

3. Cultural Heritage

Introduction

- 3.1 This Chapter reports the outcome of the assessment of likely significant environmental effects arising from the Proposed Development in relation to Cultural Heritage.
- 3.2 The Chapter describes the consultation undertaken, the scope and methodology of assessment, baseline conditions, the assessment of likely significant effects during construction and operational stages, mitigation measures, and residual effects.
- 3.3 The assessment follows the approach established in **Chapter 1** and builds on the scope and methodology established in the 2025 ES.

Summary of Consultation

- 3.4 **Table 3.1** provides an overview of consultation undertaken to inform this assessment.

Table 3.1: Summary of Technical Consultation

Consultee	Date	Summary of Discussion	Influence on Assessment
Basingstoke and Deane Historic Environment Team	22 September 2025	The Councils Historic Environment Team raised concerns over the Proposed Development's impact to the setting of selected designated and non-designated heritage assets.	An updated assessment of the impacts upon the significance of the following heritage assets, has been provided within this report Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.1 (Heritage Statement): • Monk Sherborne Conservation Area. • Sherborne St John Conservation Area. • All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne (Grade I Listed Building). • Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm (Scheduled Monument). • Rookery Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building) • Appletree Cottage (Grade II Listed Building). • Eastrop Cottage (Grade II Listed Building). • Thames Dell (Grade II Listed Building).

Consultee	Date	Summary of Discussion	Influence on Assessment
			• Monk Sherborne War Memorial (Grade II Listed Building). • Manor Farm (Non-Designated Heritage Asset). • Queen's Cottages (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).
Historic England	27 August 2025	Historic England provided a written consultation response advising on the potential impact on All Saints Church (Grade I listed building) and Keyhole Enclosure (scheduled monument). They concluded the level of harm to these heritage assets would be very low.	Additional assessment has been provided for these assets based upon the revised plans within this report Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.1 (Heritage Statement).

Scope of the Assessment

3.5 The scope of assessment for Cultural Heritage was established through the EIA Scoping process. The EIA Scoping Report was submitted to BDBC in February 2023, and the EIA Scoping Opinion was received in June 2023.

3.6 The scope of assessment has been updated since the EIA Scoping stage as detailed below, with justification provided for changes.

Effects Scoped Out

3.7 The following effects were scoped out of detailed assessment and are not considered further in this Chapter:

Impacts on the settings of non-designated cultural heritage assets and features beyond 2km

3.8 Assets beyond 2km from the Site are generally considered less sensitive to changes in their settings, and are therefore judged to be unlikely to be subject to significant settings effects.

3.9 ***Impacts on the settings of heritage assets located out with the Zone of Theoretical Visibility*** Assets outside of the ZTV are unlikely to be adversely impacted by the Proposed Development. However, where appropriate, consideration will be given to

the potential for views of assets which include the Proposed Development, even where the asset itself lies out with the ZTV.

Impacts on the settings of heritage assets beyond 2km of the Site boundary

- 3.10 Assets beyond 2km from the Site boundary will be too far distant to have their settings significantly adversely affected by the Proposed Development, and are therefore scoped out of this chapter.

Effects Scoped In

- 3.11 The following effects (**Table 3.2**) were considered likely to be significant and are reported within this Chapter. The location of sensitive receptors are illustrated on the Heritage Asset Plan included within the Heritage Statement, **Appendix 3.1**.

Table 3.2: Likely Significant Effects for Assessment

Effect	Receptor(s)	Applicable Stage(s)
Effect on Heritage Significance, including Setting	Monk Sherborne Conservation Area.	Construction and Operation
	Sherborne St John Conservation Area	
	Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm (Scheduled Monument).	
	All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne (Grade I Listed Building).	
	Rookery Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	
	Appletree Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).	
	Eastrop Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).	
	Thames Dell (Grade II Listed Building).	
	Monk Sherborne War Memorial (Grade II Listed Building).	
Change to the character and appearance of the conservation area	Manor Farm (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).	Construction and Operation
	Queen's Cottages (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).	
	Sherborne St John Conservation Area	

Assessment Methodology

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance

- 3.12 The following legislation and national and local planning policy and guidance has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 3.1: Heritage Statement.**

Legislative Context

- 3.13 The relevant legislative context includes:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended) (UK Government, 1979)ⁱ; and
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (UK Government, 1990)ⁱⁱ.

Policy Context

- 3.14 The relevant policy context includes:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026)ⁱⁱⁱ;
- Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2016)^{iv};
- Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Update 2021 to 2040 Draft for Regulation 18 Consultation (2024)^v; and
- Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2024 to 2042 Draft Spatial Strategy Regulation 18 Consultation (2025)^{vi}.

Guidance and Best Practice

- 3.15 The following guidance / advice has also informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter:

- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)^{vii};
- Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning (GPA) Note 2 'Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment' (2015)^{viii};
- Historic England GPA3 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' 2nd Edition (2017)^{ix};
- Historic England Advice Note 12: Statements of Heritage Significance (2019)^x;
- Historic England: Advice Note 1: Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management 2019 (2nd Edition)^{xi};
- Historic England Advice Note 7: 'Local Heritage Listing' 3rd Edition (2026)^{xii};
- Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA): Principles for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (2021)^{xiii}; and

- Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), LA 106: Cultural Heritage Assessment (2020)^{xiv}.

Study Area

- 3.16 The Cultural Heritage Study area expands upon the 2025 ES. The study area comprises heritage assets identified by Basingstoke and Deane Historic Environment Team where there is a potential for the Proposed Development to result in a significant effect.. These are illustrated on the Heritage Asset Plan included within the Heritage Statement, **Appendix 3.1**.
- 3.17 The 2025 ES study area for the assessment includes both the Site and heritage assets within a 2km radius of the Site.

Baseline Data Collection

- 3.18 **Table 3.3** summarises all studies/surveys/analysis/evaluations undertaken to inform the assessment presented within this Chapter.

Table 3.3: Summary of Baseline Data

Study / Survey / Analysis / Evaluation	Overview	Date of Completion
Desk-Based Heritage Assessment	Identification of assets with potential to be affected (significant and not significant) confirmed through a search of desk based resources.	January to March 2026
Site Survey	To undertake a site visual assessment of the study area and identified heritage assets. Including views from public areas.	20 January 2026
Heritage Statement	An NPPF compliant Heritage Statement has been prepared in support of the Application (Appendix 3.1). This has been carried out in light of the statutory duty of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, relevant policies of the NPPF and National Planning Practice Guidance for the historic environment. The Heritage Statement has identified heritage assets with potential to be affected, described their significance and setting and assessed the impact of the Proposed Development upon that significance. It has also considered other heritage	January to July 2026

Study / Survey / Analysis / Evaluation	Overview	Date of Completion
	assets unlikely to experience a significant effect.	
Views Assessment	Contribution to identification of viewpoints (from a heritage perspective).	January to February 2026

Assessment Process

- 3.19 The assessment within this Chapter has considered construction and operation stages. Decommissioning has not been assessed separately in detail, as any effects associated with the removal of the Proposed Development are anticipated to be temporary and broadly comparable in nature, extent and duration to those identified for the construction phase. It is therefore reasonable to assume that decommissioning effects would not give rise to materially different landscape and visual effects from those already assessed for construction.
- 3.20 This Chapter assesses the potential for significant effects to heritage assets resulting from the Proposed Development following primary and tertiary mitigation, in accordance with IEMA guidance^{xv}. The Cultural Heritage ES Chapter undertakes the following:
- Assesses the significance of the identified heritage assets and the contribution of setting to that significance.
 - Identifies those heritage assets with a potential to experience a significant effect at the construction and operational stages of the Proposed Development.
 - Identifies and defines the magnitude of change arising from the Proposed Development and the severity of the effects on those identified assets.
 - Identifies mitigation to avoid or minimise adverse effects where possible in a way that meets the requirement of the NPPF.
 - Assesses the impact of the Proposed Development and its effect on the significance of heritage assets, taking into consideration any mitigation proposed.
- 3.21 The assessment utilises the matrix in **Table 3.6** below to measure both receptor sensitivity (value/ importance) and magnitude of change/ impact to produce an assessment of the significance of the effect of the Proposed Development on identified cultural heritage assets.
- 3.22 The assessment of cultural heritage is a qualitative one, and the evaluation of Sensitivity (**Table 3.4**), Magnitude of Change (**Table 3.5**) and Level of Effect (**Table 3.6**) is ultimately a matter of professional judgement.

Reporting the Environmental Effects and Significance

- 3.23 The following sections define the approach adopted within the assessment for the determination of sensitivity (or value/importance), magnitude of change (or impact), the level of effect and significance.

Sensitivity

- 3.24 The sensitivity of receptors has been determined as High, Medium, Low or Negligible.
- 3.25 The following **Table 3.4** is taken from the guidance set out in the DMRB.

Table 3.4: Receptor sensitivity criteria

Sensitivity	Criteria
High	• Sites of international importance, such as World Heritage Sites; • Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings • Grade I and Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens • Scheduled Monuments • Registered battlefields • Conservation Areas containing heritage assets of exceptional interest
Medium	• Grade II listed Buildings • Conservation Areas • Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens • Undesignated buildings, monuments, sites, or landscapes that can be demonstrated to have heritage value; equivalent to the designation criteria
Low	• Locally listed buildings as recorded on a local authority list • Undesignated buildings, monuments, sites, or landscapes that can be demonstrated to have heritage value equivalent to the local listing criteria
Negligible	• Buildings, monuments, sites, or landscapes identified as being of very low or no historic, evidential, aesthetic, or communal interest

Magnitude of Change

- 3.26 The magnitude of change has been considered as the change experienced from the current baseline conditions and has been considered on a scale of Large, Medium, Small or Negligible.
- 3.27 In considering the potential magnitude of an impact, a professional judgement has been made about the receptor's susceptibility to change as a result of the Proposed Development. **Table 3.5** below sets out criteria which have been used to determine the magnitude of change.

Table 3.5: Magnitude of change criteria

Magnitude of Change	Criteria
Large	Change to the asset, such that it is totally altered or destroyed. Comprehensive change to the setting.
Medium	Change to the asset, such that it is significantly modified. Change to the setting such that it is significantly modified.
Small	Slight changes to the heritage asset or elements or setting that hardly affect it.
Negligible	No change to the significance of the heritage asset or its setting that materially affects an appreciation of that significance. Effects at this level are not material in the decision-making process.

Level of Effect

- 3.28 The level of effect has been informed by the sensitivity of the receptor and magnitude of change. The level of effect has been determined using professional judgement, with **Table 3.6** (reproduced from **Chapter 1**) used as a tool to assist with this process. The level of effect is expressed as Major, Moderate, Minor or Negligible.
- 3.29 Whilst **Table 3.6** provides ranges, the level of effect is confirmed as a single level and not a range, informed by professional judgement.

Table 3.6: Matrix of effects

Magnitude of change	Sensitivity (or value/importance)				
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
	Large	Major	Moderate to Major	Minor to Moderate	Negligible
	Medium	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Small	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor	Negligible
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

- 3.30 For each effect assessed, the following characteristics have been considered and reported:
- Whether the effect is adverse or beneficial;
 - Whether the effect is direct or indirect;
 - Whether the effect is permanent or temporary; and

- The duration of the effect (short-term, medium-term, or long-term).

Significance

- 3.31 For each effect, a statement has been made as to whether the level of effect is 'Significant' or 'Not Significant'. This determination has been based on professional judgement and/or relevant guidance/legislation where applicable.
- 3.32 Significance has only been concluded for residual effects (i.e. following the identification of secondary mitigation).

Baseline Conditions

- 3.33 This section describes the Cultural Heritage baseline that has informed the assessment for the 2026 ES. This expands upon the 2025 ES, Chapter 3 Cultural Heritage.
- 3.34 The EIA Scoping Opinion stated that there was the potential for impacts upon the significance of several designated and non-designated heritage assets. Heritage assets identified as requiring additional assessment are set out below and illustrated on the Heritage Asset Plan included within the Heritage Statement, **Appendix 3.1**:

- Monk Sherborne Conservation Area.
- Sherborne St John Conservation Area.
- Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm (Scheduled Monument).
- All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne (Grade I Listed Building).
- Rookery Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)
- Appletree Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).
- Eastrop Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).
- Thames Dell (Grade II Listed Building).
- Monk Sherborne War Memorial (Grade II Listed Building).
- Manor Farm (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).
- Queen's Cottages (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).

- 3.35 The heritage receptors identified above were assessed in the Heritage Statement **Appendix 3.1**.

Summary of Built Heritage Sensitivity

- 3.36 **Table 3.7** confirms the receptors scoped into this Cultural Heritage EIA assessment and their sensitivity.

Table 3.7: Sensitivity of Built Heritage Receptors

Built Heritage Asset	Sensitivity
Monk Sherborne Conservation Area.	Medium
Sherborne St John Conservation Area	Medium
All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne (Grade I Listed Building).	High
Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm (Scheduled Monument).	High
Rookery Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium
Appletree Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).	Medium
Eastrop Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).	Medium
Thames Dell (Grade II Listed Building).	Medium
Monk Sherborne War Memorial (Grade II Listed Building).	Medium
Manor Farm (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).	Low
Queen's Cottages (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).	Low

Future Baseline

- 3.37 In the absence of the Proposed Development the Site would continue under its existing agricultural use, therefore there are no anticipated changes to the Cultural Heritage future baseline.

Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

- 3.38 The assessment within this Chapter takes account of mitigation that is either inherent in the design of the Proposed Development (primary mitigation) or will be implemented through standard practice or statutory requirements (tertiary mitigation), as described in **Chapter 2**.
- 3.39 The following measures have been taken into account in the assessment of effects:

Construction

- 3.40 The following primary and tertiary mitigation which have been evaluated as part of the construction phase assessment are outlined below:
- 3.41 At the construction stage, potential heritage setting and visual effects arising from the construction operations would be mitigated through the use of site hoardings, tree and hedgerow protection measures, management of construction traffic, control of

working hours and other appropriate housekeeping on the Site in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Operation

3.42 The primary and tertiary mitigation measures embedded in the Proposed Development, and which have been evaluated as part of the operation phase assessment are outlined below:

- **Respect for Landscape Character and Openness** - The design aims to conserve the inherent openness and expansive character of the chalk downland landscape, avoiding the introduction of features or planting that would result in undue enclosure or suburbanisation.
- **Topography-Led Layout** - The siting of solar arrays responds directly to the gently rolling landform, with development directed towards lower-lying and less visually prominent areas, and away from skylines and elevated ground.
- **Minimisation of Visual Effects through Siting** - The design establishes sensitive placement of infrastructure, rather than reliance on extensive new planting. Existing landform and vegetation would be utilised to reduce intervisibility and visual intrusion.
- **Protection and Enhancement of Existing Landscape Features** - Established hedgerows, tree belts and woodland would be retained and enhanced where appropriate, with measures focused on strengthening structure, improving condition, and infilling gaps in a manner consistent with local character.
- **Avoidance of Incongruous Mitigation Measures** - Proposed landscape interventions would reflect traditional land management practices and consider the established landscape character of the Site including those characteristics identified in aforementioned landscape character appraisals. In particular, excessive hedgerow heights or substantial woodland belts that are uncharacteristic of the chalkland landscape shall be avoided.
- **Targeted Landscape Enhancement** - Where mitigation planting is required, it shall be localised and proportionate, focusing on reinforcing existing features (e.g. hedgerows and tree belts) rather than introducing new large-scale planting blocks.
- **Protection of Key Views and Visual Receptors** - The layout seeks to minimise effects on sensitive visual receptors, including:
 - Views to and from the Church of All Saints and its setting;
 - Views from the North Wessex Downs National Landscape; and
 - Public rights of way, particularly St James' Way.

- **Setback from Sensitive Boundaries and Routes** - Solar arrays would be offset from visually sensitive edges, including road corridors and footpaths, to maintain a sense of openness and reduce perceived visual dominance.
- **Reduction of Intervisibility** - In areas of weak landscape structure, opportunities would be taken to reduce intervisibility through subtle enhancement of existing vegetation, including hedgerow reinforcement and understorey planting.
- **Reinforcement of Historic Landscape Pattern** - Where appropriate, the reinstatement of historic field boundaries is proposed to break up the scale of the Proposed Development and improve landscape integration.
- **Integration with the Wider Landscape Context** - The Proposed Development has regard to its role within the setting of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, ensuring that design decisions align with relevant management objectives, including those relating to landscape character and visual quality.

Assessment of Effects

Construction Stage

3.43 The principal activities that will have an effect upon heritage assets during the construction stage include:

- Formation of construction access(s) and temporary construction compound (within the Site);
- Site preparation works, including clearance works;
- Construction of solar array and associated infrastructure (i.e. services and plant); and
- Implementation of proposed landscaping.

Change to the setting of the Monk Sherborne Conservation Area

3.44 The construction stage activities would be located to the south of Monk Sherborne Conservation Area in the wider landscape setting and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. Due to the topography and established landscape, such as hedgerows and trees, the majority of the construction stage activities will not be visible from the conservation area. Where visible, these will be localised changes.

3.45 The sensitivity of Monk Sherborne Conservation Area is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Secondary Mitigation

3.46 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

3.47 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Monk Sherborne Conservation Area is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

- 3.48 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of the Sherborne St John Conservation Area

- 3.49 The majority of works would be located in the wider landscape setting and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. Due to the topography and established landscape, such as hedgerows and trees, the majority of the construction stage activities will not be visible from the conservation area. Where visible, these will be localised changes, temporary in nature.

- 3.50 The sensitivity of Sherborne St John Conservation Area is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.51 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.52 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Sherborne St John Conservation Area is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

- 3.53 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the Character and Appearance of the Sherborne St John Conservation Area

- 3.54 The construction stage activities include excavation of cable routes within the Sherborne St John Conservation Area and therefore would have a direct effect on the character and appearance of the area.

- 3.55 The construction works will be restricted to the existing highways. The highway surface is modern in character and regularly require excavation for repair and resurfacing. The construction works will be temporary in nature and upon completion the road will be resurfaced to its existing appearance. These works will not effect the qualities of the conservation area which form its character and appearance for heritage assessment.

- 3.56 The sensitivity of Sherborne St John Conservation Area is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an direct, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.57 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.58 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Sherborne St John Conservation Area is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

- 3.59 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of the All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne (Grade I Listed Building)

- 3.60 The construction stage activities would take place in the wider landscape setting of All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne Grade I Listed Building and therefore would have an

indirect effect on the heritage asset. Due to the topography and established landscape, such as hedgerows and trees, the majority of the construction stage activities will not be visible from the listed building. Where visible, these will be localised changes.

- 3.61 The sensitivity of All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne Grade I Listed Building is considered to be High. The magnitude of change is considered to be Small. The effect would therefore be minor to moderate, however, due to the limited nature of the effect on overall setting and the heritage interests of the asset, the effect is considered to be minor. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.62 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.63 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne Grade I Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.64 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm (Scheduled Monument)

- 3.65 The construction stage activities would be in the wider landscape setting of the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm Scheduled Monument and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. The existing setting makes a very limited contribution to the value of the heritage asset due to the level of change in the landscape since the construction of the monument. The construction works will be located to the north of the monument and there will be a level of separation where the existing open agricultural field will remain.
- 3.66 The sensitivity of the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm Scheduled Monument is considered to be High. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.67 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.68 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm Scheduled Monument is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.69 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Rookery Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.70 The construction stage activities would be in the wider landscape setting of Rookery Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. Due to the topography and established landscape, such as hedgerows

and trees, the majority of the construction stage activities will not be visible from the listed building. Should construction activities be visible, these will be limited localised changes in the wider landscape.

- 3.71 The sensitivity of Rookery Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.72 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.73 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Rookery Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.74 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Appletree Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.75 The construction stage activities would be in the wider landscape setting of Appletree Cottage Grade II Listed Building and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. Due to the topography and established landscape, such as hedgerows and trees, the majority of the construction stage activities will not be visible from the listed building. Should construction activities be visible, these will be limited localised changes in the wider landscape.

- 3.76 The sensitivity of Appletree Cottage Grade II Listed Building is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.77 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.78 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Appletree Cottage Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.79 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Eastrop Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.80 The construction stage activities would be in the wider landscape setting of Eastrop Cottage Grade II Listed Building and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. Due to the topography and established landscape, such as hedgerows and trees, the majority of the construction stage activities will not be visible from the listed building. Should construction activities be visible, these will be limited localised changes in the wider landscape.

- 3.81 The sensitivity of Eastrop Cottage Grade II Listed Building is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.82 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.83 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Eastrop Cottage Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

- 3.84 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Thames Dell (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.85 The construction stage activities would be in the wider landscape setting of Thames Dell Grade II Listed Building and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. Due to the topography and established landscape, such as hedgerows and trees, the majority of the construction stage activities will not be visible from the listed building. Should construction activities be visible, these will be limited localised changes in the wider landscape.

- 3.86 The sensitivity of Thames Dell Grade II Listed Building is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.87 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.88 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Thames Dell Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

- 3.89 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Monk Sherborne War Memorial (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.90 The construction stage activities would be in the wider landscape setting of Monk Sherborne War Memorial Grade II Listed Building and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. Due to the topography and established landscape, such as hedgerows and trees, the majority of the construction stage activities will not be visible from the listed building. Should construction activities be visible, these will be limited localised changes in the wider landscape.

- 3.91 The sensitivity of Monk Sherborne War Memorial Grade II Listed Building is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.92 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

3.93 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Monk Sherborne War Memorial Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

3.94 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Manor Farm (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).

3.95 The construction stage activities would be in the landscape setting of Manor Farm Non-Designated Heritage Asset and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. Construction activities will be partially visible to the south of Manor Farm, however, this will be limited and localised in character. Screening from existing hedgerows and trees will limit visibility of the construction activities and the wider landscape, including areas to the north and surrounding, would remain agricultural in character.

3.96 The sensitivity of Manor Farm Non-Designated Heritage Asset is considered to be Low. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible to Minor.

Secondary Mitigation

3.97 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

3.98 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Manor Farm Non-Designated Heritage Asset is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

3.99 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Queen's Cottages (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).

3.100 The construction stage activities would be in the landscape setting of Queen's Cottages Non-Designated Heritage Asset and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset. Construction activities will be partially visible from Queen's Cottages, however, this will be limited and localised in character. Screening from existing hedgerows and trees will limit visibility of the construction activities and the wider landscape, which would remain agricultural in character.

3.101 The sensitivity of Queen's Cottages Non-Designated Heritage Asset is considered to be Low. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible to Minor.

Secondary Mitigation

3.102 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

3.103 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Queen's Cottages Non-Designated Heritage Asset is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

3.104 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Operation Stage

Change to the setting of the Monk Sherborne Conservation Area

3.105 The Proposed Development would be located to the south of Monk Sherborne Conservation Area in the wider landscape setting and therefore would have an indirect effect on the heritage asset.

3.106 The submitted Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) (Included within Chapter 2: Figure 2.6) demonstrates that visibility of the proposals from within the Monk Sherborne Conservation Area would be limited. The Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) (included within Chapter 2: Appendix 2.1) indicate that the Proposed Development would be experienced principally in glimpsed views from the southern approach to the village along Rookery Farm Lane and from limited locations at the edge of the Conservation Area. Existing mature hedgerows, roadside vegetation, gently rising topography, and the enclosed character of the surrounding landscape substantially restrict intervisibility between the Site and the historic core of the village. Once within the Conservation Area, the Proposed Development would not form a prominent component of the principal views through or within the historic settlement.

3.107 The Proposed Development would not be visible from the majority of the conservation area due to the topography and established landscape, such as hedgerows and trees. Where visible, the Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into a landscape that is currently characterised by open agricultural fields and a hedgerow-defined field pattern. The extent of effect would be moderated by the relatively low height of the PV arrays, and the retention of existing field boundaries and vegetation. However, to a limited degree this would change the historic character of the agricultural land.

3.108 Whilst the Proposed Development would give rise to a limited change within part of the wider rural setting of the Monk Sherborne Conservation Area, the contribution made by the Site to the significance of the Conservation Area is itself limited and principally contextual. The characteristics that make the greatest contribution to the Conservation Area's significance, including its historic settlement pattern, mature vegetation, enclosed rural character, and relationship between the dispersed settlement clusters, would remain legible and readily appreciable. Accordingly, the magnitude of change would be small.

3.109 The sensitivity of Monk Sherborne Conservation Area is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Minor.

Secondary Mitigation

3.110 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

3.111 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Monk Sherborne Conservation Area is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

3.112 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of the Sherborne St John Conservation Area

3.113 The Proposed Development is located to the west of Sherborne St John Conservation Area within agricultural land beyond the historic settlement.

3.114 The submitted ZTV and AVRs demonstrate that the Proposed Development would not be readily visible from within the Sherborne St John Conservation Area (see **Chapter 2: Figure 2.6** and **Appendix 2.1**). The Site is separated from the historic settlement by intervening agricultural land, mature hedgerows, woodland, changes in topography, and later development along the western edge of Sherborne St John. Whilst limited glimpsed views may be available from the edge of the settlement, the Proposed Development would not be experienced within the principal streets, spaces, or key views that contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.

3.115 The Proposed Development would therefore not alter the character or appreciation of the historic village core, its relationship with the Wey Brook, its principal open spaces, or the experience of its vernacular buildings and historic settlement pattern. The rural setting of the Sherborne St John Conservation Area would remain readily appreciable, with the Site continuing to be perceived as part of the wider agricultural landscape beyond the settlement edge. The retention of existing vegetation, supplementary landscape planting, and the contained nature of the Proposed Development would further limit visibility over time.

3.116 The sensitivity of Sherborne St John Conservation Area is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

3.117 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

3.118 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Sherborne St John Conservation Area is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

3.119 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the Character and Appearance of the Sherborne St John Conservation Area

3.120 The proposals include cable routes that are located within Sherborne St John Conservation Area, located on the route of the existing highway. The highway will be resurfaced to its existing appearance following construction. Should works be required during operation, they would be temporary in nature. These works will not affect the qualities of the conservation area which form its character and appearance for heritage assessment.

3.121 The sensitivity of Sherborne St John Conservation Area is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.122 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.123 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Sherborne St John Conservation Area is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.124 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of the All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne (Grade I Listed Building)

- 3.125 The Proposed Development is located within agricultural land to the south-west of the All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne Grade I Listed Building. The Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into a landscape that is currently characterised by open agricultural fields and a hedgerow-defined field pattern. However, the All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne Grade I Listed Building derives its heritage interest principally from its exceptional architectural and historic interest as a largely intact medieval parish church, together with its immediate setting comprising the churchyard, mature trees, Manor Farm, and the historic road network. Although the church occupies a rural location, it no longer forms the focus of the village, with later settlement having developed further north. Consequently, the wider agricultural landscape makes only a limited contribution to the significance of the listed building beyond reinforcing its rural context.
- 3.126 Visibility of the Proposed Development would be limited. Existing mature hedgerows, trees, gently rising topography and the enclosed nature of the surrounding landscape substantially restrict views towards the Site, with only a limited extent of the northern part of the Proposed Development potentially perceptible from parts of the churchyard. The Proposed Development would not interrupt or compete with the appreciation of the church's principal architectural qualities or its immediate relationship with the churchyard, Manor Farm, and the surrounding historic lanes.
- 3.127 Whilst the Proposed Development would result in a localised change to the historic character of the surrounding agricultural landscape, it would not alter those elements of setting that make the greatest contribution to its significance. The intimate character of the church's immediate setting would remain unchanged and the relationship between the church, its churchyard, Manor Farm, and the surrounding historic landscape would continue to be readily understood. Existing hedgerows would be retained, with additional native planting providing further landscape containment and reducing visibility over time.
- 3.128 The sensitivity of All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne Grade I Listed Building is considered to be High. The magnitude of change is considered to be Small. The effect would therefore be minor to moderate, however, due to the limited nature of the effect on overall setting and the heritage interests of the asset, the effect is considered to be minor. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Minor.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.129 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.130 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne Grade I Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.131 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm (Scheduled Monument)

- 3.132 The Proposed Development is located within agricultural land forming part of the wider landscape surrounding the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm Scheduled Monument. The Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into a landscape that is currently characterised by open agricultural fields and a hedgerow-defined field pattern. The Scheduled Monument itself would not be physically affected by the Proposed Development, with no development proposed within its scheduled area.
- 3.133 The significance of the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm Scheduled Monument derives principally from its archaeological and evidential interest, reflecting the potential survival of buried prehistoric remains capable of contributing to an understanding of Iron Age activity and landscape organisation. Whilst the Scheduled Monument occupies a rural landscape today, its significance is not principally derived from the present-day agricultural setting, which has evolved considerably since the prehistoric period. Instead, the contribution of setting relates primarily to the Scheduled Monument's topographic position within the wider landscape and its relationship with other archaeological remains and natural features.
- 3.134 The Proposed Development would not affect the archaeological resource itself or prejudice the ability to understand the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm Scheduled Monument's evidential value. Whilst the Proposed Development would give rise to a limited change within part of the wider rural setting of the Scheduled Monument, it would not alter those elements of setting that make the greatest contribution to its significance. The extent of effect would be moderated by the separation of the Proposed Development, relatively low height of the PV arrays, and the retention of existing field boundaries, vegetation and additional landscaping. Whilst the Proposed Development would remain reversible, allowing the Site to be returned to agricultural use following decommissioning, during the operational stage the rural character of the surrounding landscape will be changed to a limited degree.
- 3.135 The sensitivity of the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm Scheduled Monument is considered to be High. The magnitude of change is considered to be Small. The effect would therefore be minor to moderate, however, due to the limited nature of the effect on overall setting and the heritage interests of the asset, the effect is considered to be minor. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Minor.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.136 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.137 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for the Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm Scheduled Monument is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.138 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Rookery Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.139 The Proposed Development is located within agricultural land to the south of Rookery Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building. The Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into a landscape that is currently characterised by open agricultural fields and a hedgerow-defined field pattern. Rookery Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building derives principally from its early 19th century architectural character, surviving historic fabric, and its immediate relationship with the associated farmstead buildings, farmyard spaces, and Rookery Farm Lane. Whilst the wider agricultural landscape contributes to an understanding of the farmhouse's historic agricultural function, its significance is experienced principally within its immediate farmstead setting.
- 3.140 The farmhouse has a strongly enclosed setting. Mature hedgerows, trees, and associated agricultural buildings substantially restrict views between the Site and the listed building, such that the Proposed Development would not be experienced in direct or prominent association with the farmhouse. The Site is not visible from the principal publicly accessible views of the listed building, and the immediate rural character of the farmstead would remain unchanged.
- 3.141 The Proposed Development would therefore not affect those aspects of setting that make the greatest contribution to the significance of Rookery Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building. Its immediate farmstead context, historic relationship with associated buildings, and appreciation as a historic agricultural complex would remain readily legible. Existing field boundaries would be retained, additional landscape planting would reinforce the enclosed character of the surrounding landscape, and the wider agricultural setting of the farmhouse would continue to be understood. Owing to the enclosed nature of its immediate setting, the limited contribution made by the Site to its significance, and the absence of meaningful intervisibility between the Site and the listed building the magnitude of change would be negligible.
- 3.142 The sensitivity of Rookery Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.143 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.144 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Rookery Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.145 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Appletree Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.146 The Proposed Development is located within agricultural land to the south of Appletree Cottage Grade II Listed Building. The Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into a landscape that is currently characterised by open agricultural fields and a hedgerow-defined field pattern. The setting of Appletree Cottage Grade II Listed Building is associated with its relationship with neighbouring cottages, the village of Monk Sherborne and broadly rural character. Although the wider agricultural landscape contributes to their rural context, the Site contributes only in a broad contextual sense.
- 3.147 The submitted AVRs (included within **Chapter 2: Appendix 2.1**) demonstrate that the Proposed Development would not be visible in views to or from the listed building. Owing to the gently rising topography between the Site and the cottages, together with mature hedgerows and vegetation, there is no meaningful intervisibility between the Site and the heritage asset. Consequently, the Proposed Development would not affect the appreciation of the rural setting of the Appletree Cottage Grade II Listed Building.
- 3.148 The sensitivity of Appletree Cottage is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.149 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.150 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Appletree Cottage Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.151 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Eastrop Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.152 The Proposed Development is located within agricultural land to the south of Eastrop Cottage Grade II Listed Building. The Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into a landscape that is currently characterised by open agricultural fields and a hedgerow-defined field pattern. The setting of Eastrop Cottage Grade II Listed Building is associated with its relationship with neighbouring cottages, the village of Monk Sherborne and broadly rural character. Although the wider agricultural landscape contributes to their rural context, the Site contributes only in a broad contextual sense.
- 3.153 The submitted AVRs (included within **Chapter 2: Appendix 2.1**) demonstrate that the Proposed Development would not be visible in views to or from the listed building. Owing to the gently rising topography between the Site and the cottages, together with mature hedgerows and vegetation, there is no meaningful intervisibility between the Site and the heritage asset. Consequently, the Proposed Development would not affect the appreciation of the rural setting of the Eastrop Cottage Grade II Listed Building.
- 3.154 The sensitivity of Eastrop Cottage Grade II Listed Building is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.155 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.156 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Eastrop Cottage Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.157 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Thames Dell (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.158 The Proposed Development is located within agricultural land to the south-west of Thames Dell Grade II Listed Building. The Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into a landscape that is currently characterised by open agricultural fields and a hedgerow-defined field pattern.
- 3.159 The heritage interest of Thames Dell Grade II Listed Building is derived principally from its architectural interest and its immediate domestic setting. Although the wider rural landscape contributes to an appreciation of the building's historic context, the Site contributes in only a limited sense as wider rural agricultural land, owing to the intervening distance, mature vegetation, and enclosed nature of the listed building's setting.
- 3.160 The submitted AVRs (included within **Chapter 2: Appendix 2.1**) demonstrate that only the lowest level of theoretical visibility between the Proposed Development and Thames Dell Grade II Listed Building. The intervening topography and mature hedgerows and vegetation would restrict intervisibility, such that the Proposed Development would not interrupt important views to or from the listed building, nor would the appreciation of its architectural character or immediate domestic setting be affected. The aspects of setting that contribute to the significance of Thames Dell Grade II Listed Building would overall be preserved.
- 3.161 The sensitivity of Thames Dell Grade II Listed Building is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.162 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.163 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Thames Dell Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.164 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Monk Sherborne War Memorial (Grade II Listed Building).

- 3.165 The Proposed Development is located within agricultural land to the south of Monk Sherborne War Memorial Grade II Listed Building. The Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into a landscape that is currently characterised by open agricultural fields and a hedgerow-defined field pattern.

- 3.166 Monk Sherborne War Memorial Grade II Listed Building heritage interest derives principally from its architectural and commemorative interest, together with its prominent location at the junction of Monk Sherborne Road and Salters Heath Road, where it continues to function as a focal point for public remembrance. Its immediate setting at the road junction contributes to an appreciation of these values through its visibility, accessibility, and relationship with the surrounding village. The wider rural landscape setting does not directly contribute to the heritage interests of the listed building aside from a broad contextual sense.
- 3.167 The submitted AVRs (included within **Chapter 2: Appendix 2.1**) and site observations demonstrate that the Proposed Development would not be experienced in direct association with the war memorial. Existing mature hedgerows, roadside vegetation, and the enclosed character of the surrounding landscape substantially limit views towards the Site from the memorial and its immediate setting. The proposals would therefore not affect the appreciation of the memorial's architectural form, commemorative role, or function as a landmark within the village.
- 3.168 Whilst the Site forms part of the wider rural landscape surrounding Monk Sherborne, the significance of the war memorial is not principally derived from its relationship with the surrounding agricultural land. The Proposed Development would not alter the memorial's immediate setting or its continued appreciation as a place of remembrance.
- 3.169 The sensitivity of Monk Sherborne War Memorial Grade II Listed Building is considered to be Medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be Negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.170 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.171 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Monk Sherborne War Memorial Grade II Listed Building is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.172 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Manor Farm (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).

- 3.173 The Proposed Development is located within agricultural land historically associated with Manor Farm Non-Designated Heritage Asset. The significance of the locally listed Manor Farm Buildings derives principally from their architectural interest as a coherent group of domestic agricultural buildings. These have an economic and historical association with the surrounding farmland. Together, the buildings, farmyard spaces, and adjoining agricultural land illustrate the historic organisation and operation of a working farm that contributes positively to the heritage interest of the building.
- 3.174 The Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into land historically associated with Manor Farm Non-Designated Heritage Asset, resulting in a change to the character of part of its wider agricultural setting. Whilst the land would remain in associated use with Manor Farm, the introduction of

solar arrays and associated infrastructure would introduce a modern engineered element into part of the historic agricultural landscape, in contrast with traditional agricultural practices. This would partially erode the coherence of the rural landscape associated with the farmstead and the legibility of the historic functional relationship between Manor Farm Non-Designated Heritage Asset and its associated surrounding agricultural land.

- 3.175 The Proposed Development would not affect the historic fabric of the buildings, the immediate farmstead setting, or the appreciation of Manor Farm Non-Designated Heritage Asset as a coherent group of historic agricultural buildings. The extent of effect would be moderated by the landscape buffers, relatively low height of the PV arrays, and the retention of existing field boundaries, vegetation and additional landscaping. Whilst the Proposed Development would remain reversible, allowing the Site to be returned to agricultural use following decommissioning, during the operational stage the rural character of the surrounding landscape will be changed to a limited degree.
- 3.176 The sensitivity of Manor Farm Non-Designated Heritage Asset is considered to be Low. The magnitude of change is considered to be Small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible to Minor.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.177 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.178 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Manor Farm Non-Designated Heritage Asset is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.179 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Change to the setting of Queen's Cottages (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).

- 3.180 The Proposed Development is located within agricultural land historically associated with Queen's Cottages Non-Designated Heritage Asset. Queen's Cottages Non-Designated Heritage Asset derives principally from their vernacular architectural character, their contribution to the Monk Sherborne Conservation Area, and their historic association with Manor Farm and the surrounding agricultural landscape. Their location at the edge of the settlement helps illustrate the historic relationship between agricultural workers' housing and the surrounding farmland.
- 3.181 The Proposed Development would introduce a renewable generating energy/managed influence into part of the agricultural land that contributes to their wider rural setting. Whilst this would alter the character of part of the associated farmland, introducing a modern engineered element into part of the historic agricultural landscape, the existing field pattern, mature hedgerows, and tree belts would remain evident and would be reinforced through the proposed landscape mitigation strategy. The Proposed Development would therefore only partially reduce the coherence of the traditional rural setting and the legibility of the historic relationship between the cottages and the agricultural landscape with which they were historically associated.

The Proposed Development would not affect the cottages themselves, their immediate roadside setting, or their appreciation as a pair of modest rural workers cottages.

- 3.182 The sensitivity of Queen's Cottages Non-Designated Heritage Asset is considered to be Low. The magnitude of change is considered to be Small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible to Minor.

Secondary Mitigation

- 3.183 No secondary mitigation is required.

Residual Effect and Significance

- 3.184 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the residual effect for Queen's Cottages Non-Designated Heritage Asset is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 3.185 The effect would be **Not Significant**.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

- 3.186 All cumulative projects identified within **Table 1.4** have been considered within this Assessment of Cumulative Effects.

Construction Phase

- 3.187 It is anticipated that subject to the primary and tertiary mitigation measures, detailed above (such as site hoardings, tree and hedgerow protection measures, management of construction traffic, control of working hours and other appropriate housekeeping) being adopted at the cumulative schemes, temporary significant adverse effects from 'impact interactions' can be prevented from occurring during the construction stages of development. Accordingly, when the nature, scale and relative disposition of the identified cumulative schemes relative to the application site are considered they would not change any of the identified residual effects on the relevant built heritage assets within the study area. Accordingly, there would be no significant or additional residual effects arising from cumulative schemes during the construction phases.

Operational Phase

- 3.188 The identified cumulative schemes would not change any of the identified residual effects on the identified heritage assets, arising from the completed development, as a consequence of their nature, disposition relative to the Site and interposing distance, topography and landscape.
- 3.189 Cumulative Projects 1, 2, and 3 comprise residential development located to the west, south, and east of the Site. Whilst these developments would contribute to further built development within the wider landscape surrounding the Basingstoke area, existing built form, intervening topography, and mature vegetation mean that there are limited locations where the Proposed Development and these cumulative schemes would be experienced together in relation to the heritage assets assessed within this Chapter. Whilst the cumulative schemes would contribute to localised changes within the broader landscape, they would not materially alter those aspects of setting that make the greatest contribution to the significance of the identified heritage assets.

Accordingly, the cumulative schemes would not result in effects on heritage significance over and above those already identified for the Proposed Development.

- 3.190 Cumulative projects 4, 5, 6, and 7 are either not intervisible with the Proposed Development and / or are experienced in relation to different heritage receptors. On this basis, no cumulative effects on the significance of heritage assets are anticipated.

Limitations and Assumptions

- 3.191 To ensure transparency within the EIA process, the following limitations and assumptions apply to this assessment:
- The baseline assessment has been based on information readily available at the time of undertaking the assessment;
 - The baseline assessment relies on the accuracy of secondary source data; and
 - Inspection of the interior of historic buildings is not required as part of the baseline assessment.

Summary

- 3.192 **Table 3.7** summarises the assessment of effects on Cultural Heritage, including pre-mitigation effects, secondary mitigation measures, and residual effects. A full compilation of all mitigation measures (primary, tertiary and secondary) is provided in the Environmental Management Plan (**Table 4.1**).

Table 3.7: Summary of Effects

Effect	Receptor	Stage	Pre-Mitigation Level of Effect	Secondary Mitigation	Residual Level of Effect	Significant?
Effect on Heritage Significance, including Setting	Monk Sherborne Conservation Area.	Construction	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	No
		Operation	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	No
	Sherborne St John Conservation Area	Construction	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
		Operation	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
	All Saints Church, Monk Sherborne (Grade I Listed Building).	Construction	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	No
		Operation	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	No

Effect	Receptor	Stage	Pre-Mitigation Level of Effect	Secondary Mitigation	Residual Level of Effect	Significant?
	Keyhole Enclosure SE of Field Barn Farm (Scheduled Monument).	Construction	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
		Operation	Minor Adverse	None	Minor Adverse	No
	Rookery Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Construction	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
		Operation	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
	Appletree Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).	Construction	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
		Operation	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
	Eastrop Cottage (Grade II Listed Building).	Construction	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
		Operation	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
	Thames Dell (Grade II Listed Building).	Construction	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
		Operation	Negligible	None	Negligible	No
	Monk Sherborne War Memorial (Grade II Listed Building).	Construction	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
		Operation	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
	Manor Farm (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).	Construction	Negligible to Minor Adverse	None	Negligible to Minor Adverse	No
		Operation	Negligible to Minor Adverse	None	Negligible to Minor Adverse	No

Effect	Receptor	Stage	Pre-Mitigation Level of Effect	Secondary Mitigation	Residual Level of Effect	Significant?
	Queen's Cottages (Non-Designated Heritage Asset).	Construction	Negligible to Minor Adverse	None	Negligible to Minor Adverse	No
		Operation	Negligible to Minor Adverse	None	Negligible to Minor Adverse	No
Change to the character and appearance of the conservation area	Sherborne St John Conservation Area	Construction	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No
		Operation	Negligible Adverse	None	Negligible Adverse	No

-
- ⁱ UK Government (1979) *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979*. London: HMSO. Available at: [Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979](#) (as amended) (Accessed: 20 July 2026).
- ⁱⁱ UK Government (1990) *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*. London: HMSO. Available at: [Planning \(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas\) Act 1990](#) (Accessed: 20 July 2026)
- ⁱⁱⁱ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2026) *National Planning Policy Framework*. London: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6a8334c03bd75b81e2329ac4/National_Planning_Policy_Framework.pdf. (Accessed 26 August 2026).
- ^{iv} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2016) *Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011 to 2029*. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/doclib/1592.pdf>. (Accessed: 6 July 2026)
- ^v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2024) *Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Update 2021 to 2040: Draft for Regulation 18 Consultation*. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: <https://consult.basingstoke.gov.uk/system/files/materials/17/Local%20Plan%20Update%20Regulation%2018%202024%20-%20online%20version.pdf>. (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{vi} Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (2025) *Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2024 to 2042: Draft Spatial Strategy Regulation 18 Consultation*. Basingstoke: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. Available at: [https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/page/91413/Draft%20BDLP%202024-2042%20Updated%20Spatial%20Strategy%20\(Reg18%20Con\)%20Nov%202025.pdf](https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/page/91413/Draft%20BDLP%202024-2042%20Updated%20Spatial%20Strategy%20(Reg18%20Con)%20Nov%202025.pdf). (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{vii} Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2016) *Planning practice guidance*. London: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance> (Accessed: 6 July 2026).
- ^{viii} Historic England (2015) *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment*. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2. Swindon: Historic England. Available at: [Historic England](#) (Accessed: 20 July 2026)
- ^{ix} Historic England (2017) *The Setting of Heritage Assets*. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3. 2nd edn. Swindon: Historic England. Available at: [Historic England](#) (Accessed: 20 July 2026).
- ^x Historic England (2019) *Statements of Heritage Significance*. Historic England Advice Note 12. Swindon: Historic England.
- ^{xi} Historic England (2019) *Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management*. Historic England Advice Note 1. 2nd edn. Swindon: Historic England. Available at: [Historic England Planning Advice](#) (Accessed: 20 July 2026)
- ^{xii} Historic England (2026) *Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage*. Historic England Advice Note 7. 3rd edn. Swindon: Historic England. Available at: [Historic England](#) (Accessed: 20 July 2026).
- ^{xiii} Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) (2021) *Principles for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment*. Lincoln: IEMA. Available at: [IEMA](#) (Accessed: 20 July 2026)
- ^{xiv} National Highways (2020) *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. LA 106: Cultural Heritage Assessment*. London: National Highways.

^{xv} IEMA (2015). Environmental Impact Assessment Guide to: Shaping Quality Development and
IEMA (2016). Environmental Impact Assessment Guide to: Delivering Quality Development.

Turley Office
London

020 7851 4010