changes in noise levels or sound quality and / or very minor changes to use or access resulting in very minor change to historic landscape character.
No change	No changes to key materials, setting or other aspects.

- 6.13 The setting of a heritage asset is not a designation in its own right. The importance of setting lies in how it contributes to the significance of the asset. The magnitude for indirect impacts is therefore a judgement of whether and to what extent setting contributes to significance or the appreciation of significance, how the setting will be altered and how this would translate into potential impact on the sensitivity of the asset.

Determining Significance of Effect

- 6.14 The overall likely significant effect is determined by combining the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of impact with reference to Table 6.4.

Table 6.4 – Significance of Effects Matrix

		Magnitude of Impact				
		Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	No change
Sensitivity	Very High	Major	Major – Moderate	Moderate	Slight	Neutral
	High	Major	Moderate	Moderate – Slight	Slight	Neutral
	Medium	Moderate	Moderate – Slight	Slight	Slight – Neutral	Neutral
	Low	Moderate – Slight	Slight	Slight – Neutral	Slight – Neutral	Neutral
	Negligible	Slight	Slight – Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

6.15 If an impact is negative the resulting effect is described as being adverse, and if an impact is positive the resulting effect is described as being beneficial. In this chapter any likely significant effect that is defined as being moderate adverse / beneficial or greater is considered to be a significant effect in EIA terms.

6.16 Where the result spans two categories (e.g., Moderate – Slight) a decision will be made as to which category would apply using the evidence considered and professional judgement.

Cumulative Impacts

6.17 Cumulative impacts on buried archaeological remains can be defined as the cumulative loss of archaeological deposits resulting from developments, in particular where similar types of remains are impacted in close proximity to the Site. Potential indirect cumulative impacts could result from detectable alteration to the settings of heritage assets from more than one development at the same time. Other proposed developments within a range of 0 – 20 km of the Site have been identified. The long list of proposed developments was checked for likely cumulative impacts and developments where cumulative impacts are likely have been taken forward for assessment. The full list and search criteria have been provided in Appendix 4.2 – Volume 4.

6.18 Projects within 2 km of the Proposed Development where archaeological investigations have been conducted and a condition attached for further works during construction were considered for likely cumulative significant effects on archaeological receptors.

6.19 Projects within 5 km of the Proposed Development, particularly developments proposing new or replacement wind turbines, were considered for indirect impacts on the setting of receptors that could result in likely cumulative significant effects. Heritage Statements, Environmental Statements and consultee comments were consulted for impacts on built heritage receptors that are also considered as receptors in this assessment.

Assumptions and Limitations

6.20 It is assumed that the baseline research conducted to produce the desk-based assessment and setting assessment remain applicable. The Historic Environment Record (HER) is continually

updated and the search used to collate the baseline was valid at the time of writing. The data and the geophysical survey undertaken for this application can provide an initial indication of assets present rather than a definitive list of all potential archaeological assets. The full extent of the buried archaeological resource will be determined by site-specific archaeological field investigations. An additional check of Historic England's dataset of designated assets was made in February 2026 and no newly designated assets were identified that needed to be included within the assessment.

Baseline Conditions and Receptors

- 6.21 The archaeological baseline has been established through an archaeological desk-based assessment and has been supplemented by the geophysical survey. This baseline section has been drawn from those reports (Appendices 6.1 Archaeological Desk-based Assessment and 6.2 Geophysical Survey – Volume 4).
- 6.22 The 2 km Study Area contains nine Scheduled Monuments, 34 Listed Buildings and one Conservation Area. The Historic Environment Record records 143 non-designated heritage assets and 25 archaeological events. The locations of these assets are shown in Figures 02 – 08 of the desk-based assessment (Appendix 6.1 Archaeological Desk-based Assessment – Volume 4). The assets and assessment of potential have been discussed in chronological order by archaeological period. Designated assets are referred to by their National Heritage List for England (NHLE) number and non-designated assets by their HER monument number. The archaeological periods are set out in Table 6.5.

Table 6.5 – Archaeological periods

Period	Dates
Palaeolithic	650,000 – 8500BC
Mesolithic	8500 – 4000BC
Neolithic	4000 – 2400BC
Bronze Age	2400 – 700BC
Iron Age	700BC – AD43
Romano-British	AD43 – 409
Early Medieval	AD410 – 1065
Medieval	AD1066 – 1539
Post-medieval	AD1540 – 1799
Early Modern / Modern	AD1800 – present

Prehistoric (Palaeolithic to Iron Age)

- 6.23 Four Scheduled Monuments date from the prehistoric period. The Rudston Beacon and Round Barrows to East (1005231) comprise a series of earthwork remains of barrows extending for a distance of 450 m. They are located in an arable field to the north of Woldgate. Earthwork (Rudston 'A' Cursus) on the Sheepwalk (1005223) is also located in an arable field to the north of Woldgate and is presumed to be of Neolithic date. The earthwork remains of the South Side Mount Barrow (1005232) and the Sands Wood Round Barrow (1017994) are also located to the north of Woldgate. The former is located within an arable field and was found to contain more

than 20 cremations and burials when partially excavated prior to 1877. Neolithic arrowheads and Bronze Age pottery vessels were found. The Sands Wood Round Barrow is located within an area of woodland. These sites extend along a distinct ridge line and further evidence of additional barrows has been identified between the designated assets. These are recorded as non-designated assets (MHU4157, MHU4158, MHU7189, MHU7576, MHU9885, MHU9886, MHU9887, MHU9888, MHU11760, MHU18099, MHU18361).

- 6.24 Prehistoric activity throughout the Study Area is also well attested by non-designated heritage assets. A series of cropmarks and earthworks indicative of field systems, enclosures, trackways, ring ditches and funerary features of potential prehistory origin have been found across the Study Area (MHU521, MHU595, MHU2983, MHU2984, MHU4128, MHU4176, MHU7209, MHU7286, MHU7287, MHU7289, MHU7290, MHU7300, MHU7583, MHU3261, MHU7299, MHU7435, MHU7453, MHU7573, MHU7574, MHU7579, MHU7580, MHU7581, MHU10160, MHU11760, MHU18098, MHU18394, MHU23399, MHU24692, MHU26493).
- 6.25 A geophysical survey conducted for the adjacent consented Three Oaks Renewable Energy Park (planning reference 22/02777/STPLF) found a complex series of rectilinear ditched enclosures, probable trackways and circular anomalies. There is a second rectangular enclosure on the southern boundary with at least four circular features within it and one outside. In the south-western corner there is further suggestion of rectilinear field boundaries. Based on the morphology of the features, they are most likely to be Bronze Age to Iron Age although a later date cannot be ruled out with further investigation. The section of this survey which covered the present application showed that the proposed turbine location contains an enclosure measuring 35 m x 40 m and part of a rectangular enclosure measuring 25 m x 35 m. Other linear features and pit-like anomalies are also present. This is a short distance away from a large cluster of enclosures which has been interpreted as a multi-period settlement site.
- 6.26 Much of the evidence can only be broadly dated to the prehistoric period. Dating evidence found during investigations has allowed for a more precise identification. Neolithic occupation sites have been found within 750 m to the north of the Proposed Development (MHU11431, MHU11432, MHU11433, MHU12085, MHU12110, MHU12118, MHU18391, MHU18662, MHU18663, MHU18669, MHU18670, MHU18671, MHU18672). Within 1 km to the north-east of the Proposed Development, thirteen further occupation sites and findspots have been identified (MHU11431, MHU11432, MHU11433, MHU12085, MHU12110, MHU12118, MHU18391, MHU18662, MHU18663, MHU18669, MHU18670, MHU18671, MHU18672). Nine have also been identified to the north-west (MHU11949, MHU11959, MHU11964, MHU11270, MHU12084, MHU18094, MHU18674, MHU18680, MHU18681). These could relate to the designated barrow sites. An early Neolithic to late Bronze arrowhead was found within the Site Boundary (MHU18683). Eight other findspots are recorded by the HER across the Study Area including a flint axe (MHU15548), flint arrow heads (MHU18684, MHU18673), Bronze Age pottery (MHU3291, MHU3733), a stone axe (MHU3437), an axe fragment (MHU4121), a pebble mace head (MHU6655) and a Neolithic polished stone axe (MDR8654). Neolithic and Bronze Age pits have also been found (MHU26615, MHU26627).
- 6.27 An Iron Age grave containing one crouched inhumation burial and a pottery vessel (MHU7218) was found approximately 160 m north of the Proposed Development during works for the installation of a gas pipeline. Iron Age settlement sites are known from within the Study Area. A late Iron Age to Romano-British setting with potentially earlier roots was excavated 1.2 km east of the Proposed Development during excavations for the East Coast Pipeline project (MHU26608, MHU26610). An Iron Age ditched enclosure and a late Iron Age settlement were also found (MHU26617, MHU26616). Approximately 1.7 km to the north-west of the Proposed Development, an Iron Age settlement (MHU4139) is known which then became the site of a Roman Villa.

- 6.28 The Proposed Development is located within an active landscape with dating evidence showing use from the Neolithic period onwards. The number of barrows points to a monumental ritual landscape, and these would have been visible throughout later periods. It is also known that the landscape was inhabited during the Iron Age with evidence of settlement sites. The cropmarks within the Site could date to between the Bronze Age and the Iron Age.

Romano-British

- 6.29 Two Scheduled Monuments are located within the Study Area. Two Roman Villas are located within arable fields (1005222, 1013628), 1.7 km to the north-west and 2 km to the south-west of the Proposed Development respectively.
- 6.30 The projected line of a Roman road (MHU1439), aligned with the present Woldgate, is located 500 m to the north of the Proposed Development although there is limited evidence of its existence. It is thought to have linked York and Bridlington. A silver coin was found within 80 m of the projected route (MHU4119). A settlement site was found during works for the East Coast Pipeline 1.2 km east of the Proposed Development (MHU26608).
- 6.31 A series of cropmarks within the Study Area and extending into the Site Boundary have provisionally been interpreted as representing settlement enclosures and trackways, some of which could be of Romano-British date (MHU3256, MHU3261, MHU7290, MHU7299, MHU7435, MHU7573, MHU7574, MHU7579, MHU7581, MHU7583, MHU18098). The features identified during the geophysical survey related to the consented Three Oaks Renewable Energy Park may also have a Romano-British date. It is not possible to firmly date cropmark features without further investigations. Numerous pits and ditches of Romano-British date were identified during works for a gas pipeline in 1971 and these are recorded as being located within the Proposed Development (MHU3251).
- 6.32 The Proposed Development is located within an active Romano-British landscape and may contain features dating to this period.

Early Medieval and Medieval

- 6.33 The nearby settlements of Haisthorpe and Thornholme are named in the Domesday Survey of 1086 which implies that they were established settlements at this time. An early medieval origin is likely for both. An early medieval inhumation with a biconical urn and an iron spear ferrule were excavated at Thorpe Hall in 1906 (MHU2551), approximately 1 km north of the Proposed Development; worked silver fragments were recovered 1.35 km north-west (MHU20880, MHU21748, MHU21749), and an early medieval coin (MHU4118) was recovered from a sandpit 1.2 km to the north. Anecdotal evidence also records a silver gilt ring and Thor's hammer pendant being found approximately 1 km north of the Proposed Development (MHU19958). Burton Agnes has no entry in Domesday although the presence of medieval buildings would indicate at least a medieval origin.
- 6.34 Three medieval Scheduled Monuments are located within the Study Area. The Burton Agnes 12th century manor house (1011581) is located within the village of Burton Agnes. It is a Norman hall with an upper storey and vaulted undercroft. Two settlement sites are scheduled: Low Caythorpe deserted medieval village (1013618) and a settlement at Boynton Hall (1005207). Haisthorpe itself is recorded as a shrunken medieval village on the HER (MHU10028) with earthwork remains of a moated site and fishponds (MHU3278), and the wider medieval settlement (MHU10028). The moated site may represent the location of an earlier manor and the adjacent farmhouse of Manor Farm may have been its successor as it is

reported to contain medieval building material. Earthworks associated with the medieval settlement of Thornholme are also recorded to the south of the village (MHU10027). A deserted medieval village is also recorded south of Rudston (MHU14792).

- 6.35 Haisthorpe and Thornholme formed part of the manor of Burton Agnes which was held by the Stuteville family from the early post-conquest period. It was the Stuteville family who built the scheduled manor house. The Church of St Martin is a Grade I Listed Building (1083812) dating from the 11th century.
- 6.36 There is little evidence for medieval cultivation such as ridge and furrow (MHU26613, MHU26618), although this is most likely due to the impacts of continued arable use during the following centuries.
- 6.37 The Proposed Development was likely located in the agricultural hinterland between the known early medieval and medieval settlements. It is possible that the undated cropmarks within the Site Boundary and its vicinity date to the medieval period.

Post-medieval to Modern

- 6.38 The Grade I listed Burton Agnes Hall (1346451) was constructed in the 17th century and is located to the south-west of the Proposed Development within the Burton Agnes Conservation Area. The grounds contain a number of other 17th century or later listed structures including the Grade I listed Gatehouse (1083815), Grade II walls and gate piers of the walled garden (MHU1204927), Grade I remains of treadmill and bakery (1346453), Grade II sundial (1083818) and six Grade II garden statues (1083816, 1204926, 1280989, 1346452, 1346454, 1204924). The Burton Agnes Conservation Area contains a range of Grade II listed buildings dating from the 18th and 19th centuries including a former Methodist Church (1346455) and farmhouses (1083819, 1204968).
- 6.39 The Grade II listed Haisthorpe Hall (1346457) and the associated White House Farm (MHU20748) were built in the 18th century. The former primitive Methodist Chapel was constructed at the end of the 19th century. A series of 18th and 19th century buildings also survive at Thornholme; the Grade II Manor Farmhouse (1204971), a cottage (MHU6945) and a former primitive Methodist Chapel (MHU14819). Two pinfolds at Haisthorpe and Thornholme indicate that some of the surrounding area was managed as pasture (MHU15083, MHU15088).
- 6.40 The sites of at least three mills are also recorded; one associated with the remains of the deserted medieval village south of Rudston (MHU14792), a post mill to the north of Burton Agnes which was still in use by 1840 (MHU5426, MHU7574) and a windmill c. 1 km south of the Proposed Development associated with a 16th century chapel (MHU14812, MHU14817).
- 6.41 The Site is shown in some detail on the 1840 Burton Agnes and Haisthorpe Tithe maps. It is divided into a series of linear fields with a stone pit (MHU15089) later referred to as a lime kiln or chalk pit, on the eastern boundary of the consented Three Oaks Renewable Energy Park. The Site is also shown as linear fields on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey map published in 1854 (Figure 09 of Appendix 6.1 – Volume 4). Trackways broadly align with the current greenways. The Ordnance Survey map published in 1890 shows that large open fields have been adopted (Figure 10 of Appendix 6.1 Archaeological Desk-based Assessment – Volume 4). The Site has remained as fields in agricultural use to the present day.

Undated

- 6.42 Cropmarks are known within the Study Area and extending into the Site. Although the cropmarks have been given a broad range of dates from the Bronze Age to the medieval period, these can only be assigned a firm date if dating evidence is recovered from intrusive investigations. Some features remain undated.

Geophysical Survey Results

- 6.43 A magnetic gradiometer survey of the Proposed Development took place in September 2025. The location of the turbine which will be sited in the consented Three Oaks Renewable Energy Park was not included as that had already been surveyed as part of that application (Planning Application: 22/02777/STPLF). The results of that survey have been described in paragraph 6.25 above. The areas were numbered 1-5, starting from the top left (north-west) and ending at the centre south. Anomalies representing settlement activity were recorded in Area 4. Area 4 does contain a HER record of features associated with a Romano-British settlement (MHU3251). Internal linear anomalies suggest division within the settlement and there are features suggestive of pits and areas of burning. A trackway or ditches extend from north-east to south-west at the eastern side of Area 4. A possible curvilinear earth bank, apparently respected by the settlement, is evident at the west of Area 4 and may be natural or archaeological. A linear anomaly extends through both Areas 2 and 5 which corresponds with an undated feature on the HER (MHU3261). Another anomaly represents a former field boundary shown on the historic mapping.
- 6.44 Linear anomalies in Area 2 show enclosures, and features in Areas 2 and 3 may relate to an undated settlement complex (MHU7583). Areas 2 and 5 also contained anomalies typical of extraction pits. Areas 1 and 3 contain possible enclosures and trackways. One possible trackway which corresponds with HER record MHU7579 heads towards the north-west and may have led to the known barrows. This is part of a much larger complex to the west of Areas 1 and 4.
- 6.45 Areas 1 and 3 also showed indications of ridge and furrow, remnants of medieval to post-medieval agricultural practice, which are not visible on the surface. Two palaeochannels and drainage features were also recorded in Area 1.

Summary of Archaeological Potential

- 6.46 Known assets recorded within the area of Proposed Development are the findspot of Neolithic to Bronze Age flint arrowheads (MHU18683), Romano-British trackway / enclosures (MHU7581), Romano-British pits and ditches associated with a settlement (MHU3251), cropmarks of an undated settlement complex, an undated linear earthwork (MHU3261) and an undated trackway that is part of the cropmark complex MHU7579. The geophysical survey has also recorded undated anomalies of enclosures, trackways, pits, a curvilinear bank, ridge and furrow and possible palaeochannel or drainage features. The flint arrowheads have been removed and the findspot recorded. Therefore, this does not represent an *in situ* archaeological feature. The remaining features will be considered as receptors.
- 6.47 The data from the Study Area has also been used to inform an assessment of the archaeological potential of the Proposed Development site.

ES Chapter 6 – Historic Environment

- 6.48 The potential for encountering previously unknown remains of Neolithic to Bronze Age date is high, taking into account the previous findspot within the Site and the prehistoric evidence from the Study Area. Any remains could hold evidence of land-use and the type of activity within the landscape. The sensitivity would be medium.
- 6.49 The potential for Iron Age and Romano-British remains is considered to be high and assets within the Site have been dated to the Romano-British period. The remains are considered to be of medium sensitivity as they could contribute towards knowledge of the rural Roman settlement pattern in the vicinity of a projected Roman road and two known Scheduled Monuments of Roman Villas.
- 6.50 The geophysical survey did show some ridge and furrow and the Site appears to have been agricultural hinterland between known settlements, which have an early medieval or medieval origin. There is potential for medieval agricultural remains which would be of low sensitivity. Agricultural use continued through the post-medieval period and into the present day. Historic mapping has shown some changes to field boundaries. Any evidence relating to post-medieval or later agriculture or field boundaries would be of negligible sensitivity.
- 6.51 The Site also contains undated cropmark features and anomalies identified by geophysical survey. Although currently undated, it is likely that they fall between the Neolithic and medieval periods. As these features would contribute towards questions regarding prehistoric to medieval land-use and early rural settlement patterns, they have been assigned a medium sensitivity.
- 6.52 Any palaeochannels or drainage features would hold palaeoenvironmental evidence which could contribute towards dating the filling of the channels and towards climate reconstruction. Such evidence would be of medium sensitivity.
- 6.53 The receptors are summarised in Table 6.6 below.

Table 6.6 Archaeological Receptors and Sensitivity

Receptor	Date	Sensitivity
Prehistoric finds	Likely Neolithic to Bronze Age	Medium
Settlement site	Roman	Medium
Trackways / enclosures	Possibly Iron Age / Roman	Medium
Settlement complex	Undated	Medium
Linear earthwork	Undated	Medium
Curvilinear bank	Undated	Medium
Enclosures, tracks, pits identified by geophysical survey	Undated – possibly prehistoric to medieval	Medium
Ridge and furrow / agricultural remains	Medieval to Post-medieval	Low
Agricultural remains / field boundaries	Post-medieval to modern	Negligible

Receptor	Date	Sensitivity
Palaeochannel / drainage features	Potentially prehistoric	Medium

Setting Assessment

- 6.54 The assessment of potential impacts on the setting of heritage assets followed Historic England's Advice Note 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017). Steps 1 and 2 consist of the identification of assets likely to be impacted and an assessment of contribution from setting to the significance of the asset. A full assessment has been used to inform this chapter and is included in Appendix 6.3 – Volume 4.
- 6.55 Designated heritage assets (such as Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings) are considered to be of high heritage significance and therefore of high sensitivity. The sensitivity of non-designated heritage assets has been assigned in accordance with Table 6.2.
- 6.56 The 5 km study area, as described in paragraph 6.10 above, identified 21 Scheduled Monuments, 101 Listed Buildings and three Conservation Areas. The following factors were considered to identify which of these could potentially be impacted by the Proposed Development:
- Distance which would reduce visual impact;
 - Topography, screening from vegetation and the built environment which would reduce visual impact. Existing field boundaries, woodland plantations and hedges / tree belts along roadsides all provide existing screening;
 - Embedded mitigation where the colour of the turbines is designed to reduce prominence against the skyline;
 - Site visits to assets to ascertain the extent of setting and contribution of long-distance views to heritage significance. The visits were also essential to identifying views that were then added to the list of LVIA visualisations; and
 - Available LVIA visualisations.
- 6.57 ZTV analysis was provided by the LVIA assessor which showed the visibility of the height of the nacelle and height of the blade tip. As the blade tip will be the tallest element at 149.9 m, this has been the main source used in the assessment. It should be noted that the ZTV does not account for the screening effect of vegetation and buildings. It is possible that such vegetation could be removed although it is considered unlikely that all intervening landscape features would be, as the removal of field boundaries and plantations would alter the character of the agricultural landscape and the designed landscape of designated heritage assets.
- 6.58 As described in paragraph 6.13 above, the importance of setting lies in how it contributes to the significance of the asset. The magnitude for indirect impacts is therefore a judgement of whether and to what extent setting contributes to significance or the appreciation of significance, how the setting will be altered and how this would translate into potential impact on the sensitivity of the asset. Where no impact on heritage significance was identified, those assets have not been considered further. Where an impact has been identified, the likely significant effect on those assets has then been assessed.
- 6.59 The heritage assets within the Study Area are shown in Figures 2 and 3 of Appendix 6.3 – Volume 4. The assets and ZTV data are shown in Figures 5 to 7 of Appendix 6.3 – Volume 4.

Identification of assets, contribution from setting and impact magnitude

- 6.60 Between 2.5 km and 5 km from the Proposed Development boundary, 11 Scheduled Monuments were removed from the assessment based on the above factors. The development will not be within their immediate setting and long-distance views would be partially obscured by intervening landscape features such as field boundaries and buildings. The blade tips may be discernible, but the colour would also serve to reduce their prominence against the skyline and they would not be intrusive to the point of harming the significance of the assets.
- 6.61 Ten Scheduled Monuments are located between the Proposed Development boundary and 2.5 km. These were all visited to assess the extent of their setting and contribution to significance. Where available, LVIA visualisations were used to identify assets that could be impacted.
- 6.62 A series of Scheduled Monuments assumed to be of prehistoric date are located along a ridgeline to the north of Woldgate. These comprise the Rudston Monolith (NHLE 1013621), Rudston Beacon and Round Barrows to East (NHLE 1005231), Earthwork (Rudston 'A' Cursus) on the Sheepwalk (NHLE 1005223), South Side Mount Round Barrow (NHLE 1005323) and Sands Wood Round Barrow (NHLE 1017994). The legibility of the prehistoric landscape has been eroded by the construction of villages, farmsteads, roads and the enclosure of the agricultural landscape. Intervisibility between these monuments has been greatly reduced, which has affected the ability to appreciate the assets in the wider landscape. As their surroundings are still predominately fields and there is little urban development within their vicinity, the contribution from their setting is moderate for all assets apart from the Rudston Monolith and the Sands Wood Round Barrow. The Rudston Monolith is located within the churchyard of the Grade I Church of All Saints as Rudston and the built-up village of Rudston has reduced the contribution of setting to the understanding of this asset. The contribution is considered to be low. The Sands Wood Round Barrows is now within a woodland plantation and cannot be appreciated in an open landscape setting. Contribution from setting is also considered to be low.
- 6.63 The Proposed Development would be discernible from the Scheduled Monuments of the barrows (except Sands Wood) and the cursus earthwork in views towards the south, although distance and intervening landscape features such as field boundaries would reduce the visual impact. As the turbines would be a modern intrusion in the setting of these assets and setting contributes to a moderate degree, the impact on these assets would be of minor magnitude. The impact on the Sands Wood Round Barrow would be negligible as the woodland would restrict views and setting contributes to a low degree.
- 6.64 LVIA visualisation from viewpoint 11 shows that the turbines will be discernible from All Saints churchyard and therefore from the setting of the Rudston Monolith. The turbines are at a distance and topography reduces the visual impact. As contribution from setting is low, this alteration of the wider setting will have a negligible impact on the significance of the asset of the Rudston Monolith.
- 6.65 Two Roman villa Scheduled Monuments are located between 1.7 km and 2 km from the Proposed Development (NHLE 1005222 and 1013628). The surroundings of these assets remain agricultural although the landscape character is now largely a product of post-medieval and later enclosures. Setting therefore contributes to the significance of these assets to a moderate degree. Due to the distance and colour of the turbines in order to reduce prominence against the skyline, the turbines would be discernible in views towards the Proposed Development although this will be a small modern intrusion. The assets can still be appreciated in an agricultural landscape context and the magnitude of impact would be negligible.

- 6.66 Three medieval Scheduled Monuments are located between 1.5 km and 1.7 km from the Proposed Development. The deserted medieval villages at Low Caythorpe (NHLE 1013618) and at Boynton Hall (NHLE 1005207) can both be understood within a largely rural agricultural landscape context, although this has been somewhat altered by later landscape enclosure. Setting contributes to the significance of these assets to a high degree. The turbines would not be located within their setting and would not disrupt the relationship with the surrounding agricultural landscape. The long-distance views would constitute a modern intrusion but restricted by distance and landscape features such as field boundaries and plantations. The magnitude of impact on both assets would be minor. The Scheduled Monument of the Burton Agnes 12th century manor house (NHLE 1011581, also Grade I Listed Building 1280994) is located within the village of Burton Agnes and its setting is considered to be the historic village core. This contributes to significance to a high degree. Views of the Proposed Development will be blocked by Burton Agnes Hall and there will be no change to the setting of this asset.
- 6.67 The Kilham Conservation Area (CA) is located 3.8 km to the west of the Proposed Development at its closest point. The special interest of the CA is derived from its historic village core and the architectural value of the buildings within it. As a rural village, the immediate agricultural surroundings do contribute to an understanding of the village's development and historic economy. The Proposed Development is not within this setting although ZTV indicates that the blade tips will be visible in long-distance views. These are not designed views and will be restricted by intervening landscape features. It is not considered that these views contribute towards an appreciation of the asset and there will be no impact on the special character of the CA. The CA contains 15 Listed Buildings (11 houses, one telephone kiosk, one war memorial, one bull ring and the Grade I Church of All Saints). The setting of these assets is considered to be the village of Kilham and long-distance views to the east are not considered to contribute towards an appreciation of these assets. As such, there will be no impact on these Listed Buildings.
- 6.68 The Bessingby Conservation Area is located 3.7 km to the east of the Proposed Development at its closest point. The ZTV indicates variable views of the turbines across the Conservation Area. Due to the distance and intervening landscape features such as field boundaries and the built environment, long-distance views from within the CA will be restricted. The importance of the CA is derived from the historic village core and architectural value of the buildings within it. The relationship between the village and its immediate agricultural surroundings will not be disrupted. The long-distance view to the west is not considered to contribute towards an appreciation of the asset and it will not be impacted. The Bessingby CA contains nine Listed Buildings comprising Bessingby Hall and associated assets, the Church of St Magnus and houses. The setting of these assets is the village and long-distance views towards the west do not contribute towards an appreciation of these assets. The Proposed Development is not within their setting and no designed views will be disrupted. As such, there will be no impact on these Listed Buildings.
- 6.69 The Burton Agnes Conservation Area is located 1.4 km to the south-west of the Proposed Development. This is the closest CA to the Proposed Development. Its boundary includes the southern and eastern extents of the village but excludes the more recent developments to the west. The village contains a number of farmsteads which contribute towards its special interest. It also contains the Grade I Burton Agnes Hall and its Grade I Gatehouse. These are key contributors to the historic and architectural interest of the CA. The CA itself is of medium sensitivity and the surrounding agricultural landscape contributes to an appreciation of the asset to a high degree. The Proposed Development is located within its immediate agricultural surroundings and is considered to be within the setting of the CA. LVIA visualisations from within the CA show that topography, tree belts and buildings provide effective screening and the Proposed Development would only be partially visible from points at the eastern side of the CA. No designed views would be disrupted. The overall magnitude of impact on the special interest of the CA would be minor.

- 6.70 Burton Agnes Hall (NHLE 1346451) is located at the north-eastern end of the village and will have the most direct views towards the Proposed Development. The Hall was constructed c. 1601-1610 with later additions and alterations. It has three storeys and the main elevation faces south towards the Grade I Gatehouse (NHLE 1083815), commanding long-distance views across the countryside to the south. To the east of the Hall, a garden contains a number of Grade II listed garden features. A wall and ha-ha are located along the eastern boundary of the garden, with clear views across the fields to the east. To the south of this, a walled garden is located. Views to the north are obscured by a plantation and tree belts which are part of the designed landscape of the Hall. The setting of the Hall contributes to its significance to a high degree. Views were assessed from the garden wall above the ha-ha, the garden, the walled kitchen garden and from the library on the 2nd floor of the Hall (LVIA viewpoints 6, 7, 8 and 9 – Figures 5.18-5.21, Appendix 3a, also included in Appendix 6.3 – Volume 4). The site inspection and LVIA visualisations show that the turbines will be discernible but views will be limited by features such as the plantation, tree belts and the wall of the walled garden. LVIA viewpoint 7 was taken from the library and shows that the tree belts partially obscure the view of the Proposed Development. As views across the countryside to the south and east are considered more important than the view to the north-east, no key designed views will be disrupted. The relationship between the Hall and the village will not be impacted, and impacts will be restricted to the relationship between the Hall and the surrounding agricultural landscape. The magnitude of impact will be minor.
- 6.71 The garden contains seven Grade II listed features such as statues and a sundial. The setting of these assets is considered to be limited to the garden itself where they can be appreciated as a group. Other associated Grade II listed assets are the walls and gate piers to the north, east and west of the walled garden, the stable and coach house and the remains of a Treadmill and Bakery. The setting of these assets is considered to be restricted to the grounds of the Hall. Wider views are not considered to contribute to their significance due to their spatial and functional association with the Hall, and their significance will not be impacted by the Proposed Development.
- 6.72 The Gatehouse is located to the south of the main Hall and offers a high-status grand entrance to the grounds. Its main elevation faces south and it has commanding views across the countryside in that direction. The Proposed Development is not considered to be within the setting of this asset, which is the grounds of the Hall, and views to the north-east are not considered to contribute towards an understanding of the asset. The significance of the Gatehouse will not be impacted.
- 6.73 The Burton Agnes Conservation Area contains a further seven Listed Buildings. The Grade I Burton Agnes Manor House is also a Scheduled Monument and has been considered in paragraph 6.66. The Church of St Martin and the Old Rectory are located to the west of Burton Agnes Hall. Their setting is considered to be the historic village core and long-distance views to the Proposed Development are not considered to contribute to their significance. Views would also be blocked by buildings and the plantation to the north of Burton Agnes Hall. There would be no impact on these assets. Church Farmhouse and Home Farmhouse are located close to the grounds of Burton Agnes Hall and their setting is considered to be the village. Nearby buildings will obscure any views towards the Proposed Development and these will not be impacted. Manor Farm Cottage and the former Methodist Church are both located on Main Street within the village and views towards the Proposed Development will be obscured by the built environment. These will also not be impacted.
- 6.74 Within the wider 5 km Study Area, 12 Listed Buildings are located between 5 km – 3 km from the Proposed Development. This includes buildings at Harpham and Lowthorpe to the south-west of Burton Agnes and Fraisthorpe to the south-east. These are considered too distant to be impacted as the development will not be within their setting. Long-distance views would be

restricted by topography, intervening landscape features and the built environment and it is not considered that such views would contribute towards an appreciation of the assets.

- 6.75 A cluster of 16 Listed Buildings are located in the village of Boynton to the north-east of the Proposed Development within 2 km – 3 km of the Proposed Development. This includes Boynton Hall and associated assets such as garden features and buildings within the grounds. The setting of the Hall is considered to be the village and immediate agricultural surroundings. Long-distance views will be restricted by the built environment and landscape features such as plantations and woodland. The ZTV also indicates that topography will provide a natural restriction of views and the significance of the asset will not be impacted. The setting of associated assets is restricted to the gardens and grounds of the Hall and these assets will also not be impacted.
- 6.76 The Grade II Carnaby Temple is an 18th century folly associated with Boynton Hall but located 2.5 km east of the Proposed Development and 1.1 km north of Carnaby. It was once located within the wider grounds of the Hall but was sold and is now located within farmland. The disconnect from its original context has reduced the contribution from setting although it still offers views of the surrounding area. Setting contributes to a moderate degree and the Proposed Development would be discernible in the view to the west. LVIA viewpoint 12 shows that the turbines would be visible but at a distance and the current trees offer some screening LVIA viewpoint 12 – Figure 5.24, Appendix 3a, also included in Appendix 6.3 – Volume 4). This would have a minor magnitude of impact on the appreciation of the asset.
- 6.77 Within the village of Carnaby, two houses and an associated stable and car sheds are listed. Their setting is the village and ZTV analysis indicates that topography provides some natural screening. The views towards the north-west are not considered to contribute to significance and these will not be impacted. The Grade II* Church of St John the Baptist is located at the western side of the village with less restricted views towards the Proposed Development. The setting of the church is the village that it serves, and it is a historic focal point of the community. This setting, within a wider agricultural landscape, contributes to significance to a high degree. LVIA viewpoint 13 shows that the Proposed Development would be discernible but at a distance and partially restricted by field boundaries which are an integral part of the agricultural landscape (LVIA viewpoint 13 – Figure 5.25, Appendix 3a, also included in Appendix 6.3 – Volume 4). This would have a negligible impact on the ability to appreciate this asset.
- 6.78 Within 2 km to 3 km of the south of the Proposed Development, two listed farmhouses and a listed barn are situated close to the three Listed Buildings associated with the railway. The Proposed Development is not within the setting of these six assets and long-distance views to the north are not considered to contribute towards an appreciation of their significance. These will not be impacted. Three listed buildings at Rudston also fall within the 2 km to 3 km band to the north of the Proposed Development. The setting of the Rudston War Memorial is the village in which it is located and the Proposed Development is not within this setting. The asset could still be appreciated within its village location and it will not be impacted. The setting of the Grade I All Saints Church is also the village of Rudston and this contributes to an understanding of this asset to a high degree. Long-distance views make a connection between the village and its agricultural economy, although these do not make a large contribution to the significance of the church. LVIA viewpoint 11 shows that the Proposed Development will be discernible but at a distance and only in views to the south (LVIA viewpoint 11 – Figure 5.23, Appendix 3a, also included in Appendix 6.3 – Volume 4). The natural topography also provides partial screening. This will have a negligible magnitude of impact on the ability to appreciate the church. The Grade II listed Buttercup Cottage is also located in Rudston, 1.9 km north-west of the Proposed Development. The setting of the residence is the village and 19th and 20th century development has eroded the historic setting of the cottage. The cottage faces west and

views towards the Proposed Development do not contribute to the significance of the asset. Therefore, it will not be impacted.

- 6.79 The Grade II* Thorpe Hall is located 1.8 km to the north of the Proposed Development. It was constructed c. 1740 and forms part of a working estate. The estate also includes other listed assets; a Grade I Dairy, Grade II ice house, orangery, statue, game larder and stable block. The setting of the assets is restricted to the grounds where they can be appreciated as part of the estate. The Proposed Development is not within their setting and will not disrupt their spatial and functional association with the Hall. There will be no impact on these assets. Two Grade II listed bridges are located near to the Hall. The setting of these is limited to their immediate vicinity and association with their respective watercourses. Wider views towards the Proposed Development do not contribute to their significance and there is limited visibility due to topography. They will not be impacted. The setting of Thorpe Hall itself is the valley floor where it is located, its grounds and the enclosed agricultural land adjoining the estate. This setting contributes to significance to a high degree. The ZTV analysis shows variable views of the nacelles and blade tips, with all six blade tips only visible at the northern part of the estate. This indicates that topography forms a natural screen. The view of the blade tips would be further restricted by distance and intervening features such as plantations, which are part of the designed landscape. The visual impact would be of minor magnitude as it would introduce a modern feature into views from the Hall.
- 6.80 The closest Listed Building to the Proposed Development is the Grade II Haisthorpe Hall (NHLE 1346457) less than 1 km to the south-east. The building dates to the late 18th century and is set within a formal garden bounded by tall hedges and trees. This intentional separation gives a private character to the current Hall and the surrounding agricultural landscapes contributes to the significance of the asset to a very low degree. The main entrance to the Hall is from the south, and views towards the north-west are not considered designed views and do not contribute to significance. Therefore, this asset will not be impacted by the Proposed Development. The Grade II Manor Farmhouse is located at the southern end of the village of Haisthorpe. The farmhouse is still part of a working farm and can be appreciated in its immediate setting of the village and farm which has gradually developed over the 19th and 20th centuries. Views towards the Proposed Development are not considered to contribute towards the appreciation of the asset and its significance will not be impacted.
- 6.81 To the south of the Proposed Development, the Grade II Manor Farmhouse at Thornholme forms part of a working farm and its setting is the village. Thornholme has developed as an elongated settlement along Main Street and there are a number of 19th and 20th century buildings which has eroded contribution from setting. ZTV indicates that the blade tips will be visible, but this does not take into account the obstruction from the built environment. The housing opposite will obscure views to the north and the significance of the asset will not be impacted.
- 6.82 Two non-designated assets are located within 1 km of the Proposed Development and these were also considered as part of the assessment. White House Farm (HER ID MHU20748) is located at Haisthorpe and likely had links with Haisthorpe Hall. As a building of local interest, its sensitivity is low. As an 18th century farmhouse, the wider agricultural setting contributes to an understanding of the asset to a high degree. ZTV indicates that all six blade tips will be visible but only in views to the north-west. The modern turbines would have a minor magnitude of impact on the ability to appreciate the asset in its agricultural context. The former Primitive Methodist Chapel (HER ID MHU15818) is also located at Haisthorpe, at the northern end of the village. As a building of local interest but of modest quality, its sensitivity is low. Its setting is the village that it served but it has panoramic views towards Burton Agnes Hall to the west. The Proposed Development would be to the north-west and this view does not contribute towards an appreciation of the asset within the village. This asset will not be impacted.

Summary of Indirect Impacts

6.83 Steps 1 and 2 identified 16 assets that would potentially be affected by the Proposed Development. These are summarised in Table 6.7 below which also states their distance from the site, sensitivity, contribution from setting and magnitude of impact.

Table 6.7 Summary of built heritage receptors

NHLE no.	Name and Designation	Distance	Sensitivity	Contribution from setting	Magnitude of impact
1013621	Rudston Monolith Scheduled Monument (SM)	2.1 km north	High	Low	Negligible
1005231	Rudston Beacon and Round Barrows to East SM	700 m north-west	High	Moderate	Minor
1005223	Earthwork (Rudston 'A; Cursus) on the Sheepwalk SM	450 m north-west	High	Moderate	Minor
1005232	South Side Mount Round Barrow SM	750 m north	High	Moderate	Minor
1017994	Sands Wood Round Barrow SM	1.3 km north-east	High	Low	Negligible
1005222	Roman Villa Site SM	1.7 km north-west	High	Moderate	Negligible
1013628	Romano-British Villa east of Sandy Lane SM	2 km south-west	High	Moderate	Negligible
1013618	Low Caythorpe deserted medieval village SM	1.5 km north	High	High	Minor
1005207	Settlement Site at Boynton Hall SM	1.7 km north-east	High	High	Minor
N / A	Burton Agnes Conservation Area	1.4 km south-west	Medium	High	Minor
1162387	Church of All Saints, Rudston Grade I LB	2.1 km north	High	High	Negligible
1083823	Carnaby Temple Grade II LB	2.5 km east	High	Moderate	Minor
1083821	St John the Baptist Church Grade II* LB	2.6 km east	High	High	Negligible
1346645	Thorpe Hall Grade II* LB	1.8 km north	High	High	Minor
1346451	Burton Agnes Hall Grade I LB	1.5 km south-west	High	High	Minor
MHU20748	White House Farm, Haisthorpe, non-	900 m south-east	Low	High	Minor

NHLE no.	Name and Designation	Distance	Sensitivity	Contribution from setting	Magnitude of impact
	designated heritage asset				

Baseline Evolution

- 6.84 The adjacent consented Three Oaks Renewable Energy Park will have been constructed prior to the Proposed Development. The solar farm (ID0007 in the long list of sites provided at Appendix 4.2 – Volume 4) has the potential to impact remains of prehistoric, Iron Age and Romano-British date which would be of a similar character and part of the same landscape as the archaeological receptors within the Proposed Development. A pre-commencement scheme of trial trenching will take place to further characterise and date the archaeological deposits which will result in the generation of additional archaeological data. This will be followed by any further agreed archaeological works such as excavation and recording. In this way, adverse impacts on the cropmarks and archaeological features within that site will be mitigated. Screening has been agreed for the solar farm to reduce glint and glare which could have potentially impacted the setting of nearby designated assets. With the mitigation in place, the solar farm will not impact the setting of heritage assets.
- 6.85 An extension to Haisthorpe Water Treatment Works c. 1.2 km south-east of the Proposed Development will have occurred prior to the construction phase (ID0001 in the long list of sites). Geophysics and trial trenching have found a Roman cremation cemetery and Iron Age / Roman enclosures, which are considered to be part of the same Iron Age / Roman landscape as the archaeological receptors within the area of Proposed Development. Further mitigation will be applied in accordance with a planning condition and remains will be excavated and recorded, therefore mitigating adverse impacts on archaeological features.
- 6.86 Appendix 4.4 (Climate Projection) – Volume 4 of the ES provides an overview of the likely changes in climatic conditions at the Site resulting from climate change across the lifespan of the Proposed Development. It is not considered that the climatic projection identified would have a material impact upon the condition of the baseline as identified in this chapter.

Primary & Tertiary Mitigation

Primary Mitigation

- 6.87 The proposed wind turbines would be light grey in colour which would serve to reduce their prominence against the skyline and reduce visual impacts. This in turn would reduce indirect impacts on the setting of heritage assets.

Tertiary Mitigation

- 6.88 No tertiary mitigation has been identified for cultural heritage.

Assessment of Effects

Construction

- 6.89 Ten archaeological receptors have been identified that will be impacted by the Proposed Development. Excavations for the turbine foundations will be down to an approved load bearing strata. Cables will also be laid in trenches alongside the access tracks with a depth of 1 m. Intrusive groundworks related to the construction can truncate or entirely remove archaeological deposits. According to Table 6.3, this would be a major magnitude of impact on these receptors.
- 6.90 Eight receptors are of medium sensitivity; prehistoric finds (likely Neolithic to Bronze Age), Roman settlement site, possible Iron Age / Roman trackways and enclosures, undated settlement complex, undated linear earthwork, undated curvilinear bank, undated enclosures, tracks, pits (possibly prehistoric to medieval) and palaeochannels / drainage features. The significance of effect can then be determined with reference to Table 6.4. A medium sensitivity and major magnitude of impact will result in a permanent adverse effect which is Moderate. Although the impact would result in a substantial loss within the footprint of the Proposed Development, this would not result in the complete loss of the receptors as they continue outside of the footprint. A Moderate adverse effect on these eight receptors is significant in EIA terms.
- 6.91 Medieval to post-medieval ridge and furrow / agricultural remains have low sensitivity. With reference to Table 6.4 a low sensitivity and major impact will result in a permanent adverse effect which is Moderate – Slight. As above, the receptor is likely to continue beyond the footprint of the Proposed Development and the effect is considered to be at the Slight end of the scale and not significant in EIA terms.
- 6.92 Post-medieval to modern agricultural remains / field boundaries have negligible sensitivity. With reference to Table 6.4 a negligible sensitivity and major impact will result in a permanent adverse effect which is Slight and not significant in EIA terms.
- 6.93 Indirect impacts may occur during the construction phase from the use of cranes to install the wind turbines. These would be visual impacts on the setting of heritage assets and the magnitude would be as described above. However, these effects would be temporary during the construction phase. Impacts from the turbines themselves will persist throughout the operational phase and these have been assessed below.

Operation

- 6.94 Impacts on archaeological remains will have occurred during the construction phase. No additional effects have been identified during the operational phase.
- 6.95 The identified impacts on the setting of heritage assets will mainly occur during the operational phase when the proposed turbines are in position and will operate for the temporary 40-year duration of the Proposed Development.
- 6.96 The assessment identified 16 assets comprising nine Scheduled Monuments, one Conservation Area, five Listed Buildings and one non-designated heritage asset.

- 6.97 The Scheduled Monuments of Rudston Monolith, Sands Wood Round Barrow, Roman Villa site and Romano-British Villa east of Sandy Lane have high sensitivity and the magnitude of impact has been assessed as negligible. With reference to Table 6.4, a high sensitivity and negligible magnitude of impact will result in a temporary adverse effect which is Slight and is not significant in EIA terms.
- 6.98 The Scheduled Monuments of Rudston Beacon and Round Barrows to East, Earthwork (Rudston 'A' Cursus) on the Sheepwalk, South Side Mount Barrow, Low Caythorpe Deserted Medieval Village and the Settlement Site at Boynton Hall have high sensitivity and the magnitude of impact has been assessed as minor. With reference to Table 6.4, a high sensitivity and minor magnitude of impact will result in a temporary adverse effect which is Moderate – Slight. The Proposed Development is not within the immediate setting of these assets and the visual impact will be reduced by the primary mitigation of the colour of the turbines. The visual impact will also be reduced by distance, topography and screening from landscape features. Due to these factors, the overall likely significant effect is considered to be at the lower end of the scale and will be a temporary adverse effect which is Slight and is not significant in EIA terms.
- 6.99 The Burton Agnes Conservation Area is of medium sensitivity and the magnitude of impact will be minor. With reference to Table 6.4, a medium sensitivity and minor magnitude of impact will result in a temporary adverse effect which is Slight and is not significant in EIA terms.
- 6.100 The Listed Buildings of the Church of All Saints at Rudston and St John the Baptist Church at Carnaby have high sensitivity and the magnitude of impact will be negligible. With reference to Table 6.4, a high sensitivity and negligible magnitude of impact will result in a temporary adverse effect which is Slight and is not significant in EIA terms.
- 6.101 The Listed Buildings of Carnaby Temple, Thorpe Hall and Burton Agnes Hall have high sensitivity and the magnitude of impact will be minor. With reference to Table 6.4, a high sensitivity and minor magnitude of impact will result in a temporary adverse effect which is Moderate – Slight. The Proposed Development is not within the immediate setting of Carnaby Temple and Thorpe Hall and visual impact will be reduced by the primary mitigation of the colour of the turbines. The visual impact will also be reduced by distance, topography and screening from landscape features such as field boundaries. Designed landscape features such as plantations will also screen Thorpe Hall. Due to these factors, the overall likely significant effect is considered to be at the lower end and will be a temporary adverse effect which is Slight and is not significant in EIA terms. The views to the north-east from Burton Agnes Hall are not considered to be designed views, such as those to the south and east, and contribute less to the appreciation of the asset. The view will also be restricted by the plantation and tree belt which is part of the designed landscape of the Hall. The overall likely significant effect is considered to be at the lower end of the scale and will be a temporary adverse effect which is Slight and is not significant in EIA terms.
- 6.102 The non-designated asset of White House Farm has low sensitivity and the magnitude of impact will be minor. With reference to Table 6.4 a low sensitivity and minor magnitude of impact will result in a temporary adverse effect which is Slight – Neutral and is not significant in EIA terms.

Decommissioning

- 6.103 Impacts on archaeological remains will have occurred during the construction phase. No additional effects have been identified during the decommissioning phase.

- 6.104 The indirect impacts on the 16 identified assets would continue into the decommissioning phase through the use of cranes which would have a visual impact on the setting of the assets. This would be temporary, and after decommissioning the views would revert to the baseline level, reversing the impact on the heritage assets.

Secondary Mitigation

- 6.105 The likely significant effects to the eight archaeological receptors would occur during the construction phase. Secondary mitigation measures applied would begin with trial trench evaluation to further characterise and date the archaeological remains within the area of Proposed Development. This would be secured via a pre-commencement planning condition in accordance with the response from the ERO Development Management Archaeologist (see Table 6.1 above) and carried out to an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI). This would take place prior to any intrusive groundworks during the construction phase. The aims of the trial trenching should be to obtain dating evidence (particularly where receptors are currently undated), investigate the depth of surviving archaeological deposits, their character, extent of preservation and potential contribution to answer research questions. Based on the results, a further programme of archaeological works would be agreed with the Council to recover and record the archaeological evidence that would be subject to substantial impact during construction.
- 6.106 As archaeological impacts are limited to the construction phase, no further mitigation is required during operation and decommissioning.
- 6.107 As no likely significant effects were identified from impacts on the setting of heritage assets due to the Proposed Development, no additional mitigation has been identified for these 16 assets. The Slight significant effect on eight designated assets (Rudston Beacon and Round Barrows to east SM, Earthwork (Rudston 'A' Cursus) on the Sheepwalk SM, South Side Mount Barrow SM, Low Caythorpe deserted medieval village SM, Settlement Site at Boynton Hall SM, Burton Agnes Conservation Area, Grade II listed Carnaby Temple, Grade II* listed Thorpe Hall and Grade I listed Burton Agnes Hall) is not considered to constitute substantial harm under NPPF. According to paragraph 215 of NPPF, less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against public benefits. The public benefits of the production of sustainable energy over the 40 year lifespan of the scheme, the contribution towards a reduction in environmental harm and the contribution to energy security are considered to offset this harm.

Assessment of Residual Effects

Construction

- 6.108 Eight archaeological receptors have been identified where the likely effect is significant. Secondary mitigation has been identified in the form of a phased approach of archaeological investigations beginning with pre-commencement trial trench evaluation. Further excavation and recording would then be agreed with the Development Management Archaeologist of the Council. All archaeological works would be carried out to a WSI agreed with the Council.
- 6.109 The implementation of a programme of archaeological works will reduce the magnitude of impact and therefore the significance of effect. The harm to the archaeological receptors will be offset by recording archaeological remains, enhancing the archaeological knowledge of the

area and informing regional research objectives. This would reduce the magnitude of impact on these receptors to Slight.

- 6.110 The residual effect has been assessed based on the anticipated effect of applying this mitigation and is shown in Table 6.8.

Table 6.8 – Residual Effects

Receptor	Sensitivity	Impact Magnitude	Nature and Duration of Effect	Significance of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Residual Impact Magnitude	Residual Significance and Nature of Effect	Confidence Level
Prehistoric finds	Medium	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Moderate adverse	Phased programme of archaeological trial trenching followed by additional excavation as agreed with the Council.	Minor negative	Slight adverse	High
Settlement site	Medium	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Moderate adverse		Minor negative	Slight adverse	High
Trackways / enclosures	Medium	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Moderate adverse		Minor negative	Slight adverse	High
Settlement complex	Medium	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Moderate adverse		Minor negative	Slight adverse	High
Linear earthwork	Medium	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Moderate adverse		Minor negative	Slight adverse	High
Curvilinear bank	Medium	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Moderate adverse		Minor negative	Slight adverse	High

Receptor	Sensitivity	Impact Magnitude	Nature and Duration of Effect	Significance of Effect	Additional Mitigation	Residual Impact Magnitude	Residual Significance and Nature of Effect	Confidence Level
Enclosures, tracks, pits identified by geophysical survey	Medium	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Moderate adverse		Minor negative	Slight adverse	High
Palaeochannel / drainage features	Medium	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Moderate adverse		Minor negative	Slight adverse	High
Ridge and furrow / agricultural remains	Low	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Slight adverse	No mitigation required	Major negative	Slight adverse	High
Agricultural remains / field boundaries	Negligible	Major negative	Permanent, direct, irreversible	Neutral	No mitigation required	Major negative	Slight	High

- 6.111 It is not considered that the residual effects identified in this section would alter in consideration of climatic changes.

Operation

- 6.112 No likely significant effects were identified during the operational phase for assets which will be impacted through changes in their setting due to the Proposed Development. No secondary mitigation will be required which would reduce the magnitude of impact. The effects that will arise would be indirect, temporary and reversible, and will remain as described in paragraphs 6.94 to 6.102.

Decommissioning

- 6.113 During the decommissioning phase, the impacts on the setting of heritage assets will be reversed due to the removal of the turbines. The setting of the identified heritage assets will revert to the baseline conditions.

Cumulative Effects

- 6.114 The erection of 9 no. affordable dwellings with associated works and infrastructure (ID0002 on the long list provided in Appendix 4.2 – Volume 4) will overlap with the Proposed Development and has been considered for cumulative effects on archaeological receptors. The dwellings will be constructed 1.9 km south-west of the Proposed Development on the western side of Burton Agnes. Geophysics and trial trenching have found prehistoric and medieval remains. The prehistoric remains include Neolithic flints, some of which were residual (not in their original context) but a small number were recovered from a ditch which indicates a surviving Neolithic feature. A planning condition for excavation and preservation by record has been applied with the option for preservation *in situ* of highly sensitive features. As the Proposed Development is located within a sensitive prehistoric landscape, there is potential for cumulative impacts to Neolithic features. As mitigation in the form of archaeological works will be applied to both developments, this will reduce the magnitude of impact to minor. The cumulative significance of effect will be a permanent adverse minor effect and not considered significant in EIA terms.
- 6.115 A replacement lattice tower will be located 3 km north-east of the Proposed Development in Hallowkiln Wood (ID0018 on the long list). This will result in an increase in height from 27 m to 35 m. A Heritage Assessment has been provided with the planning application which identified shared receptors of Carnaby Temple and St John the Baptist Church at Carnaby. The assessment concluded that no harm would occur to these receptors due to the increased height of the new development and therefore no cumulative impacts will occur. The likely significant effect will remain Slight for St John the Baptist Church and Slight for Carnaby Temple and not considered significant in EIA terms.
- 6.116 The Carnaby Wind Energy Project (ID0027) will be located c. 3.3 km to the south-east of the Proposed Development at the eastern end of the Carnaby Industrial Estate. It will comprise the erection of 2 no. wind turbines of height 125 m with associated infrastructure including access tracks, construction compound and a control building. An Environmental Statement was produced in 2010 and the Cultural Heritage chapter was consulted for indirect impacts on shared receptors. The Scheduled Monuments of Rudston Monolith, Settlement Site at Boynton Hall, Low Caythorpe Deserted Medieval Village were considered and the ES concluded that there would be no impact due to distance, intervening natural topography, built-up residential

areas and dense vegetation. Primary mitigation will also be applied and is described in the ES as turbines being painted to reduce prominence against the skyline when viewed from a distance. The ES chapter also concluded no impacts on listed buildings within 2 km of the Carnaby Wind Energy Project which includes Burton Agnes Hall, Carnaby Temple, Church of St John the Baptist and Thorpe Hall. There will be a minor adverse significant effect on the Burton Agnes Conservation Area as the turbines will not be visible from the entirety of the CA and will only be discernible from certain locations at the eastern side. According to the ES chapter and this assessment, there will be cumulative impacts on one shared receptor of the Burton Agnes Conservation Area. A cumulative visualisation has been produced using LVIA viewpoint 7 from the Burton Agnes library window (Figure 5.38 of Appendix 3a). This is on the eastern side of the Conservation Area. The turbines of the Carnaby Wind Energy Project are not readily discernible from the library and views from the CA will be restricted by distance, intervening vegetation and topography. This view towards the Carnaby industrial estate is not considered a designed view. The cumulative significance of effect will be a temporary adverse Slight effect and not considered significant in EIA terms.

- 6.117 Project IDs 0012, 0020, 0021, 0022, 0023, 0025 and 0026 are for replacement wind turbines. No additional impacts have been identified during the planning process for these replacements apart from ID0025. This is within the 5 – 10 km range and the Heritage Statement identified no shared receptors. There will be no cumulative significant effects from these replacements.

Summary and Conclusions

- 6.118 The assessment has identified ten archaeological receptors ranging in date from the prehistoric to the modern period that would potentially be impacted by the Proposed Development. These were identified through desk-based assessment and geophysical survey. The impact on these receptors during the construction phase would be major due to truncation or removal during intrusive works. The overall significance of effect on eight receptors was assessed as permanent adverse Moderate which is significant in EIA terms. The significance of effect on the medieval to post-medieval ridge and furrow / agricultural remains was assessed as a permanent adverse Slight effect, and the effect on post-medieval to modern agricultural remains / field boundaries as a permanent adverse Slight effect, which is not significant in EIA terms. Secondary mitigation is proposed for the eight receptors which will comprise trial trench investigations followed by a programme of archaeological recording to be agreed with the Council. This will result in a permanent adverse residual effect which is Slight and not considered significant in EIA terms. This will apply to the receptors of prehistoric finds (likely Neolithic to Bronze Age), settlement site (possibly Roman), trackways / enclosure (possibly Iron Age to Roman), an undated settlement complex, an undated linear earthwork, an undated curvilinear bank, undated enclosures, tracks and pits, and palaeochannels (possibly prehistoric). These effects will occur during the construction phase and no additional effects have been identified during operation and decommissioning.
- 6.119 A combination of desk-based assessment and site visits, informed by LVIA ZTV analysis and visualisations, was used to identify receptors which would potentially be indirectly impacted by the Proposed Development through impacts to their setting. The assessment identified 16 receptors comprising 15 designated heritage assets and one non-designated heritage asset. For the Scheduled Monuments of the Rudston Monolith, Sands Wood Round Barrow, Roman Villa site and Romano-British Villa east of Sandy Lane, and Listed Buildings of Church of All Saints and St John the Baptist Church, the Proposed Development will result in a temporary adverse effect which is Slight and not significant in EIA terms. The Proposed Development will also result in a temporary adverse effect on the Burton Agnes Conservation Area which is Slight and not significant in EIA terms.

- 6.120 For the Scheduled Monuments of Rudston Beacon and Round Barrows to East, Earthwork (Rudston 'A' Cursus) on the Sheepwalk, South Side Mount Barrow, Low Caythorpe Deserted Medieval Village, Settlement Site at Boynton Hall, and the Listed Buildings of Carnaby Temple, Thorpe Hall and Burton Agnes Hall, the Proposed Development will result in a temporary adverse effect which is Moderate – Slight. Due to factors such as distance, topography, the screening effect of the built environment or vegetation, and that no designed views will be disrupted, the effect is considered to be Slight and not significant in EIA terms. For the non-designated White House Farm, the Proposed Development will result in a temporary adverse effect which is Slight – Neutral and not significant in EIA terms. As no significant effects were identified, no secondary mitigation is proposed. These effects will occur during the operation phase and will be temporary and reversible.
- 6.121 No cumulative significant effects were identified during the assessment.