



Historic England

Richard Allen
National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

25th April 2024

Dear Mr Allen,

**Application by Rampion Extension Development Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm
PINs Ref: EN010117**

The Examining Authority's Written Questions and requests for information

Historic England registration identification number: 20045343

We offer this response to the First Written Questions issued on 3rd April 2024 by the Examination Authority [Ref: PD-009] in accordance with Deadline 3 (25th April 2024) for the examination of the proposed Rampion Extension Development project (as referenced above). We have directed our attention at the questions directed to Historic England.

Ref No	Question	Historic England response
DCO 1.20 <i>Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 19</i> Historic England	Explain, as set out in RR [RR-146] why the Requirement is " <i>not sufficient for appropriate safeguards.</i> "	Our comments on the submitted onshore and marine Outline Written Schemes of Investigation (OWSI) need to be addressed before we can be confident that appropriate safeguards are in place regarding the historic environment.
HE 1.8 <i>Onshore Archaeology</i>	In the context of ES Chapter 25 Historic Environment [PEPD-020] that identifies a high	Whilst the potential for heritage has been ascertained, its presence within the route corridor



Historic England, 4th Floor, Cannon Bridge House, 25 Dowgate Hill, London EC4R 2YA
Telephone 020 7973 3700 Facsimile 020 7973 3001
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.
Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.

<p>Historic England SDNPA West Sussex CC</p>	<p>potential of archaeological remains of high heritage significance within the South Downs area and further to SDNPA Principal Areas of Disagreement Statement (PADS) point 7 [AS 006], West Sussex CC PADS points 38 to 40 [AS-008] and Historic England's RR [RR-146], comment upon the Applicant's assertion that further investigation would not change the outcome of the assessment at table 4-2 in response to paragraph 2.33.2 [REP1-017].</p>	<p>and the level of significance (its importance) have not been confirmed through pre-determination evaluations. Table 4-2 is based on an HER search (which includes known data; biased to what work has been undertaken and recorded) and can only be indicative of the potential for, as yet, unknown heritage assets. More archaeological investigations will be required to a standard secured by the onshore OWSI in order to address this.</p>
<p>HE 1.9 <i>Onshore Archaeology</i> Historic England</p>	<p>In the context of the applicant's second statutory consultation exercise feedback captured at table 25.7 of ES Chapter 25 Historic Environment [APP-066] and Historic England's concerns [RR-146], explain whether the amendment to C-225 [APP-254] to 'preservation by record' is preferable to the 'retention in situ' of unexpected archaeological remains of national significance that maybe discovered during works.</p>	<p>Retention in situ is the preferred option wherever possible, particularly in relation to assets of high significance. However, we agree that where impacts are unavoidable (these may be direct or indirect), preservation by record in consultation with relevant stakeholders may be the preferred option, as per the amended C-225.</p>

Yours sincerely,



Dr Christopher Pater
Head of Marine Planning

cc. Beth Harries (Solicitor, Historic England)
Rebecca Lambert (Inspector of Ancient Monuments, London & South East Region, Historic England)



Historic England, 4th Floor, Cannon Bridge House, 25 Dowgate Hill, London EC4R 2YA
Telephone 020 7973 3700 Facsimile 020 7973 3001
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.
Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.