Historic England

Direct Dial: [redacted]

Our Ref: PL00796054

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

26 October 2026

Dear Sir or Madam,

HISTORIC ENGLAND ADVICE
Your Ref: EN010169
Our Ref: PL00796054
Our Registration ID: [redacted]

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1) issued on 13th October 2026 for the application by Meridian Solar Farm Limited for an Order granting Development Consent for the Meridian Solar Farm Project.

We offer the following response to those questions directed to Historic England.

Question 12 - Historic Environment

Q12.0.4 Embedded Mitigation

To LCC and Historic England (HE): Please confirm whether a 20m buffer zone is considered acceptable [around two scheduled monuments within the OL]

Yes, 20 metres is appropriate in this specific instance due to the character of the monuments and based on the archaeological work undertaken in their environs to understand associated remains.

Q12.0.6 Archaeology

ES Chapter 8 [REP1-016] table 8-2 refers to comments made by HE that the landscape is a complex of former wet and dry lands including high potential for

Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.

waterlogged and salt industry remains and that they welcome the use of intrusive fieldwork techniques targeting those aspects of site which present the greatest challenges in characterisation and risk management. The Final Archaeological Field Evaluation Report Parts 1 - 3 [REP1-075], [REP1-076] and [REP1-077] were submitted at DL1. The ExA note from the SoCG with HE [REP2-012] that HE is awaiting detailed reporting and targeted intrusive investigations. Please comment on the Final Archaeological Field Evaluation Report and whether it satisfies HE's comments regarding the location of any intrusive fieldwork techniques.

HE is satisfied that the applicant has appropriately addressed the complex character of deposits in the application area through intrusive investigations and that the work carried out to date is sufficient to inform the decision-making process including the level of design fix at DCO. HE has provided comment on archaeological reporting and the draft Outline Written Scheme of Investigation, and these have been positively addressed by the applicant. We will reflect this in the next update to the SoCG.

Q2.0.9 Archaeology

ES Chapter 8 [REP1-016] paragraph 8.10.7 outlines that protective measures, such as fencing, during all three phases would be installed to avoid unintentional damage to archaeological assets. What approach would be taken to ensure that the fencing itself does not cause damage to archaeological heritage assets?

We note this question is directed to the applicant, but we wish to offer the following additional comment. We will review the applicant's Deadline 3 response further to item 1.4 of the Draft SoCG between HE and the applicant, regarding the important kinetic views to the tower of Crowland Abbey Church as one moves through the former monastic estate, and the refinement of array extent to conserve significance and address our comments.

If you wish to discuss our advice further, please feel free to get in touch.

Yours Sincerely

[redacted] on behalf of [redacted]
Inspector of Ancient Monuments (Infrastructure)
E-mail: [redacted]@HistoricEngland.org.uk

Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.