

Action Points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) on environmental issues, held on Wednesday 28 January to Friday 30 January 2026.

Action ref. no	Response required from	Action	HE response
52	Historic England, All relevant Councils, Applicant	<p>Heritage assets listed by the applicant [REP3-070] which are scoped out of the ES include those which are described as experiencing an adverse impact, though less than substantial at the lower end of this scale. For example, asset ID 1215749 - Buxlow Manor in Suffolk. For this example and the others like it, provide additional information as to the potential impact to the significance of each asset and further justification as to why it was scoped out.</p> <p>For all relevant Councils and Historic England, is it appropriate to scope out from the ES assessment heritage assets which are considered to have (lower end of) less than substantial impact on their significance?</p>	<p>In line with requirements of the Overarching National Policy Statement for energy (EN-1) the significance of all heritage assets which will be impacted by the proposed development should be identified and described in an Environmental Statement. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage assets and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance (EN-1 paragraph 5.9.12). The identified level of harm, which cannot be avoided by design and other mitigation measures, should then be taken into account in a decision making.</p> <p>Historic England can confirm that as part of pre-examination engagement, we agreed the scope of the assessment of the designated heritage assets with the applicant. We understand that the applicant has undertaken the initial assessment of all heritage assets that will be impacted by the scheme. The results were presented in the</p>

			<p>Cultural Heritage Baseline Report (APP-109). The heritage assets which would experience no adverse impact or where level of identified harm would be negligible have not been scoped in for further assessments. The list of these assets has been provided by the applicant in the document (REP3-070). This is a proportionate approach, and we consider that it is in line with the policy requirements. The identified level of less than substantial harm to significance of heritage assets should still be considered as part of the decision-making process and should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (EN-1 paragraph 5.9.33).</p> <p>Historic England understands that at the request of Examining Authority the applicant is preparing additional information to clarify the level of assessment of the scoped-out heritage assets experiencing negligible effects. This will be submitted by Deadline 4. We agree that clarification of the level of assessment is desirable in this case.</p> <p>We note that during the Issue Specific Hearing 2 an issue of lack of assessment of ‘Slaughden Martello tower’, scheduled monument (List</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Entry Number 1006041), and Church of St Botolph, grade II listed building (LEN 1198033) have been raised. These assets are located outside agreed study area.</p> <p>We can confirm that Historic England have not requested that these designated heritage assets are included in the heritage assessment. We consider that in these two cases any potential change to the setting of heritage assets will not result in harm to their significance.</p>
128	Applicant	Provide updated wording for requirement 3 to reflect the applicant's commitment made to allow relevant planning authorities control over Kent substation layout, design and scale.	Historic England notes that Action 128 requires the applicant to provide updated wording for requirement 3. We consider that the revised wording should retain provision for engagement with Historic England regarding detailed design of the Minster converter station. This is necessary to ensure that visual impact on the scheduled monument - Richborough Roman Fort is minimised.