

The Great Grid Upgrade

Sea Link

Sea Link

Volume 9: Examination Submissions

Document 9.27: Updated Archaeological Assessment – Suffolk

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020026

Version: A
March 2026

nationalgrid

Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	2
1.1 Overview	2
2. Trial Trenching Results	4
3. Assessment of Impacts	12
3.1 Assessment	12
3.2 Construction Phase	12
4. Additional Mitigation and Enhancement Measures	18
4.1 Assessment	18
5. Residual Effects and Conclusions	20
5.1 Assessment	20
6. Summary	23

Table of Tables

Table 1 Plots covered by evaluation trenching undertaken as part of the Phase 2a, Phase 2b, and Phase 3 evaluation trenching.	4
Table 2 Assets within the Phase 2a Plots	13
Table 3: Residual effects after the implication of additional mitigation	21

Executive Summary

Ex1.0.1 This document provides a summary of the results of archaeological evaluation work that has been undertaken in relation to the Sea Link project (thereafter referred to as the 'Proposed Project') since the submission of the DCO application in March 2025, as well as an updated assessment based on the full excavation reports that have now been submitted for all phases of evaluation works.

Ex1.0.2 The information contained in this document is based on the following reports:

- Phase 2a evaluation excavation report: see **Application Document 9.3.1 Suffolk Section Phase 2A Archaeological Evaluation Report [AS-135]**.
- Phase 2b evaluation excavation report: see **Application Document 9.3.2 Suffolk Section Phase 2B Archaeological Evaluation Report [AS-136]**.
- Phase 3 evaluation excavation interim report: see **Application Document 9.114 (A) Interim Phase 3 Archaeological Report Suffolk [REP4-103]**.
- Phase 3 evaluation final report: see **Application Document 9.127 Suffolk Phase 3 Archaeological Evaluation Final Report** submitted at Deadline 5.

Ex1.0.3 The assessment of potential impacts based on the information from the above additional archaeological evaluation and reporting has concluded that there will be no new significant effects resulting from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This report provides an overview of archaeological data collected as part of the Phase 2a, 2b, and Phase 3 evaluation trenching, as well as an assessment of potential impacts to archaeological remains resulting from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.
- 1.1.2 Whilst the majority of the Phase 2a trenching had been undertaken prior to the submission of the DCO application in March 2025 (**Application Document 6.2.2.3 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 3 Cultural Heritage [APP-050]**), the full results for this work were not available until after the DCO submission. As a result the assessment of impacts in these areas was provisional and based on interim reports, although this updated assessment has concluded that the findings of the assessment based on the interim report remains the same.
- 1.1.3 The Phase 2b trenching was largely undertaken in early 2025, and as a result interim reports were not available for all areas resulting in the assessment of impacts in these Plots being based on data from non-intrusive works (i.e. geophysical survey). Furthermore, a number of new assets were also identified as part of the Phase 2b trenching.
- 1.1.4 The Phase 3 trenching was undertaken in November and December 2025 to evaluate the land covered by Change 3 of Change Request 1 (**Application Document 9.76.2 (A) Change Request Report [CR1-052]**). As this work largely overlapped with the work undertaken near Friston as part of the Phase 2b works, the Phase 3 results are discussed alongside the Phase 2b results. Initial results from the Phase 3 work were submitted in an interim report at Deadline 4 (**Application Document 9.114 (A) Interim Phase 3 Archaeological Report Suffolk [REP4-103]**), with the final report, **Application Document 9.127 Suffolk Phase 3 Evaluation Final Report**, submitted at Deadline 5.
- 1.1.5 This document provides an overview of the new data provided as a result of the publication of the Phase 2a, Phase 2b, and Phase 3 reports, and then goes on to assess impacts, outline mitigation, and provide the residual effect after mitigation.
- 1.1.6 The full reports detailing the results of the Phase 2a, Phase 2b, and Phase 3 evaluation trenching are provided in:
- Phase 2a evaluation report: see Applicant's response to the ExA's s89(3) letter of 5 September 2025 - **Application Document 9.3.1 Suffolk Section Phase 2A Archaeological Evaluation Report [AS-135]**.
 - Phase 2b evaluation report: see Applicant's response to the ExA's s89(3) letter of 5 September 2025 - **Application Document 9.3.2 Suffolk Section Phase 2B Archaeological Evaluation Report [AS-136]**.
 - Phase 3 evaluation interim report: see **Application Document 9.114 (A) Interim Phase 3 Archaeological Report Suffolk [REP4-103]**.
 - Phase 3 evaluation final report: see **Application Document 9.127 Suffolk Phase 3 Evaluation Final Report** submitted at Deadline 5.

- 1.1.7 The assessment has been undertaken in line with the methodology used for the original assessment which is detailed in Section 3.4 of **Application Document 6.2.2.3 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 3 Cultural Heritage [APP-050]**.

2. Trial Trenching Results

2.1.1 The following table provides a summary of the known archaeological baseline conditions of the land plots within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme Order Limits that were evaluated. The table summarises archaeological information gathered from LiDAR and geophysical surveys carried out to support the DCO application, and combines this with the results of the trial trenching. **Plot numbers provided used as re per Figures 6.4.2.3.1 in Application Document 6.4.2.3 ES Figures Suffolk Cultural Heritage Part 1 of 2 [APP-229].**

Table 1 Land plots covered by evaluation trenching undertaken as part of the Phase 2a, Phase 2b, and Phase 3 evaluation trenching.

Plot Reference	Previously Recorded Assets	Overview of LiDAR, Geophysical Survey, and Trenching
58.28	FRS016 – Six Post-Medieval Quarry Pits	<p>LiDAR Plot 22. One small sub-circular feature noted in the south half of the field (Archaeological Ditch). Possible quarrying.</p> <p>Geophysical survey identified a number of features including parallel lines suggestive of trackways, as well as other linear anomalies (D6 and D7). These appear to be part of a larger complex continuing into Plot 58.34.</p> <p>The evaluation trenching was undertaken in one phase with the adjacent Plot 58.29 (FRS096), and identified one Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age pit (Trench 864) and a small Iron Age/Roman pit (Trench 871), as well as confirmed the presence of the trackways previously identified as part of the geophysical survey although no dating evidence for these was recovered. The quarry pits were also confirmed, although these were also undated. The remaining features noted were largely linear features suggesting agricultural activity rather than settlement activity</p> <p>Features grouped as AECOMS008.</p>
58.29	FRS016 – Six Post-Medieval Quarry Pits; FRS017– Hazelwood Aerodrome; ADB261	<p>LiDAR Plot 22. No new features recorded.</p> <p>Geophysical survey identified a number of features including parallel lines suggestive of trackways, as well as other linear anomalies (D7 and D8). These appear to be part of a larger complex continuing into Plot 58.28. A former post-medieval field boundary was also noted (FB1).</p>

Plot Reference	Previously Recorded Assets	Overview of LiDAR, Geophysical Survey, and Trenching
		<p>The evaluation trenching was undertaken in one phase with the adjacent Plot 58.28 (FRS096), and identified one Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age pit (Trench 864) and a small Iron Age/Roman pit (Trench 871), as well as confirmed the presence of the trackways previously identified as part of the geophysical survey although no dating evidence for these was recovered. The quarry pits were also confirmed, although these were also undated. The remaining features noted were largely linear features suggesting agricultural activity rather than settlement activity</p> <p>Features grouped as AECOMS008.</p>
58.26	FRS104: Possible trackway north of Hazelwood Farm; FRS105: Possible enclosure north of Hazelwood Farm	<p>LiDAR Plot 26. One small circular feature noted (Archaeological Ditch) although not identified in geophysical survey. Geophysical survey identified a number of features including parallel lines suggestive of trackways (D9), as well as other linear anomalies, and a possible enclosure (E?1). One area of possible quarrying was also noted (Q?2i) (FRS104).</p> <p>Phase Two archaeological evaluation trenching (FRS095) identified a number of the features recorded as part of the geophysical survey. These features appeared to form part of an enclosure which contained a number of cremations as well as a single animal burial (Trenches 848 and 849). Other remains confirmed the trackways and possible enclosures in the northwest and southeast, although most were undated.</p> <p>Features grouped as AECOMS009.</p>
25.2	None	<p>LiDAR Plot 33. Two possible features noted ('Archaeological Ditches'). Linear feature possible former field boundary.</p> <p>Geophysical survey not undertaken in field.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching (FRS116) (results published in the Phase 2b report) noted that part of a possible henge was identified in this field, with the feature continuing into Plot 25.1. Other remains included five pits dated to the Early Neolithic, as well as possible traces of the Bronze Age field system identified in Plot 25.3.</p>
25.1	FRS107: Enclosures east of Friston	<p>LiDAR Plot 34. Three possible features recorded ('Archaeological Ditches'), all of which appear to be quarrying. Geophysical survey identified a number of features including possible enclosures (E3; E?3),</p>

Plot Reference	Previously Recorded Assets	Overview of LiDAR, Geophysical Survey, and Trenching
		<p>linear anomalies (D12), and areas of possible quarrying (Q?5) (FRS107).</p> <p>Area where geophysical survey overlapped LiDAR coverage both suggest quarrying.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching (results published in the Phase 2b report) noted that part of a possible henge was identified in this field, with the feature continuing into Plot 25.2. Other remains included five pits dated to the Early Neolithic, as well as possible traces of the Bronze Age field system identified in Plot 25.3.</p>
25.3	None	<p>LiDAR Plot 35. One feature noted that appears to represent quarrying ('Archaeological Ditch').</p> <p>No features noted on geophysical survey, although geophysical survey in this field was based on the Draft Order Limits and as such did not cover the whole area that now falls within the Order Limits. This Plot has not been subject to full geophysical survey as part of Change Request 3.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching (FRS115) (results published in the Phase 2b report) noted that traces of a prehistoric field system tentatively dated to the Bronze Age was recorded in a number of trenches and appeared to continue into Field 25.2 to the southeast. Three small pits were also recorded, as well as a former quarry.</p>
20.2	None	<p>LiDAR Plot 36. No features recorded.</p> <p>Geophysical survey identified a limited number of features including possible quarrying (Q?6), and a post-medieval field boundary (FB3).</p> <p>Evaluation excavation was undertaken in both plots as part of the Phase 2a trenching (FRS114), and as such only preliminary results were available at the time of writing. However, these noted that archaeological remains were very limited, and largely consisted of former quarrying as identified by the geophysical survey. The linear features identified on the geophysical survey were also confirmed, although dating evidence was limited to a few small sherds of possible prehistoric pottery. Similar linear features were noted in Plot 20.1 where the geophysical survey had been undertaken, and these also contained a limited number of sherds of prehistoric pottery. Assets grouped as AECOMS013.</p>
20.1	None	<p>LiDAR Plot 39. One feature noted that appears to represent quarrying ('Archaeological Ditch').</p> <p>Geophysical survey not undertaken in field.</p>

Plot Reference	Previously Recorded Assets	Overview of LiDAR, Geophysical Survey, and Trenching
25.1	FRS107: Enclosures east of Friston	<p>Evaluation excavations undertaken as part of the Phase 2a trenching (KND073) revealed a limited number of features, some of which appeared to be a continuation of features recorded in Plot 20.2. Dating evidence was limited, with two pits containing pottery (possibly residual) dating to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age (Assets grouped as AECOMS013).</p> <p>LiDAR Plot 34. Three possible features recorded ('Archaeological Ditches'), all of which appear to be quarrying. Geophysical survey identified a number of features including possible enclosures (E3; E?3), linear anomalies (D12), and areas of possible quarrying (Q?5) (FRS107).</p> <p>Further geophysical survey undertaken in September and October 2025 to inform Change Request 1 confirmed the extent of a 'D-Shaped Enclosure' which forms part of FRS116. Areas where geophysical survey overlapped LiDAR coverage both suggest quarrying.</p> <p>Phase 2b trenching was limited to the northeastern corner of the plot. This included a single trench over the northern side of the 'D-Shaped Enclosure'.</p>
25.2	None	<p>LiDAR Plot 33. Two possible features noted ('Archaeological Ditches'). Linear feature possible former field boundary. Geophysical survey not originally undertaken in the field, however, it was undertaken as part of the additional geophysical survey works associated with Change Request 1 in September and October 2025. This confirmed the extent of a 'D-Shaped Enclosure' (E4) which forms part of FRS116 and continues west into Plot 25.1. Other features were limited to possible quarry pits and the former field boundary.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching in the area was undertaken as part of the Phase 2b and Phase 3 work. This confirmed the geophysical survey data, noting that remains were largely linked to the 'D-Shaped Enclosure' (E4) which forms part of FRS116, along with traces of a possible Bronze Age field system and a grouping of Early Neolithic Pits to the south. Other features were limited to quarrying activity and post-medieval field systems.</p>
25.3	None	<p>LiDAR Plot 35. One feature noted appears to represent quarrying ('Archaeological Ditch'). No features noted on the original geophysical survey, although original geophysical survey in this field was based on the Draft</p>

Plot Reference	Previously Recorded Assets	Overview of LiDAR, Geophysical Survey, and Trenching
		<p>Order Limits and as such did not cover the whole area within the Order Limits.</p> <p>Additional geophysical survey works associated with Change Request 1 was undertaken in September and October 2025 and identified remains of quarrying in the southern section of the Plot, as well as a number of possible enclosures in the northern section of the Plot.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching was undertaken as part of the Phase 2b and Phase 3 work, with the Phase 2b works in the southern section of the Plot (HER Code FRS115), and the Phase 3 works in the northern area of the Plot (FRS118). This work largely confirmed the results of the geophysical survey regarding the extent of features. The remains included traces of Neolithic and Bronze activity (including pits) in the southern end of the field, with traces of a possible enclosure containing medieval pottery in the northern end of the field (FRS118).</p>
41	None	<p>Not originally within the Order Limits but added as part of Change Request 1.</p> <p>Geophysical survey undertaken in September and October 2025 identified possible field boundaries as well as traces of quarrying.</p> <p>Evaluation excavations were undertaken as part of the Phase 3 works, and these recorded a ditch containing Roman pottery, as well as a ditch/possible enclosure containing medieval pottery. These features have been grouped under the HER code FRS118.</p>
28.16	KND064; Linear anomalies recorded as part of EA1N/2 surveys.	<p>LiDAR Plot 45. One possible 'Archaeological Ditch' recorded.</p> <p>Area subject to geophysical survey as part of EA1N/2 scheme with possible enclosure recorded in localised area in south of field (KND064).</p> <p>Field largely trenched as part of EA1N/2 works, with Proposed Project's trenching (covering areas not previously trenched by EA1N/2) undertaken alongside Plot 28.14 as part of the Phase 2a works (KND071). This identified the outer ditch of the rectilinear enclosure (Trenches 739 and 741), as well as two small pits (Trenches 740 and 742).</p>
28.14	None	<p>LiDAR Plot 45. One possible 'Archaeological Ditch' recorded.</p> <p>Possible enclosure identified through geophysical survey.</p>

Plot Reference	Previously Recorded Assets	Overview of LiDAR, Geophysical Survey, and Trenching
		<p>Archaeological evaluation trenching undertaken alongside Plot 28.16 as part of the Phase 2a works (KND071) confirmed the presence of the enclosure (Trenches 729 and 731), as well as outlying ditches (Trenches 727 and 728). A number of postholes suggesting of a structure were also identified (Trench 735), as well as other possible ditches. There was a lack of material in all trenches, with the limited material recovered largely dating to the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age.</p> <p>Assets grouped as AECOMS014.</p>
28.5	None	<p>LiDAR Plot 44. One possible 'Archaeological Bank' recorded running north-south, as well as a possible 'Archaeological Ditch' recorded. Ditch feature possible quarrying. Linear feature continues north into 'LiDAR Field 47'.</p> <p>No geophysical survey undertaken due to access restrictions.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching as part of the Phase 2a evaluation (KND072), identified a cobbled surface (Trench 713) tentatively dated to the medieval period, as well as a gully that also contained medieval pottery and a lava quern (Trench 706). Other features included linear features/ditches, most of which were undated.</p> <p>Assets grouped as AECOMS015.</p>
28.12	KND066; Square enclosure with internal features.	<p>LiDAR Plot 48. Areas of possible ridge and furrow recorded.</p> <p>Geophysical survey not undertaken as part of Project Project's as previously surveyed as part of EAN/2 with a square enclosure identified (KND066).</p> <p>Phase 2a archaeological evaluation trenching (KND046) confirmed the presence of the enclosure with internal divisions, with the material recovered suggesting a medieval date. The excavations also highlighted heavy truncations across the site, with many of the archaeological remains heavily truncated.</p> <p>Other features identified included a post-medieval ditch (Trenches 674; 678; 680; 684; 691) and pond (Trench 693) that had been filled in during the 20th century, as well as a single prehistoric pit containing burnt flint (Trench 679).</p>
3.3	KND047; Geophysical anomalies identified as part of EA1N/2 and Lion Link	<p>LiDAR Plot 57. Ridge and furrow noted, along with two possible quarries ('Archaeological Ditches').</p> <p>Geophysical survey undertaken as part of the Proposed Project covered areas not previously</p>

Plot Reference	Previously Recorded Assets	Overview of LiDAR, Geophysical Survey, and Trenching
		<p>examined by EA1N/2. Survey identified a complex system of field drains, with some limited quarrying. Evaluation trenching (KND3.3) (results published in the Phase 2b report) recorded that two quarries and an unrelated ditch were identified in the southern half of the field, while a modern field boundary was also recorded. The two quarry pits were identified in Trenches 668 and 672, while the field boundary was identified in Trench 669.</p>
3.4	FRS013; Friston Moor. KND047; anomalies identified as part of EA1N/2 and Lion Link.	<p>LiDAR Plot 56. No features identified.</p> <p>Geophysical survey identified a complex system of field drains, with some limited quarrying (Q?7).</p> <p>Evaluation trenching (KND069) (results published in the Phase 2b report) noted that five small pits were identified across the central area of the field (Trenches 641, 642, 646, 651, 652), one of which contained Roman pottery. A post-medieval trackway and associated ditch (recorded on historic mapping) was also recorded in Trench 656.</p>
89.5	SNF036; Anomalies recorded as part of the Lion Link project geophysical survey. SNF037; EA1N/2 Excavation Site 1.	<p>LiDAR Plot 60 and 61.</p> <p>Not subject to geophysical survey. Christmas trees in northern end of plot and Sea Link works limited to proposed access tracks in south.</p> <p>Some areas of plot also previously covered by EA1N/2, as well as more recent works linked to Lion Link. These works identified a number of anomalies suggesting of Romano-British activity in the southern end of the plot (SNF036), with EA1N/2 Mitigation Area 1 involving the excavation of the main areas of anomalies.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching (SNF041) (results published in the Phase 2b report) noted that most trenches did not contain any archaeological features, with remains limited to Trenches 617 and 634. Trench 617 contained undated features possibly associated with clay extraction, while Trench 634 contained a pit containing pottery dating to the Roman period.</p>
468.1	SXM010, artifact scatter (Civil War coin hoard).	<p>LiDAR Plot 78. Features identified include traces of a possible enclosure system ('Archaeological Banks' and 'Archaeological Ditches') on two distinct alignments suggesting at least two separate phases. Geophysical survey identified limited traces of possible linear features, as well as a possible pond (FP9), and an area of magnetic disturbance (MD1).</p>

Plot Reference	Previously Recorded Assets	Overview of LiDAR, Geophysical Survey, and Trenching
468.5	SXM003, Double line cropmark marking possible former road/track.	<p>Phase Two evaluation trenching (SNF040) revealed limited assets, all of which were focused at the western end of the field towards the River Fromus. These included a possible cremation (Trench 598), as well as a possible round house gully (Trench 604) and a possible Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age pit (Trench 601). Other remains were limited, but included former boundaries probably related to the former Hurts Hall parkland, as well as evidence of quarrying.</p> <p>New assets recorded as AECOMS017-019.</p> <p>LiDAR Plot 79. Review identified a number of linear features representing a possible trackway running north-south, along with traces of a possible field system running off the track.</p> <p>The geophysical survey also noted the track and associated field system, although traces of the field system were fragmentary.</p> <p>Evaluation trenching (SXM087) identified at least one possible cremation (Trench 582) as well as a possible post-medieval structure (Trench 588) with possible demolition debris also noted (Trench 589). Other remains included former field boundaries. Most remains were focused in the eastern section of the field near the River Fromus. Assets grouped as AECOMS016.</p>

3. Assessment of Impacts

3.1 Introduction

- 3.1.1 This section sets out the likely significant effects of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme on heritage assets that have been identified as part of the Phase 2b and Phase 3 archaeological evaluation trenching undertaken since the DCO application was submitted, as well as assets identified as part of the Phase 2a trenching where the provisional assessment based on interim data has altered following publication of the final report.
- 3.1.2 The following provides a proportionate assessment of likely significant effects on cultural heritage. As such, only those assets which are considered likely to be impacted by the Suffolk Onshore Scheme are discussed. Those assets which would not experience an impact, either physically or through changes to their setting, are omitted.

3.2 Construction Phase

- 3.2.1 This section identifies potential permanent impacts and resulting likely significant effects arising from the construction phase of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.
- 3.2.2 As stated in Section 3.3 of the original assessment (**Application Document 6.2.2.3 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 3 Cultural Heritage [APP-049]**), temporary impacts arising from changes to the setting of heritage assets during the construction phase of the Proposed Project have been scoped out, as it is recognised that the temporary and reversible nature of the impact would not result in a significant effect.
- 3.2.3 Permanent and irreversible long-term (for the lifespan of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme) impacts lasting beyond the construction phase may arise as a result of the following activity:
- Any below ground activities, including but not limited to groundworks, planting, earth-moving operations, topsoil removal for haul road or compound locations, trenches for cabling, the construction of above ground infrastructure including the Friston Substation, Saxmundham Converter Station and Overhead Line (OHL) works associated with Friston Scenario 2, and associated infrastructure, that are required for the construction of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, as described in **Application Document 6.2.1.4 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 4 Description of the Proposed Project [REP1A-003]**. This is because all of the principal Suffolk Onshore Scheme components, either entirely or in part, would entail impacts to the existing ground surface, resulting in the physical disturbance, truncation or removal of archaeological remains that may be present.
 - Construction activities such as site clearance, resulting in the partial or total loss of important elements of the historical landscape including hedgerows and areas of ridge and furrow through physical impacts.

Phase 2a Evaluation Areas

- 3.2.4 The original assessment of assets in some Plots was based on provisional data from the Phase 2a interim reports. In most cases, the final report for Phase 2a has not included any new information that has altered the results of the assessment and as a result the conclusion of the assessment provided in Section 3.9 of the original assessment (**Application Document 6.2.2.3 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 3 Cultural Heritage [APP-049]**) remains unchanged. These are detailed in Table 2.
- 3.2.5 The only change to the original assessment of the Phase 2a trenching is a non-material change relating to the date of the Square Enclosure with Internal Features (KND066) in Plot 28.12. The original assessment assumed that the remains dated to the Roman period, however, the analysis provided in the final Phase 2a report has noted that the date of this feature is medieval and not Roman as previously assumed.
- 3.2.6 While the date of the asset has now changed, the value of the complex is still largely associated with its archaeological and historic interest relating to the information it contains relating to settlement and land use/activity although during the medieval period and not the Roman period. The features are still considered to be of local importance as they are common in the region, and have been extensively damaged by ploughing. As such, they are still deemed to be of Low Value, which is the same as the original assessment.
- 3.2.7 As noted in the original assessment, the remains are within the Order Limits and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme has the potential to result in physical impacts on these from the installation of the cable and haul road, resulting in the partial loss of archaeological and historic value. The LoD in this area have been moved to the southern section of the field to limit the impacts on the asset through avoidance. Therefore, it is assessed that the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would result in a small magnitude of impact. On an asset of low value, this would result in a **negligible** effect which is not significant. This conclusion is the same as the original assessment.

Table 2 Assets within the Phase 2a Plots

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude	Significance	Change since DCO
Possible Trackway West of Chapel Barn Farm and geophysical anomalies (FRS103; AECOMS008)	Negligible	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	No
Possible Enclosure North of Hazelwood Farm (FR105) and linear features (FRS104; AECOMS009)	Medium	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Minor	No
Linear Features and Quarrying (AECOMS013)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	No

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Magnitude	Significance	Change since DCO
Possible Enclosures (KND064/AECOMS014)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	No
Boundaries and Quarrying Remains (AECOMS015)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	No
Square Enclosure with Internal Features (KND066)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	No

Phase 2b and Phase 3 Evaluation Areas

- 3.2.8 While a number of assets covered by the plots that were the focus of the Phase 2b evaluation trenching were examined as part of the original assessment, the majority of the assessment was not based on detailed information as only interim reports were available at the time. Furthermore, some plots were subject to evaluation excavations undertaken after the DCO application was submitted and as such a limited number of new assets have been identified since the DCO application was submitted. The assessment of impacts on these assets is provided below, with the assets discussed by plot from east to west.
- 3.2.9 The Phase 3 works focused on areas that were included in Change Request 1, and fell within two plots that had been evaluated as part of the Phase 2b works (Plots 25.2 and 25.3), with a limited number of trenches located within a new plot (Plot 40). In most cases the features encountered in the Phase 3 areas represent a continuation of assets identified as part of the Phase 2b works, and so the Phase 2b and Phase 3 results are considered together.

Plots 25.2 and 25.1: Geophysical Anomalies Possibly Relating to Enclosures and Settlement Activity (FRS107) and a D-Shaped Enclosure (FRS116)

- 3.2.10 Traces of enclosures and possible field systems were recorded during the geophysical survey in the northeast corner of Plot 25.1 as part of the geophysical survey, with possible features extending into Plot 25.2 (FRS107). While the original geophysical survey only covered a limited section of the Plot (**Application Document 6.3.2.3.D ES Appendix 2.3.D Geophysical Survey Report [APP-112]**), additional geophysical survey was undertaken in September and October 2025 to better understand the extent of the 'D-Shaped Enclosure' as part of Change Request 1 (**Application Document 9.76.5.2 Change Request Appendix B Geophysical Survey Report [CR1-057]**).
- 3.2.11 The Phase 2b and Phase 3 trenching examined most of the plot and confirmed that the possible field system dated to the Bronze Age, while the large enclosure represents a Bronze Age 'D-Shaped enclosure' which has been partially disturbed by later quarrying. A number of Neolithic pits were also recorded to the south of the enclosure and it was noted that quarrying had removed some elements of the enclosure.

- 3.2.12 The value of the enclosure is largely associated with its archaeological and historic interest relating to the information it contains on land use during the Bronze Age period, and the evaluation excavations have confirmed that remains date to the Neolithic and Bronze Age. Discussions undertaken with SCC and HE have concluded that the remains are considered to be of Regional Importance, and as such deemed to be of Medium Value.
- 3.2.13 The remains fall within the Order Limits, and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme has the potential to result in physical impacts as a result of works including the installation of the cable and haul road as well as a temporary compound. The construction of the underground cable and temporary haul road has the potential to remove approximately half of the D-Shaped enclosure, resulting in the loss of archaeological and historic interest and altering the ability to understand and appreciate the asset's function. This would constitute a medium magnitude of impact which on an asset of medium value would result in a **moderate adverse** effect which is significant.

Plot 25.3: Bronze Age Field System (FRS115)

- 3.2.14 Traces of a possible field system were recorded in the southwest corner of Plot 25.3 as part of the geophysical survey, and appear to be an extension of a wider complex noted in Plot 25.1 to the southwest (FRS107) and Plot 25.2 to the south (FRS116). While the geophysical survey originally only covered the southwestern limits of the Plot, the evaluation excavations undertaken and published as part of the Phase 2b examined most of the Plot, with the exception of the northern third which was not trenched as a result of ecological constraints. The evaluation trenching confirmed the presence of a Bronze Age field system.
- 3.2.15 The value of the complex is largely associated with its archaeological and historic interest relating to the information it contains on land use, and the evaluation excavations have confirmed that most remains date to the Bronze Age period. These form part of a wider complex continuing further field systems and a possible enclosure in the adjacent Plot, and is considered to be of regional importance. They are therefore deemed to be of Medium Value.
- 3.2.16 The remains fall within the Order Limits, and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme has the potential to result in physical impacts as a result of works including the installation of the cable as well as a temporary compound. Only an element of the field system will be lost, with the most extensive remains falling to the southwest, and as a result only a limited section of the field system will be removed, with the possible enclosures to the southwest remains untouched. Therefore, the magnitude of impact is considered to be small. On an asset of medium value, this would result in a **minor adverse** effect which is not considered to be significant.

Plots 25.3 and 40.1: Medieval Enclosure and boundaries (FRS118)

- 3.2.17 Traces of a possible small rectilinear enclosure were recorded in the northeast corner of Plot 25.3 and the northern end of Plot 41 as part of the geophysical survey (FRS118). Evaluation excavations undertaken and published as part of Phase 3 confirmed the geophysical anomalies represented traces of small medieval enclosure and field system, with most pottery dating to the 12th to 14th centuries.
- 3.2.18 The value of the remains is largely associated with their archaeological and historic interest relating to the information they may contain relating to settlement and land

use/activity during the medieval period. The features are considered to be of local importance, and as such deemed to be of Low Value.

- 3.2.19 The remains fall within the Order Limits and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme has the potential to result in physical impacts from the underground cable installation and access track works, as well as a possible compound. While it is assumed that only a limited section of the ditches will be lost, a worse-case scenario has been adopted for the small rectilinear enclosure, and therefore it is assumed that this elements of the complex will be lost. Therefore, the magnitude of impact on the complex is considered to be medium. On an asset of low value, this would result in a **minor adverse** effect which is not considered to be significant.

Plot 40.1: Roman Ditch (FRS118)

- 3.2.20 A number of linear features were identified in Plot 41 as part of the geophysical survey (FRS118). Evaluation excavations undertaken and published as part of Phase 3 confirmed the geophysical anomalies represented traces of enclosure and field system, with most pottery dating to the 12th to 14th centuries, however, a single ditch contained pottery dating to the Roman period.
- 3.2.21 The value of the remains is largely associated with their archaeological and historic interest relating to the information they may contain relating to settlement and land use/activity during the medieval period. The features are considered to be of local importance, and as such deemed to be of Low Value.
- 3.2.22 The remains fall within the Order Limits and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme has the potential to result in physical impacts from the underground cable installation and access track works, as well as a possible compound. These works will, however, only result in the loss of part of the larger complex. Therefore, the magnitude of impact on the complex is considered to be small. On an asset of low value, this would result in a **negligible adverse** effect which is not considered to be significant.

Plot 3.3

- 3.2.23 No archeological features were identified in lot 3.3 with remains limited to post-medieval quarrying and field systems.

Plot 3.4: Geophysical Survey Anomalies of Possible Enclosures and Linear Features (KND047)

- 3.2.24 Geophysical surveys undertaken as part of the EA1N/EA2 and Lion Link schemes have identified a series of features to the north of Friston in Plots 3.1, 3.4, 5.1, and 13.1. These are assumed to relate to enclosures and associated field systems and in the original assessment were tentatively dated to the Late Iron Age and Romano-British period based on style/form and on similar remains in the adjacent fields, and some linear features may also be post-medieval field boundaries. The majority of the features are located in the southern area of the field and fall within EA1N/EA2 schemes mitigation area.
- 3.2.25 Evaluation excavations undertaken as part of the Proposed Project's Phase 2b works identified a number of pits across the central area of the Plot, one of which contained Roman pottery. Other remains were limited to a post-medieval trackway and ditches.
- 3.2.26 The value of the remains is largely associated with their archaeological and historic interest relating to the information they may contain relating to settlement and land

use/activity during the late prehistoric/Romano-British period. The features are considered to be of local importance, and as such deemed to be of Low Value.

- 3.2.27 The remains fall within the Order Limits and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme has the potential to result in physical impacts from the underground cable installation and access track works. While some mitigation in this area is being undertaken as part of the EA1N/EA2 schemes, the area of the pits will be impacted as a result of works such as the constriction of the haul road and cable trench which will remove the most of the remains. Therefore, the magnitude of impact is considered to be medium. On an asset of low value, this would result in a **minor adverse** effect which is not considered to be significant.

Plot 89.5: Roman pit (SNF041)

- 3.2.28 An isolated pit was recorded during the Phase 2a archaeological evaluation trenching in Trench 634 located in the eastern limits of Plot 89.5, with material recovered from the pit dating it to the Roman period.
- 3.2.29 The value of the feature is largely associated with its archaeological and historic interest relating to the information it, and any associated features, may contain relating to settlement and land use/activity during the Roman/Romano-British period. The feature is considered to be of local importance, and as such deemed to be of Low Value. However, as the feature was fully excavated during the evaluation trenching it no longer exists, although it is assumed similar remains might survive in the area based on the results of excavations undertaken as part of the EA1/2 works.
- 3.2.30 The feature falls within the Order Limits and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme which has the potential to result in physical impacts from the underground cable installation and access track works. While the pit identified as part of the evaluation works has been removed archaeologically, other similar features in the area could be partially removed during the construction phase. Therefore, the magnitude of impact is considered to be medium. On an asset of low value, this would result in a **minor adverse** effect which is not considered to be significant.

4. Additional Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 Topic and site-specific mitigation measures that have been applied to mitigate or offset any likely significant effects are included in **Application Document 9.84 (C) Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC)** submitted at Deadline 5.

4.1.2 Measures relevant to the mitigation of potential permanent, physical impacts to cultural heritage assets are covered in detail within **Application Document 7.5.4.1 (B) Outline Onshore Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation - Suffolk** submitted at Deadline 5 as well as the REAC (**Application Document 9.84 (B) Register of Environmental Commitments (REAC) [REP4-235]**) and include the following:

- H05 – Locations of known archaeological interest/value to be preserved *in situ*, or areas where archaeological work is planned, would be signposted/fenced off to avoid unintentional damage.
- H06 – Where a previously unknown heritage asset is discovered, or a known heritage asset proves to be more significant than predicted at the time of application for Development Consent, then the Archaeology Advisor for Suffolk County Council and Historic England should be informed and a solution agreed that protects the significance of the new discovery, so far as is practicable, within the Proposed Project parameters.
- H07 – Archaeological excavation, recording, and publication to be undertaken where archaeological features cannot be avoided. Scope of works to be agreed with the Archaeology Advisor for Suffolk County Council, and any other relevant heritage stakeholders, prior to works commencing in the relevant area and detailed in the Suffolk Outline Onshore Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation or a site specific Written Scheme of Investigation.
- H08 – Archaeological Strip, Map, and Record, to be undertaken in pre-agreed areas of archaeological potential/features. Scope of works to be agreed with the Archaeology Advisor for Suffolk County Council, and any other relevant heritage stakeholders prior to works in the relevant area commencing and detailed in the Suffolk Outline Onshore Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation or a site specific Written Scheme of Investigation.
- H09 – Archaeological Watching Brief to be undertaken in pre-agreed areas of archaeological potential/features. Scope of works to be agreed with the Archaeology Advisor for Suffolk County Council, and any other relevant heritage stakeholders prior to works commencing in the relevant area and detailed in the Suffolk Outline Onshore Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation or a site specific Written Scheme of Investigation.
- H10 – Geoarchaeological modelling/profiling in areas of potential. Scope of works to be agreed with the Archaeology Advisor for Suffolk County Council, and any other relevant heritage stakeholders prior to works commencing and detailed in the Suffolk

Outline Onshore Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation or a site specific Written Scheme of Investigation.

- 4.1.3 Potential direct impacts on buried archaeological remains would be managed through a programme of additional mitigation which includes preservation *in situ*, archaeological investigation and recording, and a protocol for dealing with unexpected archaeological discoveries during construction. The guiding principles and methodology for the planning and implementation of the archaeological mitigation are set out in the **Application Document 7.5.4.1 (B) Outline Onshore Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation - Suffolk** submitted at Deadline 5.
- 4.1.4 Further consultation has been undertaken with the Archaeology Advisor at SCC as part of the DCO process, and this has resulted in a number of mitigation areas being established. This is largely based on the results of the evaluation trenching, and the nature and extent of the features recorded.
- 4.1.5 Preservation of the archaeological remains where works are not required within the Order Limits would require protective measures, such as fencing, during construction, operation and decommissioning activities to avoid unintentional damage (H05). Potential impacts to buried archaeological remains that cannot be avoided by design can be mitigated through a proportionate programme of archaeological investigation, recording and reporting, such as open area archaeological excavation in advance of construction, archaeological monitoring during intrusive activities, and further assessment and analysis of existing samples/finds retrieved during previous evaluation surveys, which would form additional mitigation (H07). This would not result in a reduction in the physical impacts to archaeological remains but would compensate for their loss as it would provide greater understanding and appreciation of the evidential value of archaeological remains.
- 4.1.6 Based on the current information, archaeological excavation, recording, and publication (H07) will be required in a number of areas where important archaeological remains have been identified. Further details are provided in **Application Document 7.5.4.1 (B) Outline Onshore Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation – Suffolk** submitted at Deadline 5.

5. Residual Effects and Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 Table 3 summarises the residual effects of the Proposed Project on archaeological receptors following the implementation, where necessary, of additional mitigation measures outlined in Section 4.

Table 3 Residual effects after implementation of additional mitigation

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Likely Significant Effect		Additional Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect Significance
			Magnitude	Significance		
Possible Trackway West of Chapel Barn Farm and geophysical anomalies (FRS103; AECOMS008)	Negligible	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)
Possible Enclosure North of Hazelwood Farm (FR105) and linear features (FRS104; AECOMS009)	Medium	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Minor	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)
Linear Features and Quarrying (AECOMS013)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)
Possible Enclosures (KND064/AECOMS014)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)
Boundaries and Quarrying Remains (AECOMS015)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)
Square Enclosure with Internal Features (KND066)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	H05; H07	Negligible (not significant)

Receptor	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Likely Significant Effect		Additional Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect Significance
			Magnitude	Significance		
Geophysical Anomalies Possibly Relating to Enclosures and Settlement Activity (FRS107) and a D-Shaped Enclosure (FRS116)	Medium	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Medium	Moderate	H05; H07	Minor (not significant)
Bronze Age Field System (FRS115)	Medium	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Minor	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)
Medieval enclosure and boundaries (FRS118)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Medium	Minor	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)
Roman ditch (FRS118)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Small	Negligible	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)
Geophysical Survey Anomalies of Possible Enclosures and Linear Features (KND047)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Medium	Minor	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)
Roman pit (SNF041)	Low	Direct physical impacts (permanent)	Medium	Minor	H07; H08	Negligible (not significant)

6. Summary

- 6.1.1 This document provides a summary of the results of archaeological evaluation undertaken within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme since the submission of the DCO application in March 2025 and subsequent Application Document 9.76.5 Change Request: Addendum to Volume 6 Environmental Statement [CR1-055].
- 6.1.2 This includes providing updates for areas where only interim reporting was available at the time of the submission of the application (i.e. Phase 2a trenching), as well as an overview of the results of trenching that has taken place since submission of the application and subsequent Change Request Application (i.e. Phases 2b and 3).
- 6.1.3 The document also provides an updated assessment based on the new information, and this has identified no new significant effects resulting from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, therefore the conclusions within the original ES and Addendum remain valid.

National Grid plc
National Grid House,
Warwick Technology Park,
Gallows Hill, Warwick.
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales
No. 4031152
nationalgrid.com