

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Port of Immingham Wind Turbines

Client: Associated British Ports (ABP)

Reference: C4946 - 1307

Version 1

March 2024



Report Prepared for:

Associated British Ports (ABP)

Author:

Green Cat Renewables Ltd

Checked by	Isla Ferguson	Date	18/03/2024
Approved by	Victoria Oleksy	Date	21/03/2024

Issue History	Date	Details
V0.1	15/11/2023	Issued to AOC for Peer Review
V0.2	27/11/2023	Issued for Client and Legal Review
V0.3	18/03/2024	Issued to AOC for Approval
V1.0	25/03/2024	Submission

Table of Contents

6	Cultural Heritage and Archaeology	1
6.1	Introduction	1
6.2	Legislation, Policy and Guidance	1
6.2.1	Legislation	1
6.2.2	Policy	1
6.2.3	Guidance	2
6.3	Consultation and Scope	2
6.4	Assessment Methodology	5
6.4.1	Data Sources	5
6.4.2	Within Site Boundary	5
6.4.3	Outside Site Boundary	5
6.4.4	Cumulative Assessment	6
6.4.5	Harm	6
6.4.6	Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Figures	6
6.4.7	Limitations of Scope	7
6.4.8	Assessment Criteria	7
6.5	Baseline	9
6.5.1	Heritage Assets Within Site Boundary	9
6.5.2	Heritage Assets Outside Site Boundary	9
6.6	Assessment of Predicted Impacts and Effects	19
6.6.1	Heritage Assets Within the Site	19
6.6.2	Heritage Assets Outside the Site	28
6.7	Cumulative Assessment	40
6.8	Mitigation	42
6.8.1	Permanent Land-take and Operation	42
6.8.2	Restoration	43
6.9	Summary of Effects	43
6.9.1	Physical Effects	43
6.9.2	Setting Effects	43
6.10	Conclusion	43

6 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

6.1 Introduction

Cultural heritage is represented by a wide range of features, both above and below ground, which result from past human use of the landscape. These include standing buildings, many of which are still in use; sub-surface archaeological remains and artefact scatters; industrial remains; earthwork monuments and landscape features such as field boundaries. The aim of this assessment is to identify elements of archaeological and cultural heritage value that may be impacted upon by the Proposed Development as described in **ES Chapter 2 – Proposed Development** and provide an assessment of likely significant effects and identify any mitigation that may be required.

It is noted that the port and wider estate were subject to substantial civil engineering works when originally built in the 19th century and then during subsequent update/refurbishment/redevelopment work. The port areas have undergone considerable excavation and reclamation work in intertidal areas so any archaeological remains predating the port's existence are extremely unlikely due to that extensive disturbance. Similarly repeated redevelopment of the terrestrial estate (and indeed continuous maintenance dredging within dock basin areas) would have periodically removed subsequent archaeological deposits. Paleoenvironmental remains may well still reside in extremely deep layers, but these would only be exposed to relatively minor disturbance from the Proposed Development and would be limited to the pile footprints for individual turbines.

This assessment was carried out by Green Cat Renewables Ltd with input from AOC Archaeology Group on **Section 6.6.1.1** and **Appendix 6.2**. The chapter and assessment have been peer-reviewed by AOC Archaeology Group.

The Site is split between North Lincolnshire and North East Lincolnshire Council areas. T1 is located within North Lincolnshire, while T2 is located within North East Lincolnshire.

6.2 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

The following statutory, national and local legislation, policy and guidance for assessing the potential impact of renewable energy developments on cultural heritage features has been considered:

6.2.1 Legislation

National legislation relating to the planning and protection of cultural heritage assets includes:

- *Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017;*
- *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979; and*
- *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended.*

6.2.2 Policy

National and local planning policy relating to the Proposed Development site includes:

- *The National Planning Policy Framework, UK Government (December 2023);*
- *North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Policy HE1 Conservation Areas, North Lincolnshire Council, May 2003;*
- *North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Policy HE5 Development Affecting Listed Buildings, North Lincolnshire Council, May 2003;*
- *North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Policy HE8 Ancient Monuments, North Lincolnshire Council, May 2003;*
- *North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Policy HE9 Archaeological Evaluation, North Lincolnshire Council, May 2003;*

- *North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Policy LC13 Parks, Gardens and Landscapes of Special Historic Interest*, North Lincolnshire Council, May 2003¹;
- *North East Lincolnshire Council Local Plan – Policy 31 Renewable and Low Carbon Infrastructure*, North East Lincolnshire Council, 2018;
- *North East Lincolnshire Council Local Plan – Policy 32 Energy and Low Carbon Living*, North East Lincolnshire Council, 2018;
- *North East Lincolnshire Council Local Plan – Policy 39 Conserving and Enhancing Historic Environment*, North East Lincolnshire Council, 2018;

6.2.3 Guidance

In addition to the above legislation and policy, a number of guidance documents have been produced relating to assessment and protection of cultural heritage assets.

- *The National Planning Practice Guidance – Historic Environment*, UK Government, 2014 (updated 2019);
- *The Setting of Heritage Assets – Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 3*, Historic England, 2017;
- *Historic England Advice Note 1 – Conservation Areas*, Historic England, 2019;
- *Historic England Advice Note 10 – Listed Buildings and Curtilage*, Historic England, 2018;
- *Historic England Advice Note 12 - Statements of Heritage Significance*, Historic England, 2019;
- *Historic England Advice Note 15 – Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment*, Historic England, 2021;
- *Historic England Advice Note 17 – Planning and Archaeology*, Historic England, 2022; and
- *North East Lincolnshire Council Wind Energy Supplementary Planning Document*, North East Lincolnshire Council/Engie, June 2019; and
- *North Lincolnshire Local Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance – Wind Energy Development*, North Lincolnshire Council, May 2003.

6.3 Consultation and Scope

A Scoping Report was submitted to North Lincolnshire Council and North East Lincolnshire Council in March 2023. Feedback from statutory consultees responding to this has been taken onboard in the scope of the following assessment, which is based on the Scoping Opinions. These responses are summarised in **Table 6.1**.

Table 6.1 - Summary of Consultation Responses

Consultee	Scoping Response	Action
North Lincolnshire		
Historic England	<i>“Our initial assessment shows that it would be important to assess the impacts on the significance of the following designated heritage assets in particular:</i>	Setting assessments for these heritage assets has been undertaken by AOC Archaeology Group and can be found in Appendix 6.2 .

¹ North Lincolnshire Local Plan Update is currently under review and awaiting adoption - <https://localplan.northlincs.gov.uk/>

Consultee	Scoping Response	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Thornton Abbey Scheduled Monument and Grade I listed Building ● The three listed lighthouses at Killingholme“ <p>“Given the height of the proposed turbines it is likely that they would be visible within the setting of a number of designated heritage assets, including some which are at some distance from the turbines. This assessment should extend beyond the 5km and 10km radii where the proposed turbines would appear in views which contribute to the setting and significance of designated heritage assets affected. Views of towers and spires of designated churches in particular should be assessed as they are likely to form an important part of the significance of these designated heritage assets.”</p>	<p>These have been included where appropriate and assessments can be found in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.</p>
<p>Archaeology (Historic Environment Officer)</p>	<p>“Any planning application submitted for this proposed development will need to be accompanied by a heritage assessment prepared in line with the North Lincolnshire HER advice”²</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research 2. Pre-Application Archaeological Field Evaluation 3. Assessment of Significance 4. Assessment of Impact 5. Mitigation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data sources reviewed and utilised throughout the assessment are listed in Section 6.4.1 2. Due to the nature of the port site, field evaluation is proposed to be done post consent. The details of this are outlined in Section 6.8 – Mitigation. 3. Table 6.2 - Sensitivity of outlines the criteria for establishing the sensitivity of heritage assets. 4. Assessment of potential impacts both physical and on setting have been undertaken and can be found in Section 6.6, Appendix 6.1 and Appendix 6.2. 5. Mitigation measures are outlined in Section 6.8.

² Details on each of the following components can be found within the Scoping Opinion or at [PA/SCO/2023/1 | North Lincolnshire Planning Portal \(northlincs.gov.uk\)](https://www.northlincs.gov.uk/PA/SCO/2023/1)

Consultee	Scoping Response	Action
	<p><i>“The Environmental Statement should consider what the impact of the development on the significance of the heritage assets will be together with a statement of justification of why the works would be desirable or necessary, including any benefits which justify any resulting harm. In the case of substantial harm or loss of significance, the tests in the NPPF should be applied. If the assessment demonstrates that the significance of heritage assets will be adversely affected by the proposals, then appropriate mitigation measures should be drawn up to conserve them. This may include avoiding or minimizing effects to areas of significance, if necessary by modifying the layout and/or design of the proposals ie. In situ preservation.”</i></p>	<p>A harm policy test has been undertaken on all designated assets where impacts are predicted and the result of this can be found in Appendix 6.1 and 6.2.</p> <p>Mitigation is outlined in Section 6.8.</p>
North East Lincolnshire		
Historic England	<p><i>“Our initial assessment shows that it would be important to assess the impacts on the significance of the following designated heritage assets in particular:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Thornton Abbey Scheduled Monument and Grade I listed Building</i> ● <i>The three listed lighthouses at Killingholme”</i> 	<p>Setting assessments for these heritage assets has been undertaken by AOC Archaeology Group and can be found in Appendix 6.2.</p>
	<p><i>“Given the height of the proposed turbines it is likely that they would be visible within the setting of a number of designated heritage assets, including some which are at some distance from the turbines. This assessment should extend beyond the 5km and 10km radii where the proposed turbines would appear in views which contribute to the setting and significance of designated heritage assets affected. Views of towers and spires of designated churches in particular should be assessed as they are likely to form an important part of the significance of these designated heritage assets.”</i></p>	<p>These have been included where appropriate and assessments can be found in Appendices 6.1 and 6.2.</p>
North East Lincolnshire Heritage Officer	<p><i>“We would expect the EIA to contain a full archaeological evaluation report which explores in the first place non-intrusive evaluation of the site, and, if this suggests that further information is required we would expect intrusive evaluation in the form of trial trenching to further inform the heritage impact statement as to presence/absence/ location, depth, survival and significance of any remains. This should inform a suitable mitigation strategy for the impact. In addition to the underground remains we would expect a report on the potential impact on the historic landscape. North East Lincolnshire has had Historic Landscape Characterisation undertaken and this should be consulted.”</i></p>	<p>Archaeological potential assessment has been undertaken by AOC Archaeology Group and can be found in Section 6.6.1.1.</p> <p>Consideration of the Historic Landscape Character Assessment can be found in Section 6.6.1.3.</p>
	<p><i>“Regarding setting issues, potential impacts on the settings and significance of designated and non-designated heritage</i></p>	<p>Wirelines were used during all assessments along with the ZTV and various</p>

Consultee	Scoping Response	Action
	<i>assets which would experience visual change should be evidenced using accurate visual representations. Viewpoints, including views of, from, and across heritage asset receptors as well as general intervisibility, all have historic context and need to be assessed properly to determine the contribution of the setting of the heritage asset and the potential impact upon it by development or proposed mitigation measures.”</i>	visualisations submitted as part of the LVIA chapter.

6.4 Assessment Methodology

6.4.1 Data Sources

In the preparation of this assessment, a range of historical and technical data was collected and analysed. This includes a review of all potential features that fall under the umbrella term of cultural heritage, such as historic buildings and landscapes, in addition to purely archaeological factors. The following sources were consulted:

- North East Lincolnshire Council Historic Environment Record;
- The Historic Character of The County of Lincolnshire Document³;
- Historic England Aerial Photo Viewer⁴;
- National Library of Scotland (Map Library)⁵;
- Natural England Heritage Coasts database⁶; and
- Natural Heritage List for England including; Listed Buildings (LBs), Scheduled Monuments (SMs), Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, World Heritage Sites and Protected Wreck Sites⁷.

6.4.2 Within Site Boundary

The setting assessment will consider the potential for impacts upon the setting of designated assets, including views both to and from the assets and any impacts to sense of place, sense of remoteness, cultural identity, evocation of historical past and associated spiritual responses. This assessment has considered regionally and nationally significant heritage assets including Grade I, II* and II Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas within the port boundary in terms of setting impacts where appropriate. See **Figure 6.1**.

The Port of Immingham boundary can be described as the Land Ownership boundary as illustrated in blue on **C4946 (1) 100 Site Location** and also on **Figures 6.1** and **6.2**.

The area most at risk of physical impact is the land 50m around associated infrastructure and any areas within 200m of the proposed wind turbine locations. These distances allow for micro siting, topple, vehicle movement and construction activity. Any features falling into these areas will be considered for physical impact assessment.

6.4.3 Outside Site Boundary

The impact on the setting and character of known heritage assets has been considered within this assessment. Nationally significant heritage assets such as: Scheduled Monuments, Grade I and II* Listed Buildings, Registered

³ <https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/historic-environment/historic-landscape-characterisation> - Accessed 19/03/2024

⁴ <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/archive/collections/aerial-photos/> - Accessed 09/01/2024

⁵ <https://maps.nls.uk/index.html> - Accessed 09/01/2024

⁶ <https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/heritage-coasts-england/explore> - Accessed 09/01/2024

⁷ <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/> - Accessed 09/01/2024

Parks and Gardens, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Battlefields, Heritage Coast and World Heritage Sites have been considered within 10km of the Proposed Development. Heritage assets such as Conservation Areas and Grade II Listed Buildings have been considered out to 2km of the Proposed Development where appropriate. Any sensitive heritage assets including Grade II Listed Buildings, beyond these distances have also been considered where deemed appropriate or requested by Historic England or the Council's Heritage Officer. See **Figure 6.2**.

This assessment will consider the potential for impacts upon the setting of designated assets, including views both to and from the assets and any impacts to sense of place, sense of remoteness, cultural identity, evocation of historical past and associated spiritual responses.

6.4.4 Cumulative Assessment

Setting impacts and effects will also be considered cumulatively with other wind developments above 50m in height within 10km of the Proposed Development. Developments included in this assessment are:

- Far Marsh (Operational – 7.8km);
- Pyewipe Farm (Operational – 8.1km); and
- Grimsby Onshore Wind (In Planning – 9.4km).

In addition to wind energy developments, any other developments as identified in **Table 3.3** of **ES Chapter 3 – EIA Methodology**, were considered. However, none of these would give rise to in-combination cumulative effects with the Proposed Development.

This assessment will be undertaken on heritage assets where a potential impact has been identified. Where no impact is predicted from the Proposed Development alone or impact is predicted to be neutral⁸, these heritage assets are not considered to have any cumulative impact and are, therefore, not included in the cumulative assessment.

6.4.5 Harm

As assessment of 'Harm' has been undertaken on designated heritage assets as part of this assessment as required by Planning Policy Guidance (PPG). Only those heritage assets where effects are identified as 'significant' in the following assessments have the potential to be of 'substantial' harm. Where effects are considered as 'not significant', harm is considered to be 'less than substantial'. For heritage assets where no impact is predicted, there is not considered to be any 'harm' and policy tests are not invoked.

6.4.6 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Figures

The assessment has made use of the following visual aids:

- Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), maps areas that the wind turbines are theoretically visible from. This is a 'bare earth' representation which does not take into account local screening from the natural and built environment;
- Wirelines produced using the ReSoft WindFarm programme, with cumulative developments considered inside 10km; and
- Photomontages produced for the LVIA chapter and also where relevant to this chapter, using the ReSoft WindFarm Programme.

Visual representations have been produced where it was considered to be helpful in visualising the potential setting impact of the development. Figures included in this assessment are as follows:

⁸ Neutral impacts can only occur to features assessed in Appendix 6.2.

- **Figure 6.1a** – Heritage Assets within the Site Boundary
- **Figure 6.1b** – Archaeological Potential Context Map
- **Figure 6.2** – Heritage Assets outside the Site Boundary
- References are also made to the following LVIA visualisations:
 - **Viewpoint 2** – Homestead Park;
 - **Viewpoint 7** – Stallingborough;
 - **Viewpoint 8** – Holderness Peninsula;
 - **Viewpoint 11** – Brocklesby Park and Garden; and
 - **Viewpoint 12** – Fort Paull.

6.4.7 Limitations of Scope

Data on designated assets was downloaded from Historic England’s Open Data Hub on the 1st of August 2023. An extract of the North East Lincolnshire HER was ordered on the 13th September 2023 and received on the 28th September 2023 and an extract from the North Lincolnshire HER was ordered on the 20th September 2023 and received on the 21st of September 2023. The assessment does not include any assets that have been added to these data sets or records beyond these dates.

6.4.8 Assessment Criteria

The following general criteria outlined in **Table 6.2** and **Table 6.3** have been used in the assessment of level of effect of any physical or setting impact on all cultural heritage assets within the study radius.

Table 6.2 - Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

Sensitivity	Definition
High	Grade I Listed Buildings Grade II* Listed Buildings Scheduled Monuments Registered Parks and Gardens World Heritage Sites Registered Battlefields Protected Wrecks Heritage Coast Non-designated heritage assets likely to be of national importance
Medium	Grade II Listed Buildings Conservation Areas Non-designated assets likely to be of regional importance
Low	Non-designated heritage assets likely to be of local importance Non-Inventory Parks and Gardens

Table 6.3 - Magnitude of Change

Magnitude	Definition
High	Any number of wind turbines and/or ancillary development that would result in:

Magnitude	Definition
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the removal or partial removal of key features, areas, or evidence important to the historic character and integrity of the heritage asset, which could result in the substantial loss of physical integrity; and/or a substantial obstruction or addition to the setting where it significantly alters the quality, setting or the visual amenity of the feature in views both to and from.
Medium	Any number of wind turbines and/or ancillary development that would result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the removal of one or more key features, parts of the heritage asset, or evidence at the secondary or peripheral level, but are not features fundamental to its historic character and integrity; and/or a partial obstruction or addition to the setting where it alters the quality, setting or the visual amenity of the heritage asset in views both to and from.
Low	Any number of wind turbines or ancillary developments that may result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a partial removal/minor loss, and/or alteration to one or more peripheral and/or secondary elements/features, but not significantly affecting the historic integrity of the heritage asset or affecting the key features of the feature; and/or an introduction of elements that could alter to a small degree the quality of the setting or visual amenity of the heritage assets in views both to and from.
Negligible	Any number of wind turbines or ancillary developments that may result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a relatively small removal, and/or alteration to small, peripheral and/or unimportant elements/features, but not affect the historic integrity of the heritage assets or the quality of the surviving evidence; and/or an introduction of elements that could be visible but not intrusive, and the overall quality of the setting or visual amenity of the heritage assets would not be affected in views both to and from.
No Change	There would be no change to the baseline.

The level of effects that the Proposed Development may have on the surrounding features of historical significance is determined by the combination of the sensitivity and magnitude of change. The following matrix is used to determine the overall significance of effect.

Table 6.4 - Significance of Effects Matrix

Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change				
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible	No Change
High	Major	Major/Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	None
Medium	Major/Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Minor	None
Low	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Minor	Minor/Negligible	None
Key:		Significant in terms of the EIA regulations			
		Not Significant			

The significance of any identified effects will be assessed in terms of Major, Major/Moderate, Moderate, Moderate/Minor or Minor/Negligible. The matrices should not be used as a prescriptive tool but will allow for the exercise of professional judgement.

Any effects that are classified as Major or Major/Moderate, will be considered to be equivalent to likely significant effects referred to in the EIA Regulations. Careful consideration will also be given to Moderate effects to test

whether they are significant in EIA terms or not. In all cases, whether an effect is significant or not is confirmed within the assessment.

6.5 Baseline

6.5.1 Heritage Assets Within Site Boundary

Table 6.5 below outlines all heritage assets within 200m of the proposed turbines and 50m of any proposed infrastructure which are most at risk from physical impact as a result of the construction activity for the Proposed Development and will be taken forward for a physical impact assessment. These can be seen illustrated on **Figure 6.1b**. The potential for buried archaeological remains is assessed in **Section 6.6.1.1**.

Table 6.5 - Heritage Assets within 200m of the Proposed Turbines and 50m of Proposed Infrastructure

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Type	Monument ID	Name	Period	Distance
HER01	North Lincolnshire	Local HER	MLS26146	Historic Enclosure and Drain, South Killingholme	Medieval to Post Medieval	0m
HER02	North Lincolnshire	Local HER	MLS26147	Historic field boundary, South Killingholme	Medieval to Post Medieval	10m
HER03	North Lincolnshire	Local HER	MLS26145	Undated earthworks, possible saltern, South Killingholme	Medieval to Post Medieval	74m
HER04	North East Lincolnshire	Local HER	MNL3041	Signal Box, Immingham Railway Branch	Twentieth Century	142m
HER05	North East Lincolnshire	Local HER	MNL3039	London and North Eastern Railway - Immingham Dock Branch	Twentieth Century	0m
HER06	North Lincolnshire	Local HER	MLS21959	The Barton and Immingham Light Railway	Edwardian to Mid 20th Century	153m
HER07	North Lincolnshire	Local HER	MLS21322	WWII Aircraft Obstruction	1939-1945	49m

6.5.2 Heritage Assets Outside Site Boundary

Figure 6.1 shows the nationally and regionally significant historical features such as Grade II* Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (and their associated Grade II Listed Buildings) out to 2km and Grade I Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, Protected Wreck Sites, Heritage Coast and World Heritage Sites out to 10km. **Table 6.6** below lists these historical features found within the relevant study radius. Features beyond these study areas have been included where requested by Historic England.

Table 6.6 – Historic Features within 10km of the Proposed Development

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Distance From closest turbine	List Entry Number	Name	Within ZTV?	Description ⁹
Scheduled Monuments						
SM01	North Lincolnshire	3.2km	1008044	Manor Farm moated site	Yes	The moated site at Manor Farm includes two moated sites, a smaller one located in the north-western corner of the larger one, and other associated features.
SM02	North Lincolnshire	3.5km	1007815	North Garth moated site and associated enclosures	Yes	The monument is North Garth moated site. It includes a series of dry ditches enclosing a main moated site and a group of associated enclosures. The main moated site is situated at the northern end of the monument.
SM03	North Lincolnshire	4.0km	1007813	Moated site and associated earthworks at Baysgarth Farm	Yes	The monument is the moated site at Baysgarth Farm. It includes a large sub- rectangular moated site, a second smaller moated enclosure, and other associated earthwork features.
SM04	North Lincolnshire	4.8km	1007816	Manor Farm moated site	Yes	The monument is the moated site at Manor Farm, East Halton. It includes a large moated site which is sub-divided by a series of internal ditches.
SM05	North East Lincolnshire	4.2km	1020423	Stallingborough medieval settlement, post-medieval manor house and formal gardens	Yes	The monument includes earthwork and associated buried remains of part of the settlement of Stallingborough, together with the earthworks of a post-medieval manor house and associated formal gardens.
SM06	North East Lincolnshire	4.5km	1020023	Churchyard cross	Yes	The monument includes a medieval churchyard cross and associated buried remains in the churchyard of St Peter and St Paul's Church, Stallingborough.
SM07	East Riding of Yorkshire	5.2km	1020022	World War II Decoys for Hull Docks	Yes	The monument includes the remains of World War II decoys designed to attract enemy bombers heading for Hull Docks. The monument is in three separate areas of protection: the first and largest includes the decoys for King George V, Alexandra and Victoria docks all lying along the Humber foreshore on The Outstray to the south west of Thorney Crofts; the second area includes the decoy for the River Hull, centred 700m west of Little Humber Farm; the last area lies immediately to the south west of this farm and includes the decoy's

⁹ Descriptions sourced from the list entry of each feature: <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/> - Accessed 09/01/2024

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Distance From closest turbine	List Entry Number	Name	Within ZTV?	Description ⁹
						shelter from which the operation of the decoy was controlled.
SM08	West Lindsey	5.4km	1008686	Site of Medieval Nunnery and Post-Dissolution House	Yes	The monument includes the remains of the medieval nunnery of Nun Cotham, a priory of Cistercian nuns founded in the mid-12th century and dissolved in 1539.
SM09	East Riding of Yorkshire	5.9km	1020187	Stone Creek Heavy Anti-aircraft Gunsite	Yes	The monument includes the standing, earthwork and buried remains of a World War II HAA (Heavy Anti-aircraft) gunsite initially known as Station J and then Station H9 from 1 August 1941 onwards. It includes the full extent of the original station complete with four-gun emplacements and associated structures, as well as the remains of the domestic site.
SM10	North Lincolnshire	5.9km	1011198	Thornton Abbey Augustinian monastery	Yes	Thornton Abbey is situated in Lindsey, south of the Humber estuary, and was formerly in the county of Lincolnshire. The monument comprises a single area which contains the late fourteenth century gatehouse and barbican of the Augustinian monastery, an outer precinct surrounded by a moat and containing the earthwork remains of a wide variety of ancillary features and buildings, the walled inner precinct containing the foundations of the abbey church and other cloister buildings and the buried remains of additional structures, the site of the medieval road that predated the abbey, the remains of the fourteenth century bridge that underlie modern College Bridge, and a large number of monastic fishponds.
SM11	East Riding of Yorkshire	6.9km	1008048	Old Little Humber moated site	Yes	The monument is the moated site at Old Little Humber. It includes the remains of a moated site and adjacent earthworks which are contemporary with it.
SM12	West Lindsey	6.9km	1018287	Cross in St Bartholomew's Churchyard	Yes	The monument includes the base and the lower part of the shaft of a Grade II Listed standing stone cross. The cross is located in the churchyard of St Bartholomew's Church to the south of the nave. The cross is medieval in date and is constructed of limestone.
SM13	North Lincolnshire	7.1km	1431904	Second World War QF Bombing Decoy	Yes	This Second World War decoy site includes a complete QF (P-series) oil bombing decoy display site, which comprises the structural remains of a

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Distance From closest turbine	List Entry Number	Name	Within ZTV?	Description ⁹
						circular oil ring, a pair of mirrored oil crescents, a small irregular shaped oil pool and connecting channels with balancing lines, concrete sumps, and other associated structures.
SM14	North East Lincolnshire	7.5km	1010947	Two moated sites at Healing Hall	Yes	The monument includes two moated sites at Healing Hall. The larger moat is defined by a silted (and now dry) ditch; the smaller moated site, the ditches of which remain waterlogged, is situated in the south-western corner of the larger one. The larger moated site has a roughly square island surrounded by a ditch with, on the north and west sides, an external bank.
SM15	East Riding of Yorkshire	7.5km	1007875	Paull Holme Moated Site and Tower	Yes	The monument is the site of the medieval moated manor of Paull Holme. It includes a dry rectangular moat surrounding a raised island measuring 190 metres north to south and 100 metres east to west.
SM16	North Lincolnshire	7.6km	1007820	Goxhill Hall moated site, associated drainage system, fishponds and field system	Yes	The monument is the moated site at Goxhill Hall. It includes the main moated site and associated fishponds, drainage ditches, and part of a contemporary field system.
SM17	East Riding of Yorkshire	8.1km	1020425	Paull Point Battery, coastal artillery battery and Submarine Mining Establishment	Yes	The monument includes an enclosed Victorian coastal artillery battery, the remains of a Submarine Mining Establishment and other associated standing, earthwork and buried remains to the south of the village of Paull. It also includes what is likely to be the site of at least one earlier artillery battery. The structure of the Victorian battery with its later modifications is Listed Grade II. The monument lies in two areas of protection.
SM18	North Lincolnshire	8.6km	1016858	Medieval Settlement of Croxton	Yes	The monument includes buried and earthwork remains of the medieval settlement of Croxton, together with the surviving part of the village's open field system.
SM19	West Lindsey	8.9km	1013526	Camera of the Knights Hospitallers, medieval settlement and cultivation remains, post-medieval house and gardens	Yes	The monument includes the remains of a medieval manor believed to have served as a camera of the Knights Hospitallers from the 14th to the 16th centuries.

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Distance From closest turbine	List Entry Number	Name	Within ZTV?	Description ⁹
SM20	North Lincolnshire	9.3km	1005306	Roman Settlement	Yes	This monument includes a gatehouse situated on the east side of the College Green part of Worcester Cathedral Precincts. The monument survives as a gatehouse tower that was rebuilt between 1300 and 1335, remodelled in 1369 and restored during the late 19th century.
Grade I Listed Buildings						
LB01	North East Lincolnshire	1.7km	1310011	Church of St Andrew	Yes	Parish church. C11 - C12 nave and responds to north arcade; late C12 - early C13 south arcade, south aisle, lower section of tower arch, chancel arch and west section of chancel; later C13 north arcade; C14 north door, east and west windows to aisles; C15 - C16 north aisle windows, C16-C17 tower, clerestory and chancel east window. Roof replaced in C17. Restorations of late 1880s. Restoration of north aisle in 1921 by W Bond of Grantham, of nave in 1923, of tower in 1924; nave and tower roofs renewed in 1957. Re-floored in 1969. Limestone ashlar to tower and nave clerestory; mixed limestone and ironstone rubble and squared masonry to aisles and east end of nave; similar materials to chancel with some chalk and flint rubble. Slate roofs.
LB02	North Lincolnshire	3.3km	1103701	Church of St Denis	Yes	Parish church. C12 tower arch, C13 chancel with later C13 - C14 windows, C14 nave arcades, aisles and lower stages to tower with C15 upper stage, C16-C17 clerestory and windows to south aisle. Restorations of C18, 1847, 1868, 1889,1910, and 1926 included roofing nave and chancel, re-flooring, raising chancel, new chancel arch. Ironstone and limestone ashlar tower, partly rendered.
LB03	North Lincolnshire	4.0km	1103729	Church of St Peter	Yes	Parish church. C13 chancel, C14 remainder, with some re-used C12 moulded stone. Restorations of 1868 by J Fowler of Louth included raising chancel and north aisle, new south porch, and roofs to nave and chancel. Ironstone and limestone ashlar tower; ironstone, limestone, chalk and flint rubble and brick with ashlar dressings to aisles and chancel; ashlar porch with some re-used medieval masonry.

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Distance From closest turbine	List Entry Number	Name	Within ZTV?	Description ⁹
LB04	West Lindsey	5.6km	1063419	Newsham Bridge	Yes	Bridge, circa 1772 probably by Capability Brown. Ashlar. Bridge of 7 unequal arches, the central one being the largest.
LB05	North Lincolnshire	6.3km	1215139	Remains of Thornton Abbey Church and Adjoining Monastic Ranges	Yes	Ruins of Abbey church and adjoining monastic buildings founded as a Priory in 1139. Late C12 - early C13 dormitory vault, remainder largely rebuilt between mid C13 and late C14: church begun 1264, south transept 1280-90, chapter house 1282-1308, cloistral range begun 1322-3, refectory 1348-64, with minor late C15 - early C16 additions. C20 repairs.
LB06	North Lincolnshire	6.6km	1103713	Abbot's Lodge	Yes	House, incorporating former monastic range of Thornton Abbey (qv). C13-C14 ground floor, converted to house and first floor rebuilt in C17, reputedly by Sir Vincent Skinner.
LB07	West Lindsey	6.4km	1165503	Church of All Saints	Yes	Parish Church. Constructed of ironstone, brick, ashlar dressings, slate roofs, lead broach spire. West tower, nave, chancel, north and south porches. C14 west tower with moulded plinth, of 3 stages separated by chamfered string courses. In the west side is a giant recessed pointed arch, double chamfered, without capitals.
LB08	North Lincolnshire	6.6km	1346859	Thornton Abbey Gatehouse and Wing Walls, Precinct Walls and Barbican	Yes	Abbey gatehouse and wing walls, precinct walls and barbican. Gatehouse and wing walls of 1382 for Abbot Thomas Gresham, with later C14-C15 extensions to wing walls and precinct walls; C15-C16 barbican. C20 renovations, including replacement of gatehouse chamber floors.
LB09	West Lindsey	6.7km	1359800	Brocklesby Hall	Yes	Large country house, probably C16 originally, altered before 1708 and remodelled circa 1730. Severely damaged by fire in 1898, restored by Sir Reginald Blomfield, and reduced in size and altered C20 by Phillimore.
LB10	West Lindsey	6.8km	1063417	Holgate Monument	Yes	Monument 1785, by James Wyatt. Coade stone. Monument in the form of a triangular pedestal with concave sides supported on 3 tortoises and crowned by an urn. 2 circular steps rise to a double plinth and gadrooned base upon which stand 3 tortoises.
LB11	West Lindsey	6.7km	1166049	Hunt Kennels and House	Yes	Hunt kennels and house, 1810, James Wyatt. Yellow brick with ashlar and brick dressings, slate

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Distance From closest turbine	List Entry Number	Name	Within ZTV?	Description ⁹
						hipped roofs with lead dressings, having a central apex stack.
LB12	West Lindsey	6.8km	1359820	No 9 Shop and Church End Farmhouse	Yes	Shop, formerly manor house of the South family. c,1200 with extensive alterations of the C14 and some of the C20, Squared chalk blocks, some brick patching, pantiled gabled roof with raised stone coped west gable rising to a carved and decorated C14 roof finial.
LB13	West Lindsey	6.9km	1063367	Church of St Bartholomew	Yes	Parish Church, C13, C14, C15, C16, 1692, 1847, 1908-10. West tower, nave, north and south aisles, north porch, chancel. Ironstone, limestone ashlar, chalk, brick, slate roofs. C14 west tower with moulded plinth and setback stepped buttresses of 1910, 3 stages.
LB14	West Lindsey	7.3km	1063418	The Hermitage	Yes	Root house, late C18, red brick walls lined with randomly coursed blocks of tufa with five tree trunk pillars supporting a slate roof with lead dressings.
LB15	North Lincolnshire	7.6km	1227927	Church of St Nicholas	Yes	Parish church. C13 - C14 tower with C15 parapet and spire, C13 chancel with C14 - C15 windows, C14 nave arcades and aisles. Restorations of 1852 by Keyworth of Hull, north porch rebuilt 1856, south porch rebuilt 1876, restorations of 1878-9 to south aisle and tower openings, chancel restored 1887, top section of spire rebuilt 1928-9 and repaired 1982.
LB16	North Lincolnshire	7.7km	1288428	Medieval Hall Adjoining the North East Corner of Goxhill Hall	Yes	First Floor Hall, formerly part of larger complex. Late C14 - early C15 with later alterations, including blocking of first floor windows, and late C18 roof. Renovations of 1976-78.
LB17	East Riding of Yorkshire	7.6km	1366242	Paull Holme Tower	Yes	Tower house. Mid-late C15 for Holme family. Restorations of 1871 for Colonel Bryn Holme. Banded red and blue brick in English bond (original sections with blue brick header courses).
LB18	East Riding of Yorkshire	8.5km	1083434	Church of St Andrew	Yes	Parish church. Mid C14-C15, perhaps incorporating material from former church. Burnt in siege of Hull 1643. Repairs of 1663, c1700. Restorations of 1879 included reseating, reroofing; further restorations of c1890.
LB19	North Lincolnshire	8.7km	1288450	Church of All Saints	Yes	Parish Church. C13 chancel, C14 - C15 nave, aisles and tower. Restorations of c1857 included re-

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Distance From closest turbine	List Entry Number	Name	Within ZTV?	Description ⁹
						flooring, removal of plaster; restorations of 1878 to aisles, chancel and tower.
LB20	North Lincolnshire	8.8km	1204699	Church of St Andrew	Yes	Parish church. C13 arcades. C14-15 tower. Restorations of 1851 included rebuilding new chancel and porch, chancel; top of tower rebuilt 1877; C20 restorations to north aisle.
LB21	North Lincolnshire	9.0km	1227786	Church of Saint Lawrence	Yes	Parish church. Late C12 - early C13 chancel, C13 tower, nave arcades and south door, C14 aisles, C15 tower parapet. Restorations of 1884 by J Fowler of Louth included rebuilding south porch, new nave and chancel roofs.
LB22	North East Lincolnshire	9.0km	1379843	Church of St Nicolas	Yes	Parish church. c1200, extended in C13; C14 aisles and chancel, C14-C15 tower; late C18 clerestory and north aisle west window; restorations of 1865 by James Fowler of Louth; restorations of 1929-32, including new east window; repairs to roof by W and L Bond.
LB23	West Lindsey	9.0km	1063361	Mausoleum, Wall and Screen	Yes	Mausoleum, wall and screen, 1792, by James Wyatt. Ashlar, copper dome, cast iron railings.
LB24	West Lindsey	9.2km	1359817	Church of Saint Peter	Yes	Parish Church, C12, C13, C14, C16 and various C19 alterations and additions, including a restoration of 1875.
LB25	North East Lincolnshire	9.5km	1161566	Church of St Lawrence	Yes	Parish church. C13 chancel and nave arcades; C14 south aisle, C16-C17 tower. Re-seated in 1759. C19 restorations included new aisle and chancel windows, re-roofing. Tower restored 1939. Ironstone ashlar with some squared chalk to chancel; limestone ashlar dressings. Westmorland slate roof to chancel, plain tile roof to remainder. West tower, three-bay aisled nave with south porch, two-bay chancel.
Grade II* Listed Buildings						
LB26	North Lincolnshire	3.7km	1346854	Manor Farmhouse	Yes	House consisting of 16th century east wing, 17th century west wing and late 19th century porch, extensions and alterations. Features brick construction and pantile roof, with later extensions to left return, and entrances to inner angle and rear gable end.
LB27	North East Lincolnshire	4.4km	1403222	Former Heavy Anti-Aircraft Gun Site	Yes	The former Heavy Anti-Aircraft gun site off Keelby Road, a Second World War HAA gun site for 5.25 inch guns.

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Distance From closest turbine	List Entry Number	Name	Within ZTV?	Description ⁹
LB28	North East Lincolnshire	4.4km	1346978	Church of St Peter and St Paul	Yes	Parish church built 1779-81, with interior restorations in 1874. These included removal of gallery, reseating, creation of quasi-chancel, roof then repaired and reslated in 1884 and ashlar window surrounds and glazing added 1908. Orange-brown brick construction.
LB29	West Lindsey	6.6km	1166070	Newsham Lodge	Yes	Gate Lodge constructed early 19th century, possibly by J. Wyattville. Ashlar construction featuring a picturesque composition with unbalanced elements such as off-centre arched gateway with a smaller pedestrian entrance on the right and a setback to a curtain wall which terminates in a small 2 storey faceted tower.
LB30	West Lindsey	6.6km	1063413	Main Stable Block	Yes	Stable block, Late 17th or 18th century featuring a quadrangular court with side walls and boxes rebuilt circa 1866. Red brick with hipped slate roofs, single storey. South front has clock face over central door in stone surround with cornice and keystone, flanked by 3 sash windows to either side under flat rubbed brick arches.
LB31	West Lindsey	6.6km	1165475	Gateway to House	Yes	Gate piers constructed late 18th century, possibly by James Wyatt. Features yellow brick walls with wrought iron screen panels. Gateway flanked by square rusticated brick piers with flanking screen walls pierced by round headed openings containing iron railings.
LB32	West Lindsey	6.6km	1317308	The Orangery	Yes	Orangery constructed late 18th century, probably by Charles H. Tatham. Ashlar with lead roof and single storey facade divided by 7 free standing Roman Doric columns in antis, metope frieze and entablature surmounted by a balustrade in 7 bays.
LB33	West Lindsey	6.6km	1063409	Conservatory	Yes	Conservatory, probably by James Wyatt, circa 1785. Ashlar with red brick sides, hipped glass and lead roof. 7 bay single storey facade arranged 2:3 projecting :2. Plinth, cornice and balustrade of pierced saltire panels, rusticated quoins to right only. 4 steps up to central double half glazed doors with ionic portico in antis, entablature and pediment. Flanked by single advanced glazing bar sashes with ionic pillars at the outer angles.
LB34	West Lindsey	6.7km	1165456	Garden Urn	Yes	Garden urn dated late 18 century. Made from coade stone and positioned on square pedestal.
LB35	West Lindsey	7.3km	1166061	The Arabella Aufrere Temple	Yes	Garden temple circa 1787, possibly by James Wyatt, Ashlar red brick, slate roof with lead dressings, lead roofs. Central arch springs from coupled Roman Doric columns.
LB36	North Lincolnshire	7.8km	1346831	Goxhill Hall	Yes	House constructed 1690-1705 for Henry Hildyard with later additional outshut and minor alterations. Renovated circa 1976 and featuring red brick in Flemish bond with blue brick and limestone ashlar dressings. Pantile roof. 2-room central entrance hall plan with outshut to rear left adjoining medieval hall (q.v.). 2 storeys with attic, 5 bays;

Ref	Local Planning Authority	Distance From closest turbine	List Entry Number	Name	Within ZTV?	Description ⁹
						symmetrical. Moulded ashlar plinth. Quoins to angles and slightly projecting central bay. Flight of 3 moulded stone steps to recessed 6- fielded-panel door and 4-pane overlight in ashlar surround with keyed eared architrave flanked by panelled pilasters and consoles supporting large segmental pediment. 12-pane sashes in flush wooden architraves with wooden cills and rubbed brick flat arches; recessed sash above entrance in keyed eared ashlar architrave with moulded ashlar cill.
LB37	West Lindsey	8.6km	1146937	Church of St Edmund	Yes	Parish Church constructed of random limestone and ironstone rubble, with limestone and ironstone ashlar dressings and slate roof.
LB38	North Lincolnshire	8.6km	1103712	Thornton Hall Pavilion Wings and Flanking Screen Wall	Yes	Small country house built 1695-1700 for Sir Rowland Wynne. Constructed of rubbed red brick in Flemish bond with limestone ashlar dressings.
LB39	North Lincolnshire	9.0km	1204677	Church of St Helen	Yes	Parish church featuring 13th century tower, early 14th century north arcade and later 14th century south arcade and spire erected 1838. Restorations of 1859-60 by S S Teulon included partially rebuilding chancel, opening blocked arcades and tower arch and providing new aisles.
LB40	North Lincolnshire	9.6km	1204691	Wooton Hall and Adjoining Screen Wall	Yes	Small country house and adjoining screen wall built in 1796 for John Uppleby. Constructed of red brick in Flemish bond with a Westmorland slate roof.
LB41	North Lincolnshire	9.6km	1204608	Church of St John The Evangelist	Yes	Parish church featuring 13th century north arcade, early 14th century tower and 15th century tower parapet. Restorations conducted in 1878 by James Fowler of Louth which include partial rebuilding of chancel and north aisle, new porch, windows and re-roofing of nave.
Grade II Listed Buildings						
LB42	North Lincolnshire	0.9km	1215093	Killingholme South Low Lighthouse	Yes	Four-storey tapered round brick tower lighthouse approximately 15 metres high, constructed 1836 by Francis Dales for Trinity House.
LB43	North Lincolnshire	1.0km	1103706	Killingholme High Lighthouse	Yes	Six-storey tapered round brick tower lighthouse with recessed plain door under timber lintel. Established 1831 and rebuilt between 1876-77 for Trinity House.
LB44	North Lincolnshire	1.2km	1103707	Killingholme North Low Lighthouse	Yes	Four-storey tapered brick tower lighthouse with adjoining lighthouse keepers house. Constructed 1831 by William Foale for Trinity House, with later alterations and additions to rear.
Registered Parks and Gardens						
RPGO 1	West Lindsey	5.3km	1000971	Brocklesby Park	Yes	A country house surrounded by early C20 formal gardens by Reginald Blomfield, set within a late C18 landscape park, lakes, and woodland for which Lancelot Brown, Thomas White, and Humphry Repton provided designs, with buildings by James Wyatt.

6.6 Assessment of Predicted Impacts and Effects

6.6.1 Heritage Assets Within the Site

6.6.1.1 Potential for Surviving Archaeological Evidence

The potential for surviving archaeological evidence of past activity within the Immingham Port Boundary is expressed in the report as ranging between the scales of:

- High – The available evidence suggests a high likelihood for past activity within the Application Site and a strong potential for archaeological evidence to survive intact or reasonably intact;
- Medium – The available evidence suggests a reasonable likelihood for past activity within the Application Site and consequently there is a potential that archaeological evidence could survive.
- Low – The available evidence suggests archaeological evidence of activity is unlikely to survive within the Application Site, although some minor land-use may have occurred.
- Uncertain- Insufficient information to assess

All monuments and events referenced within this section are illustrated on **Figure 6.1b**.

Paleoenvironmental Potential

The British Geological Survey¹⁰ records the bedrock underlying the Port of Immingham boundary as Burnham Chalk Formation, a sedimentary bedrock formed between 93.9 and 83.6 million years ago during the Cretaceous period. The superficial deposit recorded beneath the Port of Immingham boundary is noted by the BGS to be Tidal Flat Deposits composed of clays and silts, formed between 11.8 thousand years ago and the present during the Quaternary period.

The BGS¹¹ records four historic, non-archaeological boreholes (TA11NE262, TA11NE208, TA11NE209 & TA11NE211) within 200m of the proposed turbines and 50m of any proposed infrastructure. The depth of topsoil in the northern most boreholes (TA11NE209 & TA11NE211) was recorded as being 6 inches (0.15m) below the ground level (bgl). In TA11NE209 layers of clay, varying in colour, compaction and composition was recorded to the basal depth of the borehole, whilst in TA11NE211, two layers of clay deposits were recorded beneath the topsoil, themselves underlain by a layer of peat within a clay deposit and a layer of sand. The underlying deposits in TA11NE211 were, similarly to TA11NE209, recorded as varying types of clay to the basal depth of the borehole. The presence of sand and peat deposits, composed of organic material may indicate that the area was open and exposed at some point in the past.

The upper deposits recorded in TA11NE208 are termed “Fill “and are described as being composed of ash and a mixed ash, clay and gravel deposit to a depth of 15 ft (c. 4.57m) bgl, likely evidence of modern ground disturbance and industrial activities. The underlying deposits are varying forms of clay deposits described similarly to those in TA11NE209 & TA11NE211.

The borehole recorded as TA11NE262 documents the sinking of a well in 1911. Layers of clay, sand, gravel and silt were identified, which corresponds to the tidal flat deposits recorded within the Port of Immingham boundary.

A recent programme of trail trenching (ELS4678) within the vicinity of the northern most turbine identified peat horizons and samples were taken for environmental sampling. The works were reported in 2023 and as such there is no online available report for the works. It must be assumed that any further work associated with the sampling is currently being undertaken.

¹⁰ British Geological Survey (2023) <https://geologyviewer.bgs.ac.uk/>

¹¹ BGS (2023). Onshore GeoIndex. Available at: https://mapapps2.bgs.ac.uk/geoindex/home.html?layer=BGSBoreholes&_g

A paleoenvironmental survey (ELS4611) which extended c. 165m west of the northern most turbine identified mudflats and saltmarsh deposits as well as palaesols and peat deposits.

Peat deposits (MNL3099) containing alder wood, common reeds, and hazel were found -9.14m OD during excavations within the eastern extent of the Port of Immingham boundary and peat deposits containing pollen, suggestive of a transition environment, were also identified c. 450m from the northernmost turbine.

Trial trenching (ENL499) beyond the Port of Immingham boundary to the south-east identified deposits associated with water action deposition over a prolonged period of time including a shallow peat layer and possible flooding episodes.

Archaeological works (ELS3317) within metres to the west of the 50m buffer surrounding the proposed infrastructure identified a buried soil horizon, which had been buried by increasing sea levels.

Silts containing estuarine molluscs, plant debris and peat within a pre-Ipswichian channel between Kirmington to the south-west and Immingham¹² have been attributed to the Hoxian interglacial (c. 425000-380000 BP).

Overall, the presence of alluvial sealed remains and deeply buried geoarchaeological deposits including peat deposits cannot be wholly discounted, however the impact of deep modern industrial activities on the Site must be taken into account. Based on recent identification of peat deposits within 200m of the northern most turbine there is considered to be a High potential for paleoenvironmental remains to survive in the vicinity of the northern most turbine and a Low potential for remains to survive elsewhere.

The Site lies within the remit of the East Midlands Research Framework, updated to include North Lincolnshire and North East Lincolnshire in 2012. The following time periods reflect those as set out in the Updated Research Agenda and Strategy^{13&14}.

General Prehistoric

Deer antlers (MNL845) described as being found in a submerged forest bed were recovered during the excavation of Immingham Dock in the late 1950s. The findspot is recorded within the dock within the Port of Immingham boundary. The remains are thought to date to the prehistoric period, although there is no further information to refine the dating of the remains.

Collections of worked flints scatters (MLS21544 & MLS22737) and individual flint findspots have been found during field walking surveys within 2km to the north-west of the Port of Immingham boundary.

Palaeolithic (c. 950000 years ago-9500 cal BC)

Two watercourses (MNL4271 & MNL4269) within the Port of Immingham boundary are thought to have originated in the Palaeolithic period. Both watercourses have been anthropogenically altered in the modern period.

Silts containing Clactonian and Achulean worked flints have been reportedly found within a pre-Ipswichian channel between Kirmington to the south-west and Immingham and have been attributed to the Hoxian interglacial (c. 425000-380000 BP)⁷.

¹² Usai, M.R. 2005. Centre for Archaeology Report 54/2005 Geoarchaeology in Northern England I. The Landscape and Geography of Northern England. Available at:

<https://historicengland.org.uk/research/results/reports/5450/GeoarchaeologyinNorthernEnglandITheLandscapeandGeographyofNorthernEngland>

¹³ Knight, D. Vyner, B & Allen, C. 2013. East Midlands Heritage An Updated Research Agenda and Strategy for the Historic Environment of the East Midlands. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/east-midlands-heritage/>

¹⁴ East Midlands Historic Environment Research Framework. 2023. Available at: <https://researchframeworks.org/emherf/>

Mesolithic (c. 9500 cal B- c. 4000cal BC)

Later Mesolithic radiocarbon dates (4727-4451 cal BC) were obtained from peat deposits (MLS22851) between -4.14m to -4.21m OD c. 450m northwest of the northern most turbine within the Port of Immingham boundary. Pollen identified the presence of alder, hazel, oak, willow, lime and elm as well as ferns and herbaceous plants suggestive of a fen carr environment transitioning to a salt marsh.

A peat layer (MNL3099) containing ecofactual remains were recovered at -9.14m OD within the eastern extent of the Port of Immingham boundary, parallel to the coast. The ecofacts were radiocarbon dated to c. 5790-5350 cal BC within the later Mesolithic period, indicating that there was land in this location at that date.

Approximately 1.4km north of the Port of Immingham boundary flint scatters (MLS19727) dating from the Mesolithic to the Neolithic periods have been recovered.

Neolithic and Early to Middle Bronze Age (c. 4000 cal BC- c. 1150 cal BC)

A burnt mound (MLS21555) radiocarbon dated to the Middle Bronze Age was recorded (ELS3317) 5m west of the 50m buffer around the proposed infrastructure. Deposits reflecting the change in sea level in the period were also identified.

Further to the west, c. 270m west of the 50m buffer around the proposed infrastructure a Bronze Age ditch (MLS21554) as found alongside Middle to Late Bronze Age remains sealed under layers of alluvium (ELS3317).

A former stream (MLS26743) which was dated to the Early Neolithic to Late Bronze Age is recorded to the north-west of the Port of Immingham boundary.

Late Bronze Age and iron Age (c. 1150 cal BC-AD43)

An Early Iron Age to Romano-British enclosure (MLS22428) has been found c. 620m west of the Port of Immingham boundary. Subsequent archaeological investigations (ELS3578, ELS4281, ELS4650, ELS4686) identified remains associated with a settlement although the excavators could not definitely state whether there were two settlements or just one divided by a tidal inlet.

An Iron Age ditch (MLS20422) has been reported c. 830m north-west of the Port of Immingham boundary and extending 400m parallel to Rosper Road (ELS2517). The excavators interpreted the ditch as a boundary marker.

Possible Iron Age boundaries and enclosures have been identified in the land over 1km to the north-west of the Port of Immingham boundary.

In general, prehistoric remains and deposits have been identified in close proximity to the Proposed Development however the adverse impact of the development of the Port of Immingham must be taken into account and there is judged to be a Low potential for remains of any prehistoric sub-periods to survive. Any remains, if they survive, would likely be truncated and damaged.

Romano-British (AD43-c. 410)

West of the south-western corner of the Port of Immingham Boundary a possible enclosure (MNL4124) dated on morphology to the late Iron Age and Romano-British period has been transcribed from aerial photography.

Romano-British finds have been recovered during a field walking survey to the north-west of the Port of Immingham boundary.

A Romano-British settlement (MLS20199) has been identified over 2.7km north-west of the Port of Immingham boundary. The majority of Romano-British remains, including occupation sites and enclosures have been reported over 1km to the north-west of the Port of Immingham boundary, suggesting that activity in this period was likely centred on land to the north-west.

Whilst Romano-British remains have been identified in the area around Immingham, activity in this period appears to be centred to the north-west. Alternatively, Romano-British remains may have been adversely impacted by the development of the Port and thus any remains of this period which may have been present are likely to have been removed. Overall, there is considered to be a Low potential for archaeology of this period to survive.

Early Medieval (c. AD 410- 1066)

There is a paucity of remains from this period within the vicinity of the Port of Immingham boundary. Over 1km to the north-west an Anglo Saxon ceramic findspot (MLS19659) is recorded.

Overall, there is considered to be a Low potential for remains of this period to survive.

High Medieval (AD 1066- 1485)

A historic boundary (HER 02) which extends south of the northern most turbine is thought to have originated in the medieval period. Mounds interpreted as possible medieval salterns (HER 03) have been recorded c. 110m east of the northern proposed turbine.

Within the Port of Immingham boundary, a medieval harbour (MNL1801) documented in 1276 as “*portum de Iningham*”; a saltern site (MNL273) first recorded in the 12th century; and two areas of medieval ridge and furrow (MNL4667 & MNL4666) have been identified.

To the south of the Port of Immingham boundary waterlogged deposits of possible late medieval origin within an area of known drainage systems (MNL284), still in use, and a possible saltern (MNL4105) are recorded.

Medieval remains within 1km north-west of the Port of Immingham boundary include the location of a possible farmstead (MLS19827) documented in the 12th century and areas of ridge and furrow, illustrative of an agricultural landscape.

A number of medieval remains including a deserted settlement; areas of ridge and furrow; and findspots have been reported over 2km north-west of the Port of Immingham boundary. This area appears to have continued to be a focus of activity.

The Domesday Book (1086)¹⁵ records the nearest settlement as Immingham to the south-west of the Port of Immingham boundary. The settlement is noted as being in the 20% of the largest settlements recorded and was documented in association with ploughland and meadow. There is no mention of a harbour, although it is likely the coastline was used as an informal harbour before the establishment of a formal harbour.

There is judged to be a Low potential for medieval remains to survive. Any remains would likely consist of truncated and damaged agricultural remains.

Post-Medieval (AD 1485-1750)

Immingham is annotated on Saxton’s map dated 1573¹⁶ and Blaeu’s map dated 1646¹⁷. The settlement is depicted set back from the coastline and no coastal features are illustrated, although a harbour (MNL1801) likely existed at this time.

A Napoleonic period coastal battery (MNL1532) known as Stallingborough Coastal battery is recorded along the coastline to the east of the Port of Immingham boundary. The battery is noted as being ruinous by 1887. An 18th

¹⁵ <https://opendomesday.org/place/TA1714/immingham/>

¹⁶ Saxton, C. 1573. LINCOLNIAE NOTINGHAMIAQUE Comitatum

¹⁷ Blaeu J. 1646. Lincolnia comitatvs anglis Lincoln-Shire

century farmstead known as Habrough Marsh (MNL1798) associated with remains of a field system (MNL4648) are also recorded to the east.

In general, remains from this period are illustrative of a rural and agricultural coastal landscape. There is judged to be a Low potential for remains of this period to survive in the eastern half of the Proposed Development due to the impact of the later development of Immingham Dock. Any remains which *may* survive will likely consist of truncated or damaged agricultural remains.

Modern (AD 1750- Present)

An early 19th century map by Metcalf illustrates the Port of Immingham boundary within land, bound by a coastal defense. The coastal battery (MNL1532) is annotated as a “gun emplacement”. South Killingholme Haven is labelled to the north of the northern most turbine. Four jetties (MLS26136; MLS26138; MLS26141 & MLS26142) of this period are recorded in the vicinity of the annotated Haven and these remains may be contemporary. The settlement of Immingham is illustrated to the south-west of the Port of Immingham boundary.

The eastern half of the Port of Immingham boundary was recorded on the Tithe map for Immingham parish dated 1842. The land was recorded in the ownership of The Right Honorable, the Earl of Yarborough and plot names indicate that the area was occupied by marshland and individual crofts. A “Warehouse, Coal Yard, Landing Wharf and Part off Haven” are documented in Plot 237 which was previously described as South Killingholme Haven. This likely locates the coastal port of Immingham.

The Ordnance Survey (OS) map published in 1887 illustrates a relatively rural landscape, occupied by large fields. Industrial activities, such as a small harbour with coastguard station and a brick yard (MLS22003) are depicted along the coast.

Between 1887 and the OS map published in 1911 the brick yard (MLS22003) appears to have expanded however no further changes are recorded within the vicinity of the Port of Immingham boundary. This OS map was surveyed in 1905 prior to the construction of the Immingham Dock.

Immingham Dock (MNL272) was constructed between 1906 and 1912 c. 865m north-east of the southern most proposed turbine. The dock was designed to take larger vessels which could not be accommodated at Grimsby. The Immingham Dock Branch of the London and North Eastern Railway (HER 05) was constructed to facilitate transport to the dock in the early 20th century and extended across the area of the southern most proposed turbine and its associated infrastructure. The roughly east-west aligned Barton and Immingham Light Railway (HER 06) which extends c. 170m north of the northern most proposed turbine was constructed in the early 20th century to further facilitate transport for and to the dock. The impact on earlier archaeological remains must be considered and it is likely that the construction of the railway network had an adverse impact on any underlying earlier archaeological remains which may have survived.

The OS map published in 1932 illustrates Immingham Harbour and associated infrastructure. The eastern half of the proposed infrastructure and southern most turbine would be located within this industrial area. The western portion of the proposed infrastructure and the northern most turbine are depicted within agricultural land to the west which does not appear to have undergone any great changes in the early 20th century. A larger number of buildings, including residential and community buildings, are illustrated in this area and were likely constructed as a response to an increased population required for the docklands.

An aerial photograph taken in 1947 (RAF_CPE_UK_1748_V_5027) locates the northern most turbine in a rectangular field. Regularly spaced linear features are visible within the field indicating that ploughing activities have been undertaken. Positive linear features in surrounding fields may identify upstanding remains of rig and furrow in the late 1940s. Another photograph taken in the same run (RAF_CPE_UK_1748_V_5026) shows the location of the southern most turbine which appears to have been located in a railway yard, occupied by train carriage containers and other such storage. The land between the two proposed turbine locations is visible as agricultural and industrial land, occupied by railway lines, as recorded on historic mapping.

Subsequent maps available until 1968 indicate that the area underwent very little change in this period.

Aerial photography from 2006 (20616_004; 20620_001; 20620_002) shows the locations of the proposed turbines being brownfield sites occupied by mounds of material and pools of water to the south and west of an active industrial area. This suggests that the location of the northern most turbine was developed some time after 1968 and before 2006.

Modern remains within and in close proximity to the Port of Immingham boundary are illustrative of an agricultural landscape which was developed as docklands in the early 20th century. Second World War defensive assets, sited to protect the harbour and associated infrastructure are also well recorded in the area. Hull to the north-west, on the northern side of the River Humber, experienced the largest tonnage of bombs dropped and the largest percentage of destruction of the northern cities during the Second World War. Whilst Immingham was not impacted to the extent Hull was, as a harbour in close proximity it would have experienced its share of damage. Indeed, two bomb craters have been identified to the north (MLS26143) and west (MLS26149) of the northern most proposed turbine.

Immingham Dock was developed in the 20th century as an industrial site, and as such any underlying archaeological remains which *may* have survived are likely to have been adversely impacted by the development. The eastern area of the Port of Immingham boundary appears to have been developed by the mid-20th century whilst the western area appears to have been disturbed and developed for industrial use in the later 20th century. Whilst there is considered to be a High potential for modern remains to survive, any such remains are likely to relate to the construction, use and abandonment of well documented infrastructure and the resulting associated ground disturbance.

Previous Archaeological Investigations

Where relevant, previous archaeological works have been mentioned above in association with finds recorded.

A National Mapping Project (NMP)¹⁸ records post-medieval and modern drainage systems (MCX431), and enclosures (MLS26146); and Second World War anti-landing earthworks (MLS26150) within 200m of the proposed turbine and 50m of any proposed infrastructure. To the north of the northern most turbine, the remains of the 19th and 20th century brickworks (MLS22004) were recorded and to the west areas of ridge and furrow cultivation are documented.

A recent programme of trial trenching (ELS4678) within the vicinity of the northern most proposed turbine did not identify any archaeological remains.

Ground Investigation (GI) works (ENL520) within the southeastern area of the Port of Immingham boundary did not identify any archaeological remains however deeply buried geoarchaeological deposits were identified. A subsequent evaluation (ENL521) of the southern extent of the GI works area concluded that deep ploughing had likely removed all archaeological deposits and thus there were no suitable deposits for environmental sampling.

A large number of non-invasive and invasive archaeological works have been undertaken in the vicinity of the Port of Immingham boundary. In general, these investigations have identified archaeological remains to the west of the port in areas which have undergone relatively less development, and thus below ground disturbance, in the recent past.

¹⁸ Fleming, F. & Royall, C. 2020. The Inner Humber Estuary Rapid Coastal Zone Assessment: Aerial Investigation and Mapping Project
Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/research/results/reports/redirect/16468>

6.6.1.2 Assessment of Physical Impacts

Table 6.7 below assesses the potential physical impact on heritage assets within 200m of the proposed turbines and 50m of any proposed infrastructure as a result of the construction activity associated with the Proposed Development.

Table 6.7 - Assessment of Physical Impact on Heritage Assets within 200m of the Proposed Turbines and 50m of Proposed Infrastructure

Feature	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Significance of Effect	Assessment
HER01	Low	Negligible	Minor/Negligible	<p>The feature has no upstanding remains and has since been destroyed by the presence of a modern coal terminal. It is nevertheless possible that buried remains exist.</p> <p>The proposed access track for T1 would cover this feature, these tracks are proposed to use existing infrastructure where possible and as such, excavations would be minimal.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is low. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a minor/negligible level of effect which is not significant.</p>
HER02	Low	No Change	None	<p>The feature has no upstanding remains. It is nevertheless possible that there are buried remains.</p> <p>The feature is outside the area of groundbreaking and as such would not be impacted upon by the construction of the Proposed Development. As there are no above ground remains, erosion from vehicle movements would not occur.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is low. There is no magnitude of change resulting in a level of effect of none.</p>
HER03	Low	No Change	None	<p>The feature has no upstanding remains and has been destroyed by the modern coal terminal. It is nevertheless possible that there are buried remains.</p> <p>The feature is outside the area of groundbreaking and as such would not be impacted upon by the construction of the Proposed Development. As there are no above ground remains, erosion from vehicle movements would not occur.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is low. There is no magnitude of change resulting in a level of effect of none.</p>
HER04	Low	No Change	None	<p>The feature has no upstanding remains. It is nevertheless possible that there are buried remains.</p> <p>The feature is outside the area of groundbreaking and as such would not be impacted upon by the construction of the Proposed Development. As there are no above ground remains, erosion from vehicle movements would not occur.</p>

Feature	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Significance of Effect	Assessment
				The sensitivity of the feature is low. There is no magnitude of change resulting in a level of effect of none .
HER05	Low	Low	Minor	<p>The feature has no upstanding remains and has since been destroyed by the presence of a modern coal terminal. It is nevertheless possible that buried remains exist.</p> <p>All proposed infrastructure for T2 would cover this feature, the tracks are proposed to use existing infrastructure where possible, hard standings will be dug out to approx. 1m and as such, excavations for these components would be minimal.</p> <p>The turbine foundations will likely be piled and as such, would be deep, and therefore have the potential to disturb any archaeological remains of the feature resulting in the potential loss of information.</p> <p>However, the Proposed Development would only be impacting upon a small section of the overall asset and as such, the potential loss of information would be limited.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is low. The magnitude of change is low resulting in a minor level of effect which is not significant.</p>
HER06	Low	No Change	None	<p>The feature is outside the area of groundbreaking and as such would not be impacted upon by the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is low. There is no magnitude of change resulting in a level of effect of none.</p>
HER07	Low	No Change	None	<p>The feature is outside the area of groundbreaking and as such would not be impacted upon by the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is low. There is no magnitude of change resulting in a level of effect of none.</p>

In addition to the potential for impacts upon known assets as set out in **Table 6.7**. This assessment has indicated that there is High potential for palaeoenvironmental remains to survive in the vicinity of the northern most turbine and a Low potential for such remains to survive elsewhere on Site. There is also judged to be Low potential for buried archaeological remains for all periods, excepting the modern period, to survive on Site. There is considered to be High potential for remains of the modern period to survive on Site.

Groundbreaking works and piling for the construction of the turbines have the potential to impact upon any unknown buried archaeological remains which may survive. Impacts have the potential to be of high magnitude as they could result in the removal or destruction of any such remains. However, the significance of any resulting effect would be dependent upon the nature, character and significance of any remains encountered and the extent to which the Proposed Development would affect those remains. The mitigation proposed in **Section 6.8.1** below takes into consideration the potential for buried archaeological remains to survive.

6.6.1.3 *Assessment of Effects on Historic Landscape Character*

The Proposed Development would be located within The Northern Marshes regional historic landscape character area as characterised by The Historic Character of The County of Lincolnshire¹⁹. The current legibility of the historic landscape character is generally very well preserved in terms of the pattern of medieval settlement. The introduction of the Proposed Development would not have any physical impacts on the earthwork remains surrounding the settlements, the pattern of the medieval pattern of settlement or the survival of planned enclosure.

The Proposed Development would be located within a section of the landscape already characterised by industrial elements, including many vertical elements such as stacks. The Proposed Development would be of a similar vertical and rectilinear infrastructure and as such would not result in a material change to the current character of the area.

The sensitivity of the landscape is medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible resulting in a **minor** level of effect which is not significant.

¹⁹ https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/lincolnshire_hlc_2017/downloads.cfm

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

6.6.2 Heritage Assets Outside the Site

6.6.2.1 Setting Impacts

The setting impact of the Proposed Development on each designated heritage asset taken forward for assessment is summarised in **Table 6.8** below. Detailed assessments, along with a statement of harm where effects are predicted, for the heritage assets in the study areas can be found in **Appendix 6.1** or **Appendix 6.2**.

Table 6.8 – Summary of Effects and Evaluation of Significance: Setting Effects Outside Port of Immingham Boundary

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
Scheduled Monuments									
SM01 & LB26	Manor Farm moated site & Manor Farmhouse	1008044 & 1346854	Surrounding vegetation would largely screen visibility of the Proposed Development from the features meaning only blade tips would be visible and would be in conjunction with existing industrial elements. The vegetation would also screen views towards the features making contra unlikely. The addition of the Proposed Development would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.	2	2	3.2km	High	Negligible	Moderate/minor – not significant
SM02	North Garth moated site and associated enclosures	1007815	Turbine bases would be screened with the Proposed Development seen rising above vegetation. This visibility would be in conjunction with existing industrial development. The feature is not prominent within the landscape and would be screened by vegetation from many views, limiting most intervisibility with the Proposed Development from third party locations. The addition of the Proposed Development would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.	2	2	3.5km	High	Negligible	Moderate/minor – not significant

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
SM03	Moated site and associated earthworks at Baysgarth Farm	1007813	Turbine bases would be screened with the Proposed Development seen rising above vegetation. This visibility would be in conjunction with existing industrial development. The feature is not prominent within the landscape and would be screened by vegetation from many views, limiting most intervisibility with the Proposed Development from third party locations. The addition of the Proposed Development would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.	2	2	4.0km	High	Negligible	Moderate/minor – not significant
SM04	Manor Farm Moated Site	1007816	Turbine bases would be screened with the Proposed Development seen rising above vegetation. This visibility would be in conjunction with existing industrial development. The feature itself has no upstanding features and with surrounding vegetation, intervisibility from third party locations would not occur. The addition of the Proposed Development would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.	2	2	4.8km	High	Negligible	Moderate/minor – not significant
SM05	Stallingborough medieval settlement, post-medieval manor house and formal gardens	1020423	Turbine bases would be screened with the Proposed Development seen rising above vegetation with more prominent infrastructure visible in conjunction. Similar views are illustrated in LVIA Viewpoint 7 . The features lack of upstanding remains and screening provided by buildings and vegetation limits most opportunity for intervisibility. The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape	2	2	4.2km	High	Low	Moderate – not significant

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
			setting while visible, would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.						
SM06 & LB28	Churchyard Cross & Church of St Peter and St Paul	1020023 & 1346978	Woodland surrounding the features creates an enclosed setting and restricts visibility of and intervisibility with the Proposed Development. The introduction of the Proposed Development into the setting of the features would not detract from the ability to appreciate them and their setting and function.	2	2	4.4km	High	No Change	None
SM07	World War II Decoys for Hull Docks	1020022	Views from the feature are open however some screening of the Proposed Development would be provided by port infrastructure. Similar views are illustrated in LVA Viewpoint 8 . Due to existing infrastructure in the views, the Proposed Development, although somewhat prominent, would not result in a material change to the existing baseline or interrupt key views from the feature. The feature itself is not prominent in the landscape and intervisibility from third party locations is unlikely to occur.	2	2	5.2km	High	Low	Moderate – not significant
SM08	Site of Medieval Nunnery and Post-Dissolution House	1008686	Vegetation surrounding the feature prevents both visibility of the Proposed Development and also the potential for intervisibility with the Proposed Development from third party locations. There would be no impact to the setting of the feature or the ability to appreciate it as intended.	2	2	5.4km	High	No Change	None

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
SM09	Stone Creek Heavy Anti-aircraft Gunsite	1020187	The Proposed Development would be visible as blade tips rising above vegetation and would be seen alongside existing port infrastructure. The feature itself is not prominent in the landscape and intervisibility is unlikely to occur. The Proposed Development would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature or its setting.	2	2	5.9km	High	Negligible	Moderate/minor – not significant
SM10, LB05, LB06 & LB08	Thornton Abbey Augustinian monastery	1011198, 1215139, 1103713 & 1346859	See Appendix 6.2						
SM11	Old Little Humber moated site	1008048	Vegetation and farm buildings surrounding the feature will largely screen visibility of the Proposed Development. Where visible, blade tips would be seen in conjunction with existing port infrastructure. Intervisibility would also be highly restricted and there would be no significant impact to the feature's setting.	2	2	6.9km	High	Negligible	Moderate/minor – not significant
SM12 & LB13	Cross in St Bartholomew's Churchyard & Church of St Bartholomew	1018287 & 1063367	The features have an enclosed setting as a result of buildings and vegetation restricting outward views and so the Proposed Development would not be visible. The features lack of prominence in the wider landscape also makes intervisibility from third party locations very unlikely. The Proposed Development would not detract from the ability to understand the features or their relationship or their setting.	2	2	6.9km	High	No Change	None

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
SM13	Second World War QF Bombing Decoy	1431904	The feature has an enclosed setting due to surrounding woodland. The Proposed Development would not be visible from the Scheduled Monument, nor would it be visible in views in conjunction with the Proposed Development.	2	2	7.1km	High	No Change	None
SM14	Two moated sites at Healing Hall	1010947	Due to vegetation and intervening buildings, visibility of the Proposed Development from the feature is highly unlikely, as is the likelihood of intervisibility from third party locations. The addition of the Proposed Development would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and the baseline setting would remain the same.	2	2	7.5km	High	No Change	None
SM15 & LB17	Paull Holme Moated Site and Tower & Paull Holme Tower	1007875 & 1366242	Due to surrounding vegetation, visibility of the Proposed Development from the feature would not occur and intervisibility from third party locations is unlikely to occur. The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature or its setting.	2	2	7.5km	High	No Change	None
SM16, LB16 & LB36	Goxhill Hall moated site, associated drainage system, fishponds and field system, Medieval Hall Adjoining the North East Corner of	1007820, 1288428 & 1346831	Surrounding and intervening vegetation would prevent visibility of the Proposed Development from the features and would likely remove the opportunity for any intervisibility from third party locations. The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the ability to appreciate the features or their settings.	2	2	7.5km	High	No Change	None

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
	Goxhill Hall & Goxhill Hall								
SM17	Medieval Settlement of Croxton	1016858	Although visible, the Proposed Development would be somewhat screened by vegetation from the feature and would be seen in combination with existing infrastructure. Intervisibility would be limited to the right side of the feature only. The Proposed Development would not be overly distracting or alter the current setting of the feature.	2	2	8.6km	High	No Change	Moderate/minor – not significant
SM18	Medieval Settlement of Croxton	1016858	The Proposed Development would be seen from the feature, rising above topography with some screening from vegetation. Where visible, turbines would appear in conjunction with existing port infrastructure and so would not result in a material change to the existing baseline or disruption to the setting. Intervisibility with the feature from third party locations would be unlikely due to screening and the feature's lack of prominence.	2	2	8.6km	High	Negligible	Moderate/minor – not significant
SM19	Camera of the Knights Hospitallers, medieval settlement and cultivation remains, post-medieval house and gardens	1013526	There would be no visibility of the Proposed Development from the feature due to screening from intervening vegetation. The low-lying nature of the Scheduled Monument combined with heavy screening means intervisibility of the asset with the Proposed Development from third party locations is highly unlikely.	2	2	8.9km	High	No Change	None
SM20	Roman Settlement	1005306	Due to intervening vegetation the Proposed Development would be entirely screened from the feature and there	2	2	9.3km	High	No Change	None

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
			would be no opportunity for intervisibility from third party locations. The addition of the Proposed Development would have no impact on the feature's setting.						
Listed Buildings									
LB01	Church of St Andrew	1310011	Woodland and intervening vegetation will likely screen most visibility of the Proposed Development from the feature leaving only blade tips visible from a few locations. There may be intervisibility of the church tower with the Proposed Development, however this would be intermittent and localised to the church surroundings. The feature's setting would not be diminished by the Proposed Development, nor would it detract from the feature itself.	2	2	1.7km	High	Low	Moderate – not significant
LB02	Church of St Denys	1103701	T2 would only be visible as blade tips due to screening by buildings and whilst T1 would be more prominent. The Proposed Development is in keeping with the current industrial baseline. Despite this, the Proposed Development would add an increased sense of movement. Vegetation surrounding the church suggests that third party intervisibility with the Proposed Development is unlikely. The addition of the Proposed Development would not affect the understanding and appreciation of the feature.	2	2	3.3km	High	Low	Moderate – not significant
LB03	Church of St Peter	1103729	Visibility of the Proposed Development would be entirely screened from the feature due to surrounding woodland. This woodland also prevents any	2	2	4.0km	High	No Change	None

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
			intervisibility from third party locations from occurring. The introduction of the Proposed Development would not detract from the heritage asset or diminish the ability to appreciate the setting of the church and it would remain intact.						
LB04	Newsham Bridge	1063419	This feature is located within Brocklesby Registered Park and Garden. Due to woodland directly north of the feature, the Proposed Development would not be visible whilst the RPG provides an enclosed setting. The addition of the Proposed Development would have no impact on the feature's setting.	2	2	5.6km	High	No Change	None
LB07, LB09, LB10, LB11, LB30, LB31, LB32, LB33, & LB34	Church of All Saints, Brocklesby Hall, Holgate Monument, Hunt Kennels and House, Main Stable Block, Gateway to House, The Orangery, Conservatory, Garden Urn.	1165503, 1359800, 1063417, 1166049, 1063413, 1165475, 1317308, 1063409, 1165456.	Woodland provides this group of features with an enclosed setting and limits their visibility in the wider environment. This woodland also prevents visibility towards the Proposed Development meaning there would be no impact to the features settings and intervisibility from third party locations would be unlikely.	2	2	6.4km	High	No Change	None
LB12	No 9 Shop and Church End Farmhouse	1359820	The listed building has an enclosed setting due to surrounding vegetation and buildings and as a result, the Proposed Development is unlikely to be visible. The feature is not prominent within the landscape making intervisibility from third party locations unlikely. The Proposed Development would not detract from the	2	2	6.8km	High	No Change	None

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
			sense of place or the ability to understand the feature or its setting.						
LB14 & LB35	The Hermitage & The Arabella Aufrere Temple	1063418 & 1166061	Both features are located within the Mausoleum Woods which create an enclosed setting and restrict any visibility of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development would not detract from the ability to appreciate the features, their function or setting.	2	2	7.3km	High	No Change	None
LB15	Church of St Nicholas	1227927	Due to the distance and the intervening buildings, the Proposed Development would not be visible from the church. Intervisibility of the church with the Proposed Development would also not be possible meaning there would be no impact on the feature's setting.	2	2	7.6km	High	No Change	None
LB18	Church of St Andrew	1083434	Most visibility of the Proposed Development would be screened by vegetation and where visible, would be in conjunction with existing port infrastructure. Intervisibility from third party locations would not occur due to vegetation surrounding the church. The Proposed Development would not diminish the setting of the church or the ability to appreciate it.	2	2	8.5km	High	Negligible	Moderate/minor – not significant
LB19	Church of All Saints	1288450	Woodland surrounding the Church would screen any visibility of the Proposed Development from the feature and would prevent any intervisibility from occurring from third party locations. The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape	2	2	8.7km	High	No Change	None

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
			setting of the feature would not diminish the setting of the feature.						
LB20	Church of St Andrew	1204699	The woodland surrounding the church creates an enclosed setting and restricts the views to and from the church. There would be no visibility of the Proposed Development and intervisibility from third party locations is unlikely.	2	2	8.8km	High	No Change	None
LB21	Church of St Lawrence	1227786	Due to surrounding vegetation and the features distance to the Proposed Development there is unlikely to be any visibility of the Proposed Development. Intervisibility from third party locations is also unlikely.	2	2	9.0km	High	No Change	None
LB22	Church of St Nicolas	1379843	Due to distance and screening by vegetation the Proposed Development would not be visible form the Church. Intervisibility from third party locations would also not be possible and so the Proposed Development would not impact the feature or its setting.	2	2	9.0km	High	No Change	None
LB23	Mausoleum, Wall and Screen	1063361	Due to the distance from the Proposed Development and the level of intervening screening, the Proposed Development would not be visible from or in conjunction with the mausoleum.	2	2	9.0km	High	No Change	None
LB24	Church of Saint Peter	1359817	Due to the distance from the Proposed Development and the level of intervening screening, the Proposed Development would not be visible from or in conjunction with the church.	2	2	9.2km	High	No Change	None
LB25	Church of St Lawrence	1161566	Surrounding woodland as well as distance would restrict visibility of the Proposed	2	0	9.5km	High	No Change	None

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
			Development. It is unlikely to be visible within views and intervisibility with the feature from third party locations should not occur. The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.						
LB27	Former Heavy Anti-Aircraft Gunsite	1403222	Woodland surrounding the feature screens all visibility of the Proposed Development. Woodland also screens the feature from view so there is no opportunity for intervisibility from third party locations.	2	2	4.4km	High	No Change	None
LB29	Newsham Lodge	1166070	Woodland prevents the Proposed Development from being visible from the feature and provides no opportunity for intervisibility from third party locations.	2	2	6.6km	High	No Change	None
LB37	Church of St Edmund	1146937	Due to the woodland that surrounds the feature, views from the church would be entirely screened and the Proposed Development would not be visible in the setting of the feature or in conjunction with it.	2	2	8.6km	High	No Change	None
LB38	Thornton Hall Pavilion Wings and Flanking Screen Wall	1103712	The woodland surrounding the house would restrict all visibility of the Proposed Development and prevent intervisibility from third party locations.	2	2	8.6km	High	No Change	None
LB39	Church of St Helen	1204677	Vegetation and intervening buildings block visibility of the Proposed Development from the feature and intervisibility from third party locations would not occur.	2	2	9.0km	High	No Change	None

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Associated British Ports (ABP) | C4946 - 1307 | Version 1

Reference	Name	List Entry Number	Summary of Assessment	No. of blade tips theoretically visible	No. of hubs theoretically visible	Distance to the nearest turbine	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Level of Effect
LB40	Wooton Hall and Adjoining Screen Wall	1204691	Due to the woodland that surrounds the feature and the distance from the Proposed Development, the Proposed Development would not be visible from or in conjunction with the Listed Building.	2	2	9.6km	High	No Change	None
LB41	Church of St John the Evangelist	1204608	Woodland surrounding the church makes visibility unlikely and where possible, it would be limited to glimpses and alongside existing infrastructure. Intervisibility from third party locations is unlikely to occur.	2	2	9.6km	High	Negligible	Moderate/minor
LB42	Killingholme South Low Lighthouse	1215093	See Appendix 6.2						
LB43	Killingholme High Lighthouse	1103706	See Appendix 6.2						
LB44	Killingholme North Low Lighthouse	1103707	See Appendix 6.2						
Registered Parks and Gardens									
RPG01	Brocklesby Park	1000971	Dense woodland that makes up most of the RPG would restrict visibility of the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development would be a minor feature in the RPG's wider setting and would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature.	2	2	5.3km	High	Negligible	Moderate/Minor

6.7 Cumulative Assessment

This assessment considers cumulative impacts on the setting of heritage assets within 10km of the Proposed Development. The assessment considers all other wind developments above 50m within 10km of the Proposed Development including:

- Far Marsh (Operational – 7.8km);
- Pyewipe Farm (Operational – 8.1km); and
- Grimsby Onshore Wind (In Planning – 9.4km).

This assessment will be undertaken on heritage assets where a potential impact has been identified. Where no impact or a neutral impact²⁰ is predicted, these heritage assets are not considered to have any cumulative impact and are, therefore, not included in the cumulative assessment.

Table 6.9 - Assessment of Cumulative Impact

Feature	Assessment of Cumulative Impact
Scheduled Monuments	
SM01	<p>Far Marsh – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Grimsby – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
SM02	<p>Far Marsh – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Grimsby – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
SM03	<p>Far Marsh – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Grimsby – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
SM04	<p>Far Marsh – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p>

²⁰ Neutral impacts can only occur for features assessed in **Appendix 6.2**.

Feature	Assessment of Cumulative Impact
	<p>Grimsby – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
SM05	<p>Far Marsh – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – Visible in the opposite direction of the Proposed Development but largely screened by vegetation and buildings.</p> <p>Grimsby – Visible in the opposite direction of the Proposed Development but largely screened by vegetation and buildings.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the features is high. The magnitude of change is low resulting in a moderate level of effect that is not significant.</p>
SM07	<p>Far Marsh – May be visible in views with the Proposed Development but mostly screened by vegetation with tips visible.</p> <p>Pyewipe – Unlikely to be visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to distance and screening.</p> <p>Grimsby – Visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development but would appear distinctly separate.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high, the magnitude of change is considered to be low resulting in a moderate level of effect which is not significant.</p>
SM09	<p>Far Marsh – May be visible within the same views as the Proposed Development but well screened by vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – Not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to distance and screening.</p> <p>Grimsby – Visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development but well spaced and not prominent within the landscape.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
SM11	<p>Far Marsh – May be visible in views with the Proposed Development but largely screened by vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – Not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to distance and screening.</p> <p>Grimsby – Visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development but would appear distinctly separate.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
SM17	<p>Far Marsh - May be visible in views with the Proposed Development with some screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – Not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to distance and screening.</p> <p>Grimsby – Visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development but would appear distinctly separate.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
SM18	<p>Far Marsh – Not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to topography.</p> <p>Pyewipe – Not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to topography.</p> <p>Grimsby – Not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to topography.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change resulting in a level of effect of none.</p>
LB01	<p>Far Marsh - Not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening by vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – Visible in the opposite direction to the Proposed Development but would be screened by vegetation and buildings.</p> <p>Grimsby – Visible in the opposite direction to the Proposed Development but would be screened by vegetation and buildings.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high, the magnitude of change is considered to be negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect which is not significant.</p>
LB02	<p>Far Marsh – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Grimsby – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>

Feature	Assessment of Cumulative Impact
LB18	<p>Far Marsh – Visible in the opposite direction to the Proposed Development but screened by vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>Grimsby – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
LB41	<p>Far Marsh – Not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Pyewipe – Not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to topography.</p> <p>Grimsby – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from vegetation.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
LB42, LB43 & LB44	<p>Far Marsh – Visible in the opposite direction to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Pyewipe – In the same view as the Proposed Development but not visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development due to screening from port and oil refinery infrastructure.</p> <p>Grimsby – In the same view as the Proposed Development but largely screened by port infrastructure.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the features is medium. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>
RPG01	<p>Far Marsh – May be visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development within some of the RPG. Where visible there would be considerable screening by vegetation.</p> <p>Pyewipe – May be visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development within some of the RPG. Where visible there would be considerable screening by vegetation.</p> <p>Grimsby – May be visible in conjunction with the Proposed Development within some of the RPG. Where visible there would be considerable screening by vegetation.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a moderate/minor level of effect that is not significant.</p>

6.8 Mitigation

Planning guidance states that it is Government policy to protect and preserve archaeological sites and monuments in situ wherever feasible. Where preservation in situ is not possible, planning authorities should ensure that an appropriate level of excavation, recording, analysis, publication, and archiving is carried out, before and/or during development.

6.8.1 Permanent Land-take and Operation

Current proposals indicate that two known heritage assets are within the area of ground-breaking, these features are HER01 which lies in the ground breaking area for T1 and HER05 which is in the groundbreaking area for T2. While these features are not visible above ground, it is possible that remains survive below the surface. Additionally, there are a further five known heritage assets within 200m of the proposed turbine locations and 50m of the proposed infrastructure.

Section 6.6.1.1 has established that there is High potential for palaeoenvironmental remains to survive in the vicinity of T1 and a Low potential from such remains to survive elsewhere on Site. There is also judged to be Low potential for buried archaeological remains for all periods, excepting the modern period, to survive on Site. There is considered to be High potential for remains of the modern period to survive on Site, though it is considered that, in all likelihood, any such remains would relate to the construction, use and abandonment of well documented infrastructure and the resulting associated ground disturbance.

As such, mitigation, in the first instance should comprise of archaeological review on the results of any ground or site investigation works. This would provide more detail on archaeological and paleoenvironmental potential and inform the need for any further mitigation works, should these be warranted.

6.8.2 Restoration

No restoration measures are currently proposed.

6.9 Summary of Effects

6.9.1 Physical Effects

Within 200m of the proposed turbine locations and 50m of the proposed infrastructure there are seven known heritage assets. Only two of these features are within the area of ground-breaking around the infrastructure. Due to the nature of the port and the presence of the coal yard, these heritage assets are not visible in the landscape or on satellite imagery, however, it is nevertheless possible that archaeological remains survive underground. The two assets are considered to be of low sensitivity, the magnitude of change is considered to be negligible to low resulting in a **minor to minor/negligible** level of effect which is not significant.

Section 6.6.1.1 has established that there is High potential for palaeoenvironmental remains to survive in the vicinity of the northern most turbine and a Low potential from such remains to survive elsewhere on Site. There is also judged to be Low potential for buried archaeological remains for all periods, excepting the modern period, to survive on Site. There is considered to be High potential for remains of the modern period to survive on Site, though it is considered that, in all likelihood, any such remains would relate to the construction, use and abandonment of well documented infrastructure and the resulting associated ground disturbance.

6.9.2 Setting Effects

The setting impacts upon heritage assets within 10km of the Proposed Development have been considered in the assessment. High sensitivity assets within 10km include 20 Scheduled Monuments, 25 Grade I Listed Buildings, 16 Grade II* Listed Buildings and one Registered Park and Garden. The assessment also included a number of medium sensitivity heritage assets including Grade II Listed Buildings.

No likely significant effects were found on the setting of any heritage assets included in the assessment. There were a number of non-significant setting impacts on heritage assets found throughout the assessment with the majority of heritage assets receiving no impact at all. Any potential impacts found would cause **'less than substantial'** harm to the significance of the assets.

6.10 Conclusion

With regard to physical effects there were no significant effects found. Seven heritage assets were found to be within 200m of the proposed turbine locations, two of these would be in the area of ground-breaking, HER01 for T1 and HER05 for T2. As such, the Proposed Development could result in the loss of information relating to these two assets. **Section 6.6.1.1** has established that there is High potential for palaeoenvironmental remains to survive in the vicinity of the northern most turbine and a Low potential for such remains to survive elsewhere on Site. There is also judged to be Low potential for buried archaeological remains for all periods, excepting the modern period, to survive on Site. There is considered to be High potential for remains of the modern period to survive on Site, though it is considered that, in all likelihood, any such remains would relate to the construction, use and abandonment of well documented infrastructure and the resulting associated ground disturbance.

The assessment found a number of non-significant impacts on the surrounding heritage assets which would cause **'less than substantial harm'** in NPPF terms. However, the majority of heritage assets would receive no impact.

There is a significant amount of vegetation cover within the study area and around a number of the heritage assets. This not only provides a strong setting element but also a large degree of screening of views towards the Proposed Development, thus minimising any impacts to setting.

Overall, the Proposed Development would cause **'less than substantial harm'** or no harm to the heritage resource of the surrounding area in NPPF terms. Any less than substantial harm will need to be weighed against the public benefits of the Proposed Development in line with Paragraph 208 of the NPPF. For assets where no effect or neutral effects have been identified there would be no harm in terms of the NPPF and for these assets the policy tests are not invoked.

Appendix 6.1 - Setting Assessment

SM01 - Manor Farm moated site (1008044) and LB26 – Manor Farmhouse (1346854)

Setting

The Listed Building and Scheduled Monument are located approximately 3.2km of to the west of the Proposed Development at the closest point. The features are located within an area of grassland and surrounded by vegetation on all sides which creates a somewhat inward setting to the features. There are farm buildings located at the centre of this grassland. Beyond the vegetation the features have views of the infrastructure associated with the oil refinery, the Port of Immingham and various transmission lines. Stacks and pylons can be seen rising from above the vegetation. The surrounding area has a mix of agricultural and industrial use.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub and hub level. This visibility will be largely screened by the surrounding vegetation and blade tips will be seen rising from behind. This visibility will be in conjunction with various other industrial elements including stacks and transmission lines. While the Proposed Development will be visible and would create some movement that the feature does not currently experience, it would not create a material change to the existing baseline due to the number of industrial elements.

Intervisibility from third-party locations would be unlikely to occur due to the vegetation surrounding the features which restrict views from the west towards the heritage assets.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting while visible, would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the features is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect that is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause **'less than substantial harm'** to the setting of the Scheduled Monument and Listed Building in terms of NPPF.

SM02 - North Garth moated site and associated enclosures (1007815)

Setting

The feature is located approximately 3.5km to the west of the Proposed Development to the north of North Killingholme. The Scheduled Monument is located within an area of rough grassland and scrub vegetation including woodland. The surroundings are generally of an agricultural and industrial nature due to the proximity to Immingham and the associated industry and as such the assets has views of stacks and transmission lines among other infrastructure. There are no upstanding remains and the feature does not have any prominence in the wider landscape.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. The bases of the turbines would be screened by the vegetation on the feature. As such, the Proposed Development would be seen rising from behind the vegetation. This visibility would be in conjunction with a number of other industrial elements including stacks and transmission lines and while the turbines would create some movement, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not create a material change to the existing baseline.

The heritage asset does not have any upstanding features and as such has no prominence in the wider landscape. Third party-intervisibility would be restricted to the areas directly west of the feature on east Halton Road. Beyond this, vegetation would screen all visibility towards the feature.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting while visible, would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect that is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Scheduled Monument in terms of NPPF.

SM03 - Moated site and associated earthworks at Baysgarth Farm (1007813)

Setting

The feature is located approximately 4.0km to the north-west of the Proposed Development. It is located to the south of East Halton and to the north of North Killingholme. The surroundings of the feature are largely comprised of agricultural grounds and oil refinery and port infrastructure, and the field is used for agricultural grazing. There are no upstanding remains, but earth works are visible in the landscape and on satellite imagery.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. Vegetation would screen the bases of the turbines and they would be seen rising from behind the vegetation. This visibility would be in conjunction with a number of other industrial elements including stacks and transmission lines and while the turbines would create some movement, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not result in a material change to the existing baseline.

The heritage asset does not have any upstanding features and as such has no prominence in the wider landscape. Third party-intervisibility would be restricted to the areas directly west of the feature on east Townside. Beyond this, vegetation would screen all visibility towards the feature.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting while visible, would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect that is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Scheduled Monument in terms of NPPF.

SM04 – Manor Farm Moated Site (1007816)

Setting

The feature is located approximately 4.8km to the north-west of the Proposed Development on the eastern edge of the settlement of East Halton. The feature is located within an area of rough grassland with vegetation lining the edge of the field and the wider surroundings are of an agricultural, residential and industrial nature. The moat and dividing drains can be seen in the landscape on satellite imagery. There are no prominent upstanding remains and vegetation and buildings restrict all views from and towards the Scheduled Monument.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. Vegetation would screen the bases of the turbines and they would be seen rising from behind the vegetation. This visibility would be in conjunction with a number of other industrial elements including stacks and transmission lines and while the turbines would create some movement, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not result in a material change to the existing baseline.

The heritage asset does not have any upstanding features and the hedges surrounding the field screen all visibility towards it. As such, third party intervisibility would not occur.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting while visible, would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect that is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Scheduled Monument in terms of NPPF.

SM05 - Stallingborough medieval settlement, post-medieval manor house and formal gardens (1020423)

Setting

The heritage assets are located approximately 4.2km to the south of the Proposed Development on the western edge of Stallingborough. The heritage asset covers a large area of rough grassland with some scrub vegetation located throughout. Views are relatively open to the west while views to the east are restricted by the buildings in Stallingborough and the vegetation associated with the settlement.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. The bases of the turbines would be screened by vegetation, but the turbines would be seen rising from behind. The turbines would appear in the same view as the oil refinery infrastructure and would appear separated and in the same view as a major transmission line. The transmission line is closer to the feature and as such would be the more dominant feature in the view. The Proposed Development would be less prominent but would provide some movement. The view would be similar to that illustrated in **LVIA Viewpoint 7** which was taken approximately 500m to the south-east of the feature.

Due to the lack of upstanding remains and the buildings and vegetation that surround the feature to the south and east, third party intervisibility would be rare and would be limited to glimpses of blade tips seen with the asset.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting while visible, would not diminish the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is low resulting in a **moderate** level of effect that is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause **'less than substantial harm'** to the setting of the Scheduled Monument in terms of NPPF.

SM06 – Churchyard Cross (1020023) and LB28 – Church of St Peter and St Paul (1346978)

Setting

The heritage assets are located approximately to the south-east of the Proposed Development on the edge of the settlement of Stallingborough. They are set within a grass churchyard surrounded by woodland, which is key to the setting of the church, restricting outwards views and limiting the prominence in the wider landscape and therefore, has a largely enclosed character. The churchyard cross would have been intended for viewing at close proximity and as such does not have a wider landscape setting.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development from the heritage assets with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. The woodland surrounding the churchyard creates an inward setting for the features and restricts the majority of visibility from the feature towards the Proposed Development. As such, the Proposed Development would not be visible from the features, and they would retain their sense of place.

This woodland, along with other vegetation in the surrounding area would also restrict any intervisibility from third-party locations of both the features and the Proposed Development in conjunction with each other.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the setting of the features would not detract from the ability to appreciate them and their setting and function.

The sensitivity of the features collectively is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

SM07 – World War II Decoys for Hull Docks (1020022)

Setting

The feature is located on the western coast of the Holderness Peninsula approximately 5.2km to the north-east of the Proposed Development. The feature is formed of three sections of varying sizes. The coastal location is a key part of the function and setting of the feature and views over the water to the south-east are key. There are limited above ground remains and as such, the Proposed Development does not have any prominence in the wider landscape.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. Views from the feature are relatively open, however port infrastructure would create some form of screening to the Proposed Development. Views would be similar to those illustrated in **LVA Viewpoint 8** which is taken to the south of the feature, further down the Holderness Peninsula. All visibility would be in conjunction with existing port infrastructure and as such, the Proposed Development would not result in a material change to the existing baseline. Proposed Development would not appear in key views to the south-east of the Scheduled Monument.

As the feature does not have much wider landscape prominence due to the limited upstanding remains, intervisibility between the Scheduled Monument and the Proposed Development from third-party locations is unlikely to occur.

As such, while the Proposed Development would be visible from the feature, this would not be in views key to the setting or function of the feature. These views may be prominent in some instances but would not diminish the feature or the ability to appreciate and understand its function.

The sensitivity of the feature is high, the magnitude of change is considered to be low resulting in a **moderate** level of effect which is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Scheduled Monument in terms of NPPF.

SM08 - Site of Medieval Nunnery and Post-Dissolution House (1008686)

Setting

The Scheduled Monument is located approximately 5.4km to the south of the Proposed Development. The feature is set within an area of rough grassland and surrounded by hedgerows. The feature has no upstanding remains and as such does not have any wider landscape prominence. The hedge row surrounding the feature along with the mature woodland located to the north-east of the feature restrict all views to and from the feature and creates a largely enclosed setting and as such it does not have a wider landscape influence.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. Vegetation located to the north-east of the Scheduled Monument would screen all visibility of the Proposed Development and as such, would not be visible from the feature and would not diminish the ability to understand the feature and its setting.

Due to the level of vegetation in the surrounding area, there are no views towards the feature and as such, intervisibility from third-party locations would not occur.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the setting of the features would not detract from the ability to appreciate them and their setting and function.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

SM09 - Stone Creek Heavy Anti-aircraft Gunsite (1020187)

Setting

The feature is located across the Humber Estuary on the Holderness Peninsula approximately 5.9km to the west of the Proposed Development in an area of grassland surrounded by vegetation. The features are very low to the ground, this in conjunction with the vegetation does not allow for wider-ranging views or give the feature any prominence in the landscape. The location was likely chosen to allow good visibility over the Humber Estuary to allow for countering activities of enemy aircraft but may have been designed to be inconspicuous in the landscape given their defensive function.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility from the entire feature of both turbines at tip and hub level. This visibility would be in conjunction with other port infrastructure. Due to the vegetation, visibility of the Proposed Development would be largely screened with glimpses of blade tips possible. **LVA Viewpoint 8** provides a similar but more open view to that which would be experienced from the Scheduled Monument. Due to the low prominence of the feature, third-party visibility is unlikely to occur.

As such, these factors in combination with the distance mean that the introduction of the feature into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature or its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect that is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Scheduled Monument in terms of NPPF.

SM11 - Old Little Humber moated site (1008048)

Setting

The Scheduled Monument is located on the Holderness Peninsula approximately 6.9km to the north of the Proposed Development. The feature is located on the edge of a farmstead and is comprised of areas of dense woodland and areas of grassland. The wider surroundings are generally comprised of agricultural land. The feature does not have any prominence in the wider landscape due to the level of screening and the lack of upstanding remains.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. Due to the vegetation and farm buildings surrounding the feature, it is likely that this visibility will be largely screened and as such, it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be visible from the Scheduled Monument. Any visibility would be blade tips and would be in conjunction with the rest of the port infrastructure.

Vegetation in the surrounding area would also restrict the third party intervisibility from locations that would include both Proposed Development and the Scheduled Monument. As such, the Proposed Development would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect that is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Scheduled Monument in terms of NPPF.

SM12 - Cross in St Bartholomew's Churchyard (1018287) and LB13 – Church of St Bartholomew (1063367)

Setting

The church and cross are located approximately 6.9km to the south of the Proposed Development within a residential area in the settlement of Keelby. The heritage assets are surrounded by sparse woodland which give them a somewhat enclosed setting which is further enclosed by the surrounding buildings within the settlement. The church tower gives the feature some prominence within the localised area, however, the church does not have much wider landscape setting influence due to the presence of the buildings within the settlement. The churchyard cross was likely only intended to be viewed at close-range and as such does not have a wider landscape setting.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility from the feature of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. However, the presence of buildings and vegetation restrict the outwards views from the feature. Due to these factors, in combination with distance, it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be visible from the feature.

The features do not have prominence in the wider landscape beyond the localised area and as such, it is unlikely that intervisibility of the Proposed Development in conjunction with the feature from third party locations would occur.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the sense of place or the ability to understand the features, their relationship or their setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

SM13 - Second World War QF Bombing Decoy (1431904)

Setting

The feature is located approximately 7.1km to the north-west of the Proposed Development. The feature is located within dense vegetation on the edge of agricultural land and as such, the feature has no open views nor is it visible in the landscape.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development from the feature with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. The woodland that covers the feature restricts all views into and out from the feature and as such, the Proposed Development would not be visible from the Scheduled Monument, nor would it be visible in views in conjunction with the Proposed Development.

The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape would not detract from the feature.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

SM14 - Two moated sites at Healing Hall (1010947)

Setting

The feature is located approximately 7.5km to the south-east of the Proposed Development within the grounds of Healing Hall. The feature is surrounded by estate woodland associated with Healing Hall. This woodland restricts all visibility to and from the feature and as a result the feature does not have much wider landscape prominence, however, the feature is visible on satellite imagery.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility from the entirety of the feature of the Proposed Development at both tip and hub level however, due to the surrounding woodland and subsequent intervening buildings, it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be visible from the feature. Due to the vegetation, third-party intervisibility is also unlikely to occur.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the setting of the feature would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and the baseline setting would remain the same.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

SM15 – Paull Holme Moated Site and Tower (1007875) and LB17 - Paull Holme Tower (1366242)

Setting

The feature is located on the Holderness Peninsula approximately 7.5km to the north of the Proposed Development in an area of rough grassland and scrub vegetation and woodland. The tower is upstanding however, due to the level of vegetation in the local area, it is generally not very visible and does not have a wider prominence in the landscape. Additionally, this woodland creates an enclosed setting to the feature.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub height. Due to the vegetation surrounding the feature, the majority of views in the direction of the Proposed Development would be screened and as such, the Proposed Development would not be visible from the feature.

The vegetation in the vicinity of the feature also screens all views towards the feature and therefore, intervisibility of the Proposed Development in conjunction with the feature is unlikely to occur.

The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature or its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

SM16 - Goxhill Hall moated site, associated drainage system, fishponds and field system (1007820), LB16 - Medieval Hall Adjoining the North East Corner of Goxhill Hall (1288428) and LB36 – Goxhill Hall (1346831)

Setting

The heritage assets are located approximately 7.5km to the north-west of the Proposed Development across the Humber Estuary on the southern edge of the settlement of Goxhill. The Scheduled Monument survives as primarily earthwork remains with some upstanding features while the Listed Buildings are upstanding but due to the level of vegetation in the area do not have much wider prominence. The surroundings of the features are generally comprised of agricultural land, woodland and residential properties. The features are surrounded by vegetation and as such have limited outwards views and there are limited views towards the features.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines being theoretically visible at tip and hub level. Vegetation surrounding the features and further intervening vegetation would further restrict the visibility of the Proposed Development and as such, it would not be visible. This would also restrict all views towards the Scheduled Monument and Listed Buildings and as such, third party intervisibility is unlikely to occur.

The sensitivity of the features is collectively high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

SM17 - Paull Point Battery, coastal artillery battery and Submarine Mining Establishment (1020425)

Setting

The feature is located approximately 8.1km to the north of the Proposed Development on the coast of the Humber Estuary. The feature covers woodland, grassland and an aircraft museum. The location on the coast is key to the setting of the feature in terms of defence with views over the coastline to the south being a key component. Due to the woodland that surrounds the feature, there is no prominence in the wider environment.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level from the majority of the feature. Much of the feature is enclosed by woodland and vegetation and as such would not have visibility of the Proposed Development. Visibility would only be from the western edge of the Scheduled area on the coast and the views are illustrated in **LVA Viewpoint 12**. The turbines would be visible and somewhat prominent features but would always be seen in conjunction with the port and oil refinery infrastructure and as such would not result in a material change to the existing baseline. The turbines would create some movement; however, the port is an active port with activity and boat movement occurring and as such this would not diminish the setting of the fort. Therefore, while they would appear in key views, due to the distance, it would not diminish the setting of the feature or the ability to appreciate it.

Due to the lack of prominence the Scheduled Monument has in the wider landscape, it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be seen in conjunction with the feature and as such third party intervisibility would not occur.

The sensitivity of the feature is high, the magnitude of change is considered to be low resulting in a **moderate** level of effect which is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Scheduled Monument in terms of NPPF.

SM18 - Medieval Settlement of Croxton (1016858)

Setting

The Scheduled Monument is located approximately 8.6km to the south-west of the Proposed Development. The feature is set within an area of grassland and is divided on the western side by Croxton Road. The feature has no upstanding remains but is visible as earthworks in the landscape. The surroundings are largely agricultural and residential with various areas of vegetation. The feature has views of the stacks at the oil refineries at South Killingholme and of port infrastructure.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. The bases of the turbines would be screened by topography and the turbines seen rising behind. The turbines would be somewhat screened by the surrounding vegetation but would still be visible. This visibility would be in conjunction with the stacks and other industrial elements and as such would not result in a material change to the existing baseline. The turbines would add an element of movement, however due to the distance this would not be distracting and would not diminish the setting of the feature.

Due to the lack of upstanding remains and the level of surrounding vegetation, visibility of the asset in conjunction with the Proposed Development would only occur from right next to the feature on Croxton Road. Beyond this, the Proposed Development and Scheduled Monument are unlikely to be visible in conjunction with each other.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. The magnitude of change is negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect that is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Scheduled Monument in terms of NPPF.

SM19 - Camera of the Knights Hospitallers, medieval settlement and cultivation remains, post-medieval house and gardens (1013526)

Setting

The Scheduled Monument is located approximately 8.9km to the south-west of the Proposed Development within an area of grassland to the east of the settlement of Great Limber to the south of the A18. The surrounding area is comprised of residential properties, agricultural land and infrastructure such as powerlines. There are areas of vegetation scattered throughout the surrounding areas. The feature has no upstanding remains and as such has no prominence in the wider landscape.

Assessment of Impacts

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. Due to the level of intervening vegetation between the Scheduled Monument and the Proposed Development all visibility is likely to be screened and as such would not be visible from the feature.

Due to the low-lying nature of the feature and the lack of upstanding remains coupled with the level of screening and the distance from the Proposed Development, intervisibility is unlikely to occur were the Proposed Development and Scheduled Monument are seen together in the same view.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

SM20 – Roman Settlement (1005306)

Setting

The Roman Settlement is located approximately 9.3km to the south-west of the Proposed Development to the west of the settlement of Kirmington. The feature has no upstanding remains and is made up of agricultural land and as such has no prominence in the wider landscape. The surroundings are residential and agricultural in nature with Humberside Airport located directly south of the feature.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip level. Due to intervening vegetation the Proposed Development would be entirely screened and as such would not be visible from the Scheduled Monument and third party intervisibility would not occur.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB01 – Church of St Andrew (1310011)

Setting

The church is located approximately 1.7km to the south-west of the Proposed Development within the settlement of Immingham next to Immingham Golf Club. There is some woodland surrounding the churchyard which restricts the outwards view from the feature, however the scale of the church tower provides some localised prominence to the feature. The church is accessed from the south side via Church Lane.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. The woodland surrounding the church along with further intervening vegetation would screen the majority of this visibility and it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be visible beyond the blades of T2, similar to the view illustrated in **LVIA Viewpoint 2**. This visibility would only occur from the graveyard on the eastern side of the church, and it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be seen on approach. The Proposed Development would not be a notable feature in the setting of the church, it would not diminish the setting or the ability to understand it.

The church tower has some prominence in the localised landscape, there is a chance the turbines would be visible in conjunction with the church from Church Lane. This would be intermittent and would only occur in the localised surroundings of the church.

The sensitivity of the feature is high, the magnitude of change is considered to be low resulting in a **moderate** level of effect which is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Listed Building in terms of NPPF.

LB02 - Church of St Denys (1103701)

Setting

The church is located approximately 3.3km to the west of the Proposed Development within the settlement of North Killingholme in North Lincolnshire. The church is set within a churchyard of grassland cover and has largely residential surroundings. It has open views down St Crispins Close, where the oil refinery is visible at the end of the street. Views in other directions are largely restricted by buildings and vegetation. The surrounding vegetation also restricts the prominence of the church in the local area.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. The presence of buildings would restrict the visibility of the southern-most turbine (T2), located in North East Lincolnshire, which would only be visible as intermittent blade tips from the church. T1, located in North Lincolnshire, would be visible at the end of St Crispins Close, would occupy the same view as the oil refinery and would appear rising from behind the refinery. This would mean that the Proposed Development would be in keeping with the current baseline but would increase the sense of movement in the area. Despite this, while the Proposed Development would be a prominent feature in the setting of the church, the function and setting of the church would still be understood and not rendered incoherent.

Due to the presence of vegetation limiting the prominence of the church tower in the local area, intervisibility from a third-party location, where the Proposed Development would be seen in conjunction with the church is unlikely to occur and as such would not create a competition between these two elements in the wider landscape setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high, the magnitude of change is considered to be low resulting in a **moderate** level of effect which is not significant. The Proposed Development is considered likely to cause **'less than substantial harm'** to the setting of the Listed Building in terms of NPPF. It is noted that any predicted harm would be reversible and, while the Proposed Development would be a prominent feature in views from the church, and the Proposed Development is not anticipated to render the affected views incoherent.

LB03 – Church of St Peter (1103729)

Setting

The church is located approximately 4.0km to the north-west of the Proposed Development to the North of North Killingholme. The church is set within a churchyard of grassland cover and is surrounded by woodland on all sides. Directly north of the church is a group of agricultural buildings. The church has a relatively inward setting provided by the woodland and the buildings which screen the majority of the views into and out of the churchyard. Some breaks in the woodland to the east allow for views in and out, however these are restricted.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. These views would be to the south-east and as such would not be viewed from the breaks in the woodland surrounding the feature. The woodland surrounding the church and the further intervening vegetation and buildings would entirely screen these views of the Proposed Development. The woodland would also restrict the ability for intervisibility to occur.

The introduction of the Proposed Development would not detract from the heritage asset or diminish the ability to appreciate the setting of the church and it would remain intact.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB04 – Newsham Bridge (1063419)

Setting

The bridge located approximately 5.6km to the south-west of the Proposed Development and is set within Brocklesby Registered Park and Garden on the southern edge of Alder Wood and crosses Newsham Lake on a north-west to south-east orientation. The wider area is comprised of grassland and areas of woodland. The bridge is an upstanding feature, however, due to the presence of the woodland to the north and other surrounding vegetation, the bridge has little prominence in the landscape and cannot be viewed in the wider area giving a sense of seclusion.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. This visibility would not be in the direction of the bridge's orientation and as such would not detract from the key function of the bridge. Further, due to the woodland located directly north of the bridge, the Proposed Development would not be visible. This woodland is a key setting feature to the RPG which the bridge is set within and contributes to the sense of seclusion that can be felt at the bridge.

The introduction of the Proposed Development would not detract from the heritage asset or diminish the ability to appreciate the setting of the bridge, its setting or function and these elements would remain intact.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB07 – Church of All Saints (1165503), LB09 – Brocklesby Hall (1359800), LB10 – Holgate Monument (1063417), LB11 – Hunt Kennels and House (1166049), LB30 – Main Stable Block (1063413), LB31 – Gateway to House (1165475), LB32 – The Orangery (1317308), LB33 – Conservatory (1063409) and LB34 – Garden Urn (1165456)

Setting

This collection of Listed Buildings is located within Brocklesby RPG and is located approximately 6.4km to the south-west of the Proposed Development at the closest point. The Listed Buildings are all set within woodland which provide a key setting element to the features, creating a sense of enclosure and restricting views to and from the Listed Buildings. The features all exist as upstanding features, however the presence of the estate woodland means that the buildings do not have any prominence in the wider environment.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level from the features. Due to the extensive estate woodland that surrounds the buildings and further intervening vegetation the Proposed Development would not be visible from the features and as such would not detract from the ability to appreciate the features, their setting or function. This vegetation would also limit the ability for third party intervisibility which would be unlikely to occur.

The sensitivity of these features collectively is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB12 - No 9 Shop and Church End Farmhouse (1359820)

Setting

The feature is located in the settlement of Keelby and is located approximately 6.8km to the south-east of the Proposed Development. The feature is surrounded by buildings which provide an enclosed setting, limiting wide range views. The feature does not have any prominent elements and is relatively low lying, and as such does not have any influence over the wider landscape setting.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development from the Listed Building, however, the presence of buildings and vegetation restrict the outwards views from the feature. Due to these factors, in combination with distance, it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be visible from the feature.

The feature does not have any prominence in the wider landscape and as such, it is unlikely that intervisibility of the Proposed Development in conjunction with the feature from third party locations would occur.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the sense of place or the ability to understand the feature or its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB14 – The Hermitage (1063418) and LB35 - The Arabella Aufrere Temple (1166061)

Setting

The Listed Buildings are located approximately 7.3km to the south-west of the Proposed Development within the Brocklesby RPG. Both features are set within the Mausoleum Woods. The woodland creates an enclosed setting to both of the Listed Buildings restricting the majority of views to and from the features and creating a sense of seclusion to the features. The features exist as upstanding features but do not have any prominence in the wider landscape due to the level of woodland screening surrounding them.

Assessment of Impacts

The Proposed Development would be theoretically visible from the Listed Buildings with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. Due to the woodland that surrounds both of the Listed Buildings, the Proposed Development would not be visible from or in conjunction with the Proposed Development. As such the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting of the features would not detract from the ability to appreciate the features, their function or setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB15 – Church of St Nicholas (1227927)

Setting

The Listed Building is located approximately 7.6km to the west of the Proposed Development in the settlement of Ulceby. The church is located within a churchyard of grassland cover and surrounded by woodland. The wider setting of the feature is residential and agricultural in nature. The church tower has some prominence in the local area and can be seen on approach to the settlement.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. Due to the distance and the intervening buildings, the Proposed Development would not be visible from the church. The church tower has some prominence in the local area with the tower being visible on approach to the settlement from the west. However, due to the distance from the Proposed Development, the turbines would be entirely screened by the buildings and vegetation surrounding the settlement of Ulceby and as such, third party intervisibility would not occur.

The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting of the church would not detract from the ability to appreciate the church and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB18 – Church of St Andrew (1083434)

Setting

The church is located approximately 8.5km to the north of the Proposed Development across the Humber Estuary. The church is situated to the south-east of the settlement of Paull on Thorngumbald Road. The church is set within a churchyard which comprises of grassland cover with woodland present to the south of the church. The church tower has some localised prominence which can be seen on approach to the church along Thorngumbald Road.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. The church has a considerable amount of vegetation to the south and this would screen the majority of visibility towards the Proposed Development. Any visibility that would occur would be in conjunction with other port infrastructure and the oil refinery and as such would not result in a material change to the existing baseline. However, due to the distance and level of screening provide, the Proposed Development would not diminish the setting of the church or the ability to appreciate it.

The level of vegetation surrounding the feature would also limit the ability for third party intervisibility to occur.

The sensitivity of the feature is high, the magnitude of change is considered to be negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect which is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause '**less than substantial harm**' to the setting of the Listed Building in terms of NPPF.

LB19 – Church of All Saints (1288450)

Setting

The church is located approximately 8.7km to the north-west of the Proposed Development in the settlement of Goxhill. The church is set within a churchyard comprised of grassland cover and lined with woodland vegetation on the northern, southern and eastern sides. The wider surroundings of the church are largely residential in nature.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. The woodland that surrounds the church would screen all views in the direction of the Proposed Development. As such, the setting would remain intact.

Intervisibility with the Proposed Development in conjunction with the church, would not occur due to the level of screening from woodland in the surrounding areas.

The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting of the feature would not diminish the setting of the feature.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB20 – Church of St Andrew (1204699)

Setting

The church is located approximately 8.8km to the west of the Proposed Development within the settlement of Wootton. The church is set in a churchyard of grassland cover and surrounded by woodland. The wider area is of a residential and agricultural nature. The woodland surrounding the church creates an enclosed setting and restricts the views to and from the church. Due to this, the church does not have any prominence in the wider landscape setting.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. Due to the woodland that surrounds the church in combination with the distance from the Proposed Development, there would be no visibility of the Proposed Development from the church. These factors would also limit the ability for third party intervisibility to occur.

The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting of the feature would not diminish the setting of the feature.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB21 – Church of St Lawrence (1227786)

Setting

The church is located approximately 9.0km to the west of the Proposed Development in the settlement of Thornton Curtis. The church is set within a churchyard of grassland cover surrounded by woodland to the north, east and south. The wider sitting is comprised of residential and agricultural elements. The church tower gives the church some prominence in the localised landscape and can be seen on approach to the settlement from the south.

Assessment of Impacts

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level. Due to the surrounding vegetation along with further intervening vegetation and the distance from the Proposed Development, it is unlikely that visibility from the church or intervisibility where the church and the Proposed Development are seen in conjunction would occur.

The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting of the feature would not diminish the setting of the feature.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB22 – Church of St Nicolas (1379843)

Setting

The church is located approximately 9.0km to the south-east of the Proposed Development in a residential area of Great Coates. The church is largely surrounded by woodland with a break in the woodland providing an open view to the north-east. Despite this, intervening buildings and other vegetation restrict this visibility somewhat. The church tower gives some localised prominence to the feature.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at tip and hub level to the north of the church. Due to the woodland that surrounds the majority of the church and the distance from the Proposed Development all visibility of the Proposed Development would be screened and as such not visible from the church.

Due to the level of vegetation to the south of the church, views towards the church are screened and as such, there would be no third-party locations from which the church and the Proposed Development would be visible in the same view. The only open views towards the church are from the east where the Proposed Development would not be visible in the view.

The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the ability to appreciate the church and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB23 – Mausoleum, Wall and Screen (1063361)

Setting

The Mausoleum is located approximately 9.0km to the south-west of the Proposed Development on an area of elevated land within the Brocklesby RPG. The Listed Building is located on an area of grassland which is surrounded by woodland. This woodland provides a sense of seclusion to the Mausoleum and limits the views to and from it creating an inward setting and limiting the prominence in the landscape.

Assessment of Impacts

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. Due to the distance from the Proposed Development and the level of intervening screening, the Proposed Development would not be visible from or in conjunction with the mausoleum. As such, the seclusion created by the trees would not be impacted.

The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the ability to appreciate the Listed Building and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB24 – Church of Saint Peter (1359817)

Setting

The church is located approximately 9.2km to the south-west of the Proposed Development in the settlement of Great Limber. The church is set within a churchyard of grassland cover and is surrounded by vegetation on most sides. The wider setting is largely comprised of agricultural land and residential properties with the RPG of Brocklesby located to the north of the church which provides a large area of vegetation cover. The vegetation surrounding the church restricts the wider prominence of the church and as such it does not have much wider landscape influence.

Assessment of Impacts

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. Due to the distance from the Proposed Development and the level of intervening screening, the Proposed Development would not be visible from or in conjunction with the church.

The introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the ability to appreciate the Listed Building and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and as such the level of effect is **none**.

LB25 – Church of St Lawrence (1161566)

Setting

The church is located approximately 9.5km to the south-east of the Proposed Development in the village of Aylesby. The church is constrained by some woodland and by buildings on all sides which somewhat restricts the outwards views. While the church tower provides scale, due to the large concentration of vegetation in the surrounding area, the church does not have much prominence beyond the localised area.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible as blade tips from the church. The rest of the turbines would be screened by topography. Given the presence of woodland around the church and in the surrounding areas in combination with the distance, it is unlikely that the Proposed Development would be visible from the feature. Additionally, this woodland would restrict intervisibility from a third-party location.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB27 – Former Heavy Anti-Aircraft Gunsite (1403222)

Setting

The feature is located approximately 4.4km to the south of the Proposed Development. The majority of the feature is set within dense woodland on the edge of grassland. The woodland creates an inward setting to the feature and restricts all outwards visibility. The features are also very low-lying, which was likely intentional, as such they have no prominence in the wider landscape.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines being theoretically visible at tip and hub level. However, the woodland the surrounds the feature would screen all visibility of the Proposed Development. Additionally, it would screen all views towards the Listed Building. As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape, would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB29 – Newsham Lodge (1166070)

Setting

The gate house is located approximately 6.6km to the south-west of the Proposed Development within the Brocklesby RPG and is situated just off Brocklesby Road. The surrounding area is comprised of grassland and woodland. Views from the gatehouse are open to the south but woodland restricts all visibility to the north. The vegetation surrounding the feature restricts the sense of prominence created by the gate house and it does not have much wider landscape influence.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. Due to the woodland that is directly north and north-east of the Listed Building and the distance from the Proposed Development, the Proposed Development would not be visible from or in conjunction with the Listed Building. As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape, would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB37 – Church of St Edmund (1146937)

Setting

The church is located approximately 8.6km to the south of the Proposed Development in the settlement of Riby. The church is set within a churchyard of grassland cover which is surrounded by woodland. The wider area is comprised of agricultural land, grassland, woodland and residential properties.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development from some parts of the feature where the turbines would both be visible at tip and hub level. The towers of the turbines would be screened by topography and the turbines would be seen rising from behind. Due to the woodland that surrounds the feature, views from the church would be entirely screened and the Proposed Development would not be visible in the setting of the feature.

Due to the extensive vegetation in the surrounding vicinity of the church, screening all views towards the church from the surrounding area, intervisibility from third-party locations is unlikely to occur.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting of the church would not impact upon the sense of place of the feature.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB38 - Thornton Hall Pavilion Wings and Flanking Screen Wall (1103712)

Setting

The hall is located approximately 8.6km to the west of the Proposed Development to the east of the settlement of Thornton Curtis. The hall is situated within estate grounds and gardens and is surrounded by dense vegetation which provides a key setting element and limits the views to and from the hall. As such, the hall does not have much wider landscape prominence.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at both tip and hub level. However, the woodland surrounding the house would restrict all visibility of the Proposed Development and as such would not impact the setting of the Listed Building. As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape, would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB39 – Church of St Helen (1204677)

Setting

The church is located approximately 9.0km to the south-west of the Proposed Development within the settlement of Kirmington. The church is set within an open churchyard of grassland cover and the wider area is of residential and agricultural nature. The church spire is a prominent feature in the wider landscape surrounding the settlement and can be seen from many directions, while some directions are screened by the presence of woodland.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. However, due to the distance from the Proposed Development and some intervening buildings and vegetation, the Proposed Development would not be visible from the church. Additionally, due to the distance from the Proposed Development, it would not be seen in conjunction with the church spire as the surrounding settlement would screen all visibility of the Proposed Development when viewing the church from a third-party location.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape, would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB40 - Wootton Hall and Adjoining Screen Wall (1204691)

Setting

The Listed Building is located approximately 9.6km to the west of the Proposed Development to the north of the settlement of Wootton. The hall is set within estate grounds including gardens and woodland. This woodland provides an enclosed setting to the feature and restricts all views to and from the feature and as such, it does not have prominence or influence in the wider landscape.

Assessment of Impacts

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. Due to the woodland that surrounds the Listed Building and the distance from the Proposed Development, the Proposed Development would not be visible from or in conjunction with the Listed Building. As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape, would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting.

The sensitivity of the feature is high. There is no magnitude of change and therefore the level of effect is **none**.

LB41 – Church of St John the Evangelist (1204608)

Setting

The church is located approximately 9.6km to the south-west of the Proposed Development in the settlement of Croxton. The church is set within a churchyard of grassland cover surrounded by woodland. The church tower provides a sense of prominence in the wider landscape which can be seen on approach to the settlement.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines theoretically visible at tip and hub level. However, due to the presence of woodland that surrounds the church, visibility is unlikely to occur, brief visibility may occur from breaks in the woodland, however this would be rare, and any visibility would be seen in conjunction with existing port infrastructure. Due to the distance, this visibility would not be prominent or distracting and would be in keeping with the current baseline setting.

Due to the distance, the settlement would screen all visibility of the Proposed Development when looking towards the church and as such intervisibility from third-party locations would be unlikely to occur.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting of the feature would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting or the ability to understand these.

The sensitivity of the feature is high, the magnitude of change is considered to be negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect which is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause **'less than substantial harm'** to the setting of the RPG in terms of NPPF.

RPG01 – Brocklesby Park (1000971)

Setting

Brocklesby Park RPG is located approximately 5.3km to the south-west of the Proposed Development at the closest point. The RPG covers a large area between Caistor in the south and Harbrough in the north. Brocklesby Hall is situated at the northern end of the designation and there are a number of Listed Buildings scattered throughout the designated area. The RPG is largely comprised of woodland and grassland with some formal garden areas.

Assessment of Impact

The ZTV predicts visibility of the Proposed Development with both turbines visible at various levels from different locations throughout the RPG. However, due to the dense woodland that comprise much of the RPG, this visibility will be restricted and will likely only occur along the eastern side of the RPG as illustrated in **LVIA Viewpoint 11**. The Proposed Development would be a minor feature in the setting of the RPG and would not detract from the setting of the RPG. These views would be rare and as such would not detract from the ability to appreciate the setting of the RPG.

As such, the introduction of the Proposed Development into the wider landscape setting of the feature would not detract from the ability to appreciate the feature and its setting or the ability to understand these.

The sensitivity of the feature is high, the magnitude of change is considered to be negligible resulting in a **moderate/minor** level of effect which is not significant. As such, the Proposed Development is considered likely to cause **'less than substantial harm'** to the setting of the Listed Building in terms of NPPF.



Registered Office

Green Cat Renewables
Stobo House
Roslin
Midlothian
EH25 9RE

+44 (0) 131 541 0060

info@greencatrenewables.co.uk
www.greencatrenewables.co.uk