



**East Pye Solar
Environmental Statement
Volume 1: Chapter 10 – Cultural Heritage**

**Revision 1
March 2026**

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN0110014

Document Reference: APP / 6.1.10

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Contents

10	Cultural Heritage	1
10.1	Introduction.....	1
10.2	Consultation.....	1
10.3	Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance.....	15
10.4	Assessment Assumptions and Limitations.....	18
10.5	Assessment Methodology.....	20
10.6	Baseline Conditions.....	25
10.7	Embedded Mitigation.....	39
10.8	Assessment of Likely Effects.....	43
10.9	Additional Mitigation Measures.....	51
10.10	Residual Effects.....	53
10.11	Cumulative Effects Assessment.....	54
10.12	Conclusion.....	57

Tables

Table 10-1	Relevant Scoping Opinion Comments from Statutory Bodies relating to Cultural Heritage	3
Table 10-2	Summary of Further Engagement Undertaken.....	14
Table 10-3	Sensitivity Criteria of Identified Receptor.....	22
Table 10-4	Criteria for Determining Magnitude of Impact.....	23
Table 10-5	Scale of Effect.....	25
Table 10-6	Designated Heritage Assets Scoped In for Assessment.....	27
Table 10-7	Sensitivity of Identified Receptor.....	35
Table 10-8	Short List Developments/Allocations relevant to Cultural Heritage.....	55
Table 10-9	Summary of Residual Effects for Cultural Heritage.....	57

10 Cultural Heritage

10.1 Introduction

- 10.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of effects on Cultural Heritage as a result of the Scheme.
- 10.1.2 This chapter identifies and proposes measures to address the potential impacts and likely significant effects on Cultural Heritage, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning Phases.
- 10.1.3 The information presented within this chapter has been informed by the Scheme information provided in **ES: Chapter 4 The Scheme [EN0110014/APP/6.1.4]**.
- 10.1.4 The following aspects have been considered within the Cultural Heritage assessment process:
- An assessment of potential effects upon archaeological assets resulting from direct impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme;
 - An assessment of potential effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets resulting from direct impacts during the construction phase of the Scheme; and
 - An assessment of potential effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets due to changes in their settings during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Scheme.
- 10.1.5 This Cultural Heritage chapter has been prepared by appropriately qualified experts. For further details, refer to the **Statement of Expertise [EN0110014/APP/6.3.1.2]**.
- 10.1.6 A glossary of abbreviations can be found in **ES: Chapter 0 Contents, Glossary and Abbreviations [EN0110014/APP/6.1.0]**.

10.2 Consultation

- 10.2.1 The Scheme has been subject to consultation throughout the preparation of the DCO application. A request for an EIA Scoping Opinion was sought from the Secretary of State (SoS) through the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in January 2025. A Scoping Opinion was adopted by PINS in February 2025 **[EN0110014/APP/6.3.2.3]**.

- 10.2.2 The issues raised in the Scoping Opinion relating to Cultural Heritage are summarised and responded to within **Table 10-1** which demonstrates how the matters raised in the Scoping Opinion are addressed in this ES.

Table 10-1 Relevant Scoping Opinion Comments from Statutory Bodies relating to Cultural Heritage

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
The Planning Inspectorate, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	3.16.1 <i>'Direct Impacts to designated heritage assets – All Phases; This matter is proposed to be scoped out on the basis that there are no designated heritage assets within the Proposed Development boundary. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that direct significant impacts on heritage assets are unlikely to occur. This matter can be scoped out of the ES.'</i>	This has not been assessed further in the ES.	N/A
The Planning Inspectorate, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	3.16.2 <i>'Direct impacts to below ground archaeology – decommissioning; This matter is proposed to be scoped out on the basis that there would be no further likely significant effects that would arise from the decommissioning phase than from the construction phase and measures outlined in the outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) will be sufficient to mitigate potential impacts. This matter can be scoped out of the ES.'</i>	This has not been assessed further in the ES.	N/A

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
The Planning Inspectorate, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	3.16.3 <i>'Indirect impacts to designated and non-designated heritage assets (solar panels, BESS and substation areas – Decommissioning); The matter is proposed to be scoped out on the basis that whilst there would be indirect impacts to heritage receptors during decommissioning, they would be lower in magnitude than during construction and therefore considered not significant. Whilst the Inspectorate agrees that the impacts from decommissioning would be of lower magnitude than construction, insufficient information has been provided on the decommissioning activities to suggest they would not be significant. As such, the ES should assess indirect decommissioning impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets'</i>	Indirect impacts to designated and non-designated heritage assets during decommissioning is considered below in this chapter of the ES.	Section 10.8
The Planning Inspectorate, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	3.16.4 <i>'Indirect impacts to designated and non-designated heritage assets (CRC) – All Phases; This matter is proposed to be scoped out on the basis</i>	This has not been assessed further in the ES.	N/A

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
	<p><i>that, as the cable infrastructure is to be buried, there will be no post-construction impacts on setting and construction impacts are short-term and not much bigger in magnitude than the current agricultural use. The inspectorate agrees and can be scoped out of the ES'</i></p>		
<p>The Planning Inspectorate, Scoping Opinion, February 2025</p>	<p>3.16.5 <i>'Temporary Construction Compounds; Due to the unknown locations of the temporary construction areas, the baseline is incomplete. The ES should identify any potential receptors and impact pathways from these temporary elements and undertake an assessment where significant effects are likely to occur'</i></p>	<p>The locations of temporary construction compounds are now available and their impact on heritage assets is assessed in the chapter herein.</p>	<p>Section 10.8</p>
<p>The Planning Inspectorate, Scoping Opinion, February 2025</p>	<p>3.15.6 <i>'Study Areas; The ES should justify the study areas and any sensitive receptors, particularly concerning those with views towards or from the Scheme. It should include relevant approaches, such as Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), and</i></p>	<p>The Study Area is defined in Section 10.5. Consideration of possible effects on heritage assets outside of the study area indicated by models showing ZTV has been considered and ground-truthed by walkover surveys undertaken between Summer 2024 and Autumn 2025. Heritage-specific visibility analysis has been undertaken to accompany the ZTVs and are included as part of ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1]. Further assessment of</p>	<p>See section 10.5 for the study area, section 10.8 for the assessment of sensitive receptors and ES: Appendix 10.1 – Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1] for visibility analysis.</p>

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
	<p><i>approach made clear. Consultation with the relevant bodies should be made to agree the approach and sensitive receptors with relevant consultation bodies. Evidence should be supported through plans'</i></p>	<p>the sensitive receptors has been provided in this chapter.</p>	
<p>Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025</p>	<p>HE highlighted the following designated heritage assets to be assessed: Church of St Catherine, Fritton, Church of St Michael, Stratton St Michael, Church of St John the Baptist, Morningthorpe, Wacton Hall, Church of St Peter, Brooke, Porch House, Kirkstead Hall, Church of St Margaret, Kirkstead, Church of St Mary the Virgin, Saxlingham, the Old Rectory, Saxlingham, the Old Hall, Saxlingham, Ditchingham Hall and Ditchingham Registered Park and Garden.</p>	<p>These designated heritage assets have been assessed and those identified as potentially sensitive to the Scheme have been detailed herein. Several have been scoped out of further assessment following Desk-Based Research, Viewshed Analysis and Site Visits which determined that they would not be sensitive to the Scheme. Details of this are included in ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1]</p>	<p>See section 10.6 for baseline conditions, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects and section 10.10 for residual effects.</p>
<p>Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025</p>	<p>Attention should be paid to the following Conservation Areas: Brooke, Saxlingham Green, Hempnall, Fritton and Wacton.</p>	<p>These designated heritage assets have been assessed and those identified as potentially sensitive to the Scheme have been detailed herein.</p>	<p>See section 10.6 for baseline conditions, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects and section 10.10 for residual effects.</p>

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	The likely effects of substations on heritage assets.	The likely effects of substations on heritage assets have been assessed in this chapter.	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects and section 10.10 for residual effects.
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Grade II Listed Buildings should also be assessed.	Grade II Listed Buildings have been assessed and those identified as potentially sensitive to the Scheme have been detailed herein.	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects and 10.10 for residual effects.
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Impacts on non-designated heritage assets should also be assessed.	Non-designated heritage assets have been assessed and those identified as potentially sensitive to the Scheme have been detailed herein.	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects and 10.10 for residual effects.
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	The historic environment should be dealt with in a separate chapter within the ES.	The historic environment has been dealt with in a separate chapter (i.e. this chapter (10 Cultural Heritage).	N/A (whole chapter)
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Consultation with statutory bodies, such as Conservation Officers is recommended.	Statutory bodies have been consulted throughout the process and that consultation is detailed herein.	Section 10.2
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	A ZTV should be used to identify all heritage assets whose setting may be impacted.	ZTVs and heritage specific visibility analysis has been undertaken to support the assessment and is demonstrated in section 10.6 and ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1] .	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions and ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1] .
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	The assessment should take into account potential impact of associated activities, such as construction, on the understanding of heritage assets. It should also consider any alterations to drainage patterns that may affect archaeological	Assessment of construction activities has been included within this chapter.	Section 10.8

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
	remains or subsidence of buildings or monuments.		
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	An assessment of setting of heritage assets not restricted to visual receptors, but to include the landscape as a whole and the impact of other receptors, such as noise and traffic, etc.	Environmental impacts to heritage setting has been included within the assessment of sensitive receptors herein.	See ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1] and section 10.8 (likely effects).
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	The EIA should define the setting of each heritage asset and the contribution which different elements of that setting make to the asset's significance to assess the magnitude of impact and any resulting benefit, loss or harm. Cumulative impact should also be considered.	The setting of each heritage asset and contribution made by said setting to their significance is set out within ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1] and cumulative impacts are considered within this chapter.	ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1] and section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects.
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Professional judgement should also be used to assess setting.	Professional judgement has been applied to the ongoing assessment, with results presented in this chapter.	N/A (whole chapter).
Planning Archaeologist, Norfolk County Council Pre-Scoping Meeting, November 2024	Meeting to introduce the Scheme. Geophysical survey arranged as soon as possible. Proposed to target trial trenching on results of assessments and surveys and he has asked for a	Geophysical survey and trial trenching (as agreed with NCC) was completed to inform this ES, the results of which are summarised in section 10.6 and detailed in ES: Appendix 10.3 Geophysical Survey [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.3] and ES: Appendix 10.5 Trial Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5] .	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions, ES: Appendix 10.3 Geophysical Survey [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.3] and ES: Appendix 10.5 Trial Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5] .

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
	trench location plan to be agreed.		
South Norfolk Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Para 9.4.6 of the Scoping Report in which it proposes that consultation with South Norfolk Council is undertaken to identify non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs). South Norfolk Council expects the applicant to identify/initially select sites of potential assets	Whilst it is normally within the remit of the Council to provide and maintain a local list of NDHAs, this has been researched and the results are presented within section 10.6 .	Section 10.6
South Norfolk Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	The council suggests that reference is made to 'harm' as well as 'adversely affects' the significance of any designated heritage asset.	This has been noted and a judgement of harm has been included within section 10.10 .	Section 10.10
South Norfolk Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Consideration of the impact of access roads as well as location of equipment and solar panels on heritage assets.	Access routes are identified in ES: Chapter 11 – Transport and Access [EN0110014/APP/6.1.11] . Likely effects of access routes on heritage assets have been assessed within this chapter.	ES: Chapter 11 – Transport and Access [EN0110014/APP/6.1.11] and section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects.
Alburgh Parish Council, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	All aspects of cultural heritage should be scoped in. Maps of all Listed Buildings and proposed infrastructure should be provided to assess the threat to cultural heritage. ZTVs should be provided	This has been noted, although some aspects have been scoped out following PEIR stage.	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects and ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1] .

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
Bergh Apton Parish Council, Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings will be totally destroyed by this expanse of industrial power equipment.	Assessment of likely effects on Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings is included within this chapter.	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects and 10.10 for residual effects.
Brooke Parish Council, BEPS - Residents Action Group and Shelton and Hardwick Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	It is inadequate to only list the impact to Grade II Listed Buildings within 100m of the site and should be 500m, if not further, with the distance measured from the curtilage of the Listed Building.	The Scoping Report stated a 2km study area for Grade II Listed Buildings (with a flexible approach to any identified listed buildings that may be sensitive outside of these areas) and a 5km study area for higher grade heritage assets. These wider study areas have been adopted for this ES chapter, rather than the erroneous distances suggested in the comment.	Section 10.5
Brooke Parish Council, BEPS - Residents Action Group and Shelton and Hardwick Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	There may be impacts to Listed Buildings from vibrations during construction or traffic.	The effects from vibration from traffic are scoped out of the noise and vibration assessment (see ES: Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [EN0110014/APP/6.1.12]). The effects of vibration from the construction of the Scheme are considered in ES: Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [EN0110014/APP/6.1.12] for receptors up to a distance of 100m from vibration-generating construction activity. Vibration effects from the Cable Route Corridor (CRC) are scoped out of the assessment.	See Section 12.8 of ES: Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration [EN0110014/APP/6.1.12] .
Brooke Parish Council, BEPS - Residents Action Group and Shelton and Hardwick Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Native hedging/trees for screening may not be of an adequate height for a decade and these interim impacts need to be assessed.	The effects of screening with vegetation is part of the assessment in conjunction with the landscape and visual assessment (see ES: Chapter 7 – Landscape and Visual [EN0110014/APP/6.1.7]). Interim effects on heritage assets while landscaping features mature is also considered within this chapter and where appropriate, a judgement of the scale of these effects in the interim period is included, together with how this scale will be changed once hedges/trees mature.	See section 10.7 for embedded mitigation, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects, section 10.9 for additional mitigation measures and section 10.10 for residual effects; ES: Chapter 7 – Landscape and Visual [EN0110014/APP/6.1.7] .

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
Brooke Parish Council, BEPS - Residents Action Group and Shelton and Hardwick Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Direct and indirect impacts to cultural heritage during the construction and decommissioning phases need to be scoped in.	These have been assessed in this chapter.	Section 10.8
Brooke Parish Council, BEPS - Residents Action Group and Shelton and Hardwick Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Cumulative impacts to cultural heritage should be scoped in.	These have been assessed in this chapter.	Section 10.11
Brooke Parish Council, BEPS - Residents Action Group and Shelton and Hardwick Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Maps should be provided with all Listed Buildings and proposed infrastructure.	This has been assessed and maps showing the location of all listed buildings are included.	ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1].
Hempnall Parish Council and Aslacton Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Impacts on Conservation Areas are fully assessed	These have been assessed in this chapter.	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects and section 10.10 for residual effects.
Morningthorpe and Fritton Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	There are many Listed Buildings close-by including the Grade I St Catherine's Church	Likely effects on listed buildings have been assessed in this chapter.	See section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects and section 10.10 for residual effects.
Norfolk County Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Following consultation with GHC Archaeology and Heritage, trial trenching has been agreed to commence	Trial trench evaluation has been undertaken and the results are detailed herein (section 10.6) and in ES:	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions and ES: Appendix 10.5 Trial Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5].

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
	as soon as possible irrespective of the EIA stage	Appendix 10.5 Trial Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5].	
Seething Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	To optimise screening and minimise heritage impact, the security fencing must be located inside the perimeter hedgerow and tree planting	This has been assessed within ES: Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [EN0110014/APP/6.1.7].	ES: Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [EN0110014/APP/6.1.7].
Seething Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Cable installation must be underground and should avoid heritage/archaeological features	The design will seek to avoid heritage and archaeological features as far as possible. Details on cable installation and the final design parameters can be found in ES: Chapter 4 – The Scheme [EN0110014/APP/6.1.4].	ES: Chapter 4 – The Scheme [EN0110014/APP/6.1.4].
Shotesham Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	It is inadequate to only list the impact to Grade II Listed Buildings within 100m of the site and should be 500m, if not further, with the distance measured from the curtilage of the Listed Building	The Scoping Report stated a 2km study area for Grade II Listed Buildings (with a flexible approach to any identified listed buildings that may be sensitive outside of these areas) and a 5km study area for higher grade heritage assets. These wider study areas have been adopted for this ES chapter, rather than the erroneous distances suggested in the comment.	Section 10.5
Shotesham Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Uppgate Green Farm should be assessed	Uppgate Green Farm has been assessed in this chapter.	See section 10.7 for embedded mitigation and ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1].
Shotesham Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Trial trenching should be undertaken across the proposed sites and cable route corridors (CRC).	Trial trench evaluation has been undertaken and the results are detailed herein (section 10.6) and in ES: Appendix 10.5 Trial Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5].	See section 10.6 for baseline conditions and ES: Appendix 10.5 Trial Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5].

Consultee and Date	Comment and Scoping Opinion ID No.	How has the comment been addressed in the ES chapter	Location of response in ES Chapter
Shotesham Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	There may be impacts to Listed Buildings from vibrations during construction or traffic.	The effects from vibration from traffic are scoped out of the noise and vibration assessment (see ES: Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration [EN0110014/APP/6.1.12]). The effects of vibration from the construction of the Scheme (excluding the CRC) are considered in ES: Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration [EN0110014/APP/6.1.12] for receptors up to a distance of 100m from vibration-generating construction activity. Vibration effects from the CRC are scoped out of the assessment.	ES: Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [EN0110014/APP/6.1.12].
Shotesham Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Native hedging/trees for screening may not be of an adequate height for a decade and these interim impacts need to be assessed.	The effects of screening with vegetation is part of the assessment in conjunction with the landscape and visual assessment (see ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [EN0110014/APP/6.1.7]).	See section 10.7 for embedded mitigation, section 10.8 for assessment of likely effects, section 10.9 for additional mitigation measures and section 10.10 for residual effects; ES: Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [EN0110014/APP/6.1.7] .
Shotesham Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Direct and indirect impacts to cultural heritage during the construction and decommissioning phases need to be scoped in.	These have been assessed in this chapter.	Section 10.8
Shotesham Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Cumulative impacts to cultural heritage should be scoped in.	These have been assessed in this chapter.	Section 10.11
Shotesham Parish Council Scoping Opinion, February 2025	Maps should be provided with all Listed Buildings and proposed infrastructure.	This has been assessed and maps showing the location of all listed buildings are included.	ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1].

Statutory Consultation and Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)

- 10.2.3 Statutory consultation was held between 18th June 2025, and 6th August 2025. Relevant responses to the PEIR relating to cultural heritage and how these have been addressed through the ES are set out within **Consultation Report Appendix 10 Section 47 Applicant Response Table [EN0110041.5.11]** and **Consultation Report Appendix 11 Section 42 Applicant Response Table [EN0110041.5.12]**.
- 10.2.4 Further engagement has been undertaken as part of stakeholder engagement specific to Cultural Heritage, as detailed within **Table 10-2** below.

Table 10-2 Summary of Further Engagement Undertaken

Consultee and Date	Summary of Matter	Response
Planning Archaeologist, Norfolk County Council, July 2025	Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for informative trial trenching agreed.	Trial trenching completed in adherence to the agreed WSI. Works commenced in August 2025 and were monitored throughout by the Planning Archaeologist. The results are presented in ES: Appendix 10.5 Evaluation Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5] .
Historic England, October 2025	Teams meeting to agree heritage viewpoint locations and further correspondence over email to address other points raised in response to the PEIR.	Awaiting response.
Conservation Officer Broadland Council, November 2025	Teams meeting to discuss embedded mitigation and resulting changes to which heritage assets have been scoped in/out. Further correspondence to agree judgement of level of harm during ES preparation.	Awaiting final response.

Targeted Consultation

- 10.2.5 A further round of targeted consultation was undertaken between 22nd October 2025 and 26th November 2025 following changes to the development boundary area of the Scheme presented in the PEIR and during Stage Two Statutory Consultation. All the changes are documented in full in the **Consultation Report [EN0110014/APP/5.1]**. These changes did not give rise to any materially new or different likely significant environmental effects compared to those reported in the PEIR. How these have been addressed through the ES are set out

within **Consultation Report Appendix 10 Section 47 Applicant Response Table [EN0110014/APP/5.11]** and **Consultation Report Appendix 11 Section 42 Applicant Response Table [EN0110014/APP/5.12]**.

10.3 Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance

- 10.3.1 A summary of applicable legislation, planning policy and other guidance documents against which the Scheme has been considered relating to cultural heritage is set out in **ES: Appendix 2.3 Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance [EN0110014/APP/6.3.2.3]**.
- 10.3.2 An overview of the legislation, planning policy and guidance against which the Scheme will be considered for the Cultural Heritage assessment is set out below.

Legislation and Regulations

- Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 (Ref 10-1)
- Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Ref 10-2)
- Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 (Ref 10-3)
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (AMAAA) 1979 (Ref 10-4)
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (P(LBCA)A) 1990 (Ref 10-5)
- Planning Act 2008 (Ref 10-6)
- Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (Ref 10-7)
- UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and National Heritage 1972 (Ref 10-8)

Planning Policy

National Planning Policy

- 10.3.3 The National Policy Statements (NPS) are a suite of documents issued by the SoS, setting out the government's policy for delivery of major energy infrastructure and represent the primary policy tests against which this DCO Application for the Scheme will be considered. Listed below are the details

of the elements of NPSs considered relevant to the Cultural Heritage assessment:

- The Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1, 2025) (Ref 10-9) sets out the government’s policy for the delivery of major energy infrastructure and, in conjunction with relevant technology-specific NPSs, forms the primary policy for Secretary of State decision making for such developments. Part 5 of EN-1 details the policies on the assessment of common impacts across the range of energy technologies, with Section 5.9, entitled ‘Historic Environment’, specifying the predominant policy concerning impacts of major energy infrastructure on the historic environment, including guidance on the assessment and mitigation of these impacts. This section requires applicants to assess the significance of any heritage assets with the potential to be affected and provides advice on the means of reducing any impact, which should be considered throughout the design process.
- Paragraph 5.9.33 and 5.9.34 of EN-1 recognise that the Secretary of State should take into account the positive role that large-scale renewable projects play in the mitigation of climate change, the delivery of energy security and the urgency of meeting the net zero target, stating that this public benefit must be weighed against any loss or harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset.
- The relevant technology-specific NPS for the Scheme comprises the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (Ref 10-10). Section 2.10 of EN-3 details government policy on developments for Solar Photovoltaic Generation and incorporates specific considerations in regard to cultural heritage.
- The National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) (Ref 10-11) details government policy on electricity infrastructure. With regards to cultural heritage, the document largely refers to policies set out in EN-1 and EN3 but recognises the potential impacts upon the setting of designated heritage assets from overhead cables and direct impacts from undergrounding in paragraph 2.9.26.

10.3.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ref 10-12), as revised in December 2024, sets out national planning policies that reflect priorities of the Government for operation of the planning system and the economic, social, and environmental aspects of the development and use of land. The NPPF has a strong emphasis on sustainable development, with a presumption in favour of such development. The NPPF has the potential to be considered important and relevant to the SoS consideration of the Scheme. Listed below provides details of the elements of the NPPF that are relevant to this chapter:

- Overall, the objectives of Section 16 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the: Delivery of sustainable development; Understanding the

wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment, and Conservation of England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

- Section 16 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 212 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that the level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.
- Heritage Assets are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: “a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).” Annex 2 also defines ‘Archaeological Interest’ as a heritage asset which “holds or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point”. Heritage Assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.

National Planning Practice Guidance

- 10.3.5 The Planning Practice Guidance (Ref 10-13) is a web-based resource which is to be used in conjunction with the NPPF. It is aimed at planning professionals and prescribes best practice within the planning sector. The relevant section is entitled ‘Historic Environment’. The guidance given in this section sets out the best practice to applying government policy in the NPPF.

Local Planning Policy

- 10.3.6 The Scheme is located within the administrative areas of Norfolk County Council (NCC) and South Norfolk Council (SNC) who are the host authorities. Local planning plan policies which are relevant to Cultural Heritage and have informed the Cultural Heritage assessment are detailed below.
- The Greater Norwich Local Plan (adopted March 2024) (Ref 10-13) comprises policies to support development in Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk district councils working in partnership with Norfolk County Council and the Broads Authority. Policy 3 Environmental Protection and Enhancement is of relevance to the Cultural Heritage Assessment:
 - The South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (Ref 10-14) includes the following objective:

To protect, manage and enhance the natural, built and historic environment, including key landscapes, natural resources and areas of natural habitat or nature conservation value.

Other Guidance

10.3.7 The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the following other guidance documents:

- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (Ref 10-16);
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment (Ref 10-17);
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition): The Setting of Heritage Assets (Ref 10-18);
- Statement of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets. Historic England Advice Note 12 (Ref 10-19);
- Advice Note 15: Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment (Ref 10-20);
- Norfolk County Council Standards for Developer-Led Archaeological Projects in Norfolk (Ref 10-21);
- Historic England Piling and Archaeology (Ref 10-22);
- Historic England Using Airborne LiDAR in Archaeological Survey (Ref 10-23);
- Historic England Land Contamination and Archaeology (Ref 10-24); and
- Historic England Preserving Archaeological Remains (Ref 10-25).

10.4 Assessment Assumptions and Limitations

10.4.1 The Cultural Heritage assessment has considered the following assumptions:

- Baseline information has been collated from **ES: Appendix 10.1 – Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1]** and **ES: Appendix 10.2 – Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.2]**, as well as the results of archaeological evaluation (**ES: Appendix 10.3 Geophysical Survey [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.3]**; **ES: Appendix 10.4 Aerial Photograph Survey [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.4]** and **ES Appendix 10.5 Trial**

Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5]). It is assumed that information provided by secondary sources (i.e. HER, PAS, NRHE, NHLE, cartographic information) and third parties is accurate.

- Assessment of impact has been undertaken with consideration to the parameters detailed in **ES: Chapter 4 – The Scheme [EN0110014/APP/6.1.4]**; **Works Plans [APP/2.3]** and **Design Parameters and Design Principles [APP/7.18]**. A number of the detailed design aspects and features of the Scheme cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the Scheme has been completed. Therefore, where assessment has been made on the significance of effects, this has been undertaken applying the Rochdale Envelope principle as described in **ES: Chapter 2 EIA Methodology [EN0110014/APP/6.1.2]**.
- The setting assessment assumes all solar infrastructure would be at the maximum possible height as set out in **ES: Chapter 4 The Scheme [EN0110014/APP/6.1.4]**.

10.4.2 The Cultural Heritage assessment has considered the following limitations:

- Whilst the extent and nature of piling for the metal frames upon which the PV panels will be mounted is reasonably well understood, and its impact is recognised as being extremely low (typically less than 0.5% of site area), the details of the amount and location of associated cabling is not yet available (to be determined at detailed design). It is, however, recognised that during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme, relatively low levels of below ground disturbance are expected, depending upon the exact layout and construction methods utilised (typically in the region of 5%-7% of site area).
- It should be noted that the red line boundary shown in the Geophysical Survey (**ES: Appendix 10.3 Geophysical Survey [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.3]**) and the Aerial Photograph Assessment (**ES: Appendix 10.4 Aerial Photograph Survey [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.4]**) differ from the Order Limits. These surveys were undertaken at an earlier stage in the process based on an initial boundary that has been subject to change. The surveys have, however, covered the areas of the Order Limits proposed for Solar PV Arrays, Project Substations, National Grid Substation, and BESS. Neither the geophysical survey, nor trial trench evaluation, include the CRC as this had not been finalised at the time of survey. Below ground disturbance is expected within the CRC, but it has been agreed with NHES that there further archaeological investigation in these areas can be carried out subsequent to the submission of the DCO. NHES further added that there is no overwhelming reason for further trial trenching to be carried out pre-determination, but this may be revisited based on the results of further geophysical survey in these areas. This is not considered to be a significant limitation to the assessment herein.

10.5 Assessment Methodology

10.5.1 This section sets out the scope and methodology for the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on Cultural Heritage.

Sources of Information

10.5.2 The following sources of information that have been consulted in the preparation of this chapter:

- Norfolk Historic Environment Record (NHER);
- National Heritage List for England (NHLE);
- The Broadland and South Norfolk website for information on Conservation Areas;
- Relevant and accessible archives along with online repositories for historical maps, LiDAR data, aerial photographs, plans and relevant documentary sources, including published and unpublished documentary sources;
- The East of England Regional Research Framework (Ref 10-26);
- British Geological Survey borehole data;
- Walkover surveys (undertaken between Summer 2024 and Autumn 2025) undertaken in sunny, dry conditions to provide an assessment of the character of the Site and appraise the likely significant effects of the Scheme on heritage assets;
- An aerial mapping survey completed by Headland Archaeology in 2024 (**ES: Appendix 10.4 – Aerial Photograph Survey [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.4]**);
- A geophysical survey was conducted in 2024 and 2025 by Magnitude Surveys (**ES: Appendix 10.3 – Geophysical Survey [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.3]**) to inform the initial appraisal of the Scheme and to provide the results and baseline provided in this Chapter; and
- Archaeological trial trench evaluation was undertaken in August to November 2025 (**ES: Appendix 10.5 – Trial Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5]**).

Study Area

10.5.3 Good practice guidance does not suggest a specific radius for assessing the effects resulting from a development on the historic environment, and

therefore the judgement of a qualified heritage professional has been used. It is common practice for a 1km search area to be employed in evidence to support planning applications. However, given the scale of the Scheme, a larger Study Area is proposed to ensure a rigorous approach, with a wider area for those heritage assets of the highest grade accorded a corresponding greater sensitivity.

- 10.5.4 A flexible approach has been adopted for heritage assets located beyond the Study Areas, where relevant, in consideration of their physical and historical relationships with other monuments and the wider landscape.
- 10.5.5 The Study Area extends to 5km from the Sites (Site 1, Site 2, Site 3, Site 4, Site 5, Site 6, Site 7, Site 8, Site 9 and Site 10) and BESS Site and for the highest grade heritage assets (i.e. World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings; see Table 10.7). A Study Area of 2km has been adopted for the remaining designated heritage assets (i.e. Grade II Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) and 1km for non-designated heritage assets and Historic Environment Record (HER) entries. As per the PINS Scoping Opinion (**ES: Appendix 2.2 Scoping Opinion [EN0110014/APP/6.3.2.2]**), this includes a consideration of possible effects on heritage assets outside of the above radii indicated by models of ZTV (see **ES: Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [EN0110014/APP/6.1.7]**) and ground-truthed by walkover surveys.
- 10.5.6 For the CRC, the Study Area has extended to 500m from the CRC boundary for all heritage assets, which is considered proportionate as the cable trenches currently have a proposed width varying between 1m to 7m. However, the width and spacing of the cable trenches may differ depending on environmental constraints or engineering requirements. If the CRC crosses third-party apparatus (i.e. utilities), a working width of 50m has been allowed for.

Potential Impacts

- 10.5.7 Embedded mitigation measures being incorporated into the design and construction of the Scheme are set out in Section 10.7 below. Prior to the implementation of any mitigation (embedded or additional), the Scheme has the potential to have an effect on heritage receptors (beneficially or adversely), during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases in the following ways:
- Direct impacts to below ground archaeological remains caused by groundwork during the construction phase resulting in their partial/total loss;
 - Direct impacts upon heritage assets beyond the Order Limits caused by traffic and piling vibration during the construction and decommissioning phases;

- Beneficial impacts upon below ground archaeology by removing fields from agricultural use during the operational phase of the Scheme; and
- Indirect impacts on the significance of heritage assets brought about by changes to their setting and the way in which they draw significance from that setting during the construction, operational and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme.

Impact Assessment Methodology

10.5.8 The Cultural Heritage assessment follows the general approach to undertaking EIA, explained in **ES: Chapter 2 EIA Methodology [EN0110014/APP/6.1.2]**, albeit it has been modified in order to encompass the full range of heritage assets, magnitude of impact and scale of effect, these informed by professional judgement. The methodology for attributing sensitivity of receptors, magnitude of effects and the significance of effects in relation to Cultural Heritage is described further below in this chapter of the ES.

Sensitivity of Receptor

- 10.5.9 The sensitivity of likely impacted receptors, defined depending on the vulnerability, recoverability and value/importance of the receptor, to potential effects arising from the Scheme is assessed in line with the below, as detailed in **Table 10-3 Sensitivity Criteria of Identified Receptor** . The value of a heritage asset (its heritage significance) is guided by its designated status but is derived also from its heritage interest which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic (NPPF Annex 2, Glossary). In EIA terms, this is defined as the receptor sensitivity, as detailed in Table 10-3.
- 10.5.10 Using professional judgement and the results of consultation, heritage assets are also assessed on an individual basis, and regional variations and individual qualities are taken into account, where applicable.

Table 10-3 Sensitivity Criteria of Identified Receptor

Sensitivity	Description
Very High (International)	World Heritage Sites
High (National)	Scheduled Monuments Grade I and II* Listed Buildings Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens Registered Battlefields Archaeological sites of schedulable quality and significance
Medium (Regional)	Grade II Listed Buildings Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens Conservation Areas

Sensitivity	Description
	Archaeological sites that can be shown to have demonstrable regional importance
Low (Local)	Locally listed buildings Archaeological sites that can be shown to have demonstrable local importance Assets where the significance is limited by poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations
Negligible	Heritage assets with very little or no surviving research value. Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor contextual association, or very common archaeological features/buildings of little or no value at local or other scale.

Magnitude of Impact

10.5.11 The categorisation of the magnitude of impact takes into account the following factors:

- Extent;
- Duration;
- Frequency; and
- Reversibility.

10.5.12 Impacts can potentially be caused during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases and can be direct (affecting the physical fabric of a heritage asset) or indirect (affecting the significance of a heritage asset through the contribution made by its setting).

10.5.13 The magnitude of impact is the level of change caused by the Scheme and is defined in Table 10-4 Criteria for Determining Magnitude of Impact.

Table 10-4 Criteria for Determining Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Description
High	Adverse: Total or substantial loss of the significance of a heritage asset. Substantial harm to a heritage asset’s setting, such that the significance of the asset would be totally lost or substantially reduced (e.g. the significance of a designated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its designation would be questionable or the significance of a non-designated heritage asset would be reduced to such a degree that its categorisation as a heritage asset would be questionable.
	Beneficial: Restoration of a heritage asset that is at risk of complete loss or an element of its setting that makes a substantial contribution to significance.
Medium	Adverse: Partial loss or alteration of the significance of a heritage asset.

	<p>Considerable harm to a heritage asset's setting, such that the asset's significance would be materially affected/considerably devalued, but not totally or substantially lost.</p> <p>This equates to less than substantial harm in terms of the NPSs EN-1 and EN-3.</p>
	<p>Beneficial:</p> <p>Preservation of a heritage asset that is in a deteriorating condition or an element of its setting that makes a contribution to significance.</p> <p>Reintroduction of public access to an asset to better reveal its significance.</p>
Low	<p>Adverse:</p> <p>Slight loss of the significance of a heritage asset. This could include the removal of fabric that forms part of the heritage asset, but that is not integral to its significance (e.g. the demolition of later extensions/additions of little intrinsic value).</p> <p>Some harm to the heritage asset's setting, but not to a degree that it would materially compromise the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Perceivable level of harm, but insubstantial relative to the overall interest of the heritage asset.</p>
	<p>Beneficial:</p> <p>Suspension of an activity that is causing harm to an asset. Increase of understanding about the significance of an asset e.g. information board.</p>
Negligible	<p>Adverse:</p> <p>A very slight change to a heritage asset. This could include a change to a part of a heritage asset that does not materially contribute to its significance.</p> <p>Very minor change to a heritage asset's setting such that there is a slight impact but not materially affecting the heritage asset's significance.</p>
	<p>Beneficial:</p> <p>Very slight improvement to a heritage asset or minor improvement to its setting that results in no material change to its significance.</p>

Categorising Scale of Effect

10.5.14 The scale of effect that the Scheme may have on an impacted receptor will be influenced by a combination of the sensitivity of the identified receptor and the magnitude of impact.

10.5.15 There are four categories demonstrating the scale of effect:

- Neutral (i.e. no or inconsequential change);
- Minor;
- Moderate; and
- Major.

10.5.16 The term Neutral has been used for the lowest scale of effect in this chapter as opposed to Negligible, which has been used in other chapters. This is based on professional judgement and the reasoning that a Negligible impact is so small as to be inconsequential/not worth of consideration meaning that the end effect is effectively no change, or neutral.

Table 10-5 Scale of Effect

Magnitude of Impact	Sensitivity				
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	Major	Major	Major/Moderate	Moderate	Neutral
Medium	Major	Major/Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Neutral
Low	Major/Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Minor	Neutral
Negligible	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

- 10.5.17 The nature of effects will be defined as either: beneficial or adverse.
- 10.5.18 The matrix is not intended to 'mechanise' judgement of the significance of effect but acts as a check to ensure that judgements regarding value, magnitude of impact and scale of effect are reasonable and balanced in order to allow for professional judgement.
- 10.5.19 In some cases, the matrix allows a choice of significance of effect when a magnitude of impact and a value are combined. In these cases, the individual attributes of a specific asset, along with any relevant site-specific factors and consideration of other influencing elements, have been considered, based on which is the most appropriate significance of effect to apply. There may also be situations where the tabulated nature of the matrix presents a restriction on the assessment of the effect, for example where professional judgement suggests an impact falls between categories.
- 10.5.20 Based on professional judgement, a 'significant' effect in terms of the EIA process is considered to be one of Moderate or above scale.

10.6 Baseline Conditions

The Order Limits

- 10.6.1 The Scheme is located within the administrative areas of Norfolk County Council (NCC) and South Norfolk Council (SNC) who are the host authorities. A full description of the Order limits is provided in **ES: Chapter 3 The Order Limits [EN0110014/APP/6.1.3]**.

Existing Baseline

- 10.6.2 The existing baseline conditions are derived from the completed desk and field-based studies including: an archaeological desk-based assessment; heritage statement; geophysical survey; aerial photography assessment; and a trial trench evaluation.

Designated Heritage Assets

- 10.6.3 There are no designated heritage assets within the Order Limits.
- 10.6.4 Chapter 10 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) outlined that no impacts were identified to numerous heritage assets within both the 5km and 2km Study Areas surrounding the Order Limits. Further assessment undertaken subsequent to the PEIR, and considering responses to the PEIR (as outlined above in Table 10.1) provided by statutory consultees, have identified the following designated heritage assets as sensitive, and as such requiring consideration within the Cultural Heritage assessment presented here, with other designated heritage assets being 'scoped out' of assessment within this ES Chapter. Designated Heritage Assets scoped in are shown in **Table 10-6**.

Table 10-6 Designated Heritage Assets Scoped In for Assessment

Designated Heritage Asset	NHLE Reference	Designation	Distance from the Order Limits
Moulton Farmhouse	1373270	II	c.150m to the east of Sub-Site 1B
Barn Cottages	1050010	II	c.280m to the south of the BESS Site
Broadgate Way	1050318	II	c.100m to the south of Sub-Site 1A
Laurels Farmhouse	1153200	II	c.300m to the north of Sub-Site 1B
Barn immediately east of Laurels Farmhouse	1050326	II	c.300m to the north of Sub-Site 1B
Hill House	1050216	II	c.67m east of Sub-Site 2A
French's Farmhouse	1050252	II	c.360m east of Sub-Site 2C
Townhouse Farmhouse	1153325	II	c.70m to the north of Site 3
Rose Cottage	1304365	II	c.80m to the north of Site 3
Three Feathers	1153315	II	c.90m to the north of Site 3
Barn and Stable range adjoining Three Feathers to the south-west	1050334	II	c.85m to the north of Site 3
Camp in Village	1003984	Scheduled Monument	c.630m north of Sub-Site 4A
Church of St Michael	1304267	I	c.50m to the south of Sub-Site 4B
The Old Rectory	1373264	II*	c.70m to the south of Sub-Site 4B
Barn north of the Old Rectory	1050306	II	c.15m to the south of Sub-Site 4B
Church Farmhouse	1153545	II	c.50m to the south of Sub-Site 4B
Cottage occupied by Mr and Mrs Woods	1050305	II	c.30m to the south-west Sub-Site 4B
Walnut Tree Cottage and Low Cottage	1050313	II	c.370m to the south-west Sub-Site 4B
Pair of Houses owned by Mr B R Weeden	1153535	II	c.200m to the west of Sub-Site 4B
Cottage occupied by Mrs Rye	1050315	II	c.210m to the west of Sub-Site 4B
The Cedars	1304177	II	c.70m to the west of Sub-Site 4B
The Hollies	1373282	II	c.250m to the east of Sub-Site 4A
Church of St Catherine	1373281	I	c.20m to the south of Sub-Site 5B

Designated Heritage Asset	NHLE Reference	Designation	Distance from the Order Limits
Church Farmhouse	1050259	II	c.60m to the south-east Sub-Site 5B
Barn immediately north-west of Church Farmhouse	1050260	II	c.30m to the south-east Sub-Site 5B
Fritton Conservation Area		Conservation Area	c.10m south of Sub-Site 5B
Grove Farmhouse	1050330	II	c.60m to the south of Sub-Site 7C
Wood Farmhouse	1373238	II	c.30m south of Field Sub-Site 7C
The Countryman Public House	1373407	II	c.300m to the west of Sub-Site 7A
Former Quaker Meeting House	1178892	II	c.85m to the south-west of Sub-Site 7A
Hill Farmhouse	1050016	II	c.250m to the west of Sub-Site 7A (c.10m north of Order Limits for 7A access)
Tramp's Hall	1302215	II	c.30m south of Sub-Site 7A Access
Barn Immediately East of Trap's Hall	1050048	II	c.20m south of Sub-Site 7A Access
Manor Farmhouse Barn	1152344	II	c.65m to the north-west of Sub-Site 7D
Manor Farmhouse	1050675	II	c.70m to the north of Sub-Site 7D
Manor Cottage	1373079	II	c.55m to the north of Sub-Site 7D
Hill Cottages	1373062	II	c.90m to the north of Sub-Site 7D
Hill House	1152265	II	c.150m to the north of Sub-Site 7D
Saxlingham Green Conservation Area	N/A	N/A	c.5m to the north of Sub-Site 7D
Oaks Farmhouse	1170906	II*	c.150m to the east of Sub-Site 7Lw
Uppgate Green Farmhouse	1050681	II	c.250m to the north of Sub-Site 8B
Outhouse to north of Uppgate Green Farmhouse	1304804	II	c.300m to the north of Sub-Site 8B
Oldhouse Farmhouse	1372864	II	c.200m to the west of Site 9
Barn at Oldhouse Farmhouse	1051155	II	c.200m to the west of Site 9
Waterfield Cottage	1372865	II	c.150m to the north-west of Site 9
Littlebeck Farmhouse	1051154	II	c.250m south-east of Site 9

Designated Heritage Asset	NHLE Reference	Designation	Distance from the Order Limits
Brooke Conservation Area	N/A	N/A	c.50m to the north of Site 9
Beulah House	1051115	II	c.400m to the west of Sub-Site 10B
Beulah Barn	1305841	II	c.400m to the west of Sub-Site 10B
Old Rectory	1051116	II	c.300m to the west of Sub-Site 10B

10.6.5 A full list of all designated heritage assets within the surrounding 2km Study Area and those of the highest grades (Scheduled Monuments and Grade I or Grade II* Listed Buildings) within the 5km Study Area are listed in Table 1 of **ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1]**, with locations illustrated on figures accompanying the heritage statement. The combined results of the viewshed analysis and walkover surveys were used to inform the detailed Site-specific setting assessments included in the Heritage Statement.

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 10.6.6 In accordance with Planning Practice Guidance and Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage, HE Advice Note 7 (Ref 10-27), non-designated heritage assets can only be identified by Local Planning Authorities when they justifiably have a degree of heritage significance and their status as non-designated heritage assets is made clear through their inclusion in local heritage lists, local and neighbourhood plans, Conservation Area appraisals and decision-making on planning applications. SNC refers to Locally Important Buildings in their Neighbourhood Plans which they regard as non-designated heritage assets. However, at present, SNC does not appear to maintain a list of such buildings.
- 10.6.7 Buildings within Conservation Areas identified as Buildings of Townscape Significance are assumed to be regarded as non-designated heritage assets. These Buildings of Townscape Significance within Conservation Areas are the only currently identified non-designated heritage assets within a 1km radius of the Order Limits. A total of 202 Buildings of Townscape Significance within Conservation Areas were identified within the study area, a full gazetteer of which is included as Table 1 of **ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1]**.

Historic Landscape

- 10.6.8 The South Norfolk and High Suffolk Claylands National Character Area (NCA) lies at the heart of East Anglia, occupying much of the county as it stretches from south of Norwich to north of Ipswich. The fields within the Order Limits largely comprise 20th century agricultural fields with boundary loss, although there are some exceptions to this. The Historic Landscape Characterisation of the Order Limits is summarised as follows:
- Site 1, 2 and BESS: 20th century agriculture with boundary loss (Site 1, Sub-Site 2A and BESS); and 18th and 19th century piecemeal enclosure by agreement;
 - Site 3: 20th century agriculture;
 - Site 4: a combination of 20th century agriculture and 20th century agriculture with boundary loss (Sub-Site 4B); and 18th and 19th century piecemeal enclosure by agreement (Sub-Sites 4A and 4B);
 - Site 5: 20th century agriculture;
 - Site 6: 20th century agriculture;
 - Site 7: a combination of 20th century agriculture and 20th century agriculture with boundary loss (Parts of all Sub-Sites within Site 7); inland managed wetland represented by an enclosed meadow (Sub-Site 7B); coaxial enclosure dating to pre-18th century (Sub-Site 7K); and no classification (Sub-Site 7D and 7F);
 - Site 8: 20th century agriculture (majority of Sub-Sites 8A and 8b); and 18th-19th century agriculture (western part of both Sub-Sites);
 - Site 9: 20th century agriculture; and
 - Site 10: 20th century agriculture, except for the southern part of Sub-Site 10A, which is classified as 18th to 19th century enclosure by piecemeal agreement.

Archaeological Remains

- 10.6.9 The assessment of archaeological potential is based upon a search of the HER, a desk-based assessment (in **ES: Appendix 10.2 Desk Based Assessment [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.2]**), geophysical survey (in **ES: Appendix 10.3 Geophysical Survey [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.3]**), trial trench evaluation (in **ES: Appendix 10.5 Trial Trenching Report [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.5]**) and an aerial mapping survey, including LiDAR (**Appendix in ES: Appendix 10.4 Aerial Photograph Assessment [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.4]**). Locations of HER entries within the

surrounding Study Area are illustrated within the archaeological desk-based assessment.

Sites 1, 2 and BESS

- 10.6.10 The HER does not contain any entries within the BESS Site; nor has the geophysical survey identified any potential archaeology within these areas. Whilst there is a general potential for more scattered and low significance prehistoric and/or Roman remains to be present, the potential is considered to be low.
- 10.6.11 Trial trench evaluation of the BESS Site identified an undated large pit or watering hole and two post-medieval ditches, both visible as field boundaries on historic mapping.
- 10.6.12 The HER contains two records within the southern part of Sub-Site 1B. One of these records relates to the recorded location of All Saints Church, which was demolished in 1570 but is noted as being situated within Sub-Site 1B. It is possible that some medieval settlement associated with the church also survives in this area. A scatter of medieval and early post-medieval pottery is recorded to the north of the postulated church site. This may merely represent a manuring scatter (broken pottery and other artefacts were often disposed of in dung heaps that were subsequently spread on fields as fertiliser), but the concentration may be indicative of settlement activity given the proximity to the former church.
- 10.6.13 The geophysical survey of Sub-Site 1B shows a faint magnetic response in the purported location of the medieval church but neither this, nor the aerial survey or LIDAR, present any substantial evidence to support the suggestion of a church being located at this point. Trial trenches targeting the location of the purported church failed to identify any trace of it. The remaining trenches excavated within Site 1 encountered a series of post-medieval ditches (all visible on historic mapping) and two pits, one of which is thought to be of potential medieval to post-medieval date.
- 10.6.14 There are no HER entries within Site 2, although there are a number of multi-period findspots (dating from the prehistoric through to the post-medieval period) in the vicinity of, and adjacent to, Site 2. In addition, the current A410, which lies to the immediate east of Site 2, originated as a Roman road.
- 10.6.15 The geophysical survey of Site 2 shows there are disturbances of uncertain nature and origin. The tithe mapping of 1839 indicates that there were occupational and industrial activities in this area. In the western section of Sub-Site 2B, there are two areas of magnetic disturbance that may relate to ponds. Trial trenches targeting these anomalies confirmed them to be mainly post-medieval to modern ditches visible on historic mapping, although there was also a series of five medieval ditches and one pit within Trench 2a-01.

Site 3

- 10.6.16 A small part of Site 3 is recorded by the HER as forming part of a World War II (WWII) airfield and possibly falls within the limits of a potential medieval deer park.
- 10.6.17 Site 3 is recorded on the HER as being subject to fieldwalking in the 1980s and metal detecting in 2018. Those surveys identified concentrations of burnt flint, which can be common finds on prehistoric sites, likely related to food preparation. The HER notes these finds as potential burnt mounds. However, no corresponding responses were noted in the geophysical survey nor features identified during the trial trenching that would correspond to this interpretation, and it is likely that the burnt flints only survive as surface deposits. The metal detecting survey identified a range of objects including a Roman coin and key handle, which may be related to the possible site of a Roman building located to the immediate north.
- 10.6.18 The geophysical survey of Site 3 has largely identified former field boundaries shown on historic mapping.
- 10.6.19 Trial trench evaluation within Site 3 identified a series of medieval remains including ditches, pits including extraction pits and cobbled surfaces. Post-medieval ditches were also identified throughout the area, largely corresponding to former field boundaries on historic maps.

Site 4

- 10.6.20 There are fourteen HER entries within Site 4. These are predominantly artefacts recovered from fieldwalking and metal detecting, comprising multi-period finds spanning the prehistoric to post-medieval periods. In addition to this, the HER records medieval earthworks extending slightly into the southern edge of Sub-Site 4A. No such earthworks are visible in the LiDAR data, although the geophysical survey has identified a group of enclosures in this area which extend to both sides of the A140.
- 10.6.21 Cropmarks of a ring ditch and possible Roman field system are recorded in the north-eastern part of Sub-Site 4B and the ring ditch is also apparent in the geophysical data. Trial trenches excavated along the northern edge of Sub-Site 4B in 2018 (in association with the highway junction improvements) revealed no archaeologically significant material, whilst trial trenches in the north-eastern edge of Sub-Site 4A, again in 2018, exposed poorly dated pits and ditches with finds of flints and post-medieval brick and tile, largely from unstratified contexts.
- 10.6.22 The geophysical survey has also identified a concentration of enclosures and a possible trackway in the southern part of Sub-Site 4B. Subsequent trial trenching targeting these features identified remains of (possibly) prehistoric and Roman date, predominantly comprising ditches and pits but

also including flint wall footings of a square building of putative Roman date. Additionally, post-medieval ditches were recorded across the Site.

Site 5

- 10.6.23 There are five HER entries within Site 5, comprising a possible site of a medieval building and multi-period finds. The southern tip of Boyland deserted medieval village and Hall is also recorded as extending into the northern part of Sub-Site 5A.
- 10.6.24 The geophysical survey has identified a range of enclosures and associated features along the eastern edge of Sub-Site 5B which were thought to represent medieval/early post-medieval settlement and/or stock enclosures, which were largely confirmed by the trial trench evaluation. The medieval remains included a potential occupational layer, a cobbled surface, post-holes and pits along with the ditched enclosures identified by the geophysical survey. Later features included a series of post-medieval ditches.

Site 6

- 10.6.25 The only HER record falling within Site 6 relates to Saxon, medieval and post-medieval finds recovered by metal detecting within the site. It would seem likely that these finds derive from manuring scatters.
- 10.6.26 The geophysical survey has identified a number of former field boundaries, some of which are not represented on historic mapping, but are on a similar alignment and pattern to those shown on historic mapping. No trial trenching was undertaken in Site 6 to inform this ES chapter due to the Site being removed from the built parameters of the Scheme.

Site 7

- 10.6.27 The HER contains eleven entries falling within Site 7. This includes the edge of a medieval moated site in Sub-Site 7C and a post-medieval coin found by metal detecting in sub-Site 7A. Fieldwalking in Sub-Site 7B and 7C recovered medieval and post-medieval pottery. The site of a medieval/post-medieval house is recorded in the northern part of Sub-Site 7D (which coincides with a series of geophysical anomalies potentially indicating roadside settlement and/or stock enclosures).
- 10.6.28 A possible medieval moated site is recorded on the southern boundary of Sub-Sites 7E and 7F. However, nothing obvious relating to this is shown on the LiDAR data and the area of the record was not suitable for geophysical survey due to it falling partly within a block of woodland and partly overgrown fallow land. A WWII bombing decoy is recorded in Sub-Site 7H but no indication of any associated remains was identified by the geophysical survey. The remaining records within Site 7 relate to multi-period findspots dating from the Bronze Age to post-medieval periods.

- 10.6.29 In addition to the roadside features in Sub-Site 7D that are noted above, the geophysical survey has identified what was interpreted as a likely prehistoric ring ditch in Sub-Site 7B and a series of undated enclosures in Sub-Site 7C.
- 10.6.30 The trial trench evaluation identified multi-period remains across Site 7. The earliest of these related to prehistoric watering holes in Sub-Sites 7K and 7F, along with post-holes and three pits in the latter Sub-Site. Three ditches tentatively dated to the Roman period were recorded in Sub-Site 7A, and a series of medieval remains including ditches, extraction pits and a cobbled surface were identified in Sub-Site 7C. Post-medieval to modern features were present throughout, largely ditches.

Site 8

- 10.6.31 The only HER entry for Site 8 relates to a findspot of five palaeolithic flint flakes recovered from the ploughed surface within Sub-Site 8B. The only features identified by the geophysical survey within Site 8 relate to field boundaries shown on historic mapping. This was confirmed by trial trenching within Site 8, which encountered a small number of former field boundaries of post-medieval/modern date but no features of archaeological interest.

Site 9

- 10.6.32 One HER entry has been identified within Site 9 following metal detecting in the central part of the Site, which recovered a medieval coin and a medieval/post-medieval copper alloy vessel fragment.
- 10.6.33 The geophysical survey has identified a series of enclosures of uncertain date in the north-eastern part of Site 9. These may be related to settlement activity or stock enclosures, which align with the former field boundary visible on the early 19th century enclosure and tithe maps suggestive of a medieval to post-medieval date.
- 10.6.34 The trial trench evaluation in Site 9 recorded ditches and pits of likely prehistoric date, including a ditch preliminarily dated to the Neolithic/Bronze Age period, and a series of Iron Age settlement remains including a potential roundhouse (comprised of ring ditches and post-holes), ditches and pits. Roman remains included a small number of potential cultivation trenches, ditches and pits of unknown purpose. A trackway, consisting of two parallel ditches with a metalled surface between along with a number of ditches and pits of medieval remains were also encountered, and there were a number of post-medieval to modern ditches visible as field boundaries on historic maps.

Site 10

- 10.6.35 There are four HER entries within Site 10 relating to metal detecting finds in Sub-Site 10C, comprising a medieval harness pendant, a medieval bronze plaque, a Roman coin and sherds of late Saxon and medieval pottery. Sub-Site 10E contained a fragment of a Roman quern-stone, and a medieval seal matrix was recorded in Sub-Site 10A. The north-eastern part of Sub-Site 10C, the eastern part of sub-Site 10B, along with Sub-Site 10D and 10E, fall within the extents of the WWII airfield at Seething, which was considerably larger than the existing airfield beyond the Site boundary.
- 10.6.36 The geophysical survey has identified a number of rectilinear enclosures within Sub-Site 10C. It is not possible to date these features on morphological grounds, although it was concluded that they are unlikely to be prehistoric.
- 10.6.37 A single feature of prehistoric date comprising a pit filled with burnt stone was identified during the trial trenching of Site 10 within Sub-Site 10C. Medieval remains were more abundant and notably included the presence of several pottery kilns with associated features also within Sub-Site 10C.

Cable Route Corridor (CRC)

- 10.6.38 The desk-based assessment of the CRC has concluded that there is a high potential for the CRC to contain remains from the prehistoric period in CRC4, CRC6, CRC8, CRC11, high potential for Roman remains in CRC4, CRC6, CRC8, CRC10 and CRC13, high potential for Saxon and medieval remains in CRC4, CRC6, CRC8 and CRC9 and high potential for post-medieval and modern remains in CRC4, CRC5, CRC10 and CRC14. The remaining CRCs have low potential for archaeological remains.

Sensitivity of Receptors

- 10.6.39 Based on the criteria set out in Table 10-3 Sensitivity Criteria of Identified Receptor the sensitivities of identified receptors are shown below in Table 10-7 Sensitivity of Identified Receptor.

Table 10-7 Sensitivity of Identified Receptor

Sensitivity	Identified Receptor
High	Camp in Village (Tasburgh Hillfort) Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1003984)
	Church of St Michael Grade I Listed Building (NHLE 1304267)
	Church of St Catherine Grade I Listed Building (NHLE 1373281)
	Oaks Farmhouse Grade II* Listed Building (NHLE 1170906)
	The Old Rectory Grade II* Listed Building (NHLE 1373264)

Sensitivity	Identified Receptor
Medium	Moulton Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373270)
	Barn Cottages Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050010)
	Broadgate Way Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050318)
	Laurels Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153200)
	Barn immediately east of Laurels Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050326)
	Hill House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050216)
	French's Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050252)
	Townhouse Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153325)
	Rose Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1304365)
	Three Feathers Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153315)
	Barn and Stable range adjoining Three Feathers to the south-west Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050334)
	Barn north of the Old Rectory Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050306)
	Church Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153545)
	Cottage occupied by Mr and Mrs Woods Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050305)
	Walnut Tree Cottage and Low Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050313)
	Pair of Houses owned by Mr B R Weeden Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153535)
	Cottage occupied by Mrs Rye Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050315)
	The Cedars Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1304177)
	The Hollies Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373282)
	Church Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050259)
	Barn immediately north-west of Church Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050260)
Fritton Conservation Area	
Poacher's Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153291)	
The Firs Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373239)	
The Haven Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1304384)	
Grove Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050330)	

Sensitivity	Identified Receptor
	Wood Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373238)
	The Countryman Public House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373407)
	Former Quaker Meeting House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1178892)
	Hill Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050016)
	Tramp's Hall Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1302215)
	Barn Immediately East of Trap's Hall Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050048)
	Manor Farmhouse Barn Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1152344)
	Manor Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050675)
	Manor Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373079)
	Hill Cottages Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373062)
	Hill House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1152265)
	Saxlingham Green Conservation Area
	Uppgate Green Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050681)
	Outhouse to north of Uppgate Green Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1304804)
	Oldhouse Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1372864)
	Barn at Oldhouse Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1051155)
	Waterfield Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1372865)
	Littlebeck Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1051154)
	Brooke Conservation Area
	Beulah House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1051115)
Beulah Barn Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1305841)	
Old Rectory Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1051116)	
Medieval pottery kilns and associated features Site 10	
Low	Undated pit/watering hole Infrastructure Site
	Five medieval ditches and one pit Site 2
	Medieval ditches, pits, extraction pit and cobbled surface Site 3

Sensitivity	Identified Receptor
	Prehistoric/Roman remains Site 4 including ditches, pits and a possible Roman stone building
	Medieval occupational layer, a cobbled surface, post-holes and pits along with the ditched enclosures Site 5
	Prehistoric watering hole Sub-Site 7K
	Prehistoric watering hole, post-holes and pits Sub-Site 7F
	Roman ditches Sub-Site 7A
	Medieval ditches, extraction pits and a cobbled surface Sub-Site 7C
	Prehistoric ditches and pits Site 9
	Iron Age settlement remains Site 9
	Roman ditches, pits and cultivation trenches Site 9
	Medieval trackway, ditches and pits Site 9
	Prehistoric pit Site 10
Negligible	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Infrastructure Site
	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 1
	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 2
	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 3
	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 4
	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 5
	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 7
	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 8
	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 9
	Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 10

Future Baseline

10.6.40 This section considers changes to the baseline conditions, described above, as far as changes can be established that might occur in the absence of the Scheme coming forward during the time period over which the Scheme would be in place. The future baseline scenarios are set out in **ES: Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [EN0110014/APP/6.1.2]**.

- 10.6.41 The Cultural Heritage baseline would not likely substantially change in relation to built heritage assets beyond the Order Limits should the Scheme not proceed. With regards to archaeological remains within the Order Limits, should the Scheme not proceed and the Order Limits remain under arable farming there would be a continued deterioration of archaeological remains brought about by truncation from ploughing.
- 10.6.42 Further archaeological investigation, particularly in areas that have not yet been subject to survey (such as the CRC) will elucidate further the potential for archaeological remains within the Order Limits. A geophysical survey of the CRC is being carried out in February to April 2026, the results of which will be used to inform the strategy of further evaluation and mitigation. Future investigations are outlined within **ES: Appendix 10.6 Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [EN0100114/APP/6.3.10.6]**. Based on the results of surveys undertaken to date, together with the baseline information drawn from the archaeological desk-based assessment, it is considered unlikely that the Order Limits contain any archaeological remains of such significance as to restrict or preclude development in these areas.

10.7 Embedded Mitigation

- 10.7.1 Likely environmental effects have been or will be avoided, minimised, mitigated or reduced through design measures and/or management of the Scheme, as outlined in this section. Proposed environmental enhancements are also described where relevant.

Embedded Construction Phase Mitigation

- 10.7.2 The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme's design for the construction phase:
- 10.7.3 Setbacks (see Embedded Operation and Maintenance Phase Mitigation below) have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme (further detailed below in Embedded Operation and Maintenance Phase Mitigation) where potential cultural heritage setting impacts have been identified. These will also ensure that, during the construction phase, environmental changes associated with construction activities (namely noise, vibration and visibility of construction vehicles and temporary construction compounds) will be sufficiently removed from heritage assets to avoid or minimise (as practicable) impacts within their settings.
- 10.7.4 Wherever possible, transportation routes have been identified to avoid additional traffic movements past sensitive heritage assets. Where this has not been practicable due to limited options of suitable routes, the construction traffic associated with the scheme will be subject to measures and procedures to minimise impacts on heritage assets, which are secured within the **Outline CTMP [EN0110014/APP/7.6]**. Construction traffic and

site access is discussed further in **ES: Chapter 11 – Transport and Access [EN0110014/APP/6.1.11]**.

10.7.5 The locations of the temporary construction compounds have been sited to avoid areas of known archaeological remains wherever practicable and to be unobtrusive to the settings of heritage assets. Details of locations are provided in **ES: Figure 4.2 Indicative Temporary Construction Compound Locations [EN011014/APP/6.2.4.2]** and **Works Plans [APP/2.3]**.

10.7.6 The management of historic hedgerows will be undertaken in accordance with the Hedgerow Removal Plan as set out in the **Outline LEMP [EN0110014/APP/7.4]**. Where removal is required, no more than 10m will be removed in accordance with the requirements of the **Outline LEMP [EN0110014/APP/7.4]**

Embedded Operation and Maintenance Phase Mitigation

10.7.7 The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme's design for the operation and maintenance phase as set out in the **Outline OEMP [EN0110014/APP/7.2]**:

■ **Sites 1, 2 and BESS:**

- A 4m high acoustic fence around BESS components to ensure no significant environmental impacts on surrounding buildings (including built heritage); and
- Visual screening including linear native tree belts, enhanced hedgerows and tree planting in gaps in existing hedgerows.

■ **Site 3:**

- Part of the Site (formerly referred to as Sub-Site 3a) has been removed from the Scheme resulting in no intervisibility with Grange Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building;
- Setback of c.350m from northern boundary of Site 3 away from Lundy Green to ensure reduced or removed visibility from listed buildings within the settlement; and
- Visual screening comprising a linear native broadleaf tree belt at the field boundary to the north of an area of solar arrays to further eliminate visibility from the listed buildings within Lundy Green.

■ **Site 4:**

- Setback of c.475m from the southern boundary of Sub-Site 4B to ensure reduced or removed visibility from the Grade I Listed Church of St Michael and other listed buildings within the settlement of Stratton St Michael;
 - Visual screening in the form of a linear native broadleaf tree belt at the field boundary to the south of the solar arrays within Sub-Site 4B to further restrict visibility from the listed buildings in Stratton St Michael; and
 - Visual screening including native hedgerow with trees at the southern boundary of Sub-Site 4A to restrict oblique views from The Cedars (Grade II Listed Building).
- **Site 5:**
- Setback of c.365m from the southern boundary of Sub-Site 5B to remove and/or reduce visibility from Fritton Conservation Area and two Grade II listed buildings; and
 - Visual screening including a linear native broadleaf tree belt and enhanced hedgerows to remove/reduce visibility of built elements of the Scheme (solar arrays) from Fritton Conservation Area and two Grade II listed buildings.
- **Site 6:**
- Site 6 has been removed from the built parameters of the Scheme and will instead be retained as open land removing potential setting impacts on three Grade II Listed Buildings: The Firs, The Haven and Poacher's Cottage.
- **Sub-Sites 7A-7D:**
- Setbacks of c.100m to c.240m from the southern boundary of Sub-Site 7C to reduce visibility from two Grade II listed buildings, Wood Farmhouse and Grove Farmhouse;
 - Setback of c.180m from the northern boundary of Sub-Site 7D to remove/reduce visibility from Saxlingham Green Conservation Area and encompassed listed buildings;
 - Visual screening comprising a combination of native broadleaf woodland and linear native tree belts situated between the solar arrays within Sub-Site 7C and the two Grade II listed buildings to the south; and
 - Visual screening in the form of native broadleaf woodland between the solar arrays within Sub-Site 7D and the south-western corner of

Saxlingham Green Conservation Area to further remove/reduce visibility.

■ **Sub-Sites 7E-7H:**

- There are no designated heritage assets that have been identified as potentially sensitive to the Scheme within Sub-Sites 7E-7H and as such, no embedded mitigation is required

■ **Sub-Sites 7I-7L**

- Visual screening in the form of infill planting of the existing hedgerows and introduction of new native broadleaf woodland at the eastern boundary of Sub-Site 7L to reduce visibility from the Grade II* listed Oaks Farmhouse.

■ **Site 8**

- Removal of the northern part of Sub-Site 8A from the built parameters of the Scheme to ensure no infringement on the setting of the Grade II listed Uppate Green Farmhouse; and
- Enhancement of existing hedgerow lining the footpath that transects Sub-Site 8B to further reduce visibility of solar arrays from the listed buildings to the north.

■ **Site 9:**

- The removal of the majority of Site 9 from the built parameters of the Scheme, which will restrict impacts on Brooke Conservation Area; and
- Increased visual screening in the form of tree planting within gaps in the existing hedgerow within Site 9.

■ **Site 10**

- Visual screening in the form of native broadleaf woodland, linear native tree belts and enhanced hedgerows with trees along the boundaries where existing gaps allow for views from Grade II listed buildings to the west of Site 10.

10.7.8 Where landscaping mitigation involves new tree planting, species have been selected in line with Historic England Guidance (Ref 10-28) and a recent review on impacts of roots on archaeology produced by Oxford Archaeology for the Forestry Commission (2024) (Ref 10-29). Species with the potential to have acidifying impacts on the PH levels of soil have been avoided. Details of tree species are included in **ES: Appendix 7.10 Preliminary Arboriculture Impact Assessment [EN0110014/APP/6.3.7.10]**.

Embedded Decommissioning Phase Mitigation

- 10.7.9 The following embedded mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Scheme design for the decommissioning phase:
- 10.7.10 Banksmen must be aware of areas with archaeological assets and will be responsible for ensuring no vehicle/plant movement that could impact the archaeological horizon occurs in these areas. In line with **ES: Appendix 10.6 Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.6]** and the **Outline DEMP [EN0110014/APP/7.3]**, a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to the relevant Local Planning Authority prior to decommissioning, which will be sufficient to safeguard any archaeological remains during the decommissioning phase. The methodology for removal of such measures will include locating the decommissioning compounds in areas of low sensitivity to both the archaeological resource and the settings of designated heritage assets, and ensuring that minimal below ground disturbance is undertaken in the removal of infrastructure.
- 10.7.11 Historic England's Advice Note 15: Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment provides the following examples of best practice embedded mitigation measures to be considered during decommissioning:
- The appropriate routing of vehicles (where possible avoiding areas known for their historic character);
 - Adherence to an agreed approach on activities that generate noise (which can impact on the appreciation of heritage assets nearby); and
 - The avoidance of any archaeological remains preserved below ground during construction.

10.8 Assessment of Likely Effects

- 10.8.1 This section of the Cultural Heritage chapter identifies and characterises potential impacts arising during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Scheme.
- 10.8.2 Taking into account the embedded mitigation measures as detailed in **section 10.7**, the potential for the likely effects of the Scheme on Cultural Heritage receptors was assessed using the methodology as detailed in **section 10.5** of this chapter. In the sections below, effects during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme are assessed for Cultural Heritage receptors scoped into the ES chapter.

- 10.8.3 Any additional mitigation required to reduce these effects is then set out in **section 10.9** below. Thereafter, an assessment is made of the significance of any residual effects after all mitigation measures have been accounted for.

Construction Phase

Direct Impacts to Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 10.8.4 The PINS Scoping Opinion received in February 2025 confirmed that direct impacts to designated heritage assets would be scoped out of further assessment within this ES chapter. Further assessment of non-designated heritage assets undertaken subsequent to the PEIR (see **ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1]**) has further confirmed that there is no potential for direct impacts on non-designated heritage assets.
- 10.8.5 It is worth noting that consultation comments received in February 2025 from both Booke and Shotesham Parish Councils raised a concern that vibration during construction may directly impact the structural integrity of listed buildings. It is worth noting that the publication *Evaluation and measurement for vibration in buildings – Part 2: Guide to damage levels from groundborne vibration (British Standard BS7385- 2:1993)* states in paragraph 7.5.2 that “a building of historical value should not (unless it is structurally unsound) be assumed to be more sensitive”, and as such, the conclusions of the noise and vibration assessment (see **ES: Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [EN0110014/APP/6.1.12]**) apply regardless of a building’s designation.

Direct Impacts to Archaeological Remains

- 10.8.6 Impacts to archaeological assets within the Order Limits would largely occur during the construction phase through activities such as the installation of Solar PV Arrays, BESS, Project Substations, National Grid Substation, Cabling, Access Tracks, and Temporary Construction Compounds, which all have the potential to have an adverse, permanent, and irreversible impact upon buried archaeology.
- 10.8.7 In particular, the Project Substations, National Grid Substation, and the BESS will likely result in total destruction of archaeological remains within their footprint.
- 10.8.8 Impacts from piling for the Ground Mounted PV Modules will be at a very low level, typically ranging between 0.1% and 0.05% by area, depending upon the separation between rows.
- 10.8.9 Cabling within the CRCs will have a greater impact than piling, yet will still be relatively low, typically involving c.110m in length per hectare at widths of between 1.6m and 0.6m, but up to 7m as specified in the **Outline Cable**

Route Construction Statement [EN0101104/APP/ APP/7.21]. Unlike piles, however, this impact will not be evenly spread and has potential to cause more localised impact.

- 10.8.10 Other elements of the Scheme, such as construction of Access Tracks, Conversion Units, Grid Connection Infrastructure, and Temporary Construction Compounds, will have further localised impacts including potential compaction of buried archaeological remains. Temporary Construction Compounds in particular will involve the removal of topsoil prior to the erection of the compounds, which depending on the depth of subsoil, may have medium to high impacts on any archaeological remains present.
- 10.8.11 Tree planting as part of the landscape mitigation will further have the potential to impact below ground archaeological remains through effects of roots, soil acidification, dewatering and the potential for tree throws. Species have been carefully selected to avoid acidifying effects on the soil and a mixture of root depths have been chosen to prevent the risk of tree throws (see embedded mitigation).
- 10.8.12 The use of HDD, particularly for cabling, will be at sufficient depth (maximum of 12m) to avoid any direct impacts to archaeological remains. However, the drilling fluid used during HDD, bentonite, has the potential to affect preservation levels of archaeological remains if there is an outbreak. There are measures embedded into the **Outline CEMP [EN0101104/APP/7.1]** to minimise the potential for outbreak, and it is not considered that bentonite poses any significant risk to below ground archaeological remains. There are no known examples of bentonite outbreak impacted archaeological remains. The Historic England Pile Impacts on Archaeology: Literature Review (Ref 10-30) states that *no record of cases [of bentonite migration] were reported in the literature review*. Further, a report on 'Mitigation of Construction Impacts on Archaeology' (Ref 10-31) undertaken by Museum of London Archaeology on behalf of Historic England (then English Heritage) stated that bentonite is often a preferred choice as it is designed not to permeate the surrounding ground, and further notes that the pH level of bentonite is similar to that of water, preventing the chance of acidifying effects on soil.
- 10.8.13 Trial trenching has established that the depth of the archaeological horizon ranges from 0.3m to 0.6m, and as such, remains are shallow enough to be sensitive to the above impacts. The pottery kilns within Sub-Site 10C are considered to have the highest potential to address the research priorities of the region, particularly elucidating information about pottery type series. These remains are considered to be of medium (regional) significance. The Roman building within Site 4 and the Iron Age settlement remains within Site 9 are considered to also have potential to address the research priorities of the region, along with the medieval remains in several sites including the metalled trackway, extraction pits and cobbled surfaces and

scattered prehistoric features. These remains are considered to be of low (local) interest. The remaining features relating to low-level agricultural activities are of less interest.

Conclusion

- 10.8.14 Impacts resulting from piling for the PV panel mounting structures would result in very low percentages of truncation and are considered to have a negligible impact. Excavations for cabling and other below ground elements of the Scheme would result in partial truncation of archaeological remains resulting in a low impact. For archaeological remains of low sensitivity (as indicated by the informative trial trenching to be present within the Order Limits), this negligible and low magnitude of impact to archaeological remains, prior to additional mitigation measures being put in place, would result in **neutral and minor adverse effects**, which is **not significant** in EIA terms.
- 10.8.15 Archaeological remains would be either substantially or wholly truncated by below ground impacts required for the construction of the Project Substations, National Grid Substation and BESS. Following embedded mitigation, the only archaeological remains identified within the Project Substations, National Grid Substation and majority of the BESS site are post-medieval to modern field boundaries of negligible interest. The construction of these elements of the Scheme would result in a high impact to negligible sensitivity receptors, leading to a **neutral effect**, which is **not significant**.
- 10.8.16 The exception to this is the undated watering hole in the north-eastern corner of the BESS, where high impact to a low sensitivity receptor would result in **moderate adverse effects** prior to additional mitigation, which is **significant**.
- 10.8.17 Where possible, temporary construction compounds have been sited in areas of lower archaeological interest, where either no archaeological features or remains of negligible sensitivity have been identified and there will therefore likely be **neutral effects**, which are **not significant**. The exception to this is the temporary construction compound in Sub-Site 4A, which is in an area of late Iron Age to Roman features thought to be of low (local) interest. The temporary construction compounds will have medium to high levels of impact resulting in **moderate/minor adverse effects**, which are **significant**.

Direct Impacts to Historic Landscape Character

- 10.8.18 Alterations to the historic landscape character arising from the change of use from agricultural to solar along with landscaping proposals to include new hedgerow and tree planting will occur from the construction phase of the Scheme, continuing until the decommissioning phase. There is also hedgerow removal proposed during the construction phase. Where removal

is required, no more than 10m will be removed in accordance with the requirements of the Outline LEMP [EN0110014/APP/7.4].

- 10.8.19 The historic landscape character within the Order Limits has largely been classified as 20th century agricultural fields, which hold little significance. There are parcels of remnant 18th to 19th century field patterns of greater interest, however, and Site 7 encapsulates pre-18th century coaxial enclosure and enclosed meadow.
- 10.8.20 Although there will be temporary change from arable land use to energy generation, this will both be reversible and temporary in nature. Furthermore, there will be no impact from this change of use on the legibility of the field patterns, nor the historic landscape character of the area as a whole. It is not envisaged that the landscape mitigation of the Scheme will affect this coherence, but will instead better enhance the existing field boundaries through the introduction of native tree belts and hedgerows where these are not currently present.

Conclusion

- 10.8.21 The change of use from agricultural to energy production within the Order Limits will result in a change to the historic landscape character, but will not affect the overall legibility of the field patterns or the cohesion of the wider landscape as a whole. The majority of the Order Limits is characterised as 20th century agriculture with pockets of remnant earlier field patterns surviving. These are generally of negligible to low significance. The impacts on these through the change of use, minimal (no more than 10m will be removed in accordance with the requirements of the Outline LEMP [EN0110014/APP/7.4]) of parts of hedgerows and landscaping mitigation in the form of native woodland and hedge planting will be negligible, leading to **negligible** effects, which are **not significant**.

Indirect Impacts to Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 10.8.22 During the construction phase there is potential for indirect impacts to heritage assets beyond the Order Limits, within the Study Area, through changes to their setting. These changes would be most evident during the operational phase and would commence during construction but are most closely linked to the operational phase. Indirect impacts that might occur during the construction phase would be of no greater magnitude than those experienced during the operational phase and would be of a short-term duration and reversible. They would, however, be of a different nature, for example including the possible visibility of plant, increase in traffic movements and the presence of Temporary Construction Compounds. These might result in very localised indirect impacts that could be of a different nature than what would occur during the operational phase, but the reversibility and short-term duration of these impacts would mean that the scale of the effects would soon return to no change or neutral.

- 10.8.23 The construction phase is anticipated to take up to 24 months, but the time spent on each Site would be less than this. As the indirect visual impacts would be at their greatest in terms of magnitude and duration during the operational phase, those impacts are discussed below in the section relating to operational phase impacts. In terms of impacts that would be greater or different during the operational phase, embedded mitigation in the form of positioning of Temporary Construction Compounds and traffic routes will result in these aspects having no indirect impacts on any heritage assets. Indirect impacts during the construction phase are, therefore, considered to be limited to noise levels.
- 10.8.24 An Abnormal Indivisible Load route has been identified as potentially being required within the Saxlingham Nethergate Conservation Area, along the roadside of a total of 13 Grade II listed buildings and ten non-designated heritage assets. Of these, there are three buildings situated close to the bend in the roadside on this route: the Grade II listed the Old School (NHLE 1050668), and two non-designated heritage assets: Orchard View and Orchard View Barn. There is an additional Abnormal Indivisible Load route within the nearby Saxlingham Green Conservation Area in the vicinity of four Grade II Listed Buildings: Manor Farmhouse (NHLE 1050675), Manor Farmhouse Barn (NHLE 1152344), Manor Cottage (NHLE 1373079) and Hill Cottages (NHLE 1373062). Due to the nature of the area, there are limited options for transporting Abnormal Indivisible Loads, and these routes will only be used for a small number of movements (less than ten) required to deliver transformers and other Abnormal Indivisible Loads to construct the Project Substation within Site 7. The swept path analysis of the route has identified this section of the road within the Conservation Areas as most likely requiring temporary roadworks and the suspension of all on-street parking areas along the road. Where the load may potentially oversail, it is further possible that tree canopies within the conservation area may need to be trimmed back and that roadside railings or bollards may need to be temporarily removed. The latter are modern and will be reinstated immediately following. There will be no changes made to the conservation area or other heritage assets. Movements will be closely monitored so as to reduce any risk to surrounding structures. It is, therefore, not considered that this will result in any impact to the identified heritage assets. The **Outline CTMP [EN0110014/APP/7.6]** should be referred to for further information on Abnormal Indivisible Loads.

Conclusion

- 10.8.25 The majority of heritage assets within the Study Area are sufficiently removed from the Scheme for noise during the construction phase to present no more than a negligible impact resulting in a **neutral** effect, which is **not significant**. The noise assessment presented in **ES: Chapter 12 – Noise and Vibration [EN0110014/APP/6.1.12]** has not identified any potentially significant effects upon any cultural heritage receptors. Furthermore, whilst the construction activity is likely to take up to 24

months, the noise generated will vary depending upon activity and be at varying distances from the receptors. Given the distances involved and variability of noise levels this is considered of negligible magnitude on high sensitivity receptors as a worst case scenario, resulting in a **neutral** effect that is **not significant** in EIA terms.

Operation and Maintenance Phase

Direct Impacts to Archaeological Remains

- 10.8.26 Any adverse impacts to archaeological remains within the Order Limits will have taken place during the construction phase. The impacts to buried archaeological features during the operational phase would, therefore, be of a beneficial nature, due to these remains being taken out of the agricultural cycle of regular ploughing which most of the field parcels within the Order Limits are currently subject to. Ploughing is recognised as having a widespread detrimental impact upon archaeological remains. Therefore, archaeological remains of low sensitivity (as indicated by the informative trial trenching to be present within the Order Limits), subject to a low beneficial magnitude of impact would result in a **minor beneficial effect**, which is **not significant** in EIA terms.

Indirect Impacts to Designated Heritage Assets

- 10.8.27 There are potential indirect impacts on heritage assets within the Study Area during the operational phase of the Scheme. These impacts lie in the contribution that the setting of heritage assets makes to their significance and could include changes in land use altering the character of heritage landscapes and the surrounding environs of heritage assets, visual intrusion affecting the dominance/prominence of heritage assets within their settings, glare and shadowing caused by the reflection of sunlight off solar arrays, and noise pollution. The duration of these impacts would be for the full operational lifetime of the Scheme, although will be reduced once the landscaping mitigation has matured.
- 10.8.28 It should be made clear that in assessing heritage assets, in accordance with current guidance (NPS EN-1 2025; NPPF; HE 2019), it is the impact upon the significance of the asset as a whole (encompassing all of its values and its entire setting) that is assessed, not the impact upon one particular view from a discrete part of the asset.
- 10.8.29 Potential effects on designated and non-designated heritage assets over the course of the Scheme have been assessed within the Heritage Statement undertaken in support of this chapter (**ES: Appendix 10.1 Heritage Statement [EN0110014/APP/6.3.10.1]**). The conclusions of the assessment were that, following embedded mitigation, there will be no harm for the majority of designated and every non-designated heritage assets within the Study Area. Moulton Farmhouse and Barn Cottages are

the only exceptions to this. Views of the former Grade II listed building from the footpath within Sub-Site 1B are of interest and illustrate the heritage asset's significance. These will be obscured by the Project Substation as part of the Scheme. Depending on the situation of the Project Substation within the BESS Sub-Site, there also may be visibility of taller elements of the structure from Barn Cottages, which will result in **low adverse to negligible** impact on a medium sensitivity asset. This would result in a **minor adverse** effect (equating to less than substantial harm at the lowest end of the scale) that is **not significant**. For Barn Cottages, this will be reduced to no harm once the landscaping screening has matured (expected to be approximately 30 years).

- 10.8.30 The potential indirect impact of the Scheme on designated and non-designated heritage assets ranges from low to negligible, with the scale of effects ranging from **neutral to minor adverse**, which are **not significant**.

Decommissioning Phase

Indirect Impacts to Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 10.8.31 It is considered that the decommissioning phase has the potential to temporarily affect the settings of identified designated and non-designated heritage assets, particularly in relation to plant movement and the presence of Temporary Construction Compounds. These impacts are anticipated to be similar in level or lesser to those experienced during the construction phase, and as with this, would be of a temporary nature, with an expected duration of 12 to 24 months. The scale of effect is, therefore, considered to be **neutral** which is **not significant** in EIA terms.
- 10.8.32 After decommissioning, several impacts on designated heritage assets resulting from the operational phase of the Scheme would be reversed, specifically the removal of solar arrays and possibility of returning the land to an agricultural function. There may be a retention of several elements of the Scheme including the National Grid Substation, pylons and cabling, but their continued use would cause no additional impacts to those identified during the operational phase. As such, it is not considered that any significant effects on cultural heritage will arise from this phase of the Scheme. Of further note is that new engineering approaches and technologies are likely to emerge over the Scheme's operational life that could ultimately reduce potential decommissioning impacts, or remove them altogether.

10.9 Additional Mitigation Measures

Additional Construction Phase Mitigation Measures

- 10.9.1 The mitigation measures for the archaeological resource within the Site will be secured via a requirement of the DCO and are detailed in **ES: Appendix 10.6 Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [APP/6.3.10.6]** and summarised below. Following discussions with Norfolk Historic Environment Service (NHES), it has been agreed that the mitigation will be led by, and proportionate to, the below ground impacts of the Scheme. However, as the precise layout of aspects such as cable trenches and inverter locations and the depth of impact of aspects such as Access Tracks and the temporary working areas for the grid connection infrastructure are not yet available, the precise details of areas of mitigation cannot yet be determined. It can, however, be said that the mitigation will take one or more of the following methods:

Geophysical Survey

- 10.9.2 Geophysical survey (magnetometry) will be completed in areas that were not previously available for survey, including the full 50m width of the Cable Route Corridor. Geophysical survey (magnetometry) will be undertaken in areas that were not previously available for survey, including where necessary within the Cable Route Corridor. It has been agreed with NCCHEs that any outstanding geophysical survey will take place pre-consent to allow for micro siting the route of the cable trench and working area within the Cable Route Corridor if required, and to avoid any anomalies of very high archaeological potential.

Informative Trenching

- 10.9.3 The areas of known extensive impact (National Grid Substation and Project Substations, BESS and Temporary Construction Compounds) will be subject to informative trenching at 3.5% by area.
- 10.9.4 Informative trenching will be undertaken in the remaining areas of the Site not subject to previous trenching. It has been agreed with NHES that the amount and location of any additional trenching will be targeted on areas of higher impact and proportionate to the overall impact. As such the amount and location of the trenches can only be confirmed following detailed design.

Geoarchaeological Assessment

- 10.9.5 The need for and location of deep impacts (up to 12m for piles and/or directional drilling) are not yet known and so it is not possible to firmly identify the need for and location of any geoarchaeological assessment.

Once details are available the need for and scope of any geoarchaeological assessment will be agreed with NHES.

Archaeological Excavation

- 10.9.6 Precise details of areas that will be subject to full archaeological excavation will be defined following completion of the geophysical survey and informative trenching and finalisation of the location and extent of development impacts. Some of the archaeological excavation areas may take the form of ‘compensation’ excavation rather than mitigation of individual impacts (i.e. certain areas may be examined in more detail in order to compensate for the loss of other areas).

Archaeological Monitoring

- 10.9.7 Archaeological monitoring (a ‘watching brief’) may be required in certain areas where the impacts is limited and/or where full excavation is not warranted.

Preservation in Situ

- 10.9.8 It has been agreed with NHES that the impact of piling for the panel support structures is of such a low level that it will not compromise the integrity of the archaeological or limit the ability to understand the remains should archaeological investigation be carried out at a future date, with the proviso that certain archaeological features would need to be avoided or fully excavated. Such features would include (but are not limited to) structures, waterlogged remains, features with high artefactual or environment potential, industrial features and human remains. Should such features be identified by the informative trenching this would require either the adjustment of the pile layout to avoid particular archaeological features and/or the targeted use of concrete feet rather than piles to support the panel support structure. It is not envisaged that extensive areas will require this treatment but any such works would be targeted and localised.
- 10.9.9 The option for localised areas of above ground cabling to preserve significant archaeological remains in situ where it is not practicable or desirable to mitigate by archaeological excavation will be available and will be informed by the detailed design and informative trenching.

Additional Operation and Maintenance Phase Mitigation Measures

- 10.9.10 As no significant effects have been identified above for receptors during the operational phase of the Scheme once embedded mitigation is taken into account, no additional mitigation measures for this phase are required.

Additional Decommissioning Phase Mitigation Measures

- 10.9.11 As no significant effects have been identified above for receptors during the decommissioning phase of the Scheme once embedded mitigation is taken into account, no additional mitigation measures for this phase are required.

10.10 Residual Effects

- 10.10.1 This section summarises the residual effects of the Scheme on following the adoption of embedded and additional mitigation (if additional mitigation is proposed).

Residual Effects for Archaeological Remains – Construction Phase

- 10.10.2 Prior to additional mitigation, the scale of effect on archaeological remains within the Order Limits is considered as **neutral** for the majority of the Scheme; and **moderate adverse** for the undated watering hole in the north-eastern corner of the BESS and the temporary construction compound in Sub-Site 4A. The latter is **significant**.
- 10.10.3 For buried archaeological remains, ‘preservation by record’ and ‘preservation in situ’, according to their degree of sensitivity, is proposed by means of the additional mitigation strategy detailed in Section 10.9 above. The impact on archaeological remains is the same despite the excavation and ultimate destruction of some elements of the archaeological features present, ‘preservation by record’ offsets these effects by recovering artefactual and ecofactual evidence, and providing a greater understanding of the archaeological resource and its evidential value. As such, the residual effect on archaeological remains (including the undated watering hole in the north-eastern corner of the BESS and the temporary construction compound in Sub-Site 4A) after additional mitigation is **neutral**, which is **not significant**.

Residual Effects for Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets – Operation and Maintenance and Decommissioning Phases

- 10.10.4 As no additional mitigation has been identified for the operation and decommissioning phases for Cultural Heritage, the residual effects remain as identified in Section 10.8. There will be a **negligible** impact on the majority of designated and all non-designated heritage assets identified as potentially sensitive to the Scheme, resulting in a **neutral** effect that is **not**

significant in EIA terms. This will remain unchanged following additional mitigation and there will be a residual **neutral** effect.

- 10.10.5 For a single designated heritage asset, Moulton Farmhouse Grade II Listed building, there will be a **low to negligible** impact on a medium sensitivity receptor resulting in a **minor adverse** effect, which is **not significant**.

10.11 Cumulative Effects Assessment

- 10.11.1 This section presents an assessment of cumulative effects between the Scheme and other existing and/or approved developments.

- 10.11.2 As set out in **ES: Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [EN0110014/APP/6.1.2]**, a Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) has been undertaken as part of the EIA in accordance with PINS Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment (September 2024) and has considered two types of cumulative effects.

- In combination effects: the combined effect generated by individual effects on a particular receptor (presented within **ES: Chapter 19 In-Combination Effects [EN0110014/APP/6.1.19]**); and
- Cumulative effects: effects generated by the Scheme and other planned or approved developments on the same receptor (presented in **ES Chapters 6 to 18**).

Cumulative Effects

- 10.11.3 Cumulative effects may arise as a result of effects associated with the Scheme combining with effects associated with other developments. The list of developments has been narrowed down to focus on those developments which are most likely to give rise to cumulative effects. A long-list was generated which was then refined following consultation with relevant local planning authorities, this short-list forms the basis of this assessment.

- 10.11.4 The shortlist of cumulative developments/allocations can be found in **ES Appendix 2.4: Cumulative Schemes [EN0110014/APP/6.3.2.4]**.

Relevant Developments

- 10.11.5 Those developments which have the potential to result in cumulative effects on Cultural Heritage within the associated study area are set out below. The remaining schemes are not considered to have cumulative effects within the Cultural Heritage study area due to there not being any heritage assets, archaeological remains or other elements of the historic environment whose settings encompass the Sites and the other schemes.

10.11.6

Table 10-8 Short List Developments/Allocations relevant to Cultural Heritage

Planning Ref	Description	Distance from the Scheme
TBC	South Norfolk – Tharston / Ashwellthorpe	Adjacent to the western boundary of sub-Site 4A
2024/3817	Land to the North of Station Road Tivetshall St Margaret Norfolk	Overlaps with National Grid Substation in Sub-Site 1B
2018/0111	Land East of the A140	Adjacent to southern boundary of sub-Site 4B
2014/0562	Former Site of 49 High Green Brooke, Norfolk	Approximately 200m north of Site 9
2018/0112	Land West of the A140	Approximately 200m south of sub-Site 4A
2023/1386	Land south of Church Road Woodton, Norfolk	Approximately 400m west of sub-Site 10A

Cumulative Effects Assessment

10.11.7 It is possible that several heritage assets may share intervisibility both with the Scheme and with the identified relevant developments in the area. Specifically, where heritage assessments undertaken by the developers in support of the above applications (not including South Norfolk – Tharston / Ashwellthorpe) have identified adverse effects on Barn Cottages (2024/3817); St Michaels Church (2018/0111 and 2018/0112); and the Church of St Mary and the Rectory (2014/0562). However, there are no significant effects caused by the Scheme on designated or non-designated heritage assets, and it is therefore not considered that there are any potential cumulative impacts that would result in harm to any designated or non-designated heritage asset.

10.11.8 In archaeological terms, it is not yet known what archaeology has been identified within the other development areas or how the archaeology across both the Order Limits of the Scheme and these development areas relate. However, it is clear that the works undertaken to date and those to come will add greatly to the understanding of the archaeological resource across a large section of the county. Prior to additional mitigation, the cumulative impact on archaeological remains would likely be high on low to medium value receptors, resulting in moderate to minor adverse effects, which are significant. However, following an appropriate additional mitigation strategy that ensures archaeological remains are preserved either in situ or in record according to their sensitivity and significance (see **ES: Appendix 10.6 Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [EN0100114/APP/6.3.10.6]**), the magnitude of impact is considered to be low beneficial in the elucidation of public understanding of the

archaeological resource. This residual effect would therefore be neutral, which is **not significant** in EIA terms.

10.12 Conclusion

10.12.1 This chapter has set out and assessed the likely effects of the Scheme in relation to Cultural Heritage. Likely effects have been assessed for the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Following the implementation of embedded mitigation and additional as detailed in **sections 10.7** and **10.9** respectively, residual effects have been identified in relation to Cultural Heritage during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases

10.12.2 **Table 10-9** Summary of Residual Effects for Cultural Heritage sets out a summary of the Cultural Heritage environmental effects.

Table 10-9 Summary of Residual Effects for Cultural Heritage

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
Construction Phase					
Undated pit/watering hole BESS Site	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from below ground infrastructure required for the Project Substation and BESS site	High	Neutral	Not Significant
Five medieval ditches and one pit Site 2	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
		below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering			
Medieval ditches, pits, extraction pit and cobbled surface Site 3	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Prehistoric/Roman remains Site 4 including ditches, pits and a possible Roman stone building	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; Temporary Construction Compound; compaction and dewatering	High	Neutral	Not Significant
Medieval occupational layer, a cobbled surface, post-holes and pits along with the ditched enclosures Site 5	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
		infrastructure; compaction and dewatering			
Prehistoric watering hole Sub-Site 7K	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Prehistoric watering hole, post-holes and pits Sub-Site 7F	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Roman ditches Sub-Site 7A	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
Medieval ditches, extraction pits and a cobbled surface Sub-Site 7C	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Prehistoric ditches and pits Site 9	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Iron Age settlement remains Site 9	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Roman ditches, pits and cultivation trenches Site 9	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
		secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering			
Medieval trackway, ditches and pits Site 9	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Prehistoric pit Site 10	Low	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Medieval pottery kilns and associated features Site 10	Medium	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure;	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
		compaction and dewatering			
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Infrastructure Site	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 1	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 2	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 3	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 4	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; temporary construction compound; compaction and dewatering.	Moderate/Low/High	Neutral	Not Significant
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 5	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 7	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; Substation; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 8	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 9	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
Post-medieval to modern former field boundaries Site 10	Negligible	Possible direct impacts to buried archaeological remains from piles to secure PV panels, cables and other below ground infrastructure; compaction and dewatering	Moderate/Low	Neutral	Not Significant
Operation and Maintenance Phase					
Camp in Village (Tasburgh Hillfort) Scheduled Monument (NHLE 1003984)	High	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Church of St Michael Grade I Listed Building (NHLE 1304267)	High	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Church of St Catherine Grade I Listed Building (NHLE 1373281)	High	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Oaks Farmhouse Grade II* Listed Building (NHLE 1170906)	High	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
The Old Rectory Grade II* Listed Building (NHLE 1373264)	High	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Moulton Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373270)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Low/Negligible	Minor adverse /Negligible	Not Significant
Barn Cottages Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050010)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Broadgate Way Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050318)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Laurels Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153200)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Barn immediately east of Laurels Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050326)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Hill House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050216)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
French's Farmhouse Grade	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
II Listed Building (NHLE 1050252)		wider setting of the heritage asset			
Townhouse Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153325)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Rose Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1304365)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Three Feathers Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153315)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Barn and Stable range adjoining Three Feathers to the south-west Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050334)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Barn north of the Old Rectory Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050306)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Church Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153545)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
Cottage occupied by Mr and Mrs Woods Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050305)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Walnut Tree Cottage and Low Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050313)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Pair of Houses owned by Mr B R Weeden Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153535)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Cottage occupied by Mrs Rye Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050315)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
The Cedars Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1304177)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
The Hollies Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373282)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Church Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050259)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
Barn immediately north-west of Church Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050260)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Fritton Conservation Area	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Poacher's Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1153291)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
The Firs Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373239)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
The Haven Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1304384)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Grove Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050330)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Wood Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373238)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
The Countryman Public House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373407)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Former Quaker Meeting House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1178892)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Hill Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050016)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Tramp's Hall Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1302215)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Barn Immediately East of Trap's Hall Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050048)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Manor Farmhouse Barn Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1152344)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Manor Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050675)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
Manor Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373079)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Hill Cottages Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1373062)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Hill House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1152265)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Saxlingham Green Conservation Area	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Uppate Green Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1050681)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Outhouse to north of Uppate Green Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1304804)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Oldhouse Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1372864)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Barn at Oldhouse Farmhouse Grade	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Scale and Nature of Effect Following Mitigation	Significant/Not Significant
II Listed Building (NHLE 1051155)		wider setting of the heritage asset			
Waterfield Cottage Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1372865)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Littlebeck Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1051154)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Brooke Conservation Area	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Beulah House Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1051115)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Beulah Barn Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1305841)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant
Old Rectory Grade II Listed Building (NHLE 1051116)	Low	Presence of the Scheme within the wider setting of the heritage asset	Negligible	Neutral	Not Significant

References

- Ref 10-1 UK Government (2010) *Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations*.
- Ref 10-2 UK Government (2017) *The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 No. 572*.
- Ref 10-3 UK Government (1953) *Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act*.
- Ref 10-4 UK Government (1979) *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act*.
- Ref 10-5 UK Government (1990) *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (P)LBCA*).
- Ref 10-6 UK Government (2008) *Planning Act*.
- Ref 10-7 UK Government (1997) *Hedgerow Regulations*.
- Ref 10-8 UNESCO (1972) UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and National Heritage
- Ref 10-9 Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) (2025) *The National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1)*.
- Ref 10-10 Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) (2025) *The National Policy Statement (NPS) for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)*.
- Ref 10-11 Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) (2025) *The National Policy Statement (NPS) for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5)*.
- Ref 10-12 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Department for Levelling-Up, Housing and Communities (2024) *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*.
- Ref 10-13 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Department for Levelling-Up, Housing and Communities (2024) *Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)*.
- Ref 10-14 Broadland District Council, South Norfolk Council and Norwich City Council (2024) *Greater Norwich Local Plan*.
- Ref 10-15 South Norfolk Council (2015) *Development Management Policies Document*.
- Ref 10-16 Chartered Institute of Archaeologists (CIfA) (2020) *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment*.
- Ref 10-17 Historic England (2015) *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment*.
- Ref 10-18 Historic England (2017) *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition): The Setting of Heritage Assets*.
- Ref 10-19 Historic England (2019) *Statement of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets. Historic England Advice Note 12*.
- Ref 10-20 Historic England (2019) *Advice Note 15: Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment*.
- Ref 10-21 Norfolk County Council (2018) *Standards for Developer-Led Archaeological Projects in Norfolk*.
- Ref 10-22 Historic England (2019) *Piling and Archaeology*.

- Ref 10-23 Historic England (2018) *Using Airborne LiDAR in Archaeological Survey*.
- Ref 10-24 Historic England (2017) *Land Contamination and Archaeology*.
- Ref 10-25 Historic England (2016) *Preserving Archaeological Remains*.
- Ref 10-26 East of England Research Framework (n.d) *East of England Regional Research Framework* < <https://researchframeworks.org/eoe/> > accessed 15th December 2025.
- Ref 10-27 Historic England (2021) *Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage Historic England Advice Note7 (Second Edition)*.
- Ref 10-28 Historic England (2023) *Trees and Archaeology (accessed December 2025)*.
- Ref 10-29 Oxford Archaeology (2024) *Assessing Tree Roots and Archaeology*.
- Ref 10-30 Historic England (2018) *Pile Impacts on Archaeology Literature Review*.
- Ref 10-31 MOLA (2004) *Mitigation of Construction Impacts on Archaeology*.