EXQ ref	Response required from	Question	HE response
1GEN1.	All Parties	Artificial Intelligence The Planning Inspectorate has guidance in relation to the use of artificial intelligence (AI). Have you used AI to create or alter any part of your documents, information or data? This does not include basic spell-check or grammar tools.	Historic England can confirm that AI has not been used to create or alter any part of our submissions.
1GEN39.	Applicant; Statutory undertakers	Article 44 Explain the implications for the inclusion of paragraphs (2) to (4) and signpost to similar paragraphs within made orders. Update the explanatory memorandum and other core documents accordingly. Statutory undertakers to also provide comment.	In context of this DCO Historic England's statutory role is not affected by the provisions contained in Article 44. Therefore, we have no comments to make on the wording of the Article 44.
1CH3.	Historic England; Kent County Council; Suffolk County Council	Inclusion of heritage assets in the ES assessment Are there any designated or non-designated heritage assets within either county that were not considered within the ES, or that were scoped out for further assessment within the ES, which should have been assessed? Furthermore, were the study areas used sufficient to include all heritage assets which could be impacted by the proposed development?	Historic England is not aware of any known designated or non-designated heritage assets which should have been additionally included in the assessment presented in the ES. However, as certain areas have not been fully assessed through archaeological evaluation there is still potential for unexpected discoveries. The significance of any remains which have not been evaluated so far and the level of impact which would be caused by the development to that significance is unknown at present.

			In case of the designated heritage assets, we can confirm that the scope of the assessment and extent of the study area have been discussed and agreed with Historic England during pre-application engagement. We are satisfied that the extent of the study area and level of assessment of known heritage assets presented in the ES is adequate for the purposes of this examination.
1CH5.	Applicant; Historic England; Suffolk County Council; Kent County Council	Areas not currently assessed SCC in section 7 of its LIR [REP1-130] states that there are areas within the order limits that have not been included in the trenched evaluations undertaken to this point, such as areas around the proposed Friston substation site, which would still need assessing. For the applicant, provide a plan to show areas that still require archaeological assessment and confirm when this will be done. Also, explain why this remaining assessment work has not yet been undertaken. For Historic England, SCC and KCC: If there are areas where further assessment work is required, should this be done before the close of examination so that the results can be considered along with any necessary mitigation? Or could this be done after any potential consent through secured commitments/requirements?	Historic England can confirm that there are certain areas within order limits which have not been fully assessed through archaeological trial trench evaluation. Given the access constraints indicated by the applicant [APP-050] and length of time that would be required to undertake further trial trench evaluation it would be unrealistic to expect that this work could be done within the examination of this project. As per our previous response (REP1-199), we accept that archaeological evaluation of certain areas within order limits will be undertaken post-consent. We recommend that the applicant should clearly identify the areas which require further evaluation within the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation. As further archaeological mitigation might be

			required in these areas the process for securing appropriate level of mitigation should also be clearly outlined for the avoidance of doubt. In any work undertaken post consent, the applicant will also need to be able to demonstrate they have addressed the policy consideration for asset that are of equivalent value to designated heritage assets through evaluation and characterisation, and that they have appropriate policies to manage this issue should it arise. Historic England would expect to be consulted regarding mitigation measures if remains of national importance are identified in the course of post-consent evaluation. We are content that this work can be secured through appropriately worded commitments/requirements.

1CH8.	Historic England	Wood Farmhouse Wood Farmhouse near Saxmundham has been de-listed. Can Historic England clarify if the building now has any remaining historic value or if it is still a heritage asset?	Following an extensive fire in April 2023, part of Wood Farmhouse was demolished. Only a low proportion of historic fabric survives, and the building no longer has sufficient special architectural or historic interest expected of designated heritage assets. The surviving part of the building therefore lacks architectural interest in the national context and for that reason it has been removed from the National Heritage List for England. This means it is no longer a designated heritage asset. However, the building is still recorded in the Suffolk Historic Environment Record. It is a matter for the Local Authority to decide if the surviving remains of the building are sufficiently important in the local context and how they should be addressed. We note these should be considered as a non-designated heritage asset.
1CH9	Historic England; Kent County Council	Ebbsfleet Peninsular multi-period complex archaeological site Historic England [REP1-199] describes the Ebbsfleet Peninsular multi-period complex as being of schedulable quality and of national importance. Explain why this is a non-designated heritage asset but not a Scheduled Ancient Monument, given its high value.	Currently available information indicate that Ebbsfleet Peninsular archaeological site has high potential for the presence of archaeological remains which could be of national importance. This has been recognised in the applicant's assessment contained in the Environmental Statement (APP-063). Because of this potential

			Historic England considers the site to be likely of schedulable quality. However, the site has never been subject to comprehensive scheme of archaeological investigation which could provide evidence necessary for undertaking scheduling assessment. For that reason, the site has never been formally assessed by Historic England for inclusion on National Heritage List for England. Further archaeological research is likely to add to our understanding of the site's heritage value and its significance. This could potentially lead to the formal assessment for scheduling being undertaken in the future.
1CH11	Applicant; Local Planning Authorities; Historic England	Stakeholder involvement in the converter station design Within its deadline 1 submission, HE [REP1-199] stated it has concern that dDCO [CR1-027] Schedule 3 requirement 3 (Converter Station Design) as drafted makes no explicit provision for stakeholder engagement on the issue of the design beyond the County Council. Given the proximity of heritage assets to the proposed largescale converter stations, such as Richborough Roman Fort, the ExA asks the applicant to consider amending the wording so that this requirement makes it is necessary for the	Since our representations made within deadline 1 submission [REP1-199], Historic England has provided additional comments by deadline 2 [REP2-052] which relate to further consultation on the design details of the Minster converter station. We have proposed inclusion of a further heritage commitment to the REAC Landscape and Visual section, as follows: *To minimise the change to the setting of heritage assets, the Minster Converter Station and*

		local planning authorities to consult also with HE on the design details of the converter stations. HE and LPAs – Are there any comments on the inclusion of HE for consultation as part of this requirement?	*Substation is to be designed in consideration of limiting intrusion into Heritage key views and in consultation with Historic England.* We consider that further, post consent, consultation with Historic England regarding detailed design of the Minster converter station is necessary to ensure that visual impact on Richborough Roman Fort is minimised. We have noted in our previous representations that some of the designs responses put forward at this stage [APP-365] are likely to be more intrusive within the landscape, and therefore more harmful to the significance of the nationally important designated heritage asset. Historic England will continue to work with the applicant to agree final version of the wording of either DCO or REAC commitment to address this issue.
1MA3	Historic England	Geoarchaeological Assessment Historic England in [RR-2032] notes that additional geotechnical work undertaken in October 2024 is still in progress and has not been included within the documents submitted at that time. The ExA notes that an updated supplementary Stage 1 and 2 Marine Geoarchaeological Assessment [REP1-005] was provided at deadline A.	We reviewed the updated Marine Archaeological Technical Report (REP1-005), the Supplementary Stage 1 and 2 Marine Geoarchaeological Assessment - Technical Note (updated) (REP1-031), and the Supplementary Stage 1 and 2 Marine Geoarchaeological Assessment (updated) (REP1-029) submitted at Deadline 1. We provided comments within our Written Representation (REP1-199) on the Supplementary

		Can Historic England provide an update on their position with respect to the suitability of the geoarchaeological assessment including identifying any outstanding information?	Stage 1 and 2 Marine Geoarchaeological Assessment - Technical Note (then ref. AS-034) and Supplementary Stage 1 and 2 Marine Geoarchaeological Assessment (then re. AS-033) stating that we found the report generally good but offered comments regarding the recommendations for further work. The updated versions (REP1-029 and REP1-031 respectively) have taken on board our comments and increased the number of samples proposed. This has therefore addressed our previous comments.