Table of Contents

Tables

19. Marine Heritage

19.1 Introduction

19.1.1 This chapter of the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) Report describes the existing environment with regard to the marine archaeological resource below Mean High Water Springs and assesses the potential impacts of the Proposed Development during the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning phases. Where the potential for significant effects is identified, mitigation measures and residual impacts are presented.

19.1.2 The marine and coastal archaeology resource within the Study Area (refer to Figure 19-1: Location of Marine Heritage Assets in the 1km Study Area) includes several shipwrecks and maritime artefacts, and a palaeochannel. These assets have been identified as having a degree of significance due to their heritage interest that merit consideration in planning decisions. Cultural heritage influences how people relate to places and cultures and can provide a sense of place and stability to a community.

19.1.3 This assessment has been produced in order to determine, as far as possible from existing information, the nature, extent and significance of the known and potential marine archaeological resource within the Study Area.

19.1.4 The information presented in this chapter is informed by studies undertaken for the nearby Teesside Offshore Wind Farm Environmental Statement (Forewind, 2014) of which relevant chapters have been provided as technical appendices.

19.1.5 The aims of this chapter are to:

- detail the requirements of key legislative and policy requirements and describe how the Proposed Development will consider them;
- explain how information on the existing and future environment has been collected (through desk-based studies, survey work and stakeholder consultation);
- describe the understanding of the existing and future environment, based on the baseline information;
- explain any further information to be obtained through further consultation, desk-based studies, or surveys;
- describe the potential impacts and effects of the Proposed Development on marine cultural heritage; and
- describe potential mitigation measures.

19.1.6 This chapter is supported by the Figure 19-1: Location of Marine Heritage assets in the 1 km Study Area (PEI Report, Volume II).

19.2 Legislation and Planning Policy Context

19.2.1 There is a distinct set of legislation, policy and guidance relating to marine, maritime and nautical archaeology, collectively referred to as “marine heritage” within this PEI Report.

19.2.2 Historic England is responsible for the preservation and enhancement of the archaeological resource within England’s Territorial Waters (up to 12 nautical miles) and is a consultee for the resource in the UK Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is responsible for licensing, regulating and planning marine activities in the seas around England to ensure they are carried out in a sustainable way.

19.2.3 The Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009 is the primary legislation relevant to marine licensing and the preparation of marine development plans. Under this legislation, marine plans must be consistent with the Marine Policy Statement (MPS) and fully reflect the requirements of the MPS at a local level. Marine plans must also be in accordance with other UK national policy, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, 2019).

19.2.4 Section 16 of the NPPF entitled 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' sets out the principal national guidance on the importance, management and safeguarding of heritage receptors within the planning process. The aim of NPPF Section 16 is to ensure that Regional Planning Bodies and Local Planning Authorities, developers and owners of heritage receptors adopt a consistent and holistic approach to their conservation and to reduce complexity in planning policy relating to proposals that affect them. The NPPF provides a framework that:

- recognises that heritage receptors are an irreplaceable resource;
- requires applicants to provide proportionate information on the significance of heritage receptors affected by the proposals and an impact appraisal describing the significance of any changes to the receptors;
- takes into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage receptors and their setting;
- places weight on the conservation of designated heritage receptors;
- requires developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage receptors to be lost in proportion to their importance and impact, and to make this evidence publicly accessible; and
- promotes the conservation of heritage receptors in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life for this and future generations.

19.2.5 The assessment of potential impacts upon marine heritage has been made with specific reference to relevant legislation and National Policy Statements. Those relevant to the assessment are:

Legislation

- Protection of Wrecks Act (PWA) 1973;
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (AMAA) 1979;
- Protection of Military Remains Act (PMRA) 1986;
- Merchant Shipping Act 1995;
- Planning Act 2008;
- Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009;
- Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010; and
- Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

National Planning Policy

- Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1) (DECC, 2011a);
- NPS for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) (DECC, 2011b); and
- National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG, 2019).

National Guidance

19.2.6 In summary, specific guidance into identifying, describing, evaluating and assessing the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment resource are provided in the following, and which have been considered in the development of this PEI Report:

- England's Coastal Heritage (English Heritage, 1996);
- Identifying and Protecting Palaeolithic Remains (English Heritage, 1998);
- Military Aircraft Crash Sites (English Heritage, 2002);
- Code of Practice for Seabed Development (Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee, 2006);
- North Sea Prehistory Research and Management Framework (Peeters *et al.* 2009);
- North East Regional Research Framework (Petts and Gerrard, 2006);
- Model Clauses for Archaeological Written Schemes of Investigations (The Crown Estate, 2010);
- Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (English Heritage, 2008);
- Our Seas - A Shared Resource: High Level Marine Objectives (DEFRA, 2009);
- Ships and Boats: Prehistory to Present - Designation Selection Guide (English Heritage, 2012);

- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2. Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment. Historic England (Historic England, 2015); and
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3. The Setting of Heritage Assets. (Historic England, 2017).

19.3 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

19.3.1 This section presents the following:

- identification of the information sources that have been consulted throughout preparation this chapter;
- the methodology behind the baseline assessment including the definition of an appropriate Study Area; and
- the methodology and terminology used in the assessment of effects.

Use of the Rochdale Envelope

19.3.2 At the time of writing, the final design for the Water Abstraction Corridor and Water Discharge Corridor has not been finalised. This necessitates the use of the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach, to flexibly anticipate the impacts of the worst-case scenario and to respond to those effects with appropriate mitigation.

19.3.3 The findings of the preliminary assessment may be subject to change as the design of the Proposed Development is developed and refined through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and consultation processes, and as further research and investigative surveys are undertaken to fully understand its potential effects.

19.3.4 The worst-case scenario for marine heritage comprised the construction of the Power, Capture and Compression site (PCC) and works associated with the proposed Water Abstraction and Water Discharge Corridors and the construction of the CO_2 Export Pipeline as set out in Chapter 5: Construction Programme and Management (PEI Report, Volume I).

19.3.5 The worst-case scenario for marine heritage has been interpreted to mean that any heritage assets within the Site which will be completely and irreversibly removed during the construction of the Proposed Development.

Consultation

19.3.6 A Scoping Report was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in February 2019 and a Scoping Opinion was received from the Planning Inspectorate in April 2019 (Appendix 2A: Scoping Report and Appendix 2B: Scoping Opinion). **Error! Reference source not found.**Table 19-1 provides an account of how comments raised by stakeholders in the Scoping Opinion in relation to marine heritage have been considered and actioned where appropriate.

Table 19-1: Key Issues Raised in Relation to Marine Heritage During EIA Scoping

Key issue raised (by whom, ID/page no., theme)	Response to issue raised and action taken where appropriate
Secretary of State Scoping Opinion, 4.9.5, Impacts to marine archaeology: The Scoping Report does not refer to potential impacts to marine archaeology. However, the Proposed Development may include infrastructure in the marine area. The ES should consider the potential for these works to impact on known/ unknown marine archaeological remains. Any likely significant effects to receptors in the marine environment should be assessed.	An assessment of marine heritage and archaeology impacts are presented in this chapter and the assessment will be further developed for the ES.

Study Area

19.3.7 The Study Area comprises the Site plus a 1 km buffer (refer to Figure 19-1: Location of Marine Heritage Assets within the 1 km Study Area). This has been deemed as sufficient to include nearby paleoenvironmental features, wrecks, obstructions and associated assets. Although there are additional assets outside of this Study Area, these are now-undetectable dead wrecks that should not be affected by the Proposed Development.

Sources of Information

19.3.8 Sources of information that were consulted include:

- National Heritage List for England (NHLE);
- Redcar and Cleveland Historic Environment Record (HER);
- Teesside Historic Environmental Record (HER);
- UK Hydrographic Office (UKHO) Wrecks and Obstructions EEZ Dataset;
- Published and unpublished literature;
- British Geological Survey (BGS) Geology of Britain Viewer; and
- Online bibliographic resources such as Environmental Statements from nearby offshore projects.

Impact Assessment Methodology

Assessment Criteria

19.3.9 The environmental assessment has been undertaken following relevant elements of key guidance, including:

- the requirements of EIA as set out in the EIA Directive 2014/52/EU implemented in the UK through the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Secretary of State, 2017);

- Historic England GPA Note 2, Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2015);
- Historic England GPA Note 3, The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2017); and
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Code of Conduct and Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (CIfA, 2014).

Scope and Level of Assessment

19.3.10 This section assesses the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on marine heritage assets (archaeological remains and historic landscapes). The objective of this assessment is to identify any effects upon marine cultural heritage receptors that are likely to arise from construction and/or operation of the Proposed Development.

19.3.11 Identified marine cultural heritage assets are numbered with their UKHO Wreck numbers or their HER numbers, issued by the UKHO and the Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council and Hartlepool Borough Councils respectively.

19.3.12 The principles of the impact methodology rest upon independently evaluating the value of the marine cultural heritage resources and the magnitude of impact upon them. By combining the value of the marine cultural heritage resource with the predicted magnitude of impact, the significance of the effect can be determined. The effect significance can be beneficial or adverse.

19.3.13 The marine cultural heritage assessment will include an assessment of the heritage significance of potentially affected assets, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG, 2019). This will also assess any change to heritage significance resulting from changes to the setting of heritage assets.

19.3.14 NPPF Annex 2 glossary defines value of heritage assets as deriving from *its heritage asset to present and future generations*, (MHCLG, 2019) and sets out criteria which should be considered when assessing the significance of cultural heritage assets, which include archaeological, architectural, artistic and historic interest. These criteria will be used in the assessment of value (heritage significance) for each affected asset and this information, in conjunction with professional judgement, will be used to assess the magnitude of impact of the scheme upon the asset and in turn the significance of effect.

19.3.15 Within the NPPF (MHCLG, 2019), impacts affecting the value of designated heritage assets are considered in terms of harm. There is a requirement to determine whether the level of harm amounts to ‘substantial harm’ or ‘less than substantial harm’. Although there is no direct correlation between the significance of effects identified through the EIA process and the level of harm caused to heritage significance, the assessment of harm arising from the impact of the Proposed Development will be reported within the

Environmental Statement (ES) and determined using professional judgement, and with regard to the following considerations:

- a large (significant) effect on a heritage asset would more often be the basis by which to determine that the level of harm to the significance of the asset would be substantial;
- a moderate (significant) effect is unlikely to meet the test of substantial harm and would therefore more often be the basis by which to determine that the level of harm to the significance of the asset would be less than substantial;
- a slight (not significant) effect would amount to less than substantial harm; and
- a neutral effect would be classified as having no harm.

19.3.16 The level of harm affecting each asset will be assessed on an individual basis using professional judgement. For example, some moderate effects may cross the threshold into substantial harm.

Assessment of Value

19.3.17 The value (heritage significance) of a heritage asset is derived from its heritage interest which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. The value of a place is defined by the sum of its heritage interests. Taking these criteria into account, each identified heritage asset can be assigned a level of value in accordance with the criteria set out in Table 19-2.

Table 19-2: Criteria for Determining the Value (Heritage Significance) of Heritage Assets

Value (heritage significance)	Criteria
High	Assets of international importance, such as World Heritage Sites. Scheduled monuments Non-designated archaeological assets of schedulable quality and importance. Protected Wrecks
Medium	Non-designated heritage assets of a regional resource value.
Low	Non-designated heritage assets of a local resource value as identified through consultation. Non-designated heritage assets whose heritage values are compromised by poor preservation or damaged so that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade.

19.3.18 When professional judgement is considered, some heritage assets may not fit into the specified category presented in Table 19-2 above. Each heritage asset is assessed on an individual basis taking into account regional variations and individual qualities of sites.

Magnitude of Impact

19.3.19 Having identified the value of the heritage asset, the next stage in the assessment is to identify the level and degree of impact to an asset arising

from the Proposed Development. Potential impacts are defined as a change resulting from the Proposed Development which affects a heritage asset. The impacts of a development upon heritage assets can be positive or negative; direct or indirect; long term or temporary and/or cumulative. Impacts may arise during construction, operation or decommissioning and can be temporary or permanent. Impacts can occur to the physical fabric of the asset or affect its setting.

19.3.20 The level and degree of impact (impact rating) is assigned by reference to a four-level scale as set out in Table 19-3 below. The level of impact considers mitigation measures which have been embedded within the Proposed Development as part of the design development process (embedded mitigation).

Table 19-3: Criteria for Determining the Magnitude of Impact on Heritage Assets

Magnitude of impact	Description of impact
High	Change such that the significance of the asset is totally altered or destroyed. Comprehensive change to setting affecting significance, resulting in a serious loss in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.
Medium	Change such that the significance of the asset is affected. Noticeably different change to setting affecting significance, resulting in erosion in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.
Low	Change such that the significance of the asset is slightly affected. Slight change to setting affecting significance resulting in a change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.
Minor	Changes to the asset that hardly affect significance. Minor changes to the setting of an asset that have little effect on significance resulting in no real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.

19.3.21 An assessment to classify the effect, having taken into consideration any embedded mitigation, is determined using the matrix at Table 19-4 below, which takes account of the value of the asset (Table 19-2) and the magnitude of impact (Table 19-3). Effects can be neutral, adverse or beneficial.

Table 19-4: Classification of Effects

Significance (Heritage Value)	Magnitude of Impact			
	High	Medium	Low	Minor
High	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor
Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	Minor
Low	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible

19.3.22 This chapter considers that major or moderate effects are significant for the purposes of the EIA Regulations, in accordance with standard EIA practice. In all cases, determining the level of harm to the significance of the asset arising from the Proposed Development is one of professional judgement.

19.3.23 It should be noted that paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that 'the ability to record evidence of our past should not factor into deciding whether or not such loss should be permitted' (MHCLG, 2019). Accordingly, whilst it is noted that there is potential to uncover remains of our past and generate records through the Proposed Development, the benefit or otherwise of this has not been considered as a factor that either mitigates or reduces any identified harm. Similarly, it has not been treated as a benefit of the Proposed Development.

Assumptions

19.3.24 The worst-case scenario for marine heritage involves updating and/or replacing the infrastructure for water intake and abstraction licence the former Redcar steelworks. A worst-case scenario may require dredging and the construction of a replacement pipeline off the coast of Coatham Sands and South Gare in the North Sea. The assumption has been made that any heritage assets within the Site will be completely and irreversibly removed during the construction of the Proposed Development.

19.3.25 It is assumed that all the information used from the listed sources is correct at the time of writing and submission.

19.4 Baseline Conditions

Geology

Bedrock

19.4.1 The seabed bedrock geology within the Site comprises the Triassic Sherwood Sandstone Group, Mercia Mudstone Group and Penarth Group and the Jurassic Redcar Mudstone Group. These are sedimentary bedrocks that are fluvial, lacustrine and marine in origin (British Geological Survey, n.d.). The bedrock is overlain by marine sands and gravelly muddy sands.

Superficial

19.4.2 Geophysical surveys (side-scan sonar, bathymetric surveying and magnetic and marine seismic reflection surveys) undertaken by Pelorus for the Teesside Offshore Wind Farm have identified the superficial seabed deposits to consist of silty sands and gravelly clays (Entec, 2004). These are likely to be Quaternary Tidal Flat Deposits of sand, silt and clay that are shallow-marine in origin (British Geological Survey, n.d.).

Topography

19.4.3 The area of seabed within the water abstraction and discharge corridor within the Study Area is relatively shallow (UKHO, 2019a).

19.4.4 In the area of discharge, the seabed slopes from the coast at 0 m CD (chart datum) down to approximately -6 m CD.

19.4.5 In the area of abstraction, due to previous dredging within the River Tees and the estuary of the Tees Mouth, the depth of the seabed has been artificially lowered. The seabed immediately within the Site is approximately 0 m below Mean Low Water.

Geoarchaeology and Palaeoenvironmental Potential

19.4.6 The North Sea contains important information on the colonisation and re-colonisation of the British Isles from the Pleistocene and Holocene periods. Since the earliest hominin activity in Britain (Happisburgh - 850,000 BP and Pakefield - 700,000 BP), the north-west of Europe has been shaped by episodes of climate change. Alternating warm (interglacials and interstadials) and cold (glacials and stadials) periods and associated rise and fall in relative sea level have influenced the evolution of the landscape. This is considered to have affected the suitability of the North Sea landscape for hominin exploitation (Lewis *et al.* 2019, Parfitt *et al.* 2005; 2010).

19.4.7 During the Pleistocene the North Sea was an extensive terrestrial plain between southern and eastern England and the European continent (Coles, 1998). Studies into the terrestrial plain, known as 'Doggerland', (approximately 200 km east of the Site) have identified that this was a prime location for human settlement, due to the abundance of fresh water and ecological resources (ibid). Geophysical surveying has revealed the potential for identifying not only prehistoric sites but the geographical landscape they were situated in, enabling a nuanced understanding of human-environmental relationships (Gaffney *et al.* 2007).

19.4.8 Since the end of Devensian glaciation, in the present Holocene interglacial period, relative sea level in the north east has risen by c. 30 m, resulting from eustatic[1] sea level changes from melting sea ice and isostatic rebound[2] from terrestrial uplift and topographical changes (Tolan-Smith, 2008). This continuous relative sea level rise after the last glacial maximum (LGM – the last phase during which glacial ice was at maximum extent) flooded Doggerland approximately 7,000 - 6,000 years ago.

19.4.9 The flooding of Doggerland was not necessarily gradual, or linear. Research has indicated that catastrophic events such as the Storegga landslide and accompanying tsunami at the edge of Norway's continental shelf at around 8100 BP (Bondevik *et al.* 2005) would have flooded the north-eastern coastline and the Doggerland coast (Gaffney *et al.* 2007, Tappin *et al*. 2011). The impact on communities inhabiting the North Sea is likely to have been devastating, with substantial loss of life (Smith *et al.* 2004). However, no evidence for this event has yet been observed near Teesside. Communities attracted to the increasingly hospitable environment of biodiverse temperate grassland and boreal forests (Val Baker *et al*. 2007) would have been both at-risk and unprepared for this sudden environmental change. This existing research and evidence relating to sea level change demonstrates that areas of the North Sea were once occupied, and evidence of occupation may be present within the Study Area.

Palaeolithic

19.4.10 Currently, very little is known about the Pleistocene colonisation of the North-East of England. Sites which constitute the current baseline are located on

[1] Changes in sea level as a result of meltwater influx from glaciers and sea ice. Typically occurs after a shift in climate from a glacial (cold) period to an interstadial or interglacial (warm) period.
[2] Isostatic rebound is when land masses rise following a reduction in weight from ice sheets which retreat after a shift in climate from a glacial (cold) period to an interstadial (warm) period.

the coastlines of Norfolk and Suffolk. The archaeological deposits at these sites suggest that whilst the potential for Palaeolithic archaeology is likely to be lower in the north-east, deposits located here could possibly be of similar national and international significance.

Mesolithic

19.4.11 The Mesolithic period for the Tees Valley is represented by flint scatter sites and stray find spots (Rowe, 2006). Flint scatters from nearby Hartlepool, to the north of the Site, have a wide date range extending into later prehistory (Raistrick *et al.* 1935, Weyman, 1984, Haselgrove and Healey, 1992). Archaeological evaluations at Middle Warren, Hartlepool, provide further mixed-period lithic scatters with origins in the Mesolithic period (Rowe, 2006).

19.4.12 Also in Hartlepool (approximately 8 km north west of the Site) is the regionally-significant submerged forest, containing a multi-period prehistoric sequence from the Mesolithic onwards, with diagnostic flint-work and well-preserved flora and fauna in the associated peat deposits (Waughman *et al.* 2005). The presence of wooden stakes associated with fish traps and evidence related to woodland burning in the 5th millennium BC indicate that woodland management was taking place during this period. This evidence was also associated with juvenile cattle footprints, suggesting that the semi-domestication of wild animals was also undertaken.

19.4.13 Recent work offshore nearby Redcar and Tynemouth has demonstrated the survival of Mesolithic land surfaces (Waughman *et al.* 2005). This is comparable to the landscapes identified further east of Teesside at Dogger Bank (Gaffney *et al.* 2007). This identifies that there is clear potential for archaeological deposits offshore in the greater North East and North Sea environs.

19.4.14 Currently, no evidence for Mesolithic activity is known in the Tees Estuary or the southern Tees Valley, although it is likely to have existed. It is likely that coastal erosion has destroyed much of the evidence of settlement or land use (Fulford *et al.* 1997).

Neolithic

19.4.15 As with the Palaeolithic, very little is known about the Neolithic period in the Tees valley. Wattle hurdling found in Hartlepool submerged forest may represent a fish trap (Waughman *et al.* 2005). This is unsurprising as by the Neolithic, the North Sea was no longer a terrestrial plain and human settlement would have been pushed landward to higher ground forming the then-present coastline. Due to the shift from broad-spectrum foraging to agriculture and domestication of livestock, settlement would have likely pushed back further upstream of the River Tees rather than the coastline where the landscape was more suited to these activities.

19.4.16 A later prehistoric peat bed is also known to exist on the beach at Redcar, approximately 2 km to the east of the Site (Sherlock, 2019). Given the surrounding prehistoric submerged peat beds, it is likely that there is contemporary evidence within the Site.

Post-Medieval

19.4.17 Nearly all known wrecks recorded from the Teesmouth environs are of post-medieval date or later. The number of wrecks rises after the 18th century, as a result of increased shipping due to the rise of coal and the industrial revolution, continuing into the mid-19th century where shipping increasingly used steam power and steel construction as reflected in the known wrecks recorded (Petts and Gerrard, 2006). The sea has played an essential role in the history of the North-East, acting as a linking the region to other ports in Britain and to other countries bordering the North Sea (e.g. the Netherlands). The ports thrived and a range of industries, from shipbuilding to fishing, relied on their contact with the sea (ibid). This would likely have required a significant amount of dredging to support the newer, larger and heavier ships, therefore, any buried landforms have possibly been removed or truncated by dredging activities.

Palaeoenvironment

19.4.18 Palaeogeographic landforms pertaining to the Holocene have been identified through geophysical surveying further offshore to the east of the Tees Valley (Wessex Archaeology, 2014). These fluvial features such as braided rivers and palaeochannels are key indicators of areas of human occupation and therefore archaeological potential. The evidence from Hartlepool bay, north-west of the Study Area, also suggests that occupation and settlement focused around watercourses and around palaeochannels flowing throughout the bay (Waughman *et al.* 2005). Artefactual evidence is often discovered in association with river infill and floodplain deposits. There is a single recorded palaeochannel located in the eastern limits of the Site between South Gare and Coatham Rocks (HER 6396). Palaeochannels are not typically located in isolation, and there is potential for further examples and associated features to be present and to extend into the Site.

Known Marine Heritage Receptors

Submerged Prehistoric Archaeology and Palaeolandscapes

Designated Assets

19.4.19 There are no designated assets related to submerged prehistoric archaeology or palaeolandscapes within the Study Area.

Undesignated Assets

19.4.20 There is one undesignated asset related to submerged prehistoric archaeology or palaeolandscapes within the Study Area, which is described in Table 19-5. The palaeochannel is contemporary to the early Holocene Hartlepool and Redcar submerged forests and peat beds. This known pre-existing marine heritage is of regional importance as set out in the North East Regional Research Framework (Petts and Gerrard, 2006), therefore by association, this asset can be deemed to be of medium value.

Table 19-5: Summary of HER Records of Undesignated Palaeoenvironmental Assets

HER	Name	Site Type	Period	Location	Description
6396	Between South Gare and Coatham Rocks	Palaeochannel	Prehistoric	54 38.31 N 001 5.47 W	This palaeochannel was identified during an offshore geophysical survey carried out as part of an Environmental Statement for a proposed windfarm. The channel is approximately 300 m wide and was traced for roughly 4 km from the shoreline on a similar alignment to the River Tees.

Maritime or Shipwreck Archaeology

Designated Assets

19.4.21 There are no designated shipwrecks within the Site. The closest designated asset is a shipwreck located off Seaton Carew. The asset, described in Table 19-6, is designated as a protected wreck and is of high archaeological significance.

Table 19-6: Summary of UKHO Records of Designated Maritime Assets

List Number	Wreck Location	Status	Size (ha)	Name	Description	Relation to Development
1000077	54 39.304 N 1 10.484 W	Protected Wreck	3.13	Seaton Carew	Designated 16/07/1997. Remains of an eighteenth-century oak English collier brig, believed to have been beached at Seaton Carew during a storm.	Outside the 1 km Study Area. 4.2 km west from the Site.

Undesignated Assets

19.4.22 There are 24 UKHO records on undesignated maritime shipwrecks and obstructions and 31 HER records on undesignated maritime assets identified within the Study Area and nearby environs. While it appears that there is overlap and duplication between the UKHO and HER sets of data, the multiple records (with the same name) are due to the wrecks being in a state of advanced decay and degradation, dispersing into multiple fragments in various locations throughout the River Tees and the Tees Estuary. As such, the decision was taken not to merge the records, but to add a column in the baseline tables to list the constituent parts of dispersed wrecks, showing the spatial relationship between the fragments.

19.4.23 As the HER Records and the UKHO database listed different types of information, the baseline tables have kept the assets separate to more effectively communicate the information. However, the impact assessment has merged the assets to avoid duplication of impact scores.

19.4.24 The UKHO assets are all 19th and 20th century wrecks and obstructions that are “dead” (i.e. they have not been visible on surveys for some time). This means that little of the shipwreck evidence remains, and therefore they are of low archaeological significance. These shipwrecks can be broadly

described as cargo vessels carrying coal, iron and ballast (steam ships) or military vessels (tugs and barges) used around Tees port.

19.4.25 For the purposes of this assessment, the Redcar and Cleveland and Tees HER records have been merged due to overlap and similarities between the records. These are mostly 19th and 20th century trading and military vessel wrecks and obstructions with associated maritime artefacts with a floating hospital. Little of their physical evidence remains with a lot of the HER information comprised of documentary records, therefore the assets are of low archaeological significance. The exception to this is asset HER 2814 which is a Bronze Age canoe, of regional archaeological value therefore being of medium archaeological significance. Most of the wrecks are in a poor condition of advanced decay and dispersal, contributing to their status as 'dead' wrecks (not detected on visual or radar surveys).

Table 19-7: Summary of UKHO Records of Undesignated Maritime Assets

Wreck Number	Wreck Location	Status	Category	Name	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
5581	54 37.009 N 1 9.098 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	Heckler	Merchant vessel built in 1934. Sank in the River Tees in the fairway in the vicinity of Teesport.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	HER 3119
5590	54 38.175 N 1 7.131 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	SS Eidsiva	Steam ship built in 1907. Wreck mostly salvaged 1922-23. Vessel 216 ft, x 31 ft. x 20 ft. Approx. 1053 tons. Wreck was largely salvaged between 1925 and 1932. Theoretical position, based on a variety of sources shown in 5438 10N 001 07 03W. 'EIDSVOLD', lying on the foreshore between South Gare and Warrenby since March 1918.	Within the Site	HER 3123

Wreck Number	Wreck Location	Status	Category	Name	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
5592	54 38.475 N 1 7.315 W	Dead	Foul Ground	SS Lemnos	Steam ship broken in 3 parts. Examined 14-15th September 1925. Re-examined in 1929 by divers, heavy slag and wood a threat to small shipcraft. Buoys removed in 1968.	Within the 1 km Study Area	HER 2774, HER 3125, UKHO 5596, UKHO 5799
5596	54 38.525 N 1 7.265 W	Dead	Foul Ground	SS Lemnos	Steam ship broken in 3 parts. Examined 14-15th September 1925. Re-examined 1929 by divers, heavy slag and wood a threat to small shipcraft. Buoys removed in 1968.	Within the 1 km Study Area	HER 2774, HER 3125, UKHO 5592, UKHO 5799
5799	54 38.442 N 1 7.365 W	Dead	Foul Ground	SS Lemnos	Steam ship broken in 3 parts. Examined 14-15th September 1925. Re-examined 1929 by divers, heavy slag and wood a threat to small shipcraft. Buoys removed in 1968.	Within the 1 km Study Area	HER 2774, HER 3125, UKHO 5592, UKHO 5596
66500	54 38.658 N 1 7.948 W	Dead	Wreck showing any portion of hull or superstructure	SS Charlotte	Sailing vessel, first surveyed in 1931.	Within the 1 km Study Area	
5775	54 37.908 N 1 8.364 W	Dead	Obstruction	N/A	An obstruction identified in 1984.	Within the 1 km Study Area	
5595	54 38.525 N 1 6.315 W	Dead	Foul ground	MV Guildford	Motor vessel. Surveyed in 1954.	Within the 1 km Study Area	
5591	54 38.283 N 1 9.689 W	Dead	Wreck showing any portion of hull or superstructure	S T Wallsend	Examined in 1927. Only a boiler and condenser still visible. Information too vague to chart.	Within the 1 km Study Area	HER 3124

Wreck Number	Wreck Location	Status	Category	Name	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
5597	54 38.558 N 1 9.098 W	Dead	Wreck showing any portion of hull or superstructure	Stockton Packet	Examined in 1927. Area of wreckage now covered by sand	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
5606	54 39.054 N 1 7.9 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	Victory	Tug, carrying ballast	Within the 1 km Study Area	
5604	54 38.988 N 1 7.812 W	Dead	Foul Ground	Ida Duncan	Tug. An obstruction. Wreck broken up.	Within the 1 km Study Area	HER 3130
5602	54 38.963 N 1 7.887 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	SS Harvest	Steam ship sank and dispersed by 1905. Surveyed in 1921. Remains of pig iron, a ship boiler and a large anchor mostly recovered in 1982.	Within the 1 km Study Area	HER 3129
5599	54 38.813 N 1 8.948 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	SS Carlo	Steam ship with iron ore from Norway. Examined in 1929. Wreck was exposed with some standing frames.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
5600	54 38.825 N 1 8.648 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	Cargo Fleet Number Two	Barge. Identified in 1947 but not identified since.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
5601	54 38.858 N 1 9.698 W	Dead	Wreck showing any portion of hull or superstructure	N/A	No diving survey undertaken.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
5605	54 39.025 N 1 8.814 W	Dead	Foul Ground	SS Claverin g	Steam ship with pitch and pig iron. Had sunk and dispersed by 1908. Examined in 1924.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	UKHO 5800

Wreck Number	Wreck Location	Status	Category	Name	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
5607	54 39.133 N 1 7.99 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	N/A	Sunk and was subsequently clear by 1929. Dispersed fully.	Within the 1 km Study Area	
5800	54 38.979 N 1 8.725 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	SS Claverin g	Steam ship with pitch and pig iron. Had sunk and dispersed by 1908. Examined in 1924.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	UKHO 5605
66501	54 39.008 N 1 9.098 W	Dead	Wreck showing any portion of hull or superstructu re	J P Rennol dson	Steam ship sunk by 1924. Salvage by 1960 had retrieved most of the vessel.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
89491	54 38.793 N 1 9.238 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	N/A	Possible bow of a vessel all that remains when examined in 1918.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
89492	54 38.916 N 1 8.225 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	N/A	Examined in 1918.	Within the 1 km Study Area	
63051	54 39.041 N 1 8.052 W	Dead	Dangerous Wreck	N/A	Examined in 1983. Small wreck embedded in sand	Within the 1 km Study Area	

Table 19-8: Summary of HER Records of Undesignated Maritime Assets

HER	Name	Site Type	Classification	Period	Location	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
2138	Unknown	Obstruction	Fishermens fastener	Unknown	54 38.53 N 000 45.20 W	N/A	Within the 1 km Study Area	
2279	Unknown	Obstruction	Fishermens fastener	Unknown	54 36.50 N 000 36.53 W	N/A	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
2536	Prevoyant	Sailing Vessel	Lugger	19th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	N/A	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
2390	Unknown	Obstruction	Unknown	Unknown	54 38.53 N 001 06.20 W	N/A	Within the 1 km Study Area	
2673	Unknown	Obstruction	Unknown	Unknown	54 37.00 N 000 35.00 W	A Wreck PA marked on Admiralty Chart 134.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
2774	Lemnos	Sailing vessel	Craft	19th century	54 36.00 N 001 09.00 W	Vessel of Sunderland, Weizell, Master. Sunk in the Tees after collision.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	HER 3125, UKHO 5592, UKHO 5596, UKHO 5799

HER	Name	Site Type	Classification	Period	Location	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
2812	Tees floating hospital	Vessel	Floating hospital	19th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	The Tees Floating Hospital was commissioned in 1894. The structure had two wards each with twenty beds along with a central admin block. The hospital floated on pontoons. The pontoons were moored opposite Eston Jetty, where a berth and slag wall were built. Sank in 1906.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	HER 2824
2814	Unnamed	Vessel	Canoe	Bronze Age	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	N/A	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
2822	Unknown	Vessel	Craft	19th century	54 38.08 N 001 07.03 W	Wreck marked on Admiralty Chart 01-Feb-1893, 1884/1891 Surveys. Position given is approx.	Within the Site	
2824	Tees Floating Hospital	Vessel	Unknown	19th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	N/A	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	HER 2812
2836	Pearl	Vessel	Keel	20th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	N/A	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
3104	Gilston	Vessel	Cargo vessel	19th century	54 39.00 N 001 08.50 W	Vessel built in 1873, approx. 348 tons, Reg. London. Owners; Young, Ehlers and Co. London. D. Stewart, Master. 17 crew members. Collision with S.S. 'Bear', of Middlesbrough in the entrance to the river.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	

HER	Name	Site Type	Classification	Period	Location	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
3112	Sunderland	Vessel	Cargo vessel	19th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	A steamship built in 1866, approx. 499 tons, Reg. Grangemouth. Owners; Crewford and Co. Grangemouth. J. Bell, Master. 15 crew. Stranded 5th Buoy in the River Tees.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
3119	Heckler	Vessel	Unknown	20th century	54 37.00 N 001 09.00 W	N/A	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
3123	Eidsiva	Steam vessel	Cargo vessel	20th century	54 38.10 N 001 07.02 W	Vessel 216ft, x 31ft. x 20ft. Approx. 1053 tons. Wreck was largely salvaged between 1925 and 1932. Theoretical position, based on a variety of sources shown in 5438 10N 001 07 03W. 'EIDSVOLD', lying on the foreshore between South Gare and Warrenby since March 1918.	Within the Site	UKHO 5590
3124	Wallsend	Steam vessel	Trawler	19th century	54 38.16 N 001 09.35 W	Vessel lost in 1903. Examined in 1929 when it was found that a boiler and condenser were all that remained visible covered frequently by sand. Position on N. Gare Sands 1 mile 236 degrees from South Gare Light. Vessel built in 1865, approx. 6 tons. 4 crew members.	Within the 1 km Study Area	UKHO 5591

HER	Name	Site Type	Classification	Period	Location	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
3125	Lemnos	Steam vessel	Cargo vessel - collier	19th century	54 38.28 N 001 07.13 W	Vessel 270 ft. x 34 ft. x 19 ft. Approx. 1530 tons. Examined in 1925. Both seaward portions reported level with the slag. The landward portion had some pieces left which were considered dangerous to small craft crossing the slag bank or mole. Both seaward portions were examined by divers in 1929 and were found to be level with the slag bottom. The inshore portion consists of small pieces of iron mixed with the slag, the seaward heavier pieces. Lying on foreshore between S. Gare and Warrenby since Feb. 1916. GPS position 54 38 503N 001 07 210W. Stranded and became a total wreck. A single-deck (iron), iron-screw steamer.	Within the Site	HER 2774, UKHO 5592, UKHO 5596, UKHO 5799
3129	Harvest	Steam vessel	Cargo vessel	19th century	54 38.57 N 001 07.47 W	Sank following collision with S.S. Regent. 245 ft. x 33 ft. x 16 ft. Approx. 1338 tons. Dispersed 1905. Surveyed 1921. Surveyed in 1924 after further dispersal, nothing found above ground level. Clear at 27.75 ft. and accepted as clear of all danger to navigation. Wreck lowered by scouring and blasting with dynamite to 16 ft.	Within the 1 km Study Area	UKHO 5602
3130	Ida Duncan	Steam Vessel	Unknown	20th century	54 39.00 N 001 07.42 W	N/A	Within the 1 km Study Area	UKHO 5604
3133	Motor	Steam vessel	Cargo vessel	Modern	54 39.07 N 001 07.53 W	Sunk and dispersed in 1915 and reported clear. Examined by diver in 1929s, swept clear of obstruction.	Within the 1 km Study Area	

HER	Name	Site Type	Classification	Period	Location	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
3176	Bran sands wreck	Vessel	Craft	Unknown	54 37.54 N 001 08.16 W	The remains of a wooden vessel visible at most times of the year to a height of some 0.3 m. From the outline of the visible frames the bow section seems to be relatively intact, as does the stern portion of the port side. The starboard side of the vessel appears to have been crushed inwards though still holding its shape. The wreck was surveyed by the NAS in May 1996.	Partially within the Site; partially within the 1 km Study Area	
3180	Unknown	Wreckage	Craft	Unknown	54 39.01 N 001 07.36 W	Small wreck embedded in sand. Steel ribs protruding 1.5 m to 2 m high. Length 15 m app. least depth 9.7 m. in general 10.5 to 11.3 m. Position 54 39 01.14N 001 07 56.11W or 033.5 degrees in 1983.	Within the 1 km Study Area	
3216	Unknown	Sailing Vessel	Unknown	19th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	N/A	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
3225	Anchor	Artefact	Unknown	19th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	An old anchor dredged up from a great depth at the 3rd Buoy was presented to the free Library Committee of Middlesbrough for presentation either in the Corporation's museum or at the Park. Found in 1886.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
3227	Glencairn	Steam vessel	Cargo vessel	19th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	Vessel of Middlesbrough, Crosby, Master. Sunk in the Tees. In collision with S.S. Cobden while proceeding down river to load at Eston jetty. Holed on the quarter and sank within 5 minutes.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	

HER	Name	Site Type	Classification	Period	Location	Description	Relation to Development	Associated Records
3325	Anchor	Artefact	Unknown	20th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	Part of anchor lost from H.M.S. Lucia (could not be found) below Eston Wharf. May have been dredged.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
3326	Iron tub	Artefact	Unknown	20th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	Iron tub lost overboard from coal jigger, 1918, near No.1 Deep Water Berth. Probably crushed in the mud and may be found when dredging in the vicinity.	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
3351	Boiler	Artefact	Unknown	Modern	54 38.24 N 001 09.24 W	N/A	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	
5001	Stranger	Steam Vessel	Tug	19th century	54 36.50 N 001 09.50 W	N/A	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	

Aviation Archaeology

Designated Assets

19.4.26 There are no designated assets related to aviation archaeology within the Study Area.

Undesignated Assets

19.4.27 There is one undesignated aviation asset summarised in Table 19-9. Little of its physical evidence remains with most of our knowledge deriving from documentary records, therefore the asset is of low archaeological significance.

Table 19-9: Summary of HER Records of Undesignated Aircraft Assets

HER	Name	Site Type	Classification	Period	Location	Description	Relation to Development
3174	Seaplane	Aircraft	Aircraft	20th century	54 36.00 N 001 10.00 W	Sunk in River Tees in the Fairway, south of mid-channel abreast of what was the Admiralty submarine base at Eston. Two 60 lb bombs were on board.	Outside Study Area. 4.1 km to the south of the water intake corridor.

Potential Historic Environment Receptors

Submerged Prehistoric Archaeology and Palaeolandscapes

19.4.28 Palaeochannels are rarely found in isolation, generally part of a larger complex of an extinct river system. As such, the Palaeochannel (HER 6396) located within the Study Area is likely to be part of a wider fluvial system and there is potential for palaeolandscape evidence to extend into the Site.

19.4.29 Bathymetric surveys and side-scan sonar, as part of the Pelorus geophysical survey undertaken in advance of the Teesside Offshore Wind Farm, identified 82 anomalies that could not be confirmed as being of anthropogenic interest, and therefore may be natural (Entec, 2004). These could represent palaeochannels and palaeolandscape evidence that may extend into the Site.

19.4.30 Six anomalies from the Teesside Offshore Wind Farm geophysical survey were identified as being sites of archaeological interest (Entec, 2004). These have not been investigated or surveyed further as they were not impacted by that development, so it is not known if these sites are related to submerged prehistory.

19.4.31 Submerged prehistoric archaeology has not been identified within the Site. However, the Site is located between two areas of archaeological and palaeoenvironmental potential (the submerged forests), and therefore the likelihood of any previously unrecorded submerged prehistoric remains is medium.

Maritime or Shipwreck Archaeology

19.4.32 The Navigational Hazards Project, by Bournemouth University (Merritt *et al*. 2007), assessed historical records of navigational hazards to build a

Geographic Information System (GIS) and characterise the marine historic environment. Areas of hazard were combined with a model of the preservation potential of marine sediments to identify areas where there was a high potential for ship losses and high potential for the preservation of archaeological remains. These areas are known as Areas of Maritime Archaeological Potential (AMAP). The area of the Tees estuary was identified as an AMAP, with the surrounding environs ranking as medium for navigational hazards. This would suggest the potential for the existence of multiple shipwrecks.

19.4.33 Only two geophysical anomalies were identified as wrecks in the Teesside Offshore Wind Farm geophysical survey (Entec, 2004), which have subsequently been included in the Redcar and Cleveland HER.

19.4.34 Several shipwrecks have already been identified within the Site and the Study Area. Therefore, surveys that identified these assets can be assumed to have been exhaustive and the likelihood of any unknown maritime remains within the Site is low.

Aviation or Aircraft Archaeology

19.4.35 It is unlikely that there are aviation assets within the Study Area. One asset is recorded in the wider vicinity, a seaplane (HER 3174). Records for World War I and World War II aircraft are quite fragmentary, requiring estimates on aircraft losses which are not spatially precise (English Heritage, 2002). In addition to this, the Site and Study Area is located very close to the shoreline, therefore any lost aircraft are likely to have been partially visible suggesting that the likelihood of any unknown aviation remains is low.

19.5 Development Design and Impact Avoidance

19.5.1 At present there are no design measures to reduce or avoid impacts on archaeological receptors.

19.6 Likely Impacts and Effects

19.6.1 This section identifies the potential impacts resulting from the Proposed Development. The magnitude of impacts is defined and the significance of effects is determined in accordance with the identified methodology presented in Section 19.3 above.

Construction (2022)

19.6.2 This section identifies the potential impacts resulting from the Proposed Development based on the identified methodology presented above.

19.6.3 The worst case construction scenario which has been assessed includes construction of the PCC and activities below Mean High Water Springs including dredging, cofferdam construction and piling for the Water Connections (Abstraction and Discharge Corridors) to the River Tees and Tees Bay and the launch site for trenchless technology for the CO_2 Export Pipeline.

19.6.4 Construction of the Proposed Development has the potential to affect heritage assets in the following ways:

- partial or total removal of heritage assets;
- compaction of archaeological deposits by structures; and
- adverse effects on the setting of heritage assets as a result of visual intrusion, change in noise air quality, severance, access and amenity as a result of construction works.

19.6.5 There will be no physical impact upon any designated heritage assets during construction. However, the setting of the high value Protected Wreck Seaton Carew (1000077) will be affected by the Proposed Development, as the CCGT will be visible over the Tees Mouth. The remains of this eighteenth-century oak English collier brig are situated in the tidal zone, with the setting of the asset defined by the surrounding coastal environment. The asset is already situated nearby an industrial complex therefore the Proposed Development is not significantly altering the setting of the asset. The magnitude of impact is assessed to be minor resulting in a minor adverse (not significant) effect.

19.6.6 The wreck Eidsiva (UKHO 5590/HER 3123) is a non-designated asset of low value. The asset is located within the Site required for the construction of the Proposed Development, therefore it is assumed it will be removed completely, resulting in total loss of its heritage value. This will constitute a high magnitude of impact and a moderate adverse (significant) effect.

19.6.7 An unknown vessel (HER 2822) is a non-designated asset of low value. It is wrecked within the Site required for the construction of the Proposed Development, therefore it is assumed it will be removed completely, resulting in total loss of its heritage value. This will constitute a high magnitude of impact and a moderate adverse (significant) effect.

19.6.8 The wreck Lemnos (HER 3125) is a non-designated asset of low value. Parts of the wreck are located within the Site required for the construction of the Proposed Development, therefore it is assumed it will be removed completely, resulting in total loss of its heritage value. The wreck is dispersed as a result of high degradation, with the majority of the wreck not located within the Site (UKHO 5592, 5596 and 5799/HER 2774 are associated fragments not within the Site). The loss of wreck components within the Site will constitute a medium magnitude of impact and a minor adverse (not significant) effect.

19.6.9 The wreck Bran Sands (HER 3176) is a non-designated asset of low value. One part of the wreck is located within the Site required for the construction of the Proposed Development, therefore it is assumed it will be removed completely, resulting in total loss of its heritage value. The wreck is dispersed as a result of degradation, with one other part of the wreck located within the 1 km Study Area. This will constitute a medium magnitude of impact and a minor adverse (not significant) effect.

19.6.10 The likely impacts of construction on the remaining assets are summarised in Table 19-10, Table 19-11 and Table 19-12, as the effects were all determined to be not significant.

Table 19-10: Summary of Magnitude of Impact and Significance of Effect on Undesignated Palaeoenvironmental Assets

HER	Sensitivity (Value)	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect Category	Significant effect
6396	Medium	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No

Table 19-11: Summary of Magnitude of Impact and Significance of Effect on Undesignated Maritime Assets

Wreck Number	HER Number	Significance (heritage value)	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect Category	Significant effect
5581	-	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
5592	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
5596	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
5799	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
66500	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
5775	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
5595	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
5591	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
5597	-	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
5606	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
5604	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No

Wreck Number	HER Number	Significance (heritage value)	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect Category	Significant effect
5602	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
5599	-	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
5600	-	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
5601	-	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
5605	-	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
5607	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
5800	-	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
66501	-	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
89491	-	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
89492	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
63051	-	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No

Wreck Number	HER Number	Significance (heritage value)	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect Category	Significant effect
-	2138	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor	Negligible	No
-	2279	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	2536	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	2390	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
-	2673	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	2774	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	2812	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	2814	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	2824	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No

Wreck Number	HER Number	Significance (heritage value)	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect Category	Significant effect
-	2836	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	3104	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
-	3112	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	3119	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	3123	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
-	3124	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
-	3125	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
-	3129	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
-	3130	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
-	3133	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	3176	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	3180	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No

Wreck Number	HER Number	Significance (heritage value)	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect Category	Significant effect
-	3216	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	3225	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	3227	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Low	Minor	No
-	3325	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	3326	Low	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor	Negligible	No
-	3351	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No
-	5001	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No

Table 19-12: Summary of Magnitude of Impact and Significance of Effect on Undesignated Aircraft Assets

HER	Sensitivity (Value)	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect Category	Significant effect
3174	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Minor	Negligible	No

Operation (2026)

19.6.11 There will be no physical impact upon any heritage assets during operation of the Proposed Development. The setting of the high value Protected Wreck Seaton Carew (1000077) will be affected by the Proposed Development, as

the CCGT will be visible over the Tees Mouth. The remains of this eighteenth-century oak English collier brig are situated in the tidal zone, with the setting of the asset defined by the surrounding coastal environment. The asset is already situated nearby an industrial complex therefore the Proposed Development is not significantly altering the setting of the asset. The impact on the significance of the asset is, therefore, considered to be minor resulting in a minor adverse (not significant) effect.

19.6.12 No operational effects upon the undesignated archaeological resource are envisaged.

Decommissioning (2051)

19.6.13 There will be no impacts upon marine heritage resources as a result of the decommissioning of the Proposed Development.

19.7 Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

19.7.1 The assets set to experience significant adverse effects arising from the construction of the Proposed Development should ideally be preserved in situ, following the NPPF (MCHLG, 2019). Where this is not possible, an attempt must be made to preserve them by record.

19.7.2 Prior to construction, a geoarchaeological assessment should be undertaken to determine the extent of any peat deposits and palaeoenvironmental features within the Site. Avoidance by design is recommended. Further mitigation options will be explored where necessary during design development and any further mitigation and enhancement that could be brought forward for scheme will be reported in the Environmental Statement. An appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy, for the identified impacts arising from construction, will be agreed (where possible) with the archaeological advisor to the local planning authority and, if applicable, Historic England.

19.8 Limitations or Difficulties

19.8.1 The baseline data collection has utilised all relevant sources of available secondary information, listed in Section 19.3 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria. However, no additional surveys were undertaken to collect primary data to ground-truth these records. As the previously discussed Pelorus geophysical surveys were relatively comprehensive, it was judged that additional surveys were not necessary, because the likelihood of encountering previously unknown wrecks is low.

19.8.2 Design and option selection are ongoing at the time of writing of this chapter. As the Proposed Development is subject to change, it follows that minor adjustments to this baseline and impact assessment may occur during the writing of the ES.

19.9 Residual Effects or Conclusions

19.9.1 Tables 19-13, 19-14 and 19-15 below summarise the residual significant effects of the Proposed Development on marine heritage following the implementation of mitigation measures outlined in Section 19.7 Mitigation and Enhancement Measures.

19.9.2 Significant residual effects are defined as moderate or major.

Table 19-13: Summary of Residual Effects (Construction) on Undesignated Palaeoenvironmental Assets

HER Number	Description of impact	Significance of effect without mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation
6396	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant	To be confirmed	Minor adverse Not significant

Table 19-14: Summary of Residual Effects (Construction) on Undesignated Maritime Assets

Wreck Number	HER Number	Description of impact	Significance of effect without mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation
5581	-	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
5590	-	Within the Site	Moderate adverse Significant	Avoidance by design	Moderate adverse Significant
5592	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
5596	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
5799	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
66500	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
5775	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant

Wreck Number	HER Number	Description of impact	Significance of effect without mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation
5595	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
5591	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
5597	-	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
5606	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
5604	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
5602	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
5599	-	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
5600	-	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
5601	-	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
5605	-	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
5607	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant

Wreck Number	HER Number	Description of impact	Significance of effect without mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation
5800	-	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
66501	-	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
89491	-	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
89492	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
63051	-	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
-	2138	Within the 1 km Study Area	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	2279	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	2536	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	2390	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
-	2584	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	2673	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant

Wreck Number	HER Number	Description of impact	Significance of effect without mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation
-	2774	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	2812	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	2814	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	2822	Within the Site	Moderate adverse Significant	Avoidance by design	Negligible Not significant
-	2824	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	2836	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	3104	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
-	3112	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	3119	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	3123	Within the Site	Moderate adverse Significant	Avoidance by design	Negligible Not significant
-	3124	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant

Wreck Number	HER Number	Description of impact	Significance of effect without mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation
-	3125	Within the Site	Moderate adverse Significant	Avoidance by design	Negligible Not significant
-	3129	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
-	3130	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
-	3133	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
-	3176	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
-	3180	Within the 1 km Study Area	Minor adverse Not significant		Minor adverse Not significant
-	3216	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	3225	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	3327	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	3325	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	3326	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant

Wreck Number	HER Number	Description of impact	Significance of effect without mitigation	Mitigation/Enhancement measure	Residual effect after mitigation
-	3351	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant
-	5001	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant

Table 19-15: Summary of Residual Effects (Construction) on Undesignated Aircraft Assets

HER	Sensitivity (Value)	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Effect Category	Significant effect
3174	Low	Outside the 1 km Study Area, in wider River Tees and Coatham Sands environs	Negligible Not significant		Negligible Not significant

19.10 References

Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (AMAA) 1979 (c. 46). London: The Stationery Office.

Bondevik, S., Løvholt, F., Harbitz, C., Mangerud, J., Dawson, A., Inge, J., (2005), 'The Storegga Slide tsunami - comparing field observations with numerical simulations, *Marine and Petroleum Geology* **22**: 195–208.

British Geological Survey (1986). *1:250,000 UTM series of the United Kingdom and continental shelf. Tyne Tees sheet 54 N – 02 W Sea Bed Sediments and Quaternary*. Nottingham: British Geological Survey.

British Geological Survey (n.d.). *GeoIndex Offshore* [Online]. Available from: http://mapapps2.bgs.ac.uk/geoindex_offshore/home.html# [Date accessed 16/12/2019].

Coles, B.J. (1998). Doggerland: a speculative survey. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society,* **64**:45-81.

Department of Energy and Climate Change (2011a). *National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)* [Online]. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47854/1938-overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf

Department of Energy and Climate Change (2011b). *National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5)* [Online]. Available

from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/37050/1942-national-policy-statement-electricity-networks.pdf

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2009). *Our Seas – A Shared Resource: High Level Marine Objectives*. London: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2011). *Marine Policy Statement* [Online]. London: The Stationary Office. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69322/pb3654-marine-policy-statement-110316.pdf

English Heritage (1996). *England's coastal heritage.* London: English Heritage.

English Heritage (1998). *Identifying and Protecting Palaeolithic Remains.* London: English Heritage.

English Heritage (2002). *Military Aircraft Crash Sites. Archaeological guidance on their significance and future management.* London: English Heritage.

English Heritage (2008). *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*. London: Historic England.

English Heritage (2012). *Ships and Boats: Prehistory to Present: Designation Selection Guide.* London: English Heritage.

Entec (2004). *EDF Energy (Northern Offshore Wind) Ltd: Teesside Offshore Wind Farm Environmental Statement.*

Forewind (2014). *Teesside Offshore Wind Farm Environmental Statement* [Online]. Available at: https://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Dogger-Bank-ES-Chapter-12.pdf

Fulford, M., Champion, T. and Long, A. (eds.) (1997). *England's coastal heritage: a survey for English Heritage and the RCHME*. London: English Heritage.

Gaffney, V., Thomson, K., Fitch, S. (2007). *Mapping Doggerland: The Mesolithic Landscapes of the Southern North Sea*. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Haselgrove, C, and Healey, E (1992). The prehistory of the Tyne-Tees Lowlands: some recent flint finds. *Durham Archaeological Journal* **8**, 1-24.

Historic England (2015). *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2. Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment* [Online]. Available at: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa2-managing-significance-indecision-taking/gpa2/

Historic England (2017). *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3. The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd edition*). Available at: https://historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/

Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 (SI 2010/305). London: The Stationery Office.

Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (SI 2017/572). London: The Stationery Office.

Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee (2006). *Code of Practice for Seabed Development.*

Lewis, S.G., Ashton, N., Field, M.H., Hoare, P.G., Kamermans, H., Knul, M., Mücher, H.J., Parfitt, S.A., Roebroeks, W. and Sier, M.J. (2019). Human occupation of northern Europe in MIS 13: Happisburgh Site 1 (Norfolk, UK) and its European context. *Quaternary Science Reviews,* **211**: 34-58.

Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (c. 23). London: The Stationery Office.

Merchant Shipping Act 1995 (c. 21). London: The Stationery Office.

Merrit, O., Parham, D. and McElvogue, D.M. (2007). *Enhancing our Understanding of the Marine Historic Environment: Navigational Hazards Project. Final Report.* London: English Heritage and the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund.

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2019). *National Planning Policy Framework* [Online]. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf

Parfitt, S.A., Ashton, N.M., Lewis, S.G., Abel, R.L., Coope, G.R., Field, M.H., Gale, R., Hoare, P.G., Larkin, N.R., Lewis, M.D. and Karloukovski, V. (2010). Early Pleistocene human occupation at the edge of the boreal zone in northwest Europe*. Nature, 466*(**7303**): 229.

Parfitt, S.A., Barendregt, R.W., Breda, M., Candy, I., Collins, M.J., Coope, G.R., Durbidge, P., Field, M.H., Lee, J.R., Lister, A.M. and Mutch, R. (2005). The earliest record of human activity in northern Europe. *Nature, 438*(**7070**): 1008.

Peeters, H., Murphy, P. and Flemming, N. (2009). *North Sea prehistory research and management framework.* Amersfoort: Rijksdienst voor Cultureel Erfgoed; Swindon: English Heritage.

Petts, D. and Gerrard, C. (2006). *Shared Visions: The North-East Regional Research Framework for the Historic Environment.* Durham: Durham County Council.

Planning Act 2008 (c. 29). London: The Stationery Office.

Protection of Military Remains Act (PMRA) 1986 (c. 35). London: The Stationery Office.

Protection of Wrecks Act (PWA) 1973 (c. 33). London: The Stationery Office.

Raistrick, A., Coupland, F., and Coupland, G. (1935) A Mesolithic site on the South Durham coast. *Transactions of the Northern Naturalists Union* 1 (**4**), 207-216.

Rowe, P. *Resource Assessment: The Mesolithic Period in Teesside*. In: Petts, D. and Gerrard, C. (2006). *Shared Visions: The North-East Regional Research Framework for the Historic Environment.* Durham: Durham County Council.

Shennan, I., Lambeck, K., Flather, F., Horton, B., McArthur, J., Innes, J., Lloyd, J., Rutherford, M. and Wingfield, R. (2000). Modelling western North Sea palaeogeographies and tidal changes during the Holocene, in Shennan, I. and Andrews, J. (eds.) *Holocene Land-Ocean Interaction and Environmental Change around the North Sea,* London: *Geological Society* (Special Publication **166**): 299-319.

Smith, D.E., Shi, S., Cullingford, R.A., Dawson, A.G., Dawson, S., Firth, C.R., Foster, I.D.L., Fretwell, P.T., Haggart, B.A., Holloway, L.K., Long, D. (2004), *The Holocene Storegga Slide tsunami in the United Kingdom. Quaternary Science Reviews*, *23* (**23-24**), 2291–2321.

Tappin, D.R., Pearce, B., Fitch, S., Dove, D., Geary, B., Hill, J.M., Chambers, C., Bates, R., Pinnion, J., Diaz Doce, D., Green, M., Gallyot, J., Georgiou, L., Brutto, D., Marzialetti, S., Hopla, E., Ramsay, E., and Fielding, H. (2011). *The Humber Regional Environmental Characterisation. British Geological Survey Open Report OR/10/54.* Marine Aggregate Levy Sustainability Fund.

The Crown Estate (2010). *Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries: Offshore Renewables Projects.* WA ref 73830.04. Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology, on behalf of The Crown Estate.

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (SI 2017/571). London: The Stationery Office.

Tolan-Smith, C. (2008). *North East Rapid Coastal Zone Assessment (NERCZA).* ARS Ltd Report 2008/81. Bakewell: Archaeological Research Services Ltd.

UK Hydrographic Office (2019a). *Admiralty Marine Data: Wrecks and Obstructions EEZ Dataset.* Available at: https://data.admiralty.co.uk/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=17e4bd00de0c496282ba3a149a660860. [Date accessed 16/12/2019].

UK Hydrographic Office (2019b). *Explore ENC Contours and Dredged Areas.* Available at: https://data.admiralty.co.uk/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=17e4bd00de0c496282ba3a149a660860. [Date accessed 16/12/2019].

Val Baker, M., Tapper, B., Johns, C., and Herring, P. (2007). *England's Historic Seascapes: Scarborough to Hartlepool and adjacent marine zones ref. 2007R021. Historic Seascape Characterisation.* Redruth: Historic Environment Service, Cornwall County Council.

Waughman, M., Innes, J., and Tooley, M. (2005). *The changing palaeoenvironment of Hartlepool Bay*, 121-142, In: Waughman, M., *et al.* eds. Archaeology and Environment of Submerged Landscapes in Hartlepool Bay, England. Hartlepool: Tees Archaeology.

Wessex Archaeology (2014). *Forewind Dogger Bank Teesside A & B: Environmental Statement Chapter 18 Marine and Coastal Archaeology.* Application Reference 6.18.

Weyman, J, (1984) *'The Mesolithic in north-east England'*, 38-51, In: R Miket and C Burgess (eds), Between and beyond the walls: essays in honour of George Jobey. Edinburgh: John Donald.