

**Rampion 2 Wind Farm**  
**Category 6:**  
**Environmental Statement**  
**Volume 2, Chapter 25: Historic**  
**environment (clean)**

**Date: August 2024**  
**Revision D**

Document Reference: 6.2.25  
Pursuant to: APFP Regulation 5 (2) (a)  
Ecodoc number: 004866048-04



## Document revisions

---

<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status/reason for issue</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Checked by</b>	<b>Approved by</b>
<b>A</b>	04/08/2023	Final for DCO Application	WSP	RED	RED
<b>B</b>	16/01/2024	Updated assessment to reflect additional geophysical survey results	WSP	RED	RED
<b>C</b>	03/06/2024	Updates relating to errata points and new LVIA visualisation	WSP	RED	RED
<b>D</b>	01/08/2024	Updates for Deadline 6 to align with updates to commitments and updated plans.	WSP	RED	RED

---

# Contents

---

<b>25.</b>	<b>Historic environment</b>	<b>8</b>
25.1	Introduction	8
25.2	Relevant legislation, planning policy and other documentation	10
	Introduction	10
	Legislation and national planning policy	11
	Local planning policy	17
	Other relevant information and guidance	36
25.3	Consultation and engagement	38
	Overview	38
	Early engagement	38
	Scoping Opinion	39
	Evidence Plan Process	43
	Non-statutory consultation	44
	Statutory consultation	46
25.4	Scope of the assessment	100
	Overview	100
	Spatial scope and Study Area	100
	Temporal scope	103
	Potential receptors	103
	Potential effects	106
	Activities or impacts scoped out of assessment	108
25.5	Methodology for baseline data gathering	110
	Overview	110
	Desk study and settings assessment baseline	110
	Site surveys	113
	Data limitations	114
25.6	Baseline conditions	115
	Current baseline	115
	Future baseline	203
25.7	Basis for ES assessment	203
	Maximum design scenario	203
	Embedded environmental measures	215
25.8	Methodology for ES assessment	242
	Introduction	242
	Assessment of effects and determining significance	242
25.9	Assessment of effects: Construction phase	248
	Landfall and onshore cable corridor	248
	Onshore cable corridor and onshore substation at Oakendene near Cowfold	342
	Onshore cable corridor and existing National Grid Bolney substation extension	347
	Offshore substation and wind turbine generators	348

25.10	Assessment of effects: Operation and maintenance phase	348
	Onshore substation at Oakendene near Cowfold	348
	Existing National Grid Bolney substation extension	352
	Offshore substation and wind turbine generators	353
25.11	Assessment of effects: Decommissioning phase	378
	Onshore substation	378
	Bolney substation extension	378
	Offshore substation and wind turbine generators	378
25.12	Assessment of cumulative effects	378
	Approach	378
	Cumulative effects assessment	379
25.13	Transboundary effects	409
25.14	Inter-related effects	409
25.15	Summary of residual effects	410
25.16	Glossary of terms and abbreviations	450
25.17	References	460

## List of Tables

Table 25-1	Legislation relevant to historic environment	11
Table 25-2	National planning policy relevant to historic environment	12
Table 25-3	Local planning policy relevant to historic environment	18
Table 25-4	Other relevant information and guidance	36
Table 25-5	Planning Inspectorate (2020a) Scoping Opinion responses – historic environment	39
Table 25-6	First statutory consultation exercise (July – September 2021) feedback	48
Table 25-7	Second statutory consultation exercise (October – November 2022) feedback	69
Table 25-8	Third statutory consultation exercise (February - March 2023) feedback	86
Table 25-9	Forth statutory consultation exercise (April – May 2023) feedback	98
Table 25-10	Receptors groups requiring assessment for historic environment	104
Table 25-11	Potential effects on historic environment receptors scoped in for further assessment	106
Table 25-12	Activities or impacts scoped out of assessment	108
Table 25-13	Data sources used to inform the historic environment ES assessment	110
Table 25-14	Site surveys undertaken	113
Table 25-15	Designated heritage assets selected for effects from landfall and onshore cable corridor	120
Table 25-16	Designated heritage assets selected for effects from onshore substation at Oakendene	132
Table 25-17	Designated heritage assets selected for effects from existing National Grid Bolney substation extension	132

Table 25-18	Designated heritage assets selected for effects from offshore development	133
Table 25-19	Zone 1: South Coast Plain – Known and potential archaeological receptors within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits	141
Table 25-20	Zone 2: South Downs – Known and potential archaeological receptors within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits	159
Table 25-21	Zone 3: Low Weald – Known and potential archaeological receptors within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits	188
Table 25-22	Maximum parameters and assessment assumptions for impacts on historic environment	205
Table 25-23	Relevant historic environment embedded environmental measures	216
Table 25-24	Establishing the heritage significance (or sensitivity) of receptors for onshore historic environment	244
Table 25-25	Establishing the magnitude of change	245
Table 25-26	Classification of effects	247
Table 25-27	Developments considered as part of the historic environment CEA	380
Table 25-28	Cumulative Project Design Envelope for historic environment	392
Table 25-29	Cumulative effects assessment for historic environment	394
Table 25-30	Summary of assessment of residual effects for construction phase	411
Table 25-31	Summary of assessment of residual effects for operational and maintenance phase	439
Table 25-32	Glossary of terms and abbreviations – historic environment	450

### List of Figures, Volume 3

### Document Reference

Figure 25.1	ES Assessment Boundary	6.3.25
Figure 25.2	Designated heritage assets within Study Area	6.3.25
Figure 25.3	HER monument records and UKHO wreck sites	6.3.25
Figure 25.4	Archaeological Notification Areas and features identified by remote sensing (LiDAR and aerial photographs) and historic maps	6.3.25
Figure 25.5	Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from onshore development	6.3.25
Figure 25.6	Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from onshore cable corridor and ZTV	6.3.25
Figure 25.7	Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from onshore substation and ZTV	6.3.25
Figure 25.8	Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from Bolney substation extension and ZTV	6.3.25

Figure 25.9	Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from offshore development	6.3.25
Figure 25.10	Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from offshore development and ZTV	6.3.25
Figure 25.11	Historic environment Zone of Influence	6.3.25

---

#### Appendices (Volume 4)

#### Document Reference

Appendix 25.1:	Gazetteer of onshore heritage assets	6.4.25.1
Appendix 25.2:	Onshore historic environment desk study	6.4.25.2
Appendix 25.3:	Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report	6.4.25.3
Appendix 25.4:	Onshore geophysical survey report	6.4.25.4
Appendix 25.5:	Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment	6.4.25.5
Appendix 25.6:	Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm	6.4.25.6
Appendix 25.7:	Settings assessment scoping report	6.4.25.7
Appendix 25.8:	Onshore heritage asset baseline report	6.4.25.8

# Executive Summary

---

This section summarises the assessment findings for historic environment, based on **Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2** (Document Reference: 6.2.25) of the ES.

## How effects on historic environment have been assessed

The assessment has considered the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on historic environment, including designated and non-designated heritage assets. Potential effects which have been assessed include those arising through changes to historic landscape character, direct effects and indirect effects arising through changes to setting of heritage assets. Effects have been considered for all phases of the Proposed Development, including construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning.

Information on the historic environment is based on data gathering from a number of sources, including national and local heritage databased and archives, Ordnance Survey and British Geological Society (BGS), as well as surveys completed in the course of this assessment including walkover, geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching,

The assessment has considered the geographical area in which there could be impacts from the Proposed Development on historic environment which could affect the heritage significance of assets, such as scheduled monuments, listed buildings, non-designated archaeological remains, historic landscape character and built structures with heritage interests.

## Baseline environment

The onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits intersects with a scheduled monument and a conservation area including:

- operational access A-06 utilises an existing surfaced road which crosses the scheduled Medieval earthworks east and southeast of St Mary's Church (NHLE 1005828); and
- operational access A-31 utilises an existing surfaced road which intersects with Sullington Conservation Area (shown on **Figure 25.2, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25) **[APP-112]**).

No other designated heritage assets fall within the proposed DCO Order Limits.

Within the proposed DCO Order Limits there is potential for further archaeological remains relating to all periods (as detailed in **Table 25-19, Table 25-20** and **Table 25-21**), as indicated by geophysical survey and desk-based data and research. The proposed DCO Order Limits also lie within the setting of multiple designated heritage assets, including grade I, II\* and II listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments (as detailed in **Table 25-15 to Table 25-18**).

## Embedded environmental measures

A range of environmental measures within the **Commitments Register** (Document Reference: 7.22) which relate to historic environment are embedded as part of the Rampion 2 design to remove or reduce significant environmental effects as far as possible. Examples of these embedded environmental measures include the following:

- Avoiding or minimising effects on sensitive sites (including listed buildings and scheduled monuments) by project footprint where practicable (C-6 and C-225);
- limiting the duration and working area of construction activities at defined locations (C-19, C-20 and C-22); and
- implementation of an agreed programme of archaeological recording and dissemination (C-79 and C-80) and public outreach (C-261).

## Likely significant effects

### Overview

Based on the proposed location of the onshore substation and routing of the onshore cable corridor, plus the implementation of embedded environmental measures, significant residual effects have been identified during the construction phase on potential:

- Neolithic flint mining, mortuary and settlement remains (including where these may be related to the scheduled prehistoric flint mine on Harrow Hill);
- Bronze Age and early medieval archaeological remains where these may be of national importance, within Zone 2: South Downs; and
- Undated possible enclosures or settlement (38\_1, 38\_2 and 38\_3)<sup>1</sup> indicated by geophysical survey.

Significant residual effects are also identified on listed building Oakdene Manor (NHLE 1027074) during the operation of Rampion 2, arising due to changes to its setting. No other significant residual effects have been identified for historic environment during the construction phase, or during the operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.

### Cumulative effects

No significant cumulative effects have been identified in relation to the Proposed Development on historic environment during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.

### Inter-related effects

No significant inter-related effects of greater significance compared to the effects considered alone were identified for historic environment receptors during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.

---

<sup>1</sup> As described in [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [**PEPD-031** and **PEPD-112** to **PEPD-120**] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission and summarised in **Section 25.6** of this document.



### ***Transboundary effects***

No significant transboundary effects have been identified in relation to the Proposed Development on historic environment receptors during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.

# 25. Historic environment

---

## 25.1 Introduction

- 25.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) presents the results of the assessment of the likely significant effects of Rampion 2 with respect to historic environment, including terrestrial archaeology, historic buildings / structures, and historic landscapes. It should be read in conjunction with the project description provided in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) and the relevant parts of the following chapters and appendices:
- **Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6) due to potential changes in coastal processes which might introduce onshore historic environment effects;
  - **Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment (SLVIA), Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15) due to potential changes to the setting of onshore heritage assets which draw significance from its relationship with the coast/sea;
  - **Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16) due to the interface between onshore and marine historic environments;
  - **Chapter 18: Landscape and visual assessment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18) due to potential changes to setting of onshore heritage assets which draw significance from their visual relationship with the historic landscape or landscape features;
  - **Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.21) due to potential changes in onshore noise and vibration which might introduce onshore historic environment effects;
  - **Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23) due to potential changes in onshore transport which might introduce onshore historic environment effects;
  - **Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26) due to potential changes in the onshore water environment which might introduce onshore historic environment effects; and
  - **Chapter 32: ES Addendum, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.32 and **[REP5-038]**).
- 25.1.2 This technical chapter describes:
- the legislation, planning policy and other documentation that has informed the assessment **Section 25.2: Relevant legislation, planning policy, and other documentation**);

- the outcome of consultation and engagement that has been undertaken to date, including how matters relating to historic environment within the Statutory Consultation have been addressed (**Section 25.3: Consultation and engagement**);
- the scope of the assessment for historic environment (**Section 25.4: Scope of the assessment**);
- the methods used for the baseline data gathering (**Section 25.5: Methodology for baseline data gathering**);
- the overall baseline (**Section 25.6: Baseline conditions**);
- embedded environmental measures (**Table 25-23**) relevant to historic environment and the relevant maximum design scenario (**Section 25.7: Basis for ES assessment**);
- the assessment methods used for the ES (**Section 25.8: Methodology for ES assessment**);
- the assessment of historic environment effects (**Section 25.9 - 25.11: Assessment of effects** and **Section 25.12: Assessment of cumulative effects**);
- consideration of transboundary effects (**Section 25.13: Transboundary effects**);
- inter-related effects (**Section 25.14: Inter-related effects**);
- a summary of residual effects for historic environment (**Section 25.15: Summary of residual effects**);
- a glossary of terms and abbreviations is provided in **Section 25.16: Glossary of terms and abbreviations**; and
- a references list is provided in **Section 25.17: References**.

25.1.3 The chapter is also supported by the following appendices:

- **Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage assets, Volume 4** (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1);
- **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** (Document Reference: 6. 4.25.2);
- **Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** (Document Reference: 4.25.3);
- **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4);
- **Appendix 25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4** (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5);
- **Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4** (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6);

- **Appendix 25.7: Settings scoping appraisal, Volume 4** (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7); and
- **Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline, Volume 4** (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8).

25.1.4 The chapter includes reference to the following figures:

- **Figure 25.1, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **ES Assessment Boundary**;
- **Figure 25.2, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **Designated heritage assets within Study Area**;
- **Figure 25.3, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **HER monument records and UKHO wreck sites**;
- **Figure 25.4, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **Archaeological Notification Areas and features identified by remote sensing (LiDAR and aerial photographs) and historic maps**;
- **Figure 25.5, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from onshore development**;
- **Figure 25.6, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from onshore cable corridor and ZTV**;
- **Figure 25.7, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from onshore substation and ZTV**;
- **Figure 25.8, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from Bolney substation extension and ZTV**;
- **Figure 25.9, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from offshore development**;
- **Figure 25.10, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **Designated heritage assets assessed for effects through change to setting from offshore development and ZTV**; and
- **Figure 25.11, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25): **Historic environment Zone of Influence**.

## 25.2 Relevant legislation, planning policy and other documentation

### Introduction

25.2.1 This section identifies the relevant legislation, policy and other documentation that has informed the assessment of effects with respect to the historic environment.

Further information on policies relevant to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and their status is provided in **Chapter 2: Policy and legislative context, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.2).

## Legislation and national planning policy

25.2.2 **Table 25-1** lists the legislation relevant to the assessment of the effects on historic environment receptors.

**Table 25-1** Legislation relevant to historic environment

Legislation description	Relevance to assessment
<b><i>Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979</i></b>	
<p><b>The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 sets out that sites considered to be of national importance are required to be compiled in a Schedule of Monuments. Scheduled monuments may include any above or below ground building, structure or work which fulfils the criteria for scheduling set out by the Secretary of State (SoS) for Culture, Media and Sport. These sites are accorded statutory protection and Scheduled monument Consent is required before any works are carried out which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering up a scheduled monument. Scheduled monument protection is offered not only to the known structures and remains of a site but also to the soil under and around them in order to protect any archaeological interest.</b></p>	<p>The Proposed Development has the potential to affect scheduled monuments or heritage assets of schedulable quality. The protection conferred to these heritage assets through legislation is accounted for within the scope of the assessment (see <b>Section 25.4</b>) and the environmental measures embedded within the Proposed Development detailed in <b>Table 25-23</b> and <b>Section 25.7</b>.</p>
<b><i>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</i></b>	
<p><b>The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 covers the registration of Listed Buildings (buildings that are seen to be of special architectural or historic interest) and designation of Conservation Areas (areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or</b></p>	<p>The Proposed Development will have potential effects on listed buildings and conservation areas. The protection conferred to these heritage assets through legislation is accounted for within the scope of the assessment (see <b>Section 25.4</b>) and the environmental measures embedded (<b>Table 25-23</b>) within the</p>

Legislation description	Relevance to assessment
<p>appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance).</p> <p>The Act requires local planning authorities to consider the desirability of preserving the character of a conservation area in planning decisions.</p> <p>The Act requires local planning authorities or SoS to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they might possess.</p>	<p>Proposed Development detailed in <b>Section 25.7</b>.</p>
<p><b><i>The Hedgerow Regulations 1997</i></b></p>	
<p>The Hedgerow Regulations 1997 set out criteria to be used to determine the importance of hedgerows and protect important hedges from removal. Selection criteria include heritage-based considerations.</p>	<p>The Proposed Development will have potential effects on historically important hedgerows. The protection conferred to these heritage assets through legislation is accounted for within the scope of the assessment (see <b>Section 25.4</b>) and the environmental measures embedded (<b>Table 25-23</b>) within the Proposed Development detailed in <b>Section 25.7</b>.</p>

25.2.3 **Table 25-2** lists the national planning policy relevant to the assessment of the effects on historic environment receptors.

**Table 25-2 National planning policy relevant to historic environment**

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><b><i>Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1) (Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC), 2011a)</i></b></p>	
<p>NPS EN-1 for Energy sets out guidance and requirements for nationally significant energy infrastructure projects. Paragraphs 5.8.8 and 5.8.9 require that “<i>the applicant should provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected by the proposed development and the contribution of their setting to that significance...</i>”, referencing the requirements to</p>	<p>The requirements outlined in NPS EN-1 relevant to the historic environment are accounted for within the scope of the assessment presented in <b>Section 25.4</b>.</p>

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p>have consulted the Historic Environment Record (HER), and where appropriate to carry out desk-based assessment and further field evaluation.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.8.10 states that <i>“The applicant should ensure that the extent of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of any heritage assets affected can be adequately understood from the application and supporting documents.”</i></p> <p>Paragraph 5.8.9 states that <i>“Where proposed development will affect the setting of a heritage asset, representative visualisations may be necessary to explain the impact.”</i></p> <p>Paragraphs 5.8.14 and 15 outline a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets, and notes <i>“Where the application will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset the IPC should refuse consent unless... loss of significance is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that loss or harm.”</i></p>	
<p><b>NPS EN-3 for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (DECC, 2011b)</b></p>	
<p><b>NPS EN-3 for Renewable Energy sets out guidance and requirements for nationally significant energy infrastructure projects and covers the onshore and offshore impacts to the historic environment.</b></p>	<p>The requirements outlined in NPS EN-3 relevant to the onshore historic environment are accounted for within the scope of the assessment presented in <b>Section 25.4</b>.</p>
<p>Paragraph 5.9.13 states that <i>“In considering the impact on the historic environment as set out in Section 5.8 of EN-1 and whether it is satisfied that the substantial public benefits would outweigh any loss or harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the IPC 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 national targets for renewable energy supply and emissions reductions.”</i></p>	<p>The requirements outlined in NPS EN-3 (DECC, 2011b) relevant to the offshore historic environment are accounted for within <b>Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16).</p>
<p>Paragraphs 2.6.137-139 state <i>“Generic onshore historic environment effects are covered in</i></p>	

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><b>Section 5.8 of EN-1. For offshore energy infrastructure, there are considerations for certain types of heritage assets.</b></p> <p><b>Heritage assets, as described in Section 5.8 of EN-1, may exist offshore and within the intertidal areas (the area between high tide and low tide marks). Such heritage assets can include remains from pre-historic settlements which existed prior to sea level rises as well as wreck sites and other features of historic maritime significance.</b></p> <p><b>Heritage assets can be affected by offshore wind farm development in two principal ways:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>from the direct effect of the physical siting of the development itself such as the installation of the wind turbine foundations and electricity cables or the siting of plant required during the construction period;</b></li> <li><b>and from indirect changes to the physical marine environment (such as scour, coastal erosion or sediment deposition) caused by the proposed infrastructure itself or its construction (see the policy on physical environment starting at paragraph 2.6.189 of this NPS)."</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Paragraphs 2.6.145-146 "The avoidance of important heritage assets, including archaeological sites and historic wrecks, is the most effective form of protection [...]"</b></p>	
<p><b>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) 2021</b></p>	
<p><b>Section 16 of the NPPF relates to the Historic Environment and is consistent with the policies of NPS EN-1.</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 194 states the requirement to describe the significance of heritage assets (and their setting) and any archaeological interest that may be impacted by the proposal.</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 195 requires LPAs to assess the significance of heritage assets (and their setting) that may be affected, to avoid or minimise any</b></p>	<p>The Proposed Development will have potential effects on the historic environment. The requirements outlined in the NPPF (MHCLG, 2021) relevant to the historic environment are accounted for within the scope of the assessment presented in <b>Section 25.4</b>, and <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.14</b>.</p>



---

**Policy description****Relevance to assessment**

---

**conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.**

**Paragraph 199 outlines “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.”**

**Paragraph 200 outlines “Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:**

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;**
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”**

**Footnote 68 outlines “Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.”**

**Paragraph 201 outlines “Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:**

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><b><i>a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and</i></b></p> <p><b><i>b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and</i></b></p> <p><b><i>c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and</i></b></p> <p><b><i>d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.”</i></b></p>	
<p><b>Paragraph 202 outlines “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”</b></p>	
<p><b>Paragraph 205 outlines “Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.”</b></p>	
<p><b>Footnote 69 outlines “Copies of evidence should be deposited with the relevant historic environment record, and any archives with a local museum or other public depository.”</b></p>	
<p><b>Paragraph 206 outlines “Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.”</b></p>	

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p>Paragraph 207 outlines <i>“Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 201 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 202, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.”</i></p> <p>Paragraph 208 outlines <i>“Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies, but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.”</i></p>	
25.2.4	<p>The UK Government published draft NPS EN1-EN5 for consultation in September 2021 and subsequently in March 2023 (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), 2023a; 2023b). The 2011 NPSs (DECC 2011a; DECC, 2011b) remain in force until the review is approved (designated) and under proposed transitional arrangements the 2023 amendments will only have effect in relation to applications for development consent accepted for examination after designation. However, the draft emerging NPSs can potentially be relevant planning considerations. Therefore, Rampion 2 has kept abreast of the potential changes to the energy NPSs and incorporated any updates where required in the ES.</p>
25.2.5	<p>The following emerging national planning policies are relevant to the assessment of the effects on ground conditions receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), (DESNZ, 2023a); and</li> <li>● Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), (DESNZ, 2023b).</li> </ul>
25.2.6	<p>There are no emerging expectations or changes relevant to the assessment of the effects on historic environment receptors from the current Overarching NPS EN1 for Energy (DECC, 2011a) and NPS EN3 for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (DECC, 2011b) listed in <b>Table 25-2</b>.</p>
<h2>Local planning policy</h2>	
25.2.7	<p><b>Table 25-3</b> lists the local planning policy relevant to the assessment of the potential effects on historic environment receptors.</p>

**Table 25-3 Local planning policy relevant to historic environment**

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<b>Adopted Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (July 2018) (Arun District Council, 2018)</b>	
<p>The Adopted Arun Local Plan sets out the requirements for development affecting the historic environment (Policy HER SP1). <b><i>“The Local Planning Authority will grant planning permission or relevant consent for development proposals that conserve or enhance the historic environment of the District, based on the following approach:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Designated heritage assets including listed buildings, structures and their settings; and Conservation Areas will be given the highest level of protection and should be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Non-designated heritage assets including locally listed heritage assets (Buildings or Structures of Character and Areas of Character) and their settings will also need to be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance and contribution to the historic environment;</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Development likely to prejudice any of the above, including their settings, will be refused. Any proposals for development will be required to comply with all other relevant policies and reflect any relevant appraisals or management proposals adopted by the Local Planning Authority.</i></b></p> <p>[...]</p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid direct impacts on designated heritage assets and limited the potential for indirect effects, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The approach to identifying heritage assets that may be subject to effects is set out in <b>Sections 25.4 and 25.5</b>.</p> <p>The methodology for determining significance and the assessment of effects is set out in <b>Section 25.8</b>, with the assessment of effects set out in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.12</b>.</p>

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><b><i>Development proposals involving the demolition of Listed Buildings or substantial harm to a Conservation Area will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the loss or harm achieves substantial public benefits.</i></b></p> <p>The Adopted Arun Local Plan sets out the requirements for development and listed buildings (Policy HER DM1). <b><i>“Proposals affecting statutory Listed Buildings will be required to:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>a. Preserve or enhance the historic character, qualities and special interest of the buildings;</i></b></li> <li><b><i>b. Be necessary and not detrimental to the architectural and historical integrity and detailing of a Listed Building's exterior;</i></b></li> <li><b><i>c. Protect the architectural and historical integrity and detailing of a Listed Building's interior;</i></b></li> <li><b><i>d. Protect the special interest of buildings of architectural or historic interest; and</i></b></li> <li><b><i>e. Protect, and where possible enhance the setting of the building.”</i></b></li> </ul>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid direct impacts on listed buildings and limit the potential for indirect effects, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (Table 25-23) are presented in Section 25.7. The approach to identifying listed buildings that may be subject to effects and the assessment of effects is set out in Section 25.4.</p>
<p>The Adopted Arun Local Plan sets out the requirements for development and locally listed buildings or structures of character (Policy HER DM2). <b><i>“Applications will only be granted for development which results in the loss of existing Locally Listed Buildings or Structures of Character when it can be demonstrated that the building or structure cannot be put to a beneficial use or re-use. Replacement structures will need to be of a high quality design. There may be</i></b></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid impacts on locally listed buildings or structures of character, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (Table 25-23) are presented in Section 25.7. The approach to identifying heritage assets that may be subject to effects and the assessment of effects is set</p>

## Policy description

*circumstances where the public benefit from the proposed development outweighs any proposed harm, in such circumstances, the proposal will need to be justified as appropriate.”*

The Adopted Arun Local Plan sets out the requirements for development and conservation areas (Policy HER DM3). *“In order to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, planning permission or relevant consent will normally be granted for proposals within or affecting the setting of a Conservation Area, provided that...”* certain measures are followed including that *“It does not harm important views into, out of or within the Conservation Area.”*

The Adopted Arun Local Plan sets out the requirements for development within Areas of Character<sup>2</sup> (Policy HER DM4), including *“the retention of buildings or other featured...which make a positive contribution to the special character of the area”*, and the need for development to preserve and where possible enhance the area’s special character.

The Adopted Arun Local Plan sets out the requirements for development and Sites of Archaeological Interest (Policy HER DM6). *“There will be a presumption in favour of the preservation of scheduled and other nationally important monuments and archaeological remains. Where proposed developments will have either a direct impact on sites listed in Table 16.1 (i.e. developments*

## Relevance to assessment

out in **Section 25.4** and in **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) [APP-213].

The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid impacts on conservation areas, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (**Table 25-23**) are presented in **Section 25.7**. The approach to conservation areas that may be subject to effects and the assessment of effects is set out in **Section 25.4**.

The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid impacts on the historic environment, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (**Table 25-23**) are presented in **Section 25.7**. The Proposed Development does not cross an Area of Character.

The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid direct impacts on scheduled and other known nationally important monuments and archaeological remains. Embedded environmental measures (**Table 25-23**) are presented in **Section 25.7**.

<sup>2</sup> Areas of Character according to the Adopted Arun Local Plan, *“include areas of older development or those with a particular character of buildings or layout. Although they are not of sufficient historic or architectural interest for designation as Conservation Areas, it is important that these areas are protected because of their intrinsic quality and their local importance.”*

## Policy description

***requiring Scheduled monument Consent) or where developments will have an indirect impact on the settings of those sites listed in Table 16.1, or where a site on which development is proposed has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest (having consulted the Historic Environment Record) permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that development will not be harmful to the archaeological interest of these sites.”***

***“In all such instances:***

***a. Applicants must arrange for a desk based archaeological assessment of the proposed development site to be undertaken by a suitably qualified person. The archaeological assessment will take the form of a factual review of the known information on historic assets and an appraisal of these assets. This information shall accompany the planning application, and, where not supplied, will be required before any planning application is determined\*. Where the Planning Authority has reason to believe, either from the archaeological assessment as above, or from other evidence sources, that significant archaeological remains may exist, further assessment in the form of a field evaluation will be required to be carried out before the planning application is determined. Any field survey undertaken shall be carried out by a professionally qualified archaeological organisation or consultant only. All stages of archaeological fieldwork shall be subject to a Written Scheme of Investigation approved by the local planning authority. No development shall take place on the proposed development site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, is in receipt of a Written Scheme of Investigation that has been approved by the Local Planning Authority;***

## Relevance to assessment

The approach to identifying and characterising archaeological remains that may be impacted is set out in **Section 25.5**.

The onshore historic environment baseline is detailed in the desk study in **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) the geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report in **Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3), and survey reports provided in **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) and **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7).

An **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)** (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders. The **Outline Onshore WSI** (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application.

**Policy description****Relevance to assessment**

**or**

***b. A field evaluation as above, which shall include a historic environmental record of the archaeological site without the requirement to undertake a separate desk based archaeological assessment.***

***c. Preservation in situ of archaeological sites or remnants of such sites, is the preferred option. However, where the assessment, which shall be subject to a Written Scheme of Investigation, shows that the preservation of archaeological remains in situ is not justified, conditions may be attached to any permission granted that development will not take place until provision has been made by the developer for a programme of archaeological investigation and recording. Any such programme shall be carried out prior to the commencement of the development.***

***d. Whenever practicable, opportunities should be taken for the enhancement and interpretation of archaeological remains left in situ. Developers shall record any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and possible impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible.***

***e. Where development is to be phased the presumption would normally be that the whole site should be recorded as one project in order to maintain the continuity of the archaeological record.***

***f. Developments shall also be consistent with all other Local Plan Policies.***



Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><i>* Those submitting planning applications are strongly advised however to undertake a desk based archaeological assessment in advance of a planning application being lodged as, depending on the outcome of this assessment, further assessment in the form of a field evaluation may be required (as outlined in a. above)."</i></p>	
<p>The Adopted Arun Local Plan sets out the requirements for development and Protection of landscape character (Policy LAN DM1). <b><i>“Development within the setting of the South Downs National Park must have special regard to the conservation of that setting, including views into and out of the Park, and will not be permitted where there would be harmful effects on these considerations.</i></b></p>	<p>The Proposed Development crosses the South Downs National Park (SDNP) and its setting (<b>Section 25.6</b>). The requirements outlined in this policy are accounted for within the scope of the assessment presented in <b>Section 25.4</b> and <b>Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).</p>
<p><b><i>Development throughout the plan area should respect the particular characteristics and natural features of the relevant landscape character areas and seek, wherever possible, to reinforce or repair the character of those areas.</i></b></p>	
<p><b><i>The historic character and development pattern of settlements within the District should be respected, taking into account their distinct identity and setting.”</i></b></p>	
<p>The Adopted Arun Local Plan sets out the requirements for development and The Setting of Arundel (Policy LAN DM2). <b><i>“Development will not be permitted within the area identified on the Policies Map which would adversely affect the views of the town of Arundel, its Castle, Cathedral and its special setting. Any development, including the proposed A27 Arundel bypass, will be of a high design standard that reflects the quality of the landscape and the setting of</i></b></p>	<p>The Proposed Development crosses the area defined as The Setting of Arundel (<b>Section 25.6</b>). The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to minimise effects through changes to the setting of designated heritage assets, where possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The</p>

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><b><i>Arundel. No development will be permitted, particularly within the area shown on the Policies Map, which would adversely affect the rural views outwards from the town and in particular from the following locations:</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>1. London Road, in the vicinity of 9 and 11 London Road (north westerly views)</i></b></li> <li><b><i>2. London Road, in the vicinity of the Roman Catholic cemetery (southerly views) 3. The northern ends of Mount Pleasant, King Street and Parsons Hill and at their junction with London Road (southerly views)</i></b></li> <li><b><i>3. The northern ends of Mount Pleasant, King Street and Parsons Hill and at their junction with London Road (southerly views)</i></b></li> <li><b><i>4. London Road, in the vicinity of Tower House (easterly views)</i></b></li> <li><b><i>5. The northern end of High Street (southerly views)</i></b></li> <li><b><i>6. Bakers Arms Hill and its junction with Maltravers Street (southerly views)</i></b></li> <li><b><i>7. Kings Arm Hill and its junction with Maltravers Street (southerly views)</i></b></li> <li><b><i>8. Mount Pleasant, in the vicinity of the Old Poor House (southerly views)</i></b></li> <li><b><i>9. The Arundel river bridge, in Queen Street (easterly views)</i></b></li> </ol>	<p>approach to the assessment of effects is set out in <b>Section 25.8.</b></p>

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><b><i>Developments shall also be consistent with all other Local Plan policies.”</i></b></p> <p><b>Horsham District Planning Framework (adopted November 2015)</b></p> <p><b>The Horsham District Planning Framework sets out the requirements for development and Cultural and Heritage Assets (Policy 34). Applications for development affecting heritage assets will be required to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>1. “Make reference to the significance of the asset, including drawing from research and documentation such as the West Sussex Historic Environment Record;</i></b></li> <li><b><i>2. Reflect the current best practice guidance produced by English Heritage and Conservation Area Character Statements;</i></b></li> <li><b><i>3. Reinforce the special character of the district's historic environment through appropriate siting, scale, form and design; including the use of traditional materials and techniques;</i></b></li> <li><b><i>4. Make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area, and ensuring that development in conservation areas is consistent with the special character of those areas;</i></b></li> <li><b><i>5. Preserve, and ensure clear legibility of, locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric and materials;</i></b></li> </ol>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid direct impacts on designated heritage assets and limit the potential for indirect effects, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The requirements outlined in this policy relevant to the historic environment are accounted for within the scope of the assessment presented in <b>Section 25.4</b>.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders. The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application.</p>

## Policy description

## Relevance to assessment

**6. Secure the viable and sustainable future of heritage assets through continued preservation by uses that are consistent with the significance of the heritage asset;**

**7. Retain and improves the setting of heritage assets, including views, public rights of way, trees and landscape features, including historic public realm features; and**

**Ensure appropriate archaeological research, investigation, recording and reporting of both above and below-ground archaeology, and retention where required, with any assessment provided as appropriate.”**

### Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 (adopted March 2018)

**The Mid Sussex District Plan sets out the requirements for development and listed buildings and other heritage assets (DP34). Development is required to protect listed buildings by ensuring that “a thorough understanding of the significance of the listed building and its setting has been demonstrated. This will be proportionate to the importance of the building and potential impact of the proposal” and “special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building”.**

**“The Council will seek to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the character and quality of life of the District. Significance can be defined as the special interest of a heritage asset, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.**

The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid direct impacts on listed buildings and known heritage assets of significance, and to limit the potential for indirect effects, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (Table 25-23) are presented in Section 25.7. The requirements outlined in this policy relevant to the historic environment are accounted for within the scope of the assessment presented in Section 25.4.

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><b><i>Proposals affecting such heritage assets will be considered in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and current Government guidance.”</i></b></p> <p><b>The Mid Sussex District Plan sets out the requirements for development and conservation areas (DP35), notably <i>“Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it”</i> and <i>“will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular views into and out of the area.”</i></b></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid impacts on conservation areas, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The approach to conservation areas that may be subject to effects and the assessment of effects is set out in <b>Section 25.8</b>.</p>
<p><b>The Mid Sussex District Plan sets out the requirements for development and historic parks and gardens (DP36). <i>“The character, appearance and setting of a registered park, or park or garden of special local historic interest will be protected. This will be achieved by ensuring that any development within or adjacent to a registered park, or park or garden of local historic interest will only be permitted where it protects and enhances its special features, setting and views into and out of the park or garden.”</i></b></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid impacts on historic parks and gardens. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The approach to historic parks and gardens that may be subject to effects and the assessment of effects is set out in <b>Section 25.8</b>.</p> <p>The onshore substation is located within the boundary of a former parkland at Oakendene. A historic landscape assessment of Oakendene parkland is provided in <b>Appendix 25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5).</p>
<p><b>The Mid Sussex District Plan sets out the requirements for development and trees, woodland and hedgerows (DP37), notably <i>“...development that will damage or lead to the loss of trees, woodland</i></b></p>	<p>The Proposed Development has the potential for temporary and permanent effects on elements of the historic landscape, such as historic field boundaries.</p>

## Policy description

*or hedgerows that contribute, either individually or as part of a group, to the visual amenity value or character of an area, and/ or that have landscape, historic or wildlife importance, will not normally be permitted” and “...development should be positioned as far as possible from ancient woodland with a minimum buffer of 15 metres maintained between ancient woodland and the development boundary.”*

## Relevance to assessment

The requirements outlined in this policy relevant are accounted for within the scope of the assessment presented in **Section 25.4** and **Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18) and **Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).

## South Downs Local Plan (adopted 2 July 2019)

The South Downs Local Plan policies provide the overarching framework for evaluating all development proposals in the National Park.

**Core Policy SD1: Sustainable Development states,**  
**“1. When considering development proposals that accord with relevant policies in this Local Plan and with National Park purposes, the Authority will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It will work with applicants to find solutions to ensure that those development proposals can be approved without delay, unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise.**

**2. The National Park purposes are i) to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area; and ii) to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park by the public. Where it appears that there is a conflict between the National Park purposes, greater weight will be attached to the first of those purposes. In pursuit of the purposes, the National Park Authority will pay due regard to its duty to**

Direct and indirect effects on heritage assets within the SDNP, are assessed in summarised in **Sections 25.9 to 25.12** of this chapter. Other requirements outlined in this policy relevant are accounted for within the scope of the assessment presented in **Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18) and **Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.22).

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><i>seek to foster the economic and social wellbeing of the local communities within the National Park.</i></p> <p><b>3. When determining any planning application, the Authority will consider the cumulative impacts of development.</b></p> <p><b>4. Planning permission will be refused where development proposals fail to conserve the landscape, natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park unless, exceptionally:</b></p> <p><b>a) The benefits of the proposals demonstrably outweigh the great weight to be attached to those interests; and</b></p> <p><b>b) There is substantial compliance with other relevant policies in the development plan.”</b></p>	
<p><b>Strategic Policy SD4: Landscape Character states</b></p> <p><b>“1. Development proposals will only be permitted where they conserve and enhance landscape character by demonstrating that:</b></p> <p><b>a) They are informed by landscape character, reflecting the context and type of landscape in which the development is located;</b></p> <p><b>b) The design, layout and scale of proposals conserve and enhance existing landscape and seascape character features which contribute to the distinctive character, pattern and evolution of the landscape;</b></p> <p><b>c) They will safeguard the experiential and amenity qualities of the landscape; and</b></p>	<p>The design of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process (<b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) that has sought to broadly adopt these design principles including avoiding sensitive features in the landscape wherever possible.</p> <p>Direct and indirect effects on heritage assets within the SDNP, are assessed in summarised in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.12</b> of this chapter.</p> <p>Reference has also been made to the SDNP interactive maps covering historic landscape character.</p>

## Policy description

***d) Where planting is considered appropriate, it is consistent with local character, enhances biodiversity, contributes to the delivery of GI and uses native species, unless there are appropriate and justified reasons to select non-native species.***

***2. Where development proposals are within designed landscapes, or the setting of designed landscapes, (including historic parkscapes and those on the Historic England Register of Historic Parks and Gardens) they should be based on a demonstrable understanding of the design principles of the landscape and should be complementary to it.***

***3. The settlement pattern and individual identity of settlements and the integrity of predominantly open and undeveloped land between settlements will not be undermined.***

***4. Green and blue corridors will be safeguarded. Development proposals should identify and take opportunities to create and connect green and blue corridors.***

***5. The restoration of landscapes where features have been lost or degraded will be supported where it contributes positively to landscape character.”***

**Strategic Policy SD12: Historic Environment, sets relevant requirements for heritage assets. The policy states,**

***“1. Development proposals will only be permitted where they conserve and enhance the historic environment, including through the safeguarding of heritage assets and their setting.***

## Relevance to assessment

Strategic principles to the landscape design and approach to embedded environmental measures are presented in **Section 18.7** of **Chapter 18: Landscape and visual, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).

The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid impacts on known heritage assets, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures are presented in **Table 25-23**, in **Section 25.7**.



Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><b>2. Applicants will be required to provide a Heritage Statement sufficient to allow an informed assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of the heritage asset(s).</b></p> <p><b>3. Development proposals which affect heritage assets (whether designated or non-designated) or their setting will be determined with regard to the significance of the asset, including the long-term conservation and enhancement of that asset.</b></p> <p><b>4. Development proposals will be permitted where they enhance or better reveal the significance of heritage assets, particularly where they are considered to be at risk of irreversible harm or loss.</b></p> <p><b>5. Development proposals which appropriately re-use redundant or under-used heritage assets with the optimal viable use, which secures their long-term conservation and enhancement, including of their setting, will be supported.</b></p> <p><b>6. Development proposals for enabling development that would otherwise conflict with other planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset will be permitted provided:</b></p> <p><b>a) The proposals will not materially harm the heritage values of the asset or its setting;</b></p> <p><b>b) It can be demonstrated that alternative solutions have failed;</b></p> <p><b>c) The proposed development is the minimum necessary to protect the significance of the heritage asset;</b></p>	<p>The approach to identifying and characterising heritage assets that may be impacted is set out in <b>Section 25.5</b>.</p> <p>The onshore historic environment baseline is detailed in the desk study in <b>Appendix 25.2: Historic environment desk study, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) the geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report in <b>Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and paleoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3), and survey reports provided in <b>Appendices 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) and <b>25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7).</p> <p>An <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders. The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application.</p>

Policy description	Relevance to assessment
<p><b><i>d) It meets the tests and criteria set out in Historic England guidance Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places;</i></b></p> <p><b><i>e) It is subject to a legal agreement to secure the restoration of the asset; and</i></b></p> <p><b><i>f) It enables public appreciation of the saved heritage asset.”</i></b></p>	
<p><b>Development Management Policy SD13: Listed Buildings states,</b></p> <p><b><i>“1. Development proposals which affect a listed building or its setting will only be permitted and listed building consent granted where:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>a) They preserve and enhance the significance of the listed building and its setting by demonstrating that loss of historic fabric and detail of significance, including internal features, floor plans and the integrity of the rooms, is avoided; or</i></b></p> <p><b><i>b) Harm to the significance of the listed building or its setting is considered to be outweighed by public benefits by the Authority, when appropriate mitigation measures will be expected, including archaeological investigation (including a written report) or recording.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>2. Development proposals will be refused planning permission and/or listed building consent where they cause substantial harm to a listed building or its setting.”</i></b></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid direct impacts on listed buildings and limit the potential for indirect effects, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures are presented in <b>Table 25-23</b> in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The approach to identifying listed buildings that may be subject to effects and the assessment of effects is set out in <b>Section 25.4</b>.</p> <p>A setting scoping appraisal is provided in <b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6).</p>
<p><b>Development Management Policy SD15: Conservation Areas</b></p>	<p>The Proposed Development will have potential effects on conservation areas within the National Park. The protection conferred to these heritage assets through</p>

## Policy description

***“1. Development proposals within a conservation area, or within its setting, will only be permitted where they preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest, character or appearance of the conservation area. Sufficient information to support an informed assessment should be provided on the following matters:***

- a) The relevant conservation area appraisal and management plan;***
- b) Overall settlement layout and relationship to established landscape setting;***
- c) Historic pattern of thoroughfares, roads, paths and open spaces, where these provide evidence of the historic evolution of the settlement, and the historic street scene;***
- d) Distinctive character zones within the settlement;***
- e) Mix of building types and uses, if significant to the historic evolution of the settlement;***
- f) Use of locally distinctive building materials, styles or techniques;***
- g) Historic elevation features including fenestration, or shop fronts, where applicable;***
- h) Significant trees, landscape features, boundary treatments, open space, and focal points; and***
- i) Existing views and vistas through the settlement, views of the skyline and views into and out of the conservation area.***

***2. Within a conservation area, development proposals which involve the total or substantial demolition of buildings or structures will only be permitted where it is sufficiently demonstrated that:***

- a) The current buildings or structures make no positive contribution to the special architectural or historic interest, character or appearance of the conservation area; and***
- b) The replacement would make an equal or greater contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.”***

## Relevance to assessment

legislation and planning policy is accounted for within the scope of the assessment (see **Section 25.4**) and the environmental measures embedded (**Table 25-23**) within the Proposed Development detailed in **Section 25.7**.

A setting scoping appraisal is provided in **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6).

## Policy description

**Development Management Policy SD16: Archaeology states,**

***“1. Development proposals will be permitted where they do not cause harm to archaeological heritage assets and/or their setting. Sufficient information in a Heritage Statement is required to allow an informed assessment of the significance of the archaeological heritage asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposed development on that significance.***

***2. There will be a presumption in favour of preservation in-situ for Scheduled Monuments and other archaeological heritage assets of equivalent significance.***

***3. Development proposals that will result in unavoidable harm to, or loss of, an archaeological heritage asset’s significance, will only be permitted where there is a clear justification in terms of public benefits arising from the development which outweigh that harm and, in the case of substantial harm/ loss, also meet the following requirements:***  
***a) There is no less harmful viable option; and***  
***b) The amount of harm has been reduced to the minimum possible. In these cases, preservation by record secured through an agreed Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation will be required.”***

## Relevance to assessment

The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid direct impacts on scheduled and other known nationally important monuments and archaeological remains. Embedded environmental measures are presented in **Table 25-23** in **Section 25.7**. The approach to identifying and characterising archaeological remains that may be impacted is set out in **Section 25.4**.

The approach to identifying and characterising heritage assets that may be impacted is set out in **Section 25.5**.

The onshore historic environment baseline is detailed in the desk study in **Appendix 25.2: Historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) the geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report in **Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3), and survey reports provided in **Appendices 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) and **25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7).

An **Outline Onshore WSI** (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2

---

**Policy description****Relevance to assessment**

has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders. The **Outline Onshore WSI** (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application.

## Other relevant information and guidance

25.2.8 A summary of other relevant information and guidance relevant to the assessment undertaken for historic environment is provided in **Table 25-4**.

**Table 25-4 Other relevant information and guidance**

Document	Relevance to assessment
<b>Good Practice in Planning Advice 2 (GPA 2) Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2015)</b>	This document provides guidance and information to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment policy and ensuring compliance with NPPF (MHCLG, 2021) fundamentals. It is important to understand the nature, extent and level of significance of an asset, and the contribution of its setting to its significance, in order to understand the impact of the Proposed Development on that significance and for decisions to be made in line with legal requirements, objectives of the development plan and the policy requirements of the NPPF.
<b>Good Practice in Planning Advice 3 (GPA 3) The Setting of Heritage Assets 2nd Edition (Historic England, 2017a)</b>	Sets out guidance on managing change within the settings of heritage assets.
<b>Conservation Principles (Historic England, 2008)</b>	Sets out principles for the assessment of heritage significance and its management.
<b>Conservation Principles for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment – consultation draft (Historic England, 2017b)</b>	A draft version of the revised conservation principles for the sustainable management of the historic environment.
<b>Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2019)</b>	This Historic England advice note covers the NPPF requirement for applicants for heritage and other consents to describe heritage significance to help local planning authorities to make decisions on the impact of proposals for change to heritage assets.
<b>Advice Note 15 Commercial Renewable Energy Development</b>	This Historic England advice note describes the potential impacts on the historic environment of commercial renewable energy proposals.

Document	Relevance to assessment
<b>and the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2021)</b>	
<b>Advice Note 10 Listed Buildings and Curtilage (Historic England, 2018)</b>	Provides worked examples to assist understanding of how to define the curtilage of a listed building.
<b>Deposit Modelling and Archaeology (Historic, England 2020)</b>	Provides guidance on the development and application of deposit models to characterise deep sequences of deposits, which may have archaeological interest.
<b>Geoarchaeology (Historic England, 2005)</b>	Provides guidance on the range of geoarchaeological techniques available to understand site formation processes and landscape-scale changes over time.
<b>Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessment (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2017)</b>	Sets out standards for the production of archaeological desk-based assessments.
<b>Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment (CIfA, 2014)</b>	Sets out standards for the provision of consultancy advice in the historic environment.
<b>Wind Energy and the Historic Environment (English Heritage, 2005)</b>	Sets out guidance for developers of wind energy projects which may affect the historic environment.
<b>Climate Change and the Historic Environment (English Heritage, 2007)</b>	Statement which sets out current thinking on the implications of climate change for the historic environment to inform the development of strategies and plans relating to climate change impacts; or in projects relating to risk assessment, adaptation and mitigation.
<b>South East Research Framework (SERF) consultation draft (2019) (Kent County Council, 2019)</b>	The resource assessment was aimed at better understanding the current state of knowledge and understanding within the region. This includes period-based summaries. The research agenda and strategy identify gaps in knowledge and research topics and presents a range of research issues which could usefully be addressed within the region.

## 25.3 Consultation and engagement

### Overview

- 25.3.1 This section describes the stakeholder engagement undertaken for Rampion 2. This consists of early engagement, the outcome of, and response to, the Scoping Opinion (Planning Inspectorate, 2020a) in relation to the historic environment assessment, the Evidence Plan Process (EPP), non-statutory consultation and Rampion 2's statutory consultation. An overview of consultation and engagement undertaken for Rampion 2 relevant to the EIA is outlined in [Section 5.4 of Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5). Given the social distancing restrictions which have been in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic from 2020 to 2022 during this period, technical consultation relating to historic environment has taken place online, primarily in the form of conference calls using Microsoft Teams.

### Early engagement

#### Introduction

- 25.3.2 Early engagement was undertaken with a number of prescribed and non-prescribed consultation bodies and local authorities in relation to historic environment. This engagement was undertaken to introduce the Proposed Development and the proposed approach to scoping the EIA.

#### Arun District Council (ADC) (and Chichester District Council [CDC] at the request of ADC)

- 25.3.3 Early engagement with the ADC Conservation Officer and CDC Archaeologist was undertaken in the form of a conference call held in June 2020 to introduce the Proposed Development and the approach to scoping. Key items covered included an overview of baseline sources, brief characterisation of the historic environment, mitigation approach and planned surveys and likely significant effects.

#### Horsham District Council (HDC)

- 25.3.4 Early engagement with the HDC Conservation Officer was undertaken in the form of a conference call to introduce the Proposed Development and the approach to scoping, held in June 2020. Key items covered included an overview of baseline sources, brief characterisation of the historic environment, approach to mitigation and planned surveys and likely significant effects.

#### Historic England

- 25.3.5 Early engagement with Historic England was undertaken in the form of conference calls. A conference call was held in May 2020 to introduce the Proposed Development and the approach to scoping. Key items covered included an overview of baseline sources, brief characterisation of the historic environment, mitigation approach and planned surveys and likely significant effects.



## West Sussex County Council (WSCC)

- 25.3.6 Early engagement with the WSCC County Archaeologist was undertaken in the form of email queries to introduce the Proposed Development and invite comments on key onshore historic environment constraints/sensitivities and potential mitigation.

## Scoping Opinion

- 25.3.7 Rampion Extension Development Limited (RED) submitted a Scoping Report (RED, 2020) and request for a Scoping Opinion to the Secretary of State (administered by the Planning Inspectorate) on 2 July 2020. A Scoping Opinion was received on 11 August 2020 (Planning Inspectorate, 2020a). The Scoping Report (RED, 2020) sets out the proposed historic environment assessment methodologies, outline of the baseline data collected to date and proposed, and the scope of the assessment. **Table 25-5** sets out the comments received in Section 5 of the Planning Inspectorate’s Scoping Opinion ‘Aspect based scoping tables – Onshore’ and how these have been addressed in this ES. A full list of the Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion (Planning Inspectorate, 2020a) comments and responses is provided in **Appendix 5.2: Response to the Scoping Opinion, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.2). Regard has also been given to other stakeholder comments that were received in relation to the Scoping Report (RED, 2021).

**Table 25-5 Planning Inspectorate (2020a) Scoping Opinion responses – historic environment**

Planning Inspectorate ID number	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
5.8.1	<p><u>“Effects on heritage assets out with 1km of onshore landfall and cable route corridor.</u></p> <p><u>&amp;</u></p> <p><u>Effects of decommissioning and reinstatement of onshore substation on heritage assets out with 1km of the landfall and cable route corridor.</u></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that effects on heritage assets out with 1km of the onshore landfall and cable route corridor can be scoped out of the assessment, particularly based on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The temporary and transient nature of onshore construction (and decommissioning) works; and</i></li> </ul>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Heritage assets within 1km of the onshore part of the proposed Development Consent Order (DCO) Order Limits comprising the onshore cable corridor and landfall, and within 2km of the proposed DCO Order Limits comprising the onshore substation have been considered for effects arising through changes to setting of heritage assets (<b>Section 25.4, Sections 25.9 to 25.14 and Figure 25.1, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25).</p> <p>Where the Proposed Development connects into the existing National</p>

Planning Inspectorate ID number	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>• <i>The limited nature of the visual effects during operation as a result of the landfall area (transition bays etc).</i></p> <p><i>This does not include scoping out effects of the substation on the same basis (which should be included where significant effects could occur). This also includes the connection to the existing Bolney substation, particularly given that an overhead line connection does not appear to have been expressly ruled out by the Applicant).</i></p>	<p>Grid substation at Bolney, this will be via buried cable (C-1).</p>
<p><b>5.8.2</b></p>	<p><u><i>“Adverse direct effects on heritage assets out with the scoping boundary.</i></u></p> <p><i>The Inspectorate agrees that direct effects on assets outside of the scoping boundary can be scoped out of further assessment as there is no pathway for such direct effects.”</i></p>	<p>Acknowledged. The same logic is applied at ES whereby heritage assets outside of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits are scoped out as there is no pathway for such direct effects (<b>Section 25.4</b>).</p>
<p><b>5.8.3</b></p>	<p><u><i>“Adverse effects arising through change to setting of heritage assets out with the extended study area.</i></u></p> <p><i>Noting the comments in box 5.8.4 below, the ‘extended study area’ has yet to be defined. Whilst the Inspectorate agrees with the logic and notes the intention to refine and agree this ‘extended study area’ to capture potential effects of the Proposed Development as necessary, the Inspectorate cannot agree to this being scoped out of the assessment as its spatial extent is yet to be defined.”</i></p>	<p>Acknowledged. Since the refinement of the proposed DCO Order Limits, extended Study Areas (onshore substation and seascape Study Areas) have been determined for the purposes of assessing the settings effects as a result of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development. These extend 2km from the onshore substation site and 25km from the offshore Area of Search (see <b>Section 25.4</b> and <b>Figure 25.1, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).</p>

Planning Inspectorate ID number	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
5.8.4	<p><u>“Extended study areas</u></p> <p><i>Where an ‘extended study area’ will be used to identify heritage assets (to be determined through consultation with stakeholders and not purely based on an “arbitrary 5km or 10km boundary”), the definition and rationale for the selection of areas and relevant assets rather than simply the study area should be clearly explained.”</i></p>	<p>Acknowledged. The rationale for determining the extended Study Areas and seascape Study Area is provided in <b>Section 25.4</b>.</p>
5.8.5	<p><u>“Baseline conditions at the landfall location</u></p> <p><i>Paragraphs 2.4.20, 6.9.37 and 6.9.38 explain that Palaeolithic remains and deposits, as well as elements of a Bronze Age rural landscape, have been exposed by coastal erosion close to the landfall location at Climping. The Inspectorate therefore considers that the area has high archaeological potential (and Historic England highlight the possibility for discovery of remains of national importance). The ES should provide an assessment of significance of effects on these undesignated archaeological remains and how this is taken into consideration as part of the overall selection process for the landfall area (and onshore route).”</i></p>	<p>An onshore historic environment desk study, geoarchaeological desk study and geophysical survey has been prepared to inform the ES assessment (<b>Appendices 25.2: Historic environment desk study</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2), <b>25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3) and <b>25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) the historic environment baseline summarised in <b>Section 25.6</b>. The relevant assessment of effects is presented in <b>Section 25.9</b>.</p> <p>The design of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process (<b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3)) that has sought to broadly adopt these design principles including avoiding sensitive features in the landscape wherever possible. Historic environment receptors were a</p>

Planning Inspectorate ID number	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
		<p>consideration in this design process, together with all other environmental and engineering constraints The landfall selection process including the options appraisal and constraints mapping approach undertaken is detailed in <b>Section 3.4 in Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3))</p> <p>Early in the project design the cable installation method at landfall was chosen to be via HDD, which will be installed at a depth which would not encounter potential shallow buried/submerged archaeological remains within the landfall zone.</p>
5.8.6	<p><u>“Sensitivity of receptors</u></p> <p><i>Table 6.9.1 does not include a valuation for non-designated remains of national importance. On the basis of the information in that table, the Inspectorate understands that they would be classified as “high” sensitivity and the ES should consider the assessment of significance of effects on this basis.”</i></p>	<p>For the purposes of assessing the significance of effects, <b>Table 25-24</b> details the four classes of heritage significance (or sensitivity). Non-designated remains of national importance are included under “high” heritage significance.</p>
5.8.7	<p><u>“Assessment of offshore effects on onshore heritage assets</u></p> <p><i>Section 6.9 of the Scoping Report is focused on only impact of the onshore works on heritage assets within the onshore works boundary. Limited information is provided in terms of assessment methodology of the potential impact of the offshore works on the settings of onshore heritage assets (which is not explicitly covered in the marine</i></p>	<p>Assessment scope and methodology of the potential impact of the offshore works on the settings of onshore heritage assets is provided in <b>Sections 25.4 and 25.5</b>. The assessment considers the potential for significant effects from offshore works during construction and operation on the setting of onshore assets in <b>Sections 25.9 and 25.10</b>.</p>

Planning Inspectorate ID number	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>archaeology aspect chapter). The ES should present specific consideration of the potential for significant effects from offshore works during construction and operation on the setting of onshore assets (noting overlap with LVIA and SLVIA aspects)."</i></p>	<p>A settings scoping appraisal is provided in <b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7).</p>

## Evidence Plan Process

- 25.3.8 The Evidence Plan Process (EPP) has been set up to provide a formal, non-legally binding, independently chaired forum to agree the scope of the EIA and Habitats regulations Assessment (HRA), and the evidence required to support the DCO Application. The EPP commenced in January 2020 and has continued throughout the EIA helping to inform the ES.
- 25.3.9 For historic environment, further engagement has been undertaken via the EPP Expert Topic Group (ETG) 'Seascape, Landscape, Archaeology & Cultural Heritage and Marine Archaeology' meeting held by conference call on 15 September 2020. The conference call was attended by the following stakeholders:
- WSCC;
  - Natural England;
  - Historic England;
  - SDNPA;
  - Brighton and Hove City Council;
  - HDC;
  - CDC;
  - ADC;
  - Isle of Wight Council;
  - Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC);
  - National Trust;
  - High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnership; and
  - Chichester Harbour Conservancy AONB.
- 25.3.10 The historic environment section of the ETG meeting covered the scope of the historic environment assessment, the baseline data and supporting assessments to be used to undertake the assessment, proposed environmental measures and

the assessment methodology. The engagement also presented the proposed approach to address the Scoping Opinion comments detailed in **Table 25-5**.

- 25.3.11 The meeting provided more detail on the approach and anticipated surveys for Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) (RED, 2021) and the ES assessment based on feedback from the initial introductory meeting, namely the emphasis on the landscape approach of the onshore historic environment baseline and assessment and the need for early deposit modelling.
- 25.3.12 Two further ETG meetings were held for Seascape, Landscape, Archaeology & Cultural Heritage and Marine Archaeology on 19 March 2021 and 4 November 2021, with the same key stakeholders as the meeting in October 2020.
- 25.3.13 The historic environment section of the second ETG meeting on 19 March 2021 covered an update on progress since scoping, consultation progress, and initial feedback on the historic environment assessment in the PEIR (RED, 2021). The historic environment section of the third ETG meeting on 4 November 2021 provided an update on progress since PEIR and feedback following the first Statutory Consultation exercise undertaken 14 July to 16 September (details in **Table 25-6**).
- 25.3.14 Additional ETG meetings were held on 10 November 2022 and 01 March 2023 for Onshore Historic Environment and Landscape, and on 21 March 2023 Onshore Landscape for WSCC who could not attend 01 March 2023 meeting and requested attendance of Onshore Historic Environment specialist. The ETG meeting on 10 November 2022 provided a project update during the second Statutory Consultation exercise (October – November 2022) and an update on actions taken in response to feedback following the first Statutory Consultation exercise undertaken 14 July to 16 September. The ETG meetings on 01 March 2023 and 21 March 2023 provided a project update on the third Statutory Consultation exercise (February – March 2023) and an update on actions taken in response to feedback following the second Statutory Consultation exercise undertaken from 18 October 2023 to 29 November 2022.
- 25.3.15 A final pre-application ETG was held on 14 June 2023 for Onshore LVIA and Historic Environment and Landscape which provided a project update and update on actions taken following the ETG in March 2023. In addition, a review of EIA considerations were provided including design, commitments and further investigation and mitigation. Outstanding ETG actions were discussed with comments on how these would be addressed going forwards.
- 25.3.16 Further information is provided in the **Evidence Plan** (Document Reference: 7.21).

## Non-statutory consultation

### Overview

- 25.3.17 Non-statutory consultation captures all consultation and engagement outside of statutory consultation and has been ongoing with a number of prescribed and non-prescribed consultation bodies and local authorities in relation to historic environment. A summary of the non-statutory consultation undertaken since completion of the Scoping Report (RED, 2020) is outlined in this section.

- 25.3.18 Independent of the EPP, further engagement has been undertaken with WSCC in relation to historic environment, including archaeological geophysical survey, archaeological trial trenching and scope of the Oakendene historic parkland assessment:
- A conference call was held with the WSCC County Archaeologist on 26 February 2021 to discuss the scope of geophysical surveys. An outline of the spatial scope of magnetometry survey was provided, together with the potential coverage with resistivity at locations of particular archaeological sensitivity. The WSCC County Archaeologist provided feedback on further possible locations for resistivity survey, the need for which would be informed by the results of the initial magnetometry survey.
  - A second conference call was held with the WSCC County Archaeologist on 23 February 2022 to provide an update on preliminary results of the ongoing magnetometry survey and the potential scope of advance targeted archaeological trial trenching based on existing baseline data. Three areas within the PEIR Assessment Boundary were discussed, including land north of Crossbush Lane, land at Brook Barn Farm and land at Warningcamp Hill. Following the call, it was agreed to carry out archaeological trial trenching at all three areas with trench plans subsequently agreed.
  - Written Schemes of Investigation (WSIs) for the geophysical survey and trial trenching (for land north of Crossbush Lane and land at Brook Barn Farm) were prepared and agreed with the WSCC County Archaeologist in advance of commencing these works.

#### Non-statutory consultation exercise – January/February 2021

- 25.3.19 RED carried out a non-statutory consultation exercise for a period of four weeks from 14 January 2021 to 11 February 2021. This non-statutory consultation exercise aimed to engage with a range of stakeholders including the prescribed and non-prescribed consultation bodies, local authorities, Parish Councils and general public with a view to introducing the Proposed Development and seeking early feedback on the emerging designs.
- 25.3.20 The key themes emerging from the non-statutory consultation exercise in January 2021 relating to historic environment were:
- concerns over the location of the Wineham Lane substation search area options (this substation option is no longer part of the design assessed in the ES);
  - concerns over the use of Wineham Lane for construction traffic; and
  - onshore substation design and potential screening.
- 25.3.21 Further detail about the results of the non-statutory consultation exercise can be found in the [Consultation Report](#) (Document Reference: 5.1).

## West Sussex County Council

- 25.3.22 The WSCC response to the non-statutory consultation exercise (January/February 2021), included a comprehensive section on archaeology, with comments covering both within and outside the SDNP. The key highlights were:
- identifying known or potentially significant archaeological and geoarchaeological sites which lie within or near to the onshore cable corridor and onshore substation search areas;
  - recommendations for high resolution resistivity survey at certain locations of archaeological sensitivity;
  - recommendations for pre-construction investigation and recording, and potential archaeological mitigation;
  - preferences for particular onshore cable corridor route options based on relative archaeological sensitivity of sites at those locations including:
    - ▶ Warningcamp A onshore cable corridor route option (as set out in the consultation materials and no longer part of the design assessed in the ES) had the potential to negatively impact the heritage significance of a scheduled ringwork, as well as being more visually prominent within the setting of Arundel Castle. This onshore cable corridor route option was discounted ahead of submission of the original PEIR (RED, 2021); and
    - ▶ The northern onshore cable corridor route option at Windmill Quarry was preferable (Windmill Quarry B). Whilst both onshore cable corridor route options would encounter the line of a Roman road, the southern option (Windmill Quarry A) may also have impacted the known site of a post medieval watermill and probable Roman building. The Windmill Quarry A onshore cable corridor route option was discounted ahead of submission of the original PEIR (RED, 2021).
  - recommendation for a Historic Landscape Assessment to assess the remaining significance of the historic parkscape at Oakdene Manor, should the Bolney Road / Kent Street onshore substation search area be selected.

## Statutory consultation

### First statutory consultation exercise – July to September 2021

- 25.3.23 Rampion 2's first statutory consultation exercise ran from 14 July to 16 September 2021, a period of nine weeks. The PEIR (RED, 2021) was published as part of Rampion 2's first statutory consultation exercise which provided preliminary information on historic environment within Chapter 25 Historic Environment (RED, 2021).
- 25.3.24 **Table 25-6** provides a summary of the key themes of the feedback received in the first statutory consultation exercise in relation to historic environment and outlines how the feedback has been considered in this ES chapter. A full list of all comments received during the first statutory consultation exercise in 2021 and the responses to those comments is provided in the [Consultation Report](#) (Document Reference: 5.1).





Page intentionally blank

**Table 25-6 First statutory consultation exercise (July – September 2021) feedback**

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
<b>Arun District Council</b>	<p>Second World War coastal defence structures</p> <p><i>“The Climping Coastal defence features from the Second World War, whilst identified as being of archaeological interest, are also non-designated heritage structures. Would expect some care to be taken so as to ensure that their significance is not harmed as part of the Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) technique that will be used at the landfall location.”</i></p>	<p>Effects on the Second World War Climping coastal defence structures are assessed based on design information available at ES and presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p>
	<p>Areas of Character</p> <p>The Arun LPAA have identified both buildings and areas of character which are non-designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>Assessment of effects on Locally Listed Buildings or Structures of Character and Areas of Character, as identified by Arun District Council, is presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p>
	<p>Setting of heritage assets and indirect effects</p> <p><i>“Table 26-31 ‘Offshore substation and wind turbine generators – Potential effects arising through change to setting of heritage assets during the operation and maintenance phase -Paragraph 26.4.17 of the PIER states that the identification of heritage assets to be included within the settings assessment is based on stage 1 of GPA 3. This followed a two-stage process which included identifying those assets where the coastal setting, including views out to sea, contributes in a notable and substantial way to the heritage significance of an asset. It is therefore not clear why some</i></p>	<p><b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) details the approach for scoping in heritage assets for the assessment of indirect effects (including those selected along the Arun coast), which is presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p> <p>Littlehampton Seafront and Littlehampton River Road in Littlehampton Conservation Areas have been taken forward for assessment.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>assets have been included in this table (and table 26-12) and others haven't. [...] This table needs to be updated to reflect all of the assets along the Arun coast."</i></p> <p><i>"The WTG will be clearly visible from the seafronts of both of the coastal towns. For instance, in Littlehampton, the report states that Seafront views, including those from the sea-front promenade will be defined by open, direct views of the offshore elements (Viewpoint 11), where they will be a prominent element in good visibility of the offshore field of view. This will result in a high magnitude of change and significant (major) effect on views experienced by residents and users of Littlehampton seafront. However, the failure to include the Littlehampton conservation areas in the heritage assessment (table 26-31) means that this impact has not been fully assessed on the heritage assets."</i></p> <p><i>"The landscape study identifies that the Bognor Regis Seafront Promenade (which includes the conservation are) has a medium-high sensitivity to change, a medium high magnitude of change, resulting in the significance of residual effect being significant (major/moderate). However, the heritage report then identifies that the impact on the conservation area would be minor (in terms of the significance of the effect. Is this correct?"</i></p>	<p>The scope of LVIA assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 18: Landscape and visual, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18), which considers a wide range of landscape and visual effects and has been completed in accordance with relevant guidance for that topic. The historic environment assessment presented in this chapter (<b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>) considers the effect on heritage significance of relevant heritage assets.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>Consultation</p> <p><i>“It is not clear what form this will take. It is suggested that smaller meetings taken place with individual or neighbouring authorities.”</i></p>	<p>Details and outcomes of consultation and engagement is provided in <b>Section 25.3</b>.</p>
<p><b>Brighton &amp; Hove Council</b></p>	<p>Assessment of heritage assets</p> <p><i>“Table 26-31 should include assessment of the impact on the grade II* listed Madeira Terrace in Brighton, in view of its historic function, design and interest as a raised seafront promenade.”</i></p> <p><i>“Some of the conservation areas – notably, Kemp Town, East Cliff, Regency Square and Brunswick Town - have a very deliberate, designed relationship with the sea and seafront, whilst others have a more historic relationship (e.g., Old Town) or a less formal relationship. The contribution that the setting of open sea and seafront makes to their significance therefore varies accordingly.”</i></p> <p><i>“Rottingdean is very different again in character and appearance to the urban conservation areas and has a distinct visual and historic relationship with the sea.”</i></p> <p><i>“The assessment of the impact on the Kemp Town Enclosures registered park and garden has not properly considered that this park/garden was deliberately designed to enable sea views and access to the beach (which where it adjoins the gardens was originally private). The magnitude of</i></p>	<p><b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) details the approach for scoping in heritage assets for the assessment of indirect effects, which is presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p> <p>The grade II* listed Madeira Terrace in Brighton has been taken forward for assessment.</p> <p>The assessment of effects (including effects on the Kemp Town Enclosures registered park and garden) is presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
<b>Historic England</b>	<p><i>change and significance of effect have consequently been underassessed, given how visible the array turbines would be from this point with the increased height.”</i></p> <p>Significance and setting of heritage assets</p> <p><i>“In summary, the setting assessment should be reported in greater detail, in order to provide sufficient information to judge the validity of its conclusions. Further consideration should be given to the nature of heritage assets’ relationship with long views and the way in which temporary changes are assessed and reported.”</i></p> <p><i>“The completion of this assessment is particularly necessary where the PEIR boundary falls within the settings of grade I and II* listed buildings.”</i></p> <p><i>“The Historic Environment Figures provided show the grade I listed St Mary’s, Climping (Figure 25.3a,) the grade I listed St Mary Magdalene, Lyminster (Figure 25.3a,) the grade I listed All Saints, Buncton (Figure 25.3d) and the grade II* listed Bailiffscourt Hotel and associated buildings, Climping (Figure 25.2b) all in close proximity to the red line PEIR assessment boundary. There is no discussion of what the impact on these heritage assets is likely to be and no visual assessment in either Chapters 16 or 19 (Landscape and Visual (Onshore)). Further written information in relation to the works proposed in these locations and their likely impacts on the identified heritage assets, including their settings should be provided in any ES subsequently produced.”</i></p>	<p>Full details of the setting assessment are presented in <b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) and <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p> <p><b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) details the approach to identifying the heritage assets for inclusion in the assessment of indirect effects, which has been completed in accordance with Historic England guidance (as listed in <b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) <b>Table 25-4</b>).</p> <p><b>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) provides detail of the design of the Proposed Development.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>“Furthermore, figures 26.3a and 26.3b shows the PEIR assessment boundary in three Conservation Areas within Arun, these are Burpham and Wepham, Warningcamp and Lyminster. Further written information in relation to the nature of works proposed within and adjacent to these Conservation Areas and their likely impact should be provided.”</i></p> <p><i>“The PEIR does not report how the Applicant identified which assets were to subject to detailed setting assessment, in accordance with Step 1 of Historic England’s guidance (Historic England Good Practice in Planning be also Note 3). This step requires that the Applicant identifies all assets whose experience is capable of being affected by a proposed development. In order to demonstrate compliance with the guidance, the final ES should describe the criteria by which Step 1 was determined and, for each asset within the study area that was scoped out at Step 1, provide reasons why each did not fulfil the criteria for full assessment.”</i></p>	
	<p>Archaeological remains</p> <p><i>“We require a more fine-grained predictive model of the potential for buried archaeological remains and for this to be clearly depicted in figures;”</i></p> <p><i>“We add that in consideration of the inshore location of this proposed development that it is possible that if a site of archaeological interest is encountered which proves to be significant that designation is possible through either</i></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid, or minimise, impacts on archaeological remains, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The approach to identifying heritage assets that may be subject to effects is set out in <b>Section 25.4</b> and <b>Section 25.5</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>Protection of Wrecks Act 1973 or Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas 1979.”</i></p> <p><i>“The proposed development area may contain nationally important non-- designated archaeological remains, which are equivalent to scheduled monument in significance. Any as yet unidentified or not fully understood remains, including nationally important remains, could be subject to adverse impacts up to and including significant effects and/or substantial harm. However, insufficient assessment has been carried out to understand the significance of buried archaeological remains with sufficient confidence to inform a planning decision.”</i></p> <p><i>“Tables setting out potential and significance [...] do not appear to consider the full range of Palaeolithic and prehistoric asset types that might survive within the scheme footprint or ascribe to them an appropriate level of potential and significance.”</i></p> <p><i>“Anticipated assets will not only be isolated flints. re In situ flint scatters and other mains associated with buried land surfaces are likely and might (for the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic periods) be deeply buried within raised beach, head, river terrace and alluvial sequences. These natural Quaternary deposits have archaeological as well as palaeoenvironmental potential, yet the tables appear to separate the deposits from their associated archaeology. Similarly, important geoarchaeological and</i></p>	<p>The onshore historic environment baseline is summarised in <b>Section 25.6</b>. A detailed desk study is provided in <b>Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) the geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report in <b>Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3) and survey reports provided in <b>Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) and <b>Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6). All of which have informed the assessment of potential and significance of archaeological, geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental remains.</p> <p>Following engagement with WSCC, advanced targeted archaeological trial trenching has been undertaken to better understand the potential and significance of archaeological remains (see <b>Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>palaeoenvironmental evidence is likely to be found in other contexts than those listed.”</i></p>	<p>Reference: 6.4.25.6) which may have been impacted by Rampion 2.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders. The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application.</p>
	<p>Scope of archaeological field surveys</p> <p><i>“It is the preferred option that archaeological field assessment(s) take place prior to final cable route optioneering and, for example, onshore substation siting. This is to ensure that the design process can fulfil the requirement to minimise harm to the historic environment and preserve any nationally important remains in situ.”</i></p>	<p>Additional survey work has been undertaken to better understand potential for archaeological remains, comprising geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching (see <b>Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) and <b>Appendix 25.7: Settings scoping appraisal, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7). Methodology for baseline data gather presented in <b>Section 25.5</b>.</p>
	<p>Mitigation</p>	<p>The assessment of effects on heritage assets through change to setting is presented in</p>



Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>“Where the view from military assets would be harmfully interrupted by the scheme, the applicant should consider, as mitigation, provision of interpretation materials that emphasise the sense that they were the last bastions against an imminent threat from across the uninterrupted waters. Any such interpretation materials might also usefully reflect on the changing ways in which the seascape has been used, from defence and transport to sustainability, and how people’s conceptualisation of the open space of the sea has altered as a result.”</i></p>	<p><b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11, Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) details the approach to identifying the heritage assets for inclusion in the assessment.</p> <p>Embedded environmental measure C-261 provides for an appropriate and proportional programme of public outreach (<b>Table 25-23</b>).</p>
	<p>Geoarchaeological assessment</p> <p><i>“...we recommended a staged approach, modelling the potential of the proposed development area. The first stage should be to create a preliminary deposit model using geology and topography mapping, historic/existing boreholes, archaeological records that record the deposit sequence, information from geotechnical work carried out for the scheme (monitored by a geoarchaeologist), LiDAR data and aerial photographs (historic and modern). The model should demonstrate the expected characteristics, potential and depth of deposits with archaeological interest along the route. This model should then be tested and refined through magnetometer survey, test pits and boreholes, and an appropriate amount of evaluation trenching. The results of the deposit model should be presented as a transect and/or ‘heat map’ showing areas of differing archaeological potential and character.”</i></p>	<p>The methodology for baseline data gathering and assessment are presented in <b>Sections 25.5 and 25.8</b>, which follows the approach recommended by Historic England. An onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report was prepared (<b>Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3). Where available, results of field surveys have been incorporated into the baseline and assessment.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>Consultation</p> <p><i>“We would expect to be consulted regarding the scope of further works, including an opportunity to comment on any WSIs for fieldwork. For reasons given above, we expect that as much as possible, all necessary fieldwork will be carried out pre-submission. However, if any fieldwork cannot be carried out until after submission, outline WSIs for that work should be supplied as supporting information with the application.”</i></p> <p><i>“Although non-designated archaeology lies outside the remit of our Inspectors, our Science Advisor should be consulted along with the archaeological advisors for West Sussex County Council and South Downs National Park Authority about the scope of proposed surveys and trial trenching.”</i></p>	<p>Further stakeholder engagement in response to this request is detailed in <b>Section 25.3</b>. An <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) for further work has been prepared separately to the ES.</p>
	<p>Assessment of effects</p> <p><i>“The final ES should report unmitigated and residual effects for every individual asset.”</i></p>	<p>The methodology for assessment is provided in <b>Section 25.8</b>.</p> <p>The assessment of effects is detailed in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p> <p>A summary of residual effects is provided in <b>Table 25-30</b>.</p>
<p><b>Horsham District Council (HDC)</b></p>	<p>Potential significant effects</p> <p><i>“Where it is identified potential significant effects may arise to settings of heritage assets, those assets are subject to a more</i></p>	<p>Detailed assessment of effects, including effects on the heritage assets listed by HDC, is presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
<b>MSDC</b>	<p><i>detailed assessment in the identification of potential effects, to include Listed Building Grade I Buncton Chapel of All Saints (List entry no. 1354113); archaeological heritage assets within the vicinity of Sullington Hill including the scheduled group of four Bronze Age bowl barrows at the Chantry Post (List entry no. 1015713); and Oakendene Manor and its landscaped parkland (Grade II listed, List entry no. 1027074)”</i></p> <p><i>“Setting of heritage assets and assessment of effects</i></p> <p><i>Although I would not disagree about the list of the assets affected, there appears to be no full consideration of the nature of the special interest of any of the assets, the contribution that setting, and in particular the proposed development site, makes to that interest, or the impact that the development will have on that setting.</i></p> <p><i>I would therefore recommend that a properly detailed assessment is carried out in line with the Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’.</i></p> <p><i>[...]it is my opinion that the impact through setting on the affected heritage assets is likely to be more severe in some cases than the relatively low levels of harm identified in most cases. The site currently has an open and rural character which would be fundamentally altered by the proposed development. To the extent to which the site contributes positively to the settings of each of the assets identified, the</i></p>	<p>Full details of the setting assessment are presented in <b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) and <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p> <p><b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) details the approach for scoping in heritage assets for the assessment of indirect effects.</p> <p>Further consultation in response to this request is detailed in <b>Section 25.3</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>proposal is therefore likely to detract from the contribution which setting makes to each asset's special interest[...]</i></p> <p><i>The Mid Sussex Conservation Officer will of course be pleased to work with and help RWE to find a resolution to these matters well in advance of the submission of the DCO application."</i></p>	
<b>South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)</b>	<p><i>"Built heritage</i></p> <p><i>In respect of non-designated heritage assets [...] We consider built heritage should also be included and further detail provided of how this will be identified."</i></p>	<p>Built heritage assets are identified as non-designated heritage receptors (see <b>Section 25.4</b>).</p>
	<p><i>"Mitigation and archives</i></p> <p><i>C79 of the Commitment Register - Paleo-environmental mitigation must be designed and led by a recognised specialist contractor with a strong, proven understanding and familiarity with the South Downs paleo-archaeological landscape and geology (inc. Sussex raised beaches).</i></p> <p><i>Investment should be made in the WSCC HER to adequately record and disseminate paleoenvironmental data, which may require a degree of upgrade to their current HER software. Would urge that early conversations are held with the WSCC HER Officer and County Archaeologist as to any upgrades, enhancements or additions that could be made to the HER in order to make paleo-environmental data recordable and publicly accessible on the County HER.</i></p>	<p>An <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) has been prepared separately to the ES and submitted with the DCO Application, which sets out the requirement for specialist input to the design of appropriate mitigation strategies, and that archaeological contractors undertaking the work should be suitably experienced and qualified. The WSI also sets out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2.</p> <p>Embedded environmental measure C-79 includes provision archaeological recording</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>Appropriate curation/deposition of the site archive - The impact of an infrastructure project of this size and scale on the relevant archaeological archive repositories (which will include The Novium, Brighton Museums etc.) is likely to be significant. Early conversation needed with the relevant archaeological archive repositories to confirm whether they have capacity to collect and if not, what measures might be taken to potentially put them in a position to collect. This might be investment in collecting infrastructure such as shelving or racking to store anticipated large amounts of material from such a major project; alternatively, it may be an agreement to cover costs at DeepStore for a specified period from deposition. However, assuming that there will be space to archive archaeological material is a mistake, and the mitigation / enhancement package could include investment in publicly funded / not for profit collecting repositories, which will also enable fulfilment of this stated measure.”</i></p>	<p>and dissemination, and for appropriate curation/deposition of the site archive (see <b>Table 25-23</b>).</p>
	<p>“Consultation [...] please also include SDNPA Conservation Officer.”</p>	<p>Request acknowledged. Details of further consultation with SDNPA, where relevant, is provided in <b>Section 25.3</b>.</p>
<p><b>West Sussex County Council (WSCC)</b></p>	<p>“Direct impacts on archaeological receptors  <i>The proposal for Rampion 2 has the potential to have a significant impact on archaeological assets across West Sussex which will need to be appropriately assessed within the ES for the DCO submission. The burying of the onshore cable route will result in a significant impact on below ground</i></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid direct impacts on designated heritage assets and limited the potential for indirect effects, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>archaeological deposits. Effects on below ground archaeological deposits will be permanent with archaeological deposits within the cable corridor requiring preservation by record (open area excavation). There needs to be early assessment of these deposits.</i></p> <p><i>Recommendations made at the early stages of consultation have been taken on board with the route with least known impact now being the preferred option.</i></p> <p><i>In reference to PEIR C-4 The presence of important archaeological deposits needs to be established at the design stage so that their preservation by directional drilling can be included. This is likely to require considerable trenched evaluation to understand the extent and importance of the below ground deposits present.</i></p> <p><i>In reference to PEIR C-9 There needs to be an understanding of the below ground archaeological deposits so the impact is understood.</i></p> <p><i>In reference to PEIR C-29 For the majority of the sub surface deposits apart from the buried beeches these excavations will still impact the archaeological deposits.</i></p> <p><i>In reference to PEIR C-79 WSCC would recommend a programme of trial trenching in advance of DCO application to determine the level of mitigation required and define the heritage impact of the project on below ground deposits.</i></p>	<p>Assessment of archaeological potential and significance supported by baseline presented in <b>Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) and summarised in <b>Section 25.6</b>.</p> <p>Further consultation in response to comments regarding scope of archaeological surveys is detailed in <b>Section 25.3</b>. An <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) for further work has been prepared separately to the ES.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>The direct impact of both the underground cabling and the substation will result in the destruction of archaeological deposits within the 36 kilometres by 50m corridor as well as the substation area and is identified as being an impact of high magnitude and cannot be mitigated. It is therefore important that RED undertake appropriate assessment of the whole route to inform the ES.</i></p>	
	<p><i>The completion of an appropriate evaluation would provide the detailed information to allow a full assessment of the impact of the development corridor for the ES.</i></p>	
	<p><i>It is recommended that once this baseline assessment has been produced, further meetings for heritage considerations are conducted to ensure that the scoping of heritage assets and evaluation techniques are agreed prior to further drafting of the ES.</i></p>	
	<p><i>Trial trenching is identified within the additional work proposed. However, there is little clarity on how this will be achieved or its extent. This should be undertaken to clarify the impact on the known buried heritage assets along the route and assess the blank areas for previously unrecorded archaeological deposits and assess their extent and significance.</i></p>	
	<p><i>There should be a programme of evaluation based on the results of the geo—archaeological desk-based work to ground truth the assessment and define the level of work that will be needed in advance of the onshore cable route being</i></p>	

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>constructed. This would include elements such as dry valleys being test pitted or trenched to assess their importance.</i></p>	
	<p><i>The use of HDD installation beneath Climping Beach is supported as this will minimise the impact on the archaeological deposits in this area.”</i></p>	
	<p><i>“Other PEIR Commitments (not referred to under specific theme)</i></p> <p><i>In reference to PEIR C-1 [...] will help preserve the setting of heritage however, it will have a significant impact on below ground deposits.</i></p> <p><i>In reference to PEIR C-61 – set out what these were. Including the mitigation methods for the substation. Ensure that the option analysis takes into account the embedded mitigation provided for Rampion 1. For instance, for any screening provided previously to limit impacts to HAs in the Bolney Road / Kent Street area may be affected. In reference to PEIR C-115 The reduction of the working width in woodlands could be used also to limit impact on archaeological sites.”</i></p>	<p>C-61 relates to the offshore development from the perspective of SLVIA (see <b>Table 25-23</b>).</p> <p>Embedded environmental measure C-225 provides for narrowing of the onshore cable corridor to minimise direct impacts to archaeological remains.</p>
	<p><i>“Historic hedgerows</i></p> <p><i>The loss of historic hedgerows could potentially be avoided by the use of drilling beneath these important landscape features. Although replanting can eventually restore these historic hedgerows this takes many years whereas drilling</i></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid and minimise impacts on heritage assets, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures including C-115, C-</p>



Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>preserves the features in situ thus reducing the impact on the historic landscape.”</i></p>	<p>196 and C-220 (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>.</p> <p>Historic environment considerations outlined in this ES chapter have informed the relevant strategy within the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP)</b> (Document Reference: 7.10), which are submitted with the DCO Application and Vegetation Retention Plans are included with the <b>Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan</b> (Document Reference: 8.87 [REP5-125]).</p>
	<p><i>“Significance of heritage assets</i></p> <p><i>It is unclear why a scheduled barrow cemetery is regarded as high significance whilst a non-designated barrow cemetery is regarded as medium. This should be assessed in advance of the ES to see if the barrow cemeteries should be considered to be of similar importance. Similarly, within KP13-15 the presence of material associated with a scheduled monument may potentially be of a similar significance to the Scheduled Area following assessment, so this should be regarded as low to high within this assessment.”</i></p>	<p>The methodology for assessing significance of heritage assets is presented in <b>Section 25.8</b>.</p>
	<p><i>“Oakendene Manor</i></p> <p><i>The proposed substation site close to Oakendene Manor would have a significant impact on the surviving historic</i></p>	<p>A historic landscape assessment of the historic parkland at Oakendene was undertaken in line with WSCC information consultation response, which is presented in</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>parkland. However, more detailed assessment needs to be undertaken to understand both site options.”</i></p>	<p><b>Appendix 25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5). This exercise has informed the design process and the assessment of effects in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p>
	<p><i>“Outreach</i></p> <p><i>The PEIR contains no information on any proposal for outreach or long-term opportunities for the promotion and management of the heritage resource which will be impacted by this scheme.”</i></p>	<p>Opportunities for outreach are included in the <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) for further work has been prepared separately to the ES.</p>
	<p><i>“Archives</i></p> <p><i>The undergrounding of the cable will result in significant archaeological archive and finds assemblage. The local plan policies include recommendations that whenever practicable, opportunities should be taken for the enhancement and interpretation of archaeological remains. This project along with Rampion 1 will provide a major resource of information on the geo-archaeological and Palaeo-environmental data for West Sussex and it would be beneficial to discuss the potential of this material with the WSCC HER to maximise its potential.”</i></p>	<p>Arrangements for archiving are included in the <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) for further work has been prepared separately to the ES.</p>
	<p><i>“Scoping of assets and assessment of indirect effects</i></p>	<p>The methodology for the spatial scope of the assessment was presented in Section 26.4 of the PEIR (RED, 2021) and within the second</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>[...] there is no methodology provided for the 2km buffer for the onshore substation. PINS had stated (ID 5.8.3, 5.8.4 The Planning Inspectorate, (2020). Scoping Opinion: Proposed Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm) that it should not be an arbitrary figure. WSCC raises concerns that the search buffer has not been fully considered.</i></p> <p><i>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and viewpoints (Chapter 19; Figure 19.3, Volume 3) does not clearly show that a 2km buffer for each substation option is appropriate. The ZTV should be overlaid with the designations map (SMs, LBs, CAs, NDHAs), this should then be used for targeted scoping rather than the arbitrary 2km.</i></p> <p><i>Methodology for scoping should include heritage assets identified and assessed as part of Rampion 1. Particularly as harm identified to those may be increased.</i></p> <p><i>Understanding any historical associations/historical development of sites should also be included within the principles and selection. This is particularly important for Oakendene Manor.</i></p> <p><i>Concern regarding the limited number of surveys. WSCC requests confirmation is given that further walkovers will take place, including reviewing the offshore impacts to heritage assets onshore.</i></p>	<p>ETG (see <b>Section 25.3</b>). This methodology is also provided in <b>Section 25.4</b>, and in <b>Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6) which sets out the setting scoping appraisal.</p> <p>Targeted scoping was undertaken, informed by ZTV, viewpoints and site visits. From this exercise a 2km study area was chosen. <b>Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6) details the approach to the selection of heritage assets in line with Historic England (2017a) Good Practice Advice 3. This was made available to consultees for comment ahead of the ES.</p> <p>Figures showing designated heritage assets overlaid onto the LVIA and SLVIA ZTVs are provided in <b>Figure 25.6, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25) and <b>Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8).</p> <p>The locally listed buildings data are only available as written lists. Their locations have been cross-checked to inform the baseline</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>It would be expected that these Conservation Areas would be assessed.</i></p> <p><i>Scoped assets are not reflective of the SLVIA ZTV (Chapter 16; Figures 16.14 – 16.15, Volume 3) or the assets noted in the heritage interest column of Table 16-11 Viewpoints included in Volume 2, Chapter 16 Seascape, landscape and visual.</i></p> <p><i>ZTV map with locally listed buildings overlaid should be provided to demonstrate that these assets can be scoped out.”</i></p>	<p>and assessment presented in <b>Sections 25.6</b> and <b>25.9</b> to <b>25.11</b>. However, they have not been represented spatially within the ES.</p> <p>Additional walkovers were undertaken, including visits to off-site heritage assets to inform the assessment presented in <b>Sections 25.9</b> to <b>25.11</b>. Details of site visits presented in <b>Section 25.5</b>.</p> <p>The baseline for assets assessed for indirect effects is presented in <b>Section 25.6</b> and <b>Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline information, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8).</p>
	<p><i>“There is considerable concern the offshore element will result in harm to a high number of heritage assets. [...] There should be consideration of the visual impact that this may have for heritage assets on the coast, and the potential for visual impact, and any cumulative impacts with the turbines.”</i></p>	<p>Effects on onshore heritage assets arising from offshore and onshore development has been undertaken in <b>Section 25.9</b> to <b>25.11</b>, <b>Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6) sets out the setting scoping appraisal.</p>

- 25.3.25 Following feedback to the first Statutory Consultation Exercise in 2021 and after further analysis, it was identified that some coastal residents did not receive consultation leaflets as intended. Therefore, the first Statutory Consultation was reopened between 7 February 2022 to 11 April 2022 for a further nine weeks. No feedback or comments were received from the reopened first Statutory Consultation in relation to historic environment.

#### Second Statutory Consultation Exercise – October to November 2022

- 25.3.26 The second Statutory Consultation Exercise was undertaken from 18 October 2022 to 29 November 2022. This was a targeted consultation which focused on updates to the onshore cable route proposals which were being considered following feedback from consultation and further engineering and environmental works. As part of this second Statutory Consultation Exercise, RED sought feedback on the potential changes to the onshore cable route proposals to inform the onshore design taken forward to the application for development consent.
- 25.3.27 **Table 25-7** provides a summary of the key themes of the feedback received in the second Statutory Consultation Exercise in 2022 relation to historic environment and outlines how the feedback has been considered in this ES chapter. A full list of all comments received during the second Statutory Consultation Exercise in 2022 and the responses to those comments are provided in the [Consultation Report](#) (Document Reference: 5.1).

Page intentionally blank

**Table 25-7 Second statutory consultation exercise (October – November 2022) feedback**

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
<b>Historic England</b>	<p data-bbox="450 421 1059 453">Comparison of onshore cable route options</p> <p data-bbox="450 496 1227 600"><i>“...there is not sufficient baseline information to identify which option would be least harmful to archaeological remains.</i></p> <p data-bbox="450 643 680 675"><i>This is because:</i></p> <ul data-bbox="450 679 1245 1082" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="450 679 1245 895"><i>- the PEIR SIR Appendix K (Historic Environment) clearly outlines that there is a high potential for archaeological remains to be present across each of the Longer Alternative Cable Routes assessed. This is comparable to the potential of the existing PEIR route; and</i></li> <li data-bbox="450 900 1245 1082"><i>- there is no field evaluation work to support the desk-based assessment for the proposed amendments. Therefore, the actual presence, extent and condition of the potential archaeological remains are currently unknown.</i></li> </ul> <p data-bbox="450 1139 479 1155">...</p> <p data-bbox="450 1198 1263 1417"><i>Further field evaluation would be required for the proposed modifications in order to confidently advance route selection. In its absence it is not possible to rule out the presence of archaeological features of high significance within the LACRs (or the proposed modified and alternative routes) with any degree of confidence.”</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1294 421 2072 603">The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid, or minimise, historic environment impacts, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>.</p> <p data-bbox="1294 643 2072 825">The design process was informed by available historic environment information as detailed in the PEIR (RED, 2021), PEIR SIR (RED, 2022) and PEIR FSIR (RED, 2023), together with geophysical survey results, where available.</p> <p data-bbox="1294 865 2072 970">The approach to identifying heritage assets that may be subject to effects is set out in <b>Sections 25.4</b> and <b>25.5</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>“A number of ACR [Alternative Cable Routes] have been proposed in order to avoid areas of the original route where archaeological remains have been identified by geophysical survey.</i></p> <p><i>In principle, Historic England support re-routing the cables to avoid impacts on heritage assets. However, because the ACR locations have not been subject to the same field assessments, we cannot be certain of the presence, extent and condition of archaeological remains within the ACRs themselves. Therefore, we cannot accurately assess if the proposed modifications would then be less, more, or equally as harmful.</i></p> <p><i>Route alterations should not be fixed until field investigations have been conducted for both original and alternative route options.”</i></p>	
	<p>Impact to archaeological and geoarchaeological remains:</p> <p><i>“... we consider the following points to be relevant at this stage:</i></p> <p><i>1) Overall new land take</i></p> <p><i>Based on the results of the desk-based assessment, there is a broadly similar high potential for archaeological remains to be present throughout the study area.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed amendments, particularly the two LACR, would increase the new land take of the proposal. It is therefore more likely that non-designated archaeological</i></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid, or minimise, impacts on archaeological remains, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The approach to identifying heritage assets that may be subject to effects is set out in <b>Sections 25.4</b> and <b>25.5</b>.</p> <p>An <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion</p>



Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>remains would be encountered during the works, some of which may be of national significance.</i></p> <p><i>Although not a direct correlation, generally speaking the higher level of ground impact could equate to a higher level of harm to archaeological remains. This does not include areas where re-routing has been proposed which is informed by field assessment techniques such as geophysical survey, geoarchaeological survey and trial trenching.”</i></p> <p><i>“We recognise the logistical difficulties associated with accessing land for undertaking field assessment. However, the desk-based information as it stands does not provide sufficient granularity in the data to fully weigh the potential harm and benefits of the proposed route options. This is a concern because of the high potential for geoarchaeological deposits and archaeological remains to be present which may be of national significance.</i></p> <p><i>The geophysical survey of the existing route design has shown the benefits of undertaking field evaluation at an early stage as it has allowed for alternative routes to be proposed which would avoid sensitive locations. Geophysical survey, further geoarchaeological assessment and trial trenching should be undertaken for proposed alternative routes in order to establish a design which minimises harm and de-risks the project moving forward.</i></p>	<p>2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders. The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application.</p> <p>The onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report (<b>Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironment assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3)) has been updated in line with the proposed DCO Order Limits and Historic England comments received 23 September 2022.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>If extensive evaluation work is not possible, it must be set out within the Environmental Statement how the project would mitigate for retention in situ of unexpected archaeological remains of national significance.”</i></p> <p><i>“...the geoarchaeological desk-based assessment and the deposit model it presents should be updated to include the area of the proposed new routes. Further to our comments on the geoarchaeological assessment (Chris Pater, 23rd September 2022) the updates should include Holocene alluvial and colluvial deposits, as well as the potential for waterlogged remains. There may not be many historic boreholes from the area of the proposed route alterations therefore, information from any geotechnical work being done for the scheme should also be included (and this work monitored by a geoarchaeologist).</i></p> <p><i>The preliminary deposit model (as well as aerial photos and Lidar) should identify areas where archaeology could lie at shallow depth and magnetometer survey would be useful.</i></p> <p><i>The deposit model would also highlight areas where archaeology could lie at depth within the natural deposit sequence and test pits and/or boreholes would be needed to understand archaeological potential. Based on the above results a less extensive and more targeted</i></p>	

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>programme of evaluation trenching could be designed for any remaining route options”</i></p>	
	<p>Accesses and scheduled monuments</p> <p><i>“Any deviation from existing trackways should be avoided within or adjacent to scheduled monuments and any other areas of archaeological sensitivity which may be identified. If this is not possible, the potential for harm would need to be more accurately assessed. At a minimum, additional survey work would likely be required to demonstrate that these works would not result in harm to the archaeological remains and to inform micro-siting of any widening works.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore we consider commitment C-13 on its own to be insufficient to mitigate the potential impacts on scheduled monuments and other areas of similar archaeological sensitivity.”</i></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid, or minimise, impacts on archaeological remains, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The approach to identifying heritage assets that may be subject to effects is set out in <b>Sections 25.4</b> and <b>25.5</b>.</p> <p>Access A-27, which lies adjacent to a scheduled monument (1015880), has subsequently been changed from a construction and operational access to an operational access only, requiring no upgrade works to the existing trackway.</p> <p>Access AA-22/23, as defined in the PEIR SIR (RED, 2022) and which crossed a scheduled monument, has been removed from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Embedded environmental measure C-13, as described in the consultation documents, was subsequently removed and replaced with a measure specifically relating to surface treatments for construction traffic (see <b>Commitments Register</b> (Document Reference: 7.22 and <b>[REP5-086]</b>).</p> <p>The assessment in <b>Section 25.9</b> demonstrates that the Proposed Development will not directly impact scheduled archaeological remains.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>Setting</p> <p><i>“The onshore elements of the Proposed Development have the potential to change the setting of numerous designated heritage assets, which may impact their heritage significance.</i></p> <p><i>The summary table in Appendix K3 is useful. However due to the lack of baseline assessment for designated heritage assets, the likely changes to significance which may arise from the various proposals, and thus which route option may be least harmful, cannot be fully assessed.”</i></p>	<p>Full details of the setting assessment are presented in <b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) and <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>. Baseline information on the assets which have been assessed is provided in <b>Section 25.6</b>.</p>
<b>Horsham District Council</b>	<p>Historic environment baseline and effects relating to LACR-01c:</p> <p><i>“Within LACR-01c, there are features relating to a relic field system, comprising archaeological remains dating to the prehistoric, Roman and medieval periods, further indicating the potential for unknown remains of potentially high heritage significance at this location.</i></p> <p><i>It is noted LACR-01c introduces new designated heritage assets not previously identified within the baseline. There is potential for a very low to low magnitude of change to receptors of high heritage significance, resulting in minor to moderate adverse effects. Minor adverse effects will be Not Significant and moderate adverse effects could potentially be Significant.”</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development does not include the whole of LACR-01c, as presented in the PEIR SIR (RED, 2022). The Historic Environment baseline for the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits (which includes part of the accesses and a short section of the onshore cable corridor at the west end of LACR-01c) is provided in <b>Section 25.6</b> and <b>Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2). The assessment of effects is presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>Historic environment baseline and effects relating to ACR-06:</p> <p><i>“It is noted the magnitude of impact by of 3 heritage assets will change. This change is largely resulting from the close proximity of these assets to ACR-06, which is considered likely to increase the perceptibility of construction activities affecting the setting of these designated heritage assets: Horsebridge House; Blakes Farmhouse (1353943); and Bergen-op-Zoom Cottage. However, taking into consideration the following points and implementation of embedded environmental measures, the assessment of residual effects on these designated heritage assets will be not significant.”</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development includes land within ACR-06, as presented in the PEIR SIR (RED 2022).</p> <p>The assets referred to by Horsham District Council are scoped into the assessment in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p>
<b>West Sussex County Council</b>	<p>Historic environment baseline and effects relating to LACRs:</p> <p>LACR-01a</p> <p><i>“LACR-01a and associated accesses passes in close proximity to a number of designated assets... This includes a potential Major Adverse effect (Significant in EIA terms) identified for GII listed The Old Cottage 1027714) during construction phase.”</i></p> <p><i>“LACR-01a has the potential to intersect with heritage assets of national significance, and to result in significant adverse effects to the historic environment.”</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development includes a refined version of LACR-01a to that presented in the PEIR SIR (RED, 2022).</p> <p>The assessment of effects on heritage assets is presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b>.</p> <p>The Proposed Development does not include LACR-01b, as presented in the PEIR SIR (RED, 2022).</p> <p>Access AA-22/23, as presented in the PEIR SIR (RED, 2022) and which crossed a scheduled monument, has been removed from the Proposed Development.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>“LACR-01a has the potential to intersect with heritage assets of national significance, and to result in significant adverse effects to the historic environment.”</p>	<p>The Proposed Development assessed in the ES does not include the whole of LACR-01c, as presented in the PEIR SIR (RED 2022). The historic environment baseline for the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits (which includes part of the accesses and a short section of onshore cable corridor at the west end of LACR-01c) is provided in <b>Section 25.6</b> and <b>Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2).</p>
	<p>LACR-01b</p> <p><i>“An Archaeological Notification Area (ANA) intersects with the route, relating to multi-period archaeological activity on Harrow Hill. This indicates a potential for archaeological features of potentially high heritage significance to be present within LACR-01b.”</i></p> <p><i>“Access AA-22/23 is cause for concern as it crosses a Scheduled Monument (List Entry 1017446: Itford Hill style settlement and an Anglo-Saxon barrow field at New Barn Down). As above, the proposed creation of laybys/passing places is cause for concern; these would inevitably be within the Scheduled Monument and therefore there is the potential for significant effects to the historic environment.”</i></p>	
	<p>LACR-01c</p> <p>“LACR-01c has the potential to intersect with heritage assets of national significance, and to result in significant adverse effects to the historic environment.”</p>	<p>The Proposed Development does not include LACR-02, as presented in the PEIR SIR (RED, 2022), nor does it include the section of PEIR Assessment Boundary presented in the original PEIR (RED, 2021) which crossed Warningcamp Hill intersecting with the geophysical anomalies indication archaeological remains of possible medium to high heritage significance.</p>
	<p>LACR-02</p>	

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>“This route runs south of Warningcamp Hill, and as a result would avoid the cable route intersecting with the complex of geophysical anomalies which lie within the PEIR assessment boundary on Warningcamp Hill. These have been identified as probable archaeological features likely relating to the two ANAs that cover this area identified, of potentially medium to high significance. This change is welcomed, as this would avoid harm to archaeological heritage assets of potentially high significance. However, LACR-02 runs through another of which may contain features of equal or higher significance to the PEIR boundary.”</i></p> <p><i>“LACR-02 intersects with areas of woodland characterised in the HLC as Ancient Semi-natural and Replanted Ancient Semi-Natural and also includes three areas identified for compensation woodland planting areas.”</i></p>	
	<p>Historic environment baseline and effects relating to Alternative Cable Routes ACR-01</p> <p><i>“ACR-01 (located approximately 270m to the north-west of Littlehampton, starting adjacent to the original PEIR Assessment Boundary south of the railway) - This alternative route is suggested in order to avoid anomalies identified on the geophysical survey as being of potentially high significance. The consideration of alternative route options in order to minimise harm to these heritage assets is welcomed. However, it must be</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development does not include ACR-01, as presented in the PEIR SIR (RED, 2022).</p> <p>Geophysical survey of ACR-01 was not possible in advance of onshore cable route selection due to land access restrictions.</p> <p>Advanced archaeological trial trenching was undertaken at Brook Barn Farm to target the geophysical anomalies of interest. Results are provided in <a href="#">Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial</a></p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>highlighted that the route should not be altered/fixed on the basis of avoiding heritage assets, until the new proposed area has been subject to, at a bare minimum, geophysical survey, in order to avoid a repeat of the same issue down the line.”</i></p>	<p><b>trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6) and incorporated into the baseline and assessment presented in <b>Section 25.6</b>.</p>
	<p>Historic environment baseline and effects relating to accesses</p> <p><i>“Concern is raised over the potential for significant effects to designated heritage assets and associated belowground archaeology arising from a number of the new proposed accesses. Whilst in many cases these proposed accesses will be along an existing farm or estate track, the proposed creation of laybys/passing places may result in harm to scheduled monuments and/or associated heritage assets.”</i></p> <p><i>“AA-31 passes directly adjacent to two scheduled monuments (, Deserted medieval settlement at Upper Barpham Farm (1015882) and Cross dyke on Barpham Hill (1015715)) and two grade II listed buildings at Upper Barpham Farm (1353838 and 1232897). LACR-02 is located in close proximity to GII listed 1222537.”</i></p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been an iterative process that has sought to avoid, or minimise, impacts on archaeological remains, wherever possible. Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>. The approach to identifying heritage assets that may be subject to effects is set out in <b>Sections 25.4</b> and <b>25.5</b>.</p> <p>Since the publication of the PEIR FSIR (RED, 2023a), access A-27, which lies adjacent to a scheduled monument (1015880), has subsequently been changed from a temporary construction and operational access to an operational access only, requiring no upgrade works to the existing trackway.</p> <p>Access AA-22/23 and AA-31, as presented in the PEIR SIR (RED, 2022) and which crossed a scheduled monument, have been removed from the design of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Embedded environmental measure C-225 provides for narrowing of the onshore cable corridor to minimise direct impacts to archaeological remains (<b>Table 25-23</b>).</p>



Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>Assessment methodology</p> <p><i>“There are also concerns over the inclusion of embedded mitigation in calculations of magnitude of effect on receptors in the absence of further surveys/assessment to confirm suitability of the proposed measures and to inform assessments.”</i></p> <p><i>“The Appendix K targeted assessment for LACR-01 and LACR-02 is welcomed and the LACRs are identified as most likely to result in a greater cumulative magnitude of effect on the historic environment due to their length. Overall, this document constitutes a proportionate, robust and well-structured assessment of the additional historic environment effects which may arise from the two LACRs.”</i></p> <p><i>“...the assertion that C-79 measures (implementation of an approved programme of archaeological mitigation) will be sufficient to limit the magnitude and overall effect on archaeological assets to low to medium adverse, i.e. Not Significant in EIA terms, is not evidenced. Especially as the significance of any such features present within the various route options is not yet known.”</i></p>	<p>The methodology for baseline data gathering and assessment are presented in <b>Sections 25.5</b> and <b>25.8</b>.</p> <p>Additional survey work has been undertaken to better understand potential for archaeological remains, comprising geophysical survey and targeted archaeological trial trenching (see <b>Appendices 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) and <b>25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5)). Where there are limitations in the availability of survey data and other baseline information to support the assessment of potential and significance of archaeological remains, a reasonable worst-case has been assumed in the assessment.</p> <p>Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>, which have been adopted to reduce the potential for effects on historic environment receptors. In line with these embedded environmental measures, an <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders is submitted with the DCO Application. The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) refers to the need for “site-specific WSIs” to set out</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>Setting</p> <p><i>“WSCC would like to see a preliminary targeted baseline settings assessment of those designated heritage assets scoped in for further assessment as the potential for substantial harm to the significance of some of these assets cannot currently be ruled out.”</i></p> <p><i>“...the impacts of construction traffic upon nearby designated assets, both physical and arising from change within settings, will need to be robustly assessed.”</i></p> <p><i>“The scoping table included within Appendix K ensures that the shortlist of heritage assets scoped in for further assessment is clear and consistent, and the change from PEIR stage is clear. The comment on likely magnitude of change and significance of effect is useful. However, the opportunity has been missed to make the scoping process fully transparent, as initial stages are missing. The process by which Stage 1 of the GPA3 methodology has been carried out is currently unclear. Was this scoping exercise carried out purely on the basis of the LVIA ZTV, or were results of walkover surveys incorporated into the process?”</i></p>	<p>proposals for evaluation and mitigation stages for each area of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, which are to be agreed to relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Baseline information for historic environment assets scoped into the assessment of effects resulting from change to setting is presented in <b>Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4). The assessment is presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.12</b>, which takes into consideration effects relating to construction traffic.</p> <p>Accidental damage is not assessed within this Chapter as it is not a planned activity. Measures to avoid accidental damage are intrinsic to the measures provided in the <b>Outline CoCP</b> (Document Reference: 7.2).</p> <p>Targeted scoping was undertaken, informed by ZTV, viewpoints and site visits. Full details of the setting assessment are presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.11</b> and <b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7). Baseline information on the assets which have been assessed is provided in <b>Section 25.6</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>Impacts to archaeological and geoarchaeological remains, and field surveys</p> <p><i>“In the absence of geophysical survey results at a minimum, it is not possible to exclude the presence of archaeological features of high significance within the LACRs with any degree of confidence. The need for additional survey work does not just apply to the two LACRS; given the scale of many of the ACRs and MCRs, there is also the need for additional survey work for these route options.”</i></p> <p><i>“...trenched evaluation is required to understand the extent and significance of below ground archaeological features present. The lack of intrusive investigations to date within the PEIR boundary is highly concerning... Archaeological potential and significance must be assessed through trial trench evaluation prior to fixing any proposed route changes.”</i></p> <p><i>“The lack of additional detailed geoarchaeological assessment work for the PEIR SIR is also cause for concern, given the potential for significant geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental deposits, especially on the coastal plain/Zone 1.”</i></p> <p><i>“The removal/loss of any such high significance features, as well as the cumulative effect of other archaeological features of lesser (low to medium significance), is likely to</i></p>	<p>Survey work has been undertaken to better understand potential for archaeological remains, comprising geophysical survey and targeted archaeological trial trenching (see <b>Appendices 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) and <b>25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5)). Survey results, where available, together with all other historic environment evidence as described in <b>Section 25.5</b>, have fed into the design of the Proposed Development and the assessment of archaeological potential and significance.</p> <p>The onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report (<b>Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3)) has been updated in line with the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>Assessment of effects on archaeological remains is assessment in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.12</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>result in a significant adverse effect on the historic environment.”</i></p>	
	<p>Viewpoints</p> <p><i>“Historic environment receptors should be actively incorporated from the start when selecting additional viewpoints for the LACRs and route options. WSCC should be consulted on viewpoint locations to ensure heritage assets likely to be sensitive receptors for the new routes are adequately represented within viewpoints.”</i></p>	<p>LVIA engagement has been undertaken to determine relevant viewpoints.</p>

Page intentionally blank

### Third Statutory Consultation exercise – February to March 2023

- 25.3.28 The third Statutory Consultation exercise was undertaken from 24 February 2023 to 27 March 2023. This was a targeted consultation which focused on a further single onshore cable route alternative being considered following feedback from consultation and further engineering and environmental works. As part of this third Statutory Consultation exercise, RED sought feedback on the potential changes to the onshore cable route proposals to inform the onshore design taken forward to the application for development consent.
- 25.3.29 **Table 25-8** provides a summary of the key themes of the feedback received in the second Statutory Consultation exercise in 2023 relation to historic environment and outlines how the feedback has been considered in this ES chapter. A full list of all comments received during the third Statutory Consultation exercise in 2023 and the responses to those comments are provided in the **Consultation Report** (Document Reference: 5.1).

Page intentionally blank

**Table 25-8 Third statutory consultation exercise (February - March 2023) feedback**

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
<b>Historic England</b>	<p>Archaeological potential and significance</p> <p><i>"...there is not sufficient baseline information to fully understand the significance of any heritage assets which might be present within the route corridor for LACR-01d."</i></p> <p><i>"...the proposed LACR-01d corridor is a significant archaeological landscape for the prehistoric period. Based on our current understanding of the historic environment, we think that the amendment cannot currently be justified over the previous options."</i></p> <p><i>"The rich archaeology likely to be present within the LACR-01d area is attested by the high incidence of scheduled sites adjacent to the proposed route. It lies between two Neolithic flint mines and adjacent to Bronze Age settlements and mortuary sites as well as an Anglo Saxon burial ground."</i></p> <p><i>"Most of LACR-01d lies within 'red alert' Archaeological Notification Areas (ANA), based to a large extent on proximity to nearby scheduled sites. There is a high potential for archaeological remains contemporary with, and of likely equivalent significance to, those of the scheduled sites to be present within these ANA."</i></p>	<p>The Proposed Development includes an onshore cable route corridor along LACR-01d, as presented in the PEIR FSIR (RED, 2023).</p> <p>The methodology for the assessment of archaeological potential and significance is described in <b>Section 25.6, paragraph 25.6.37</b> and <b>Section 25.7</b>.</p> <p>The historic environment baseline presented in <b>Section 25.6</b> and <b>Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) includes details on available archaeological and geoarchaeological evidence pertaining to the onshore cable route corridor which traverses along LACR-01d, which identifies archaeological potential and significance as described by Historic England (as listed in <b>Table 25-4</b>).</p>



Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>“Without field investigation, based on the information currently available, it should be assumed that the risk of encountering highly significant archaeology is very likely.”</i></p> <p><i>“...the route follows / crosses several dry valleys, infilled with potentially deep colluvial deposits that might conceal archaeological remains and ecological evidence associated with the significant and nationally important prehistoric activity known from the area.”</i></p> <p><i>“The Boundaries of scheduled sites rarely mark the exact limits of the area of interest. Therefore, it is likely that non-scheduled remains associated with and probably of equivalent national importance to those within the scheduled areas exist in areas crossed by LACR-01d.”</i></p> <p><i>“The area crossed by LACR-01d has significance as an archaeological landscape. Table G1-1 suggests that some of the archaeological remains in the area are contemporary. It is also likely that as-yet unknown and non-designated archaeology contemporary with the scheduled sites exists beyond the boundaries of the scheduled remains. These remains are likely to relate to Neolithic flint mining; Bronze Age settlement and burial activity; Iron Age and Romano-British settlement and associated activity; as well as Saxon burial sites and medieval settlement. Therefore, any archaeological remains surviving in this area have considerable group value and the majority of the area crossed by LACR-01d (that within the SDNPA Archaeological Notification Areas)</i></p>	

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>should be considered in an equivalent way to a scheduled site.”</i></p> <p>Assessment</p> <p><i>“In the absence of detailed baseline data (such as significance, distribution and extent of features) at this stage in the assessment process a high magnitude of effect should be assumed for known and potential buried archaeological features present within the route corridor.”</i></p> <p><i>“...we disagree with the conclusion that implementing embedded environmental measures would effectively limit the magnitude and overall effect on archaeological assets to an ‘acceptable level’ of low to medium adverse, which would be not significant in EIA terms.”</i></p>	<p>Geophysical survey has been undertaken to better understand potential for archaeological remains (see <a href="#">Appendix 25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5)). Survey results, where available, together with all other historic environment evidence as described in <b>Section 25.5</b>, have been considered in the design of the Proposed Development and the assessment of archaeological potential and significance.</p> <p>Where there are limitations in the availability of survey data and other baseline information to support the assessment of potential and significance of archaeological remains, a reasonable worst-case is assumed in the assessment.</p> <p>The implementation of embedded environmental measures has been considered in the assessment of historic environment effects in <b>Section 25.9</b>.</p>
	<p>Evaluation</p> <p><i>“...any proposed development impacts in this area would require the most detailed and meticulous levels of evaluation and mitigation (prior to and following DCO</i></p>	<p>An <a href="#">Outline Onshore WSI</a> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>submission) to make sure that archaeologically important evidence is not lost.”</i></p> <p><i>“...standard evaluation techniques across the LACR-01d area might not be adequate and evaluation surveys will therefore need to include other types of geophysics, borehole surveys, fieldwalking, ploughsoil gridding, sampling and sieving for finds recovery, and deep, shored excavation test pits and trenches. without the baseline evidence these surveys would provide, we cannot be confident that embedded measures C6 (avoidance) or C79 (recording, dissemination and archiving) will be appropriate to mitigate archaeological impacts.”</i></p>	<p>with relevant stakeholders. This includes the application of non-standard evaluation techniques within the part of the proposed DCO Order Limits which falls within LACR-01d.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application.</p> <p>A site-specific WSI will be required for appropriate and proportional archaeological evaluation works to be undertaken, which will be agreed in advance with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>In the absence of baseline evidence from recommended evaluation techniques, a worst-case scenario has been considered in the assessment of historic environment effects presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.12</b>, specifically for the part of the proposed DCO Order Limits which falls within LACR-01d.</p>
	<p>Mitigation</p> <p><i>“It is also not possible to assess if mitigation through design could be effective.”</i></p> <p><i>“Given the nature of the archaeological remains we know to be present within the vicinity of this route option, and in the absence of detailed baseline survey data for LACR-01d, it is not possible to state that ‘avoidance of areas of sensitivity’ will be feasible.”</i></p>	<p>Embedded environmental measures (<b>Table 25-23</b>) are presented in <b>Section 25.7</b>, which have been adopted to reduce the potential for historic environment effects. In line with these embedded environmental measures, an <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
SDNPA	<p data-bbox="439 352 1272 603"><i>“...C-79 (recording, dissemination and archiving) is likely to require full excavation of the development footprint. This would need to be of the highest standard, given the potentially national importance of the archaeological evidence. Therefore, archaeological mitigation is likely to be expensive and to require a significant amount of time allocated within the construction programme.”</i></p> <p data-bbox="439 676 1272 703">Archaeological potential and significance</p> <p data-bbox="439 751 1272 1038"><i>“The proposed route along LACR-01d may be slightly shorter in length (compared to LACR-01c), but given this high significance, presents the possibility of a prolonged construction timetable to ensure the appropriate due diligence to archaeology that sits so closely to Scheduled Monuments. Further to this, further detailed investigation is likely to be required before final route selection i.e. before construction work commences.”</i></p> <p data-bbox="439 1086 1272 1410"><i>“Blackpatch and Harrow Hills sit on high points either side of the valley containing the proposed route corridor. Given both sites are of a prehistoric industrial nature, it is probable that the valley contains significant potential for settlement evidence from the early prehistoric (and therefore may represent some of the earliest evidence for Neolithic settlement in Britain). The landforms themselves suggest significant sediment build ups within the dry valley between both sites, with potential evidence for Neolithic</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1301 316 2056 639">stakeholders. The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application. The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) refers to the need for “site-specific WSIs” to set out proposals for evaluation and mitigation stages for each area of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, which are to be agreed to relevant stakeholders to ensure suitability and effectiveness.</p> <p data-bbox="1301 676 2056 783">The Proposed Development includes an onshore cable route along LACR-01d, as presented in the PEIR FSIR (RED, 2023).</p> <p data-bbox="1301 826 2056 959">The methodology for the assessment of archaeological potential and significance is described in <b>Section 25.6, paragraph 25.6.39</b> and <b>Section 25.7</b>.</p> <p data-bbox="1301 1007 2056 1278">The historic environment baseline presented in <b>Section 25.6</b> and <b>Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) includes details on available archaeological and geoarchaeological evidence pertaining to the onshore cable route which traverses along LACR-01d.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>and other periods lying deep in the valley profiles. This means that geophysical data is unlikely to provide a sufficiently detailed evidence base on which to base decisions relating to route options.”</i></p> <p><i>“It would appear highly unlikely that the route could be achieved without substantial permanent destruction of the historic environment.”</i></p> <p>SDNPA provided historic environment baseline information from Neolithic to Roman periods (courtesy of the Sussex Archaeological Society).</p>	
<b>WSSC</b>	<p>Archaeological potential and significance</p> <p><i>“...the level of baseline assessment undertaken is insufficient to fully understand the significance of any heritage assets that might be present within the route corridor for LACR-01d. Therefore, the effect on the historic environment cannot be accurately assessed nor statements relating to the feasibility of mitigation by design substantiated.”</i></p> <p><i>“...WSSC raises serious concerns about the risk of harm to nationally significant archaeology, which would constitute a major adverse effect (significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms) on the historic environment.”</i></p>	<p>The methodology for the assessment of archaeological potential and significance is described in <b>Section 25.6, paragraph 25.6.39</b> and <b>Section 25.7</b>.</p> <p>The onshore historic environment baseline is summarised in <b>Section 25.6</b>. A detailed desk study is provided in <b>Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2), the geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report in <b>Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3), and survey report provided in <b>Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
		<p>(Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) All of which have informed the assessment of potential and significance of archaeological, geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental remains presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.12.</b></p> <p>The potential for nationally significant archaeological remains has been identified within part of the proposed DCO Order Limits which include an onshore cable route along LACR-01d.</p>
	<p>Evaluation</p> <p><i>“In order to attempt to advance understanding of the significance of the archaeology potentially present within LACR-01d, an extensive suite of specialist field surveys would, at a minimum, be required.”</i></p> <p><i>“Standard evaluation techniques, for example, geophysical survey followed by trial trench evaluation, are likely to be fairly effective at picking up many of the more commonly encountered feature types that the PEIR FSIR has identified as being potentially present within LACR-01d.”</i></p> <p><i>“However, certain feature types would not be detectable by means of standard evaluation techniques.”</i></p> <p><i>“Depending upon the exact route chosen, constraints posed by the topography of LACR-01d mean that standard</i></p>	<p>An <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders. This includes the application of non-standard evaluation techniques within the part of the proposed DCO Order Limits which falls within LACR-01d.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application.</p> <p>A site-specific WSI will be required for appropriate and proportional archaeological evaluation works to be undertaken, which will be agreed in advance with relevant stakeholders.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>fieldwork methods may be impractical and more time-consuming and costly than usual.</i></p>	
	<p><i>“Evaluation of LACR-01d must include provision for the presence of deeply stratified colluvial deposits and the associated potential for earlier archaeological features and deposits. Borehole and/or auger survey might also be required.”</i></p>	
	<p><i>“The above factors would make it highly challenging to successfully evaluate the archaeological potential of LACR-01d and may mean that even following evaluation, there is a chance that LACR-01d would not be archaeologically de-risked to a high degree of confidence.”</i></p>	
	<p><i>“This would require considerable additional survey work to be undertaken prior to the route being fixed for DCO. This should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Further baseline assessment work on significance;</i></li> <li><i>• Geophysical survey;</i></li> <li><i>• Trial trench evaluation;</i></li> <li><i>• Specialist assessment of paleoenvironmental potential and, if appropriate, targeted environmental sampling of dry valley;</i></li> <li><i>• Test pit evaluation; and</i></li> <li><i>• Proposed mitigation strategy for accurately evaluating and assessing significance for the nationally significant prehistoric landscape that LACR01d crosses, factoring in the unique constraints posed by topography and likely feature types.</i></li> </ul>	

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>Surveys should include coverage of the entire LACR-01d corridor to ensure that the baseline evidence can support cable route changes if required.</i></p>	<p>Embedded environmental measure C-79 provides for archaeological mitigation which will entail an agreed programme of archaeological recording, as well as appropriate curation/deposition of the site archive.</p>
	<p>Mitigation</p> <p><i>“In the event that archaeology of high significance associated with the known prehistoric industrial landscape is identified, full and comprehensive mitigation to the highest standard would be required. It is worth noting that, based on previous investigations of such features, researching any prehistoric mine would be problematic and time-consuming and likely to result in the recovery of extremely large volumes of archaeological finds. It has been suggested that a single mineshaft can produce upwards of 150,000 artefacts (Baczkowski 2020).”</i></p>	<p>An <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders. The WSI also details the requirement for the design and implementation of mitigation strategies to be undertaken by suitable qualified and experience archaeologist and specialists.</p>
	<p>Setting</p> <p><i>“Identified effects on designated heritage assets arising via a change in setting, are a cause for concern, despite being temporary in duration.”</i></p> <p><i>“Further settings assessment work is required to refine assessments of significance of the affected assets and of the impacts of the proposals upon that significance.”</i></p>	<p>Baseline information for assets scoped into the assessment of effects resulting from change to setting is presented in <b>Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8). The assessment is presented in <b>Sections 25.9 to 25.12</b>.</p>



Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>Assessment of effects</p> <p><i>“WSPCC do not concur with the summary of direct effects on heritage assets for LACR-01d and associated AAs (para. 2.2.84). In particular, the assessment that a low to medium magnitude of change is most likely. In the absence of detailed baseline data at this stage in the assessment process (such as significance, distribution and extent of features), a high magnitude of effect should be assumed for known and potential buried archaeological features present within the route corridor.”</i></p> <p><i>“Substantial harm to heritage assets of national significance cannot be ruled out for LACR-01d on the basis of the available evidence.”</i></p> <p><i>“WSPCC do not support the assertion that this harm can be mitigated to an acceptable degree via standard industry mitigation practises, and certainly not by reliance on design or route micro-siting.”</i></p>	<p>Geophysical survey has been undertaken to better understand potential for archaeological remains (see <a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Survey results, where available, together with all other historic environment evidence as described in <b>Section 25.5</b>, have been considered in the design of the Proposed Development and the assessment of archaeological potential and significance.</p> <p>Where there are limitations in the availability of survey data and other baseline information to support the assessment of potential and significance of archaeological remains, a reasonable worst-case has been assumed in the assessment.</p> <p>The implementation of embedded environmental measures is considered in the assessment of historic environment effects.</p> <p>An <a href="#">Outline Onshore WSI</a> (Document Reference: 7.9) setting out the requirements for further archaeological investigation work in response to impacts of Rampion 2 has been prepared separately to the ES, informed by the results of surveys and ongoing consultation with relevant stakeholders. This includes the application of non-standard evaluation techniques within the part of the proposed DCO Order Limits which falls within LACR-01d.</p>

---

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
		<p>The <b>Outline Onshore WSI</b> (Document Reference: 7.9) is submitted with the DCO Application.</p>
		<p>A site-specific WSI will be required for appropriate and proportional archaeological evaluation works to be undertaken, which will be agreed in advance with relevant stakeholders.</p>

---

Page intentionally blank

#### Fourth Statutory Consultation exercise – April to May 2023

- 25.3.30 The fourth Statutory Consultation exercise was undertaken from 28 April 2023 to 30 May 2023. This was a targeted consultation which focused on the proposed extension works to the existing National Grid Bolney substation to facilitate the connection of the Rampion 2 onshore cable route into the national grid electricity infrastructure. As part of this fourth Statutory Consultation exercise, RED sought feedback on the proposed existing National Grid substation extension works to inform the onshore design of the Proposed Development taken forward to the DCO Application.
- 25.3.31 **Table 25-9** provides a summary of the key themes of the feedback received in the fourth Statutory Consultation exercise in 2023 in relation to historic environment and outlines how the feedback has been considered in this ES chapter. A full list of all comments received during the fourth Statutory Consultation exercise in 2023 and the responses to those comments are provided in the **Consultation Report** (Document Reference: 5.1).

**Table 25-9 Forth statutory consultation exercise (April – May 2023) feedback**

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
<b>Historic England</b>	<p>Effects through change to setting</p> <p><i>“Historic England consider that both the AIS or GIS options proposed have limited potential to impact upon designated heritage assets and their settings.</i></p> <p><i>This is largely due to the general lack of designated heritage assets within proximity of the proposed extension and new infrastructure. The exception to this being Twineham Court Farmhouse (Grade II, 1025579), which is situated approximately 270m to the east.</i></p> <p><i>It has been assessed in the PEIR (RED, 2021) that minor adverse effects to the Twineham Court Farmhouse may result from audible and visual changes during construction and operation within its setting. The potential impact appears to be similar for both the AIS and GIS options. Historic England agree that</i></p>	<p>Based on the limited potential for impacts to designated heritage assets through change to setting, a 1km buffer was used to identify heritage assets which may be scoped into the assessment of effects (as detailed in <b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7)). Only Twineham Court (NHLE 1025579) has been scoped into the assessment of effects due to the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension (<b>Sections 25.9 and 25.10</b>).</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p><i>this assessment of potential effects is proportionate.”</i></p> <p><i>“Historic England has no objection to the proposed extension to and new infrastructure at Bolney substation on heritage grounds.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the information provides, we agree with your assessment that there are minimal differences between the AIS/GIS options with regards to the historic environment.”</i></p>	
<b>WSCC</b>	<p>Impacts to archaeological remains</p> <p><i>“There is an identified potential for harm to as-yet unidentified archaeological features located within the footprint of the substation extension (both for AIS and GIS). However, WSCC agrees that the impacts would be no greater than those already assessed at PEIR. The geophysical survey report indicates that no anomalies of archaeological origin were identified within the footprint of the substation extension. WSCC notes that the results of the geophysics have yet to be ‘ground-truthed’ by trial trench evaluation in this area, so the accuracy of the geophysics results cannot yet be confirmed. In the event that significant archaeological features are identified within the footprint of the substation extension, the larger footprint of the AIS design option might potentially result in a greater degree of harm. The location of the construction compound on an area of existing hardstanding is welcomed as this will significantly reduce impacts to buried archaeological features and reduce the requirement for investigation and/or mitigation.”</i></p>	<p>The assessment of potential and significance archaeological remains which may be impacted by the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension is considered within <b>Section 25.6</b> and <b>Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2). Effects on archaeological remains are assessed in <b>Section 25.9</b>.</p>

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
	<p>Effects through change to setting</p> <p><i>“The PEIR assessed that there would be no likely significant effects to nearby designated heritage assets associated with construction or operation of the project substation and enabling works at Bolney Substation. Nearby Grade II listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (1025579) was assessed at PEIR as being subject to a possible minor adverse effect (not significant) during both construction and operation phases. WSCC concurs that the consulted design and construction parameters associated with both AIS and GIS options are unlikely to materially alter these predicted effects. However, WSCC notes that the exact effects of proposals upon heritage assets arising from changes within settings cannot be fully assessed at this stage, in the absence of detailed baseline settings assessments of significance (including contribution made by setting) for the scoped-in heritage assets.”</i></p>	<p>The baseline for heritage assets scoped in to the assessment of effects arising from change to setting is provided in <b>Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8).</p> <p>The assessment of effects is presented in <b>Sections 25.9</b> and <b>25.10</b>.</p>

## 25.4 Scope of the assessment

### Overview

- 25.4.1 This section sets out the scope of the ES assessment for historic environment. This scope has been developed as Rampion 2 design has evolved and responds to feedback received to-date as set out in **Section 25.3**.

### Spatial scope and Study Area

- 25.4.2 The spatial scope of the historic environment assessment is defined separately for the assessment of direct and indirect effects in relation to the onshore and offshore elements of the Proposed Development. Wider study areas are used for identifying heritage assets which may be subject to significant effects arising through change to setting.

## Direct effects arising from onshore elements of the Proposed Development

- 25.4.3 For direct effects, the spatial scope of the assessment is defined by the extent of works that could give rise to direct, physical disturbance of archaeological remains; for the purposes of this assessment, that is defined by the extent of the proposed DCO Order Limits.
- 25.4.4 A baseline Study Area has been adopted to establish the archaeological and historical context and inform the assessment of the potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets to be present which may be subject to direct impact. This baseline Study Area will comprise the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits and an area extending 1km from this boundary, as shown on **Figure 25.1, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25). Relevant historic baseline data is shown together with elements of the Proposed Development in Figures 25.2, 25.3 and 25.4, Volume 3.
- 25.4.5 The Study Area has been subdivided into three landscape zones within which the historic environment baseline has been established, and which will provide the context for further surveys and characterisation (**Figure 25.1, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). These are defined as:
- Zone 1: South Coast Plain
    - ▶ This landscape zone comprises the southern area of the proposed DCO Order Limits and Study Area from landfall at Climping Beach to the A27 at Hammerpot, near the southern limit of the SDNP.
  - Zone 2: South Downs
    - ▶ This landscape zone comprises the area of the proposed DCO Order Limits where it crosses the SDNP, between the A27 and the A283 north of Washington, West Sussex.
  - Zone 3: Low Weald
    - ▶ This landscape zone comprises where the Site lies northeast of the A283, which forms the northern limit of the SDNP.
- 25.4.6 Each of these zones has distinct geologies which, together with the natural processes, has determined their distinctive topographies. The geological and topographic characteristics of these zones (as described in **Section 25.6** and **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)), and the changing geomorphology of these landscapes over time, has influenced the availability and exploitation of natural resources by humans. Past human interaction with their environment has in turn substantially altered and shaped these landscapes. Within the context of these broad landscape zones it is possible to observe differences and / or commonalities in the changing patterns of human inhabitation and land use over time.

## Indirect effects arising from onshore elements of the Proposed Development

- 25.4.7 For the purposes of assessing the significance of effects through change to setting, as a result of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development (excluding the onshore substation or extension to the existing National Grid Bolney substation), the same Study Area used to establish the historic environment

baseline will be used (**Figure 25.1, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).

- 25.4.8 The judgement of a using a 1km distance from onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits along the landfall and onshore cable corridor is based on reference to the LVIA ZTV and viewpoints (**Figures 25.5 to 25.8, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25), site walkover to establish an understanding of the local landscape character, and the relative scale of construction and development proposed. The Planning Inspectorate (2020) agreed at the scoping stage that effects on heritage assets outwith the 1km of onshore landfall and onshore cable corridor as a result of construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning could be scoped out (**Table 25-6**). The rationale for scoping of heritage assets for assessment of indirect effects is presented in **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7).

#### *Indirect effects arising from the onshore substation*

- 25.4.9 A separate extended Study Area was defined in the original PEIR (RED, 2021) for the assessment of indirect effects on the historic environment as a result of the onshore substation.
- 25.4.10 At PEIR (RED, 2021), the extended Study Area measured 2km from the “onshore substation search area”, was established through reference to the LVIA ZTV and viewpoints (VP) (Figure 19.3, Volume 3 of the PEIR (RED, 2021)), site walkover to establish an understanding of the local landscape character, and the relative scale of construction and development proposed. A scoping exercise was undertaken as part of establishing a suitable spatial scope in the original PEIR (RED, 2021) to identify heritage assets which may be subject to indirect effects. This scoping exercise included identifying potential heritage assets beyond the proposed 2km Study Area, which may be subject to indirect effects, however, none were identified.
- 25.4.11 Following Statutory Consultation comments with respect to historic environment, in relation to the use of Study Areas (**Table 25-10**), the rationale for the scoping exercise and Study Area has been evidenced through production of a scoping document (**Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7)).

#### *Indirect effects arising from the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension works*

- 25.4.12 For the purposes of assessing the significance of effects through change to setting as a result of the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension works, heritage assets considered for assessment (as detailed in **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7)) are those which fall within 1km of the proposed existing National Grid Bolney substation extension. This judgement is made with reference to the ZTV and observations during site walkover, and with reference to the relative scale of construction and development proposed. The character of the immediate and wider landscape within which the substation extension will be located, includes woodland blocks, tall successive hedgerows, built infrastructure



and undulating topography. All of which limit the perceptibility of the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension location from the wider landscape.

#### Indirect effects arising from offshore elements of the Proposed Development

- 25.4.13 **Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15) uses the Marine Management Organisation's (MMO) Seascape assessment for South Marine Plan Areas: technical report (MMO, 2014) to visually define the 'Seascape'. This indicates that visibility of the sea is primarily from land within 10km of the coastline, forming a band of visibility across the coastal edge, South Downs and coastal plain. Beyond 20km inland from the coast, there is almost no visibility of the sea; and between 10-20km visibility of the sea is very limited with the exception of the South Downs where higher elevations afford more extensive sea views further inland. With reference to the SLVIA ZTV (**Figures 15.14 – 15.15, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15) which indicates visibility of the Proposed Development's worst case scenario, a 'Seascape Study Area' has been used which extends 25km from the wind farm array area to identify heritage assets with a coastal setting sensitive to visual impact, which may be subject to change through perception of the offshore substation and WTGs (**Figure 25.8, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25). For the assessment presented in this chapter, the scoping of heritage assets was reviewed in line with updated SLVIA ZTV which takes into account design changes (**Figure 25.8, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25) and SLVIA VPs. A desk-based appraisal supported by site visits was undertaken to identify those assets with settings which might be sensitive to change arising from the proposed development **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7).

### Temporal scope

- 25.4.14 The temporal scope of the assessment of historic environment is the entire lifetime of Rampion 2, which therefore covers the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases.
- 25.4.15 It is anticipated that, during the decommissioning phase, the potential removal of the onshore substation will be the only works likely to be required. The onshore electrical cables will be left in-situ with ends cut, sealed and buried.

### Potential receptors

- 25.4.16 The spatial and temporal scope of the assessment enables the identification of receptors which may experience a change as a result of Rampion 2. The receptors identified that may experience likely significant effects for historic environment are outlined in **Table 25-10**.

- 25.4.17 The historic environment is defined in NPS EN-1 (DECC, 2011a), as:

*"All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora".*

- 25.4.18 NPS EN-1 sets out that a heritage asset is an element of the historic environment which has sufficient archaeological, historic or artistic/architectural interest to be considered within the planning process.
- 25.4.19 Receptors comprise both designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets which may be subject to direct or indirect effects.

**Table 25-10 Receptors groups requiring assessment for historic environment**

Receptor group	Receptors included within group
<b>Designated heritage assets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheduled monuments (SM).</li> <li>• Listed buildings (LB).</li> <li>• Conservation areas.</li> <li>• Registered parks and gardens (RPG).</li> <li>• Protected wrecks.</li> </ul>
<b>Non-designated heritage asset</b>	<p>Archaeological heritage assets: comprising finds, features and deposits of archaeological interest, dating to any period. These include both known and previously unrecorded archaeological remains (within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits).</p> <p>Palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological remains comprising finds, features and deposits of enabling reconstruction of past environments and landscapes, dating to any period but primarily prehistoric (within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits).</p> <p>Built heritage assets: upstanding buildings or structures with some historic/architectural interest.</p>
<b>Historic landscape character</b>	<p>Landscape elements (within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits).</p> <p>Areas of Character as defined by Arun District Council.</p>

- 25.4.20 An onshore historic environment desk study ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) has been undertaken to identify the known and potential heritage assets (receptors) which may be affected by Rampion 2. [Table 5-1 to 5-3](#) in [Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2), summarise the archaeological receptors and their heritage significance.

## Selection of heritage assets for assessment of indirect effects

- 25.4.21 The process for assessing effects on the settings of heritage assets has been informed by a desk-based appraisal (**Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7)) and baseline desktop study (**Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)) supported by site visits following the staged approach in Historic England GPA 3 (2017). Heritage assets were identified from the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) and Local Planning Authority (LPA) conservation area data and Local Lists.
- 25.4.22 The overall aim has been to identify heritage assets which could be significantly affected by change in their settings, to assess the degree to which these settings contribute to heritage significance of the assets and to form the basis for an assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development.
- 25.4.23 This assessment process was informed with reference to appropriate visualisations, including the LVIA and SLVIA ZTVs.
- 25.4.24 This identification of heritage assets to be included within the settings assessment (Stage 1 of GPA 3) followed a two-stage process based on the following principles for selection of onshore heritage receptors subject to setting effects from the offshore elements of the Proposed Development:
- i. in the first instance, assets were identified where the coastal setting, including views out to sea, contributes in a notable and substantial way to the heritage significance of an asset; and
  - ii. following this, assets were selected for inclusion in the settings assessment based on those where the experience of this setting is liable to be altered in a tangible way by the Proposed Development, taking account of factors including:
    - ▶ distance to the asset;
    - ▶ perception of prominence; and
    - ▶ relationship to any other assets.
- 25.4.25 The selection of onshore heritage assets subject to setting effects from onshore elements of the Proposed Development has been based on the following principles:
- i. in the first instance, assets were identified where significance is drawn from views in which the Proposed Development will be visible;
  - ii. following this, assets were selected for inclusion in the settings assessment based on those where: the experience of this setting is liable to be altered in a tangible way by the Proposed Development, taking account of factors including:
    - ▶ distance between the asset and the Proposed Development;
    - ▶ position in relation to relevant topography;
    - ▶ relationship to any other assets;
    - ▶ predicted duration of any effect; and

- ▶ where a heritage asset's setting might be impacted in any other non-visual way by the Proposed Development (such as audible change, odour, vibration, dust, and changes to land use).

## Potential effects

- 25.4.26 Potential effects on historic environment receptors that have been scoped in for assessment are summarised in **Table 25-11**.
- 25.4.27 Direct effects on heritage assets are those which result from physical damage or disturbance which give rise to a loss of heritage significance. Consequently, it is only those assets which might be physically disturbed by (i.e., within the footprint of) the proposed development and associated enabling works such as site compounds and access routes, which are potentially subject to direct effects.
- 25.4.28 Indirect effects have been defined as those which result in change to heritage significance but do not give rise to physical damage or disturbance to the asset. In this context, these effects would generally arise through change to the settings of heritage assets.
- 25.4.29 Assessment of settings is primarily associated with designated heritage assets or non-designated heritage assets of equivalent significance (where such assets are identified).
- 25.4.30 Historic landscape character (HLC) is also considered as a heritage asset and is assessed in terms of change to the heritage significance of the landscape as distinct from the assessment of change to landscape character.

**Table 25-11 Potential effects on historic environment receptors scoped in for further assessment**

Receptor / Receptor Group	Activity or impact	Potential effect
<b>Construction phase</b>		
<b>Heritage assets (designated and non-designated) within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits</b>	Onshore land preparation (earthworks, excavation) associated with construction of landfall, onshore cable corridor and onshore substation.  Landfall construction phases and export cables.	Direct and permanent effect from permanent loss of paleoenvironmental and archaeological remains.  Potential for impacts arising from change to coastal processes during construction.
<b>Historic landscape character</b>	Onshore land preparation (earthworks, excavation) and reinstatement works associated with construction of landfall,	Potential loss of landscape elements with heritage significance. Perceptual change to historic landscape.

Receptor / Receptor Group	Activity or impact	Potential effect
	onshore cable corridor and onshore substation.	
<b>Heritage assets (designated and non-designated) beyond the proposed DCO Order Limits (as identified in Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8))</b>	All onshore and offshore construction activities.	Potential for temporary change to setting caused during the construction phase Proposed Development.
<b>Operation and maintenance phase</b>		
<b>Historic landscape character</b>	Onshore substation (all buildings and above ground infrastructure).	Perceptual change to historic landscape.
<b>Heritage assets (designated and non-designated) beyond the proposed DCO Order Limits (as identified in Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8))</b>	Onshore substation (all buildings and above ground structures and infrastructure).  Offshore substations and WTGs (above sea level).	Potential for change to setting caused during the operation and maintenance phase of the onshore and offshore elements of the Proposed Development.
<b>Decommissioning phase</b>		
<b>Historic landscape character</b>	Onshore substation (all above ground structures and infrastructure) – removal and reinstatement.	Perceptual change to historic landscape.
<b>Heritage assets (designated and non-designated) beyond the proposed DCO Order Limits (as identified in Appendix 25.8: Onshore</b>	Onshore substation – removal and reinstatement.  Offshore substations and WTGs (above sea level) removal.	Potential for significant effect to setting caused during the decommissioning phase of the onshore and offshore

Receptor / Receptor Group	Activity or impact	Potential effect
	heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)	elements of the Proposed Development.

## Activities or impacts scoped out of assessment

25.4.31 A number of potential effects have been scoped out from further assessment, resulting from a conclusion of no likely significant effect. These conclusions have been made based on the knowledge of the baseline environment, the nature of planned works and the wealth of evidence on the potential for impact from such projects more widely. The conclusions follow (in a site-based context) existing best practice. Each scoped out activity or impact is considered in turn in **Table 25-12**.

**Table 25-12 Activities or impacts scoped out of assessment**

Activity or impact	Rationale for scoping out
<b>Direct effects on heritage assets outside of the proposed DCO Order Limits.</b>	The Planning Inspectorate agreed (Planning Inspectorate ID 5.8.2 in <b>Table 25-5</b> ) “ <i>that direct effects on assets outside of the Scoping Boundary<sup>3</sup> presented in the Scoping Report can be scoped out of further assessment as there is no pathway for such direct effects</i> ”.  By the same logic, no direct disturbance, damage or alteration will arise to heritage assets outside the proposed DCO Order Limits.
<b>Direct effects on heritage assets within the proposed DCO Order Limits during the operation and maintenance phase.</b>	Any disturbance of archaeological heritage assets within the proposed DCO Order Limits will occur during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. No further effects are anticipated during the operation of the Proposed Development.
<b>Effects arising from changes to setting of heritage assets outside the 1km Study Area as a</b>	Planning Inspectorate agreed “ <i>that effects on heritage assets outwith 1km of the onshore landfall</i> ”

<sup>3</sup> The Scoping Boundary is illustrated in Figure 1.1 of the Scoping Report (RED, 2020) and the onshore element of the Scoping Boundary was approximately 2km wide along the cable corridor including a 1km buffer either side of the previous indicative potential cable centreline. It was also approximately 5.7km wide in the area being considered for the onshore substation.

Activity or impact	Rationale for scoping out
<p><b>result of onshore landfall and onshore cable corridor (all phases)</b></p>	<p><i>and onshore cable corridor can be scoped out of the assessment” for all phases.</i></p> <p>Since Scoping this has been updated to refer to heritage assets outside the 1km Study Area, described in <b>Section 25.4</b>. The same principles agreed by the Planning Inspectorate still apply.</p>
<p><b>Indirect effects arising from changes to setting of heritage assets as a result of operation and maintenance of the onshore landfall and onshore cable corridor.</b></p>	<p>Permanent elements of the landfall and onshore cable corridor will all be below ground and persist as buried features. On completion of construction, the land impacted by the construction phase will be reinstated to its former condition where possible, reversing any perceptible changes which may have impacted upon setting during the construction phase. This will mitigate loss of aesthetic and historic interest, though any loss of archaeological interest will persist. Following reinstatement, the legibility of the historic landscape will be unaffected. Operation and maintenance activities comprise only periodic testing of the cable is likely to be required (every two to five years) or emergency repair visits, using existing access routes. These activities do not represent a change to heritage significance of assets. Consequently, no further effects are anticipated during the operation of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>Effects arising from changes to setting of heritage assets, not identified in Appendix 25.7 (all phases), which listed heritage assets to be taken forward for further assessment based on selection criteria described in Section 25.4.</b></p>	<p>With reference to the LVIA and SLVIA ZTV, surrounding topography and observations during a site walkover (<b>Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7), it is considered that perceptibility of the Proposed Development will not affect the heritage significance of assets not listed in <b>Table 25-15 to Table 25-18</b>.</p>
<p><b>Direct and indirect effects on heritage assets as a result of decommissioning of the onshore cable and landfall HDD cable.</b></p>	<p>The onshore cable will be left in-situ. No further effects, other than those persisting from the construction at landfall and onshore cable route corridor, are anticipated during the decommissioning phase.</p>

## 25.5 Methodology for baseline data gathering

### Overview

25.5.1 Baseline data collection has been undertaken to obtain information over the study areas described in **Section 25.4**.

### Desk study and settings assessment baseline

25.5.2 The data sources that have been collected and used to inform this historic environment assessment are summarised in **Table 25-13**.

25.5.3 A detailed onshore historic environment baseline for the Study Area is provided in an archaeological desk study (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2). The desk study includes a review of desk-based data within the Study Area using sources detailed in **Table 25-13**. This also includes relevant readily available regional and local contextual studies, desk and field studies, geological and geotechnical data, historic mapping and aerial remote sensing data (Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR), aerial photography and satellite imagery). A gazetteer of heritage assets is provided in **Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage assets, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1).

25.5.4 Additional detailed onshore historic environment baseline is provided for heritage assets scoped into the assessment of effects arising from changes to setting as a result of the Proposed Development (**Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8).

**Table 25-13 Data sources used to inform the historic environment ES assessment**

Source	Date	Summary	Spatial coverage
<b>Adur District Council and Worthing Borough Council</b>	2023	Conservation area data.	Adur District and Worthing Borough.
<b>Arun District Council</b>	2005	List of Buildings and Structures of Character.	Arun District.
<b>British Geological Survey (BGS)</b>	2023	Solid and drift geology digital map; borehole record data.	Full coverage of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.
<b>Environment Agency, Defra</b>	July 2020	LiDAR data.	Full coverage of the proposed DCO Order Limits.
<b>Genealogist</b>	2023	Tithe mapping.	Full coverage of the onshore part of the



Source	Date	Summary	Spatial coverage
			proposed DCO Order Limits.
<b>Google Earth Pro</b>	various	Modern satellite imagery.	Full coverage of the Study Area.
<b>Groundsure</b>	December 2020 and October 2022	Historic and modern OS mapping. Ground investigation and geological data.	Full coverage of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.
<b>Historic England</b>	2023	NHLE, for information on designated heritage assets (conservation areas, scheduled monuments, listed buildings, RPGs, registered battlefields and world heritage sites) (NHLE, 2023).	Full coverage of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits Study Areas.
<b>Historic England Archive, Swindon</b>	Various	Aerial photographs.	Partial coverage of onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.
<b>Kent County Council</b>	Various	SERF including resource assessment and research agendas.	Regional coverage of southeast England, including West Sussex.
<b>Natural England</b>	2013 and 2014	National Character Area Profiles (NCAP), for information on National Landscape Character Areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● NCAP 120: Wealden Greensand;</li> <li>● NCAP 121: Low Weald;</li> <li>● NCAP 122: High Weald;</li> <li>● NCAP 125: South Downs; and</li> <li>● NCAP 126: South Coast Plain.</li> </ul>	Full coverage of the Study Area.

Source	Date	Summary	Spatial coverage
		Landscape Character Types and Landscape Description Units.	
<b>Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3)</b>	2023	Baseline information and assessment of potential for geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental deposits.	Full coverage of proposed DCO Order Limits.
<b>Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)</b>	2021-2023	Magnetometry survey data and interpretation undertaken by AOC Archaeology Ltd.	Approximately 65% of survey area complete within onshore part of proposed DCO Order Limits.  Results included where survey also undertaken within areas outside the proposed DCO Order Limits during the design process.
<b>Planning Inspectorate</b>	2020	Rampion 1 Scoping Report, Scoping Opinion, ES and other relevant supporting technical documents.	Partial coverage of Study Area.
<b>SDNPA</b>	2020	Conservation area character appraisals. Landscape Character Assessment.	SDNP.
<b>UK Hydrographic Office (UKHO)</b>	April 2020	GIS-based records of known wrecks.	Full coverage of the Study Area.
<b>Various</b>	Various	Published reports & regional syntheses (including those recommended in the Scoping Opinion).	-

Source	Date	Summary	Spatial coverage
<b>West Sussex County Archive</b>	-	Cartographic and documentary evidence.	-
<b>West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER)</b>	May to July 2022	<p>GIS-based records of a wide range of buildings, monuments, find spots, places, and landscapes of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic interest.</p> <p>Grey literature reports of previous archaeological investigations within the Study Area.</p>	Full coverage of the Study Area.

## Site surveys

25.5.5 Site surveys undertaken to date are detailed within **Table 25-14**.

**Table 25-14 Site surveys undertaken**

Survey type	Scope of survey	Spatial coverage
<b>Walkover surveys, 2020 to 2023</b>	<p>Non-intrusive activity, comprising a walk around and through the accessible areas within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits making a photographic record of existing land conditions and development. The aim was to make observations on the presence and condition of known or as yet known heritage assets, as well as to highlight areas of pre-existing impact and as such, assess the potential survival for the below ground archaeological resource.</p> <p>Site visits to off-site heritage assets to inform assessment of effects arising from change to setting. Written and photographic record made regarding specific nature of each asset's setting.</p>	Partial coverage of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits (approximately 70%) and visits to off-site heritage assets.

Survey type	Scope of survey	Spatial coverage
<b>Historic parkland survey, 2021</b>	Site visit undertaken to identify potential surviving or relic parkland features and consider key views, particularly in relation to the Oakendene Manor, which may be affected by the onshore substation which is sited within the former historic parkland at Oakendene.	Limited to area around Oakendene Manor, defined as historic parkland.
<b>Geophysical survey, 2021 to 2023</b>	Magnetometry survey in order to identify both known and previously unrecorded archaeological heritage assets.	Accessible areas within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits. A coverage of approximately 71% of land within the proposed DCO Order Limits has been achieved.
<b>Archaeological trial trenching, 2022</b>	Advance archaeological trial trenching to target geophysical anomalies at Brook Barn Farm.	Land at Brook Barn Farm only, within proposed DCO Order Limits.

## Data limitations

- 25.5.6 The limitations regarding production of SLVIA photomontage and wireline visualisations and ZTVs as assessment tools, and limitations in the accuracy of digital terrain model (DTM) data, is described in [Section 15.5](#) in [Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15) and [Appendix 15.2: SLVIA Methodology, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.15.2).
- 25.5.7 The archaeological geophysical survey within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits is ongoing and has the potential to detect anomalies with an archaeological origin, which are previously unknown or detailed in this chapter or supporting appendices. A programme of archaeological evaluation will be undertaken within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in line with the outline WSI. These evaluation works have the potential to identify previously unknown archaeological remains not otherwise indicated by existing available baseline information and to provide additional data which might alter the heritage significance as assessed in this chapter.
- 25.5.8 Limitation regarding the suitability and effectiveness of geophysical survey in the detection of archaeological remains is described in [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4). Not all land within the proposed DCO Order Limits was surveyed due to land access restrictions and ground conditions. Where geophysical data is not available, the assessment of this ES is made based on all other available historic environment data, as detailed in [Section 25.5](#). The geophysical survey is ongoing and updated survey data will subsequently be reported.

- 25.5.9 Where there are limitations in the availability of survey data and other baseline information to support the assessment of potential and significance of archaeological remains, a reasonable worst-case will be assumed.
- 25.5.10 Whilst there are some data limitations relating to historic environment these do not affect the robustness of the assessment of this ES.

## 25.6 Baseline conditions

### Current baseline

- 25.6.1 The baseline presented below is a summary of this desk-based study ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)), together with additional baseline information for the extended and seascape study areas.

#### Historic Landscape Character and historic hedgerows

##### *Overview*

- 25.6.2 This section provides a summary of the HLC for each of the landscape zones established in the historic environment desk study ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) and identified in the **Section 25.4**.

##### *Zone 1: South Coast Plain*

- 25.6.3 The coastal plain (broadly from Climping Beach to the A27 at Hammerpot as shown on [Figure 25.1, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25) landscape is relatively flat and open, and very gently rising north/north-east towards the South Downs. The shoreline is a shingle beach dominated by coastal erosion defences and anti-invasion defences. North of the shoreline, the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits is dominated by fieldscapes, developed through a mixture of medieval assarting (woodland clearance for arable purposes), medieval and post medieval piecemeal enclosure and marshland enclosure (with the creation of 'brook innings'), and modern field amalgamation. An area of Parliamentary Enclosure is located immediately south and west of the village of Poling (HWS24592). Woodland is scarce, though an area of ancient semi-natural woodland lies near the A27 (not within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits). Historic settlement was influenced by the presence of fertile soils and routeways, and the settlement form is largely of early medieval/medieval origin. There are extant remnants of medieval and post medieval settlement forming the core of existing villages or hamlets, and scattered farmsteads. However, subsequent modern urban and industrial development is a primary feature of the wider coastal plain landscape. Overall, the southern coastal landscape is characterised by agricultural improvement and urban expansion, punctuated with historic farmsteads and hamlets.

## Zone 2: South Downs

- 25.6.4 This zone is primarily characterised by the South Downs (broadly from the A27 at Hammerpot to A283 north of Washington, West Sussex as shown on [Figure 25.1, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25), a landscape which comprises a broad elevated east–west ridge with a predominantly steep, north facing scarp slope and a gentle southerly dip slope. The South Downs are furrowed by extensive branching dry valley systems. The southwest of the zone extends narrowly into the Arun valley. There are large areas of woodland between the Angmering and Harrow Hill, through which the Site traverses at Michelgrove Park.
- 25.6.5 The landscape within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits of Zone 2 is dominated by large open arable and grassland fields of the downlands, developed through a mixture of piecemeal, private and parliamentary enclosure, assarting and modern field amalgamation. Whilst fields on the South Downs are largely bounded by post and wire fencing, there may be hedgerows and tracks surviving from the earlier manorial downland landscape (SDNPA, 2020).
- 25.6.6 Significant elevations within the Study Area are Warningcamp Hill, Barpham Hill, Harrow Hill, Sullington Hill and Chantry Hill; and within the wider landscape are Cissbury and Blackpatch Hill. These peaks are important in terms of views across the landscape and as foci for human activity since the prehistoric period. There are surviving fragmented areas of unenclosed downland partly within the Site (HWS2619) and in the study area between Patching and Sullington Hill, likely resulting from an inability for arable farming on the steep slopes. This stretch of the open downland and the steep scarp is rich with prehistoric earthworks. The steep scarp here is cleared of woodland with surviving features relating to sheep-corn husbandry regime and former agricultural lime-burning industry. Beyond are the foot-slopes of the South Downs, a transition between the steep chalk scarp and the Low Weald to the north. Here the landscape is characterized by a mosaic of farmland and woodland comprising irregular fields of arable and pasture bounded by an intact network of thick hedgerows, with hedgerow oaks, and woodland (SDNPA, 2020). The onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in this zone also crosses the historic designed parkland at Angmering Park (not designated), characteristic of post medieval gentrification with the creation of landscape parks by wealthy landowners. The parkland surrounded to the north, east and west by plantation woodland and areas of extraction pits (HWS23882).
- 25.6.7 Whilst the South Downs landscape is generally open and exposed, there are pockets of woodland present north of Hammerpot, on the slopes east of Washington, West Sussex and within the designed landscape of Wiston Park. The majority of woodland is post medieval and modern plantation, though there is some ancient woodland, including *assart woodland* around Warningcamp, the extent of which is a result of enclosure of surrounding fields.
- 25.6.8 Historic settlement pattern is influenced by the availability of agricultural land and use of routeways. Along the river valley are small settlements with medieval origins at Warningcamp, Wepham and Burpham, and within the northern footslopes of the South Downs at Washington and Sullington, West Sussex. Within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 2 there are scattered isolated 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> farmsteads. Nearby modern settlement is largely focused adjacent to the major road networks, to the north and south of the South Downs.

### *Zone 3: Low Weald*

- 25.6.9 This landscape comprises the gently undulating low-lying vales of the Low Weald which begins to rise towards the High Weald AONB beyond (shown on Figure 25.1, Volume 3 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). The onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 3 is dominated by fieldscapes developed through a mixture of medieval assarting, medieval and post medieval piecemeal enclosure, and modern field amalgamation. Cohesive assart field systems are present at Ashurst, south of Partridge Green, and more extensively in an area between Shermanbury, Cowfold and Twineham, reflecting the process of piecemeal enclosure of woodland in the medieval period. These field systems are associated with isolated farmsteads and are surrounded by fragmented patches of woodland comprising plantation or regenerated woodland of uncertain date. There is a general absence of woodland along the valley and plains of the River Adur, between Ashurst and Shermanbury.
- 25.6.10 Historic settlement within this zone is characterised by isolated farmsteads and dispersed settlement. The onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 3 intersects settlements with medieval origins at Ashurst and lies adjacent to numerous isolated 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> farmsteads. The onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 3 also encompasses the historic designed parklands (not designated) of the grade II listed Oakendene Manor (NHLE 1027074) (see [Appendix 25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5)). Elsewhere within the wider landscape there are historic settlement cores at Bines Green and Wineham.

### Designated heritage assets

#### *Onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits*

- 25.6.11 The onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits intersects with one scheduled monument (shown on [Figure 25.2, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). An operational access (A-06) crosses the scheduled Medieval earthworks east and southeast of St Mary's Church (NHLE 1005828) on an existing surfaced road.
- 25.6.12 The onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits also narrowly intersects Sullington Conservation Area (shown on [Figure 25.2, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.6.13 There are no further designated heritage assets within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.

### Study Area

- 25.6.14 Within the Study Area there are:
- 20 scheduled monuments;
  - 261 listed buildings; and
  - 12 conservation areas.

- 25.6.15 The heritage assets are listed in **Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage assets, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1) and shown on **Figure 25.2, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25).

### *Scheduled monuments*

- 25.6.16 Within Zone 1, three scheduled monuments are present relating to remains of a Roman villa, a deserted medieval settlement (NHLE 1005828, Medieval earthworks E and SE of St Mary's Church) and a 19th century military defence of the Sussex coast (NHLE 1005809, Littlehampton Fort) (shown on **Figure 25.2, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). The highest concentration of scheduled monuments within the Study Area, are located within the South Downs landscape of Zone 2, reflecting multi-period occupation and exploitation from the prehistoric onwards. These include:
- prehistoric barrow sites (NHLE, 1020352, 1015713 and 1016407), earthworks (NHLE 1015712, 1015715, 1015714, 1015237), Itford Hill Style settlements (NHLE 1015881 and 1017446) and flint mines (NHLE 1015239; 1015237; 1015238; 1015880);
  - Iron Age settlement (NHLE 1005823; 1005850);
  - Romano-British shrine (NHLE 1005850);
  - Anglo-Saxon barrow cemeteries (NHLE 1017446; 1015880); and
  - deserted medieval settlements (NHLE 1015882, 1015883 and 1005828).
- 25.6.17 Within the Low Weald landscape of Zone 3. there is one scheduled monument relating to a moated medieval manor (**Figure 25.2, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).

### *Listed buildings*

- 25.6.18 There are 12 grade I listed buildings within the Study Area, comprising primarily parish churches with surviving medieval building fabric, together with St John's Priory incorporated into a later farmhouse (NHLE 1217172), and the gateway and porters lodge northwest of Ewhurst Manor (NHLE 1194178) (shown on **Figure 25.2, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). There are 11 grade II\* listed and 267 grade II listed buildings including a mix of churches, farmhouses and outbuildings, houses, cottages and a monastery.
- 25.6.19 Across the Study Area, listed buildings are largely concentrated within the Coastal Plain of Zone 1 and Low Weald of Zone 3. Within the Low Weald of Zone 3, listed buildings are generally isolated and scattered across the landscape, except at Cowfold. Where listed buildings lie within the Zone 2, these are largely limited to the southern Arun valley (Arundel, Burpham and Wepham) or the northern scarp footslopes of the downland (Washington and Sullington, West Sussex) and the Findon Valley. The distribution of listed buildings within the Study Area (shown on **Figure 25.2, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)) reflects the development of historic settlement patterns which have persisted to the present day (as discussed under HLC in **Section 25.6**).



### Conservation areas

- 25.6.20 Within the Study Area, the conservation areas encompass the historic core of settlements with medieval and post medieval origins in which survive extant buildings of these periods, many of which are often listed (shown on Figure 25.2, **Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25). Of those conservation areas within the Study Area, Lyminster and Washington Conservation Areas lie adjacent to the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.

### Designated heritage assets considered for effects arising through change to setting

- 25.6.21 The methodological approach for scoping in heritage assets to be assessed for effects arising due to change to setting as a result of onshore and offshore elements of the Proposed Development is provided in **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7). Those designated heritage assets identified for more detailed assessment within this chapter are listed in **Table 25-15** to **Table 25-18**.
- 25.6.22 Those heritage assets scoped into the assessment for effects arising through change to setting as a result of the construction of the onshore substation at Oakdene (**Table 25-16**) and the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension (**Table 25-17**), where also scoped in for effects arising through change to setting as a result of the construction within the onshore cable corridor (**Table 25-15**). These assets are therefore assessed under combined headings within **Section 25.9**, which takes into consideration effects resulting from the Proposed Development as a whole.
- 25.6.23 As described in **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) of the ES, the setting of other heritage assets not scoped into the assessment, are unlikely to be impacted due to the nature of the asset, topography, intervening planting and built infrastructure, and the relative distance from the onshore elements of the Proposed Development. No effects are therefore anticipated, and those heritage assets have not been considered for more detailed assessment as part of the ES.

**Table 25-15 Designated heritage assets selected for effects from landfall and onshore cable corridor**

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
SM 1005823	Settlement site in Chantry Bottom	270
SM 1005828	Medieval earthworks E and SE of St Mary's Church	0
SM 1005850	Muntham Court Romano-British site	2
SM 1015239	Prehistoric flint mine and a Martin Down style enclosure on Harrow hill, 850m south east of Lee Farm	630
SM 1015713	Group of four bowl barrows at the Chantry Post	0
SM 1015880	Prehistoric flint mine and part of a round barrow cemetery at Blackpatch, 400m north east of Myrtle Grove Farm	2
SM 1015881	Itford Hill style settlement on Cock Hill	150
SM 1015883	Deserted medieval settlement at Lower Barpham Farm	310
SM 1017446	Itford Hill style settlement and an Anglo-Saxon barrow field at New Barn Down, 850m north west of Myrtle Grove Farm	5

---

<sup>4</sup> At its closest point.

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
Arun District	Poling Conservation Area and Grade I and II Listed Buildings	470
Storrington and Sullington	Sullington Conservation Area and Grade I and II Listed Buildings	0
Arun District	Lyminster Conservation Area and Grade I and II Listed Buildings	0
<b>Horsham District</b>	Washington Conservation Area	1
LB Grade II 1025579	Twineham Court Farmhouse	210
LB Grade II 1025752	Coombe House and Attached Terrace Wall, Steps, Ha-Ha, North Wall, Gate and Pond of Sunken Garden	440
LB Grade II 1025758	Muttons	440
LB Grade II 1025759	Dawe's Farmhouse	370
LB Grade II 1026866	Farmgate House	50
LB Grade II 1026867	Bines Farmhouse	100
LB Grade II 1026871	Old Priors	30
LB Grade II 1027074	Oakendene Manor	90

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade II 1027089	King's Barn	40
LB Grade II 1027154	Guessgate Farmhouse	60
LB Grade II 1027155	1-4, Stocks Hill	390
LB Grade II 1027161	Brook House	120
LB Grade II 1027162	The Frankland Arms Public House	150
LB Grade II 1027163	Tilleys Cottage	190
LB Grade II 1027190	Green Farmhouse	50
LB Grade II 1027195	Old Forge	100
LB Grade II 1027196	Fern Cottage	150
LB Grade II* 1027198	The Parish Church of St Mary	140
LB Grade II 1027199	Stables of the Old Vicarage to the West of the House	130
LB Grade II 1027200	Church House	170
LB Grade II 1027201	Rose Cottage	240
LB Grade II 1027239	Chanctonbury Lodge	10

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade II 1027240	Barn at Sullington Farm to the north east of Sullington Manor House	70
LB Grade II 1027261	Horsebrook Cottage	620
LB Grade II 1027290	Pooks Farmhouse	680
LB Grade II 1027291	Cottage In the Grounds of Pooks Farmhouse to south west of the House	680
LB Grade II 1027292	Potts Farmhouse	350
LB Grade II 1027293	Vadgers	120
LB Grade II 1027330	Morley	30
LB Grade II 1027436	Eatons Farmhouse	280
LB Grade II 1027451	Binesfield	50
LB Grade II 1027452	Southblows Farmhouse	150
LB Grade II 1027454	Horsebridge House	20
LB Grade II 1027457	The Fountain Inn	20
LB Grade II 1027588	Bacon Hall	500
LB Grade II 1027589	Barn at Newhouse Buildings	330

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade II 1027590	St John's Cottage	70
LB Grade II 1027604	The Parish Church of St Mary Magdalen	190
LB Grade II 1027605	The Corner Cottage	120
LB Grade II 1027606	Calceto	540
LB Grade II 1027627	Ivy Cottage	30
LB Grade II 1027637	The Gatehouse at Bailiffscourt to the north east of the Hotel	600
LB Grade II 1027638	Outbuilding at Bailiffscourt to the North of the Chapel and Adjoining the Stables on the south west	590
LB Grade II 1027639	Climping Mill	110
LB Grade I 1027640	The Parish Church of St Mary	150
LB Grade II 1027641	The Vicarage	110
LB Grade II 1027642	Barn to the West of Nos 1 and 2 Church Farm Cottage	180
LB Grade II 1027643	Church Farmhouse East and Church Farmhouse West	40
LB Grade II 1027674	Kent's Farmhouse	220

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade II 1027675	Virginia Cottage	370
LB Grade II* 1027676	Bailiffscourt Hotel and Country Club	660
LB Grade II 1027677	Outbuilding at Bailiffscourt to the North of the Chapel	590
LB Grade II 1027713	Decoy Cottage	150
LB Grade II 1027714	The Old Cottage	30
LB Grade II 1027813	Court Wick Park	180
LB Grade II 1027819	The 6 Bells Public House	220
LB Grade II 1039953	Old Clayton	20
LB Grade II 1181126	The Old Rectory	200
LB Grade II 1181595	The Shieling	200
LB Grade II 1181605	Yew Tree Cottage	50
LB Grade II 1181625	Pinland Farmhouse	600
LB Grade II 1181633	Cart Shed and Granary to East of Brightham's Farmhouse	40
LB Grade II 1182071	Clematis Cottage	130

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade II 1182076	South Cottage	110
LB Grade II 1182115	Corner House How Man The Old Cottage	220
LB Grade II 1182122	Barn at Church Farm to South of the House	130
LB Grade II 1182442	The Old Rectory	390
LB Grade II 1182594	Bunton Manor Farmhouse	130
LB Grade II 1182603	Butchers Farmhouse	80
LB Grade II 1182621	Post Office Wiston Stores	210
LB Grade II 1191816	Doves Cottages	230
LB Grade II 1191818	Northblows Farmhouse	220
LB Grade II 1191821	Hollybush Cottage	110
LB Grade II 1191847	College Wood Farmhouse	200
LB Grade II 1191885	Granary Cottage	100
LB Grade II 1191892	Bloques Farmhouse	40
LB Grade II 1192196	Granary at Eatons Farm to south east of the House	310



<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade II 1193051	The Lodge of St Hugh's Monastery	190
LB Grade II 1193164	Bankfield Farmhouse	170
LB Grade II 1217075	Michelgrove Cottages	70
LB Grade II 1217134	Christmas Cottage and Woodpecker Cottage	550
LB Grade II* 1217152	Peckhams	310
LB Grade I 1217172	St John's Priory	260
LB Grade II* 1232882	Newplace Farmhouse	100
LB Grade II 1232897	Barn to Upper Bargeham to the West of the Farmhouse	610
LB Grade II 1233446	Kents Dairy Cottages	250
LB Grade II 1233447	Barn at Kent's Farm to the south east of the Farmhouse and to the South of Nos 1 and 2 Brookpits Manor Cottages	230
LB Grade II 1233449	Dove Cottage	400
LB Grade II* 1233450	Chapel at Bailiffscourt Hotel	590
LB Grade II 1233900	North End House	40

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade I 1233989	The Parish Church of St Andrew	810
LB Grade II 1237922	Old Granary	200
LB Grade II* 1274459	Guest House to Bailiffscourt Hotel and Country Club	690
LB Grade II 1275562	Thorn Tree Cottage	510
LB Grade II 1276262	Lyminster Cottage	70
LB Grade II 1276263	Flint Cottage Paigles	140
LB Grade II 1276284	Church Farmhouse	70
LB Grade II 1276596	Cottage to Bailiffscourt to the north east of the Hotel	650
LB Grade II 1276603	Brookpits Cottage	40
LB Grade II 1284507	Polecats	60
LB Grade II 1284545	The Old School	10
LB Grade II 1284693	The Old Vicarage	120
LB Grade II 1284745	Green Common Farmhouse	90
LB Grade II 1284780	Lower Chancton	50

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade II 1284897	Deans Cottage	150
LB Grade II 1285147	Sullington Manor	50
LB Grade II 1285777	The Royal Oak Inn	390
LB Grade II 1285826	1 and 2 Corner House	170
LB Grade II 1285831	Park Farmhouse	500
LB Grade II 1286203	Wineham Cottage	140
LB Grade II 1286335	Gratwicke	360
LB Grade II 1293605	Court Wick Park Stables	240
LB Grade II 1353838	Upper Bargeham	580
LB Grade II 1353858	Brookpits Manor	80
LB Grade II 1353860	The Black Horse Public House	330
LB Grade II 1353871	The Old Well House	10
LB Grade II 1353879	The Stables at Bailiffscourt to the north east of the Chapel	570
LB Grade II 1353880	Dovecote at Bailiffscourt on A Field to the north east of the Hotel	520

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade II 1353888	The Ruins of Michelgrove	40
LB Grade II 1353892	Little Oak, the Thatches and Waysend	520
LB Grade II 1353898	Lyminster House Old Lyminster House	180
LB Grade II 1353943	Blakes Farmhouse	60
LB Grade II 1353944	Hill's Farmhouse	180
LB Grade II 1353980	Martinsland	200
LB Grade II 1354042	Toll Cottage	130
LB Grade I 1354077	The Parish Church of St Mary	30
LB Grade II 1354089	Granary at Lower Chancton to south east of the House	70
LB Grade II 1354090	Tilleys Farmhouse	260
LB Grade II 1354093	Rose Cottage	120
LB Grade II 1354096	Church Farmhouse	140
LB Grade II 1354110	The Roundhouse, In the Grounds of the Old Rectory	450
LB Grade II 1354112	Fair Oak Farmhouse	400

<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance from proposed DCO Order Limits (m)<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
LB Grade I 1354113	Buncton Chapel of All Saints	60
LB Grade II 1354114	Yew Tree Cottage	90
LB Grade II 1354152	Allfreys	220
LB Grade II 1354155	Crateman's Farmhouse	20
LB Grade II 1354245	Brightham's Farmhouse	30
LB Grade II 1354279	Keepers Mead	380
LB Grade II 1381153	Eastlands Farm	570
LB Grade II 1393335	Bergen-Op-Zoom Cottage	50

**Table 25-16 Designated heritage assets selected for effects from onshore substation at Oakendene**

Receptor/Receptor Group		Phase scoped in	Approximate distance from proposed onshore substation at Oakendene (m) <sup>5</sup>
Designation/List Entry	Name		
LB Grade II 1027074	Oakendene Manor	Construction, and Operation and maintenance	200
LB Grade II 1193164	Bankfield Farm	Construction, and Operation and maintenance	450
LB Grade II 1354152	Allfreys	Construction only	840
LB Grade II 1381153	Eastlands Farm	Construction, and Operation and maintenance	1,020

**Table 25-17 Designated heritage assets selected for effects from existing National Grid Bolney substation extension**

Receptor/Receptor Group		Phase scoped in	Approximate distance from existing National Grid Bolney substation extension (m) <sup>6</sup>
Designation/List Entry	Name		
LB Grade II 1025579	Twineham Court Farmhouse	Construction, and Operation and maintenance	270

<sup>5</sup> At its closest point.

<sup>6</sup> At its closest point.

**Table 25-18 Designated heritage assets selected for effects from offshore development**

Receptor/Receptor Group		Approximate distance and direction from Offshore Array Area <sup>7</sup>
Designation/List Entry	Name	
<b>Scheduled monument</b>		
SM 1002201	Napoleonic Barracks 480m south-west of Foxhole Farm Cuckmere Haven	26.5km northeast
SM 1002242	Newhaven Military Fort and Lunette Battery	21.8km northeast
SM 1002288	Camp Near Belle Tout Lighthouse, Birling Gap	28.8km northeast
SM 1005809	A 19th century artillery fort known as Littlehampton Fort, 317m south west of the Windmill Theatre	15.3km north
SM 1005824	Shoreham Fort 120m SSE of East House	17.6km north
SM 1012500	Arundel Castle	21.2km north
SM 1013067	Long Barrow on Beacon Hill	18.8km northeast
SM 1014523	Hillfort and a bowl barrow on Seaford Head	24.1km northeast
SM 1015229	Long barrow on Beacon Hill, 160m north west of the windmill	18.7km northeast
SM 1014526	Hillfort, the possible remains of a Romano-Celtic temple and a group of three bowl barrows at Hollingbury	22.4km northeast
SM 1015817	Cissbury Ring hillfort prehistoric flint mine and associated remains	18.9km north
SM 1015877	Highdown Hill Camp: A Ram's Hill type enclosure an Anglo-Saxon cemetery and associated remains	16.6km north

<sup>7</sup> At its closest point.

Receptor/Receptor Group		Approximate distance and direction from Offshore Array Area <sup>7</sup>
Designation/List Entry	Name	
SM 1017359	Martello tower no 74 on Seaford Esplanade	23.7km northeast
<b>Listed building</b>		
LB Grade II 1025809	205-211, Brighton Road	14.1km north
LB Grade II 1027639	Climping Mill	15.7km north
LBs	Listed Buildings in Bailiffscourt	15.7 to 16km north
Grade II* 1027676 1233450 1274459		
Grade II 1027677 1027637 1027638 1276596 1353879		
LB Grade II 1027780	Band Stand	15.4km north
LBs	Listed Buildings at Arundel Castle	21.4 to 22.4km
Grade I 1027926		
Grade II* 1353747		
Grade II 1027928, 1248038 1414107		
LBs	Shelters at TQ 273 044 and TQ 270 045	18.9km northeast
Grade II 1187598		



<b>Receptor/Receptor Group</b>		<b>Approximate distance and direction from Offshore Array Area<sup>7</sup></b>
<b>Designation/List Entry</b>	<b>Name</b>	
1292365		
LB Grade II 1222778	17 <sup>th</sup> Century House	19.2km northeast
LBs  Grade II 1274012 1274038	Rustington Convalescent Home	15.2km to 15.3km north
LB Grade II 1380152	French Convalescent Home and Attached Wall and Railings	18.4km northeast
LBs  Grade II 1380546 1380547 1380548	Ian Fraser House and Associated Listed Buildings	18.7km northeast
LB Grade II 1380831	Roedean School Main Buildings	18.7km northeast
LB Grade II* 1381696	Madeira Terrace, Madeira Walk, lift tower and related buildings	18.4km northeast
LB Grade II 1396577	Vista Point, Including Garages and Attached Walls	14.7km north
LB Grade II 1419211	Runnymede	14.2km north
<b>Registered Park and Garden</b>		
RPG Grade II* 1000170	Arundel Castle	21.2km north
RPG Grade II 1001313	Kemp Town Enclosures	18.3km northeast
<b>Conservation Area</b>		
In Chichester District	Selsey Old Town	18km 14.9km northwest

Receptor/Receptor Group		Approximate distance and direction from Offshore Array Area <sup>7</sup>
Designation/List Entry	Name	
In Chichester District	Sidlesham Quay	187.3km northwest
In Arun District	The Steyne and Aldwick Road in Bognor Regis  Craigweil House and Aldwick Bay in Aldwick	15.3km to 16km northwest
In Arun District	Littlehampton (Sea Front), Littlehampton (River Road) in Littlehampton	15.3km to 16.1km north
In Worthing	Steyne Gardens, South Street, Marine Parade and Hinterland	13.4km to 13.7km north
In Brighton and Hove	Kemp Town, The Avenues, Brunswick Town, Cliftonville, East Cliff, Old Town, Regency Square, Rottingdean, Sackville Gardens, Pembroke and Princes, Old Hove, and Valley Gardens	14km 17.9km to 18.86km northeast

### Non-designated heritage assets

- 25.6.24 Details of the records relating to non-designated heritage assets in the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 1km Study Area are provided in [Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2). These records are incorporated in a chronological baseline. Where records relate to non-designated heritage assets not yet dated, these are included within the undated section.
- 25.6.25 The HER records identified within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits ([Figure 25.3, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25) and [Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage records, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1)) represent all periods from Palaeolithic to modern and comprise a range of record types including small find locations, historic landscapes, farmsteads, extant monuments, earthworks, buildings, military structures, memorials, telephone boxes, and archaeological sites and deposits.
- 25.6.26 In addition to these records, there are two projected Roman roads routes crossing the site, broadly east-west. The most southerly is broadly projected along that of the A27, at the boundary of Zone 1 and 2. The second is the Hardham to Barcombe Mills Roman Road through the Districts of Horsham and Mid Sussex, located at the boundary of Zone 2 and 3 ([Figure 25.3, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).

- 25.6.27 There are four UKHO records within the Study Area, which relate to wreck sites (**Figure 25.3, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25). One is identified on the west bank of the River Arun (1001702015) and is characterised as a wreck showing any portion of hull/structure which has been lifted. The other three are located below Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) and `considered within a separate marine archaeology baseline report (**Appendix 16.1: Marine archaeology technical report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.16.1).
- 25.6.28 Of the three district councils which the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits crosses, only Horsham and Arun have identified locally listed buildings (Buildings and Structures of Character), which have some historical interest. Of those listed in Horsham District, none are located within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits or Study Area. Of those listed in Arun District, none are located within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits. Those within the Study Area (Arun District Council, 2005) are largely residential buildings with a few public houses and a WWII machine gun post. Buildings or structures identified on local lists do not receive any additional statutory protection but effects on these is a material consideration in the determination of the DCO.
- 25.6.29 The onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits intersects with 19 Archaeological Notification Areas (ANA) (listed in **Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage records, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1) and shown in **Figure 25.4, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25). ANAs delineate the existence, or probable existence, of archaeological heritage assets. These are found along the length of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits and Study Area but are more concentrated and cover a larger land area within the Zone 1 South Coast Plain and Zone 2 South Downs. Within the Zone 3 Low Weald, the ANAs cover relatively discreet areas of land.
- 25.6.30 The majority of the features identified on LiDAR imagery within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits relate to previous agricultural land-use (see **Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage records, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1) and **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). Features identified within Zone 1 include the remains of former field systems, drainage ditches and flood defences, and natural phenomena such as paleochannels. On the higher ground of the South Downs (Zone 2) there are earthworks indicative of former field boundaries. Some of these were extensions of previously recorded field systems, but other examples are previously unrecorded. Some of those which share similar orientations to existing fields in the vicinity are likely to be related to the enclosure of open fields and common during the late medieval and post medieval periods. Other examples, such as features which are oriented at odds with existing field patterns, may have pre-medieval origins. Other feature types identified within Zone 2 may indicate possible barrow sites, quarry pits, routeways and/or boundaries. Across the Low Weald (Zone 3), areas of relict ridge and furrow surviving as faint earthworks were observed, alongside evidence for relict field boundaries. The results of the LiDAR review are listed in **Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage records, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1) and incorporated into the baseline in **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2).

25.6.31 As part of a historic map regression exercise detailed in **Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage assets, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1) and **25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2), certain structures and features of post medieval and modern date were identified within and adjacent to the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits which were not already identified by the HER (listed in **Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage assets, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1)). These range from agricultural buildings, pits, ponds and houses, some of which are still extant in the landscape. These features may represent areas of archaeological interest where survival of building remains may exist, whilst others may represent potential sources of post depositional impact which may have truncated buried deposits of potential archaeological interest.

### Archaeological investigations

- 25.6.32 Geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching have been undertaken within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits to support the historic environment assessment in this chapter.
- 25.6.33 Results of the geophysical survey which has been undertaken within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits are provided in **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4). The survey recorded numerous geophysical anomalies across all landscape zones, which have been interpreted as having an archaeological or potential archaeological origin (see **Table 5.1** in **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Other anomalies are identified as having an unclear origin, where these are weak, fractured or isolated and their context is difficult to ascertain.
- 25.6.34 Advanced targeted archaeological trial trenching has been undertaken within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, where a potential for archaeological remains of high heritage significance was identified in the vicinity of Brook Barn Farm, close to TC-04 KM03, through a combination of desk-based research (see **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) and geophysical survey (**Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Results of the archaeological trial trenching is provided in **Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6) and summarised below:
- Middle/Late Iron Age ditches and a pit, likely representing elements of a possible Middle/Late Iron Age driveway and/or field system; and
  - Late Iron Age/Roman enclosure strongly resembling a ‘complex’ farmstead with a ‘sub-divided enclosure’ as defined in the recent national survey of rural Roman Britain (Smith et al 2016, 28-33) with a differentiation of space reflecting areas where different activities were undertaken.
- 25.6.35 The spatial extent of these remains is predicted to be limited to the northeast, west and south due to previous ground disturbance from landfill and landscaping activities as evidenced by the geophysical survey, modern pits/deposits and the

lack of features detected in certain trenches, historic records and former trial trenching. Two trenches not excavated due to land access restrictions are confidently predicted to encounter archaeological remains, based on the ground truthing of the geophysical survey results in the other trenches.

### Previous archaeological investigations

25.6.36 Archaeological investigations (not undertaken as part of the Rampion 2 project) within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits have been limited (see [Appendix 25.1: Gazetteer of onshore heritage assets, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.1) and [Table 4-8](#) in [Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). Results of these investigations and those within the 1km Study Area, where relevant, are incorporated into the chronological baseline and discussion on archaeological potential of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits. These include a combination of desk-based assessments, geophysical survey, intrusive investigations (geotechnical, trial trenching and excavation), watching briefs and fieldwalking.

### Known and potential archaeological assets

25.6.37 Details of known and potential archaeological receptors, together with an assessment of heritage significance, within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits are provided within [Section 5, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2). In this chapter, [Table 25-19](#), [Table 25-20](#) and [Table 25-21](#) provide a summary of the baseline, according to location within the proposed DCO Order Limits (south to north).

25.6.38 A geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment for the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits is provided in [Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3) and the updated geophysical survey results are provided in [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4), and incorporated into the summary tables in this Chapter ([Table 25-19](#), [Table 25-20](#) and [Table 25-21](#)).

25.6.39 Potential for the presence of archaeological remains is described according to the following:

- very high – there is recorded evidence that archaeological features and finds are represented within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits;
- high – there is recorded evidence that archaeological features and finds are represented in close vicinity to the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits;
- medium – recovery of material or observations of activity in Study Area suggest that archaeological features and finds may be represented on the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits; or

- low – there is no to low evidence which suggests that archaeological features and finds are likely to be represented in the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.

25.6.40 For potential heritage assets identified by geophysical survey (**Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)), and not yet ground truthed by intrusive investigation (such as those at Brook Barn Farm, **Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6)), the heritage significance has been assessed based on the likely interpretation of the anomalies in the context of known historic environment baseline. Although undated, many anomalies recorded appear to represent features relating to possible former land boundaries and ridge and furrow ploughing. Archaeological remains of this character would carry low heritage significance derived from their archaeological interest as features representing pre-modern land use.

### Zone 1: South Coastal Plain

25.6.41 Overall, there is archaeological potential for all periods, ranging from low to high within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 1: South Coast Plain, which are anticipated to form elements of the following asset groups or themes:

- buried prehistoric landscapes;
- later prehistoric settlement and agriculture practices;
- later prehistoric funerary activity;
- late Iron Age to Roman settlement and land-use
- medieval settlement and agriculture;
- post medieval settlement agriculture; and
- military coastal defences.

25.6.42 Negative evidence and sources of post-depositional impact within Zone 1 are discussed in **Section 5, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2).

**Table 25-19 Zone 1: South Coast Plain – Known and potential archaeological receptors within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits**

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
<b>Arun floodplain and coastal plain</b>	<p>Palaeoenvironmental deposits.</p> <p>Potential dependant on geological context. River Terrace deposits have low potential, Raised Beach deposits have medium potential, and Alluvium has high potential.</p> <p>Valleys and rivers may represent attractive environments for hunter-gatherer groups.</p> <p>Deep alluvium deposits present within the floodplain have potential for environmental reconstruction of the Holocene.</p>	Prehistoric	Low to very high	Medium (River Terrace and Raised Beach deposits) and High (Alluvium)
<b>Intertidal zone KM 00<sup>12</sup></b>	<p>Remains associated with site of Cudlow Deserted Medieval Village (DMV) (MWS3384).</p> <p>HER record for Cudlow DMV (MWS3384) lies below MHWS but potential for remains to extend into the proposed DCO Order Limits. Reportedly lost to the sea by coastal erosion, with</p>	Medieval	High	Medium

<sup>8</sup> Specific location provided for known heritage assets within proposed DCO Order Limits, whilst general area or landscape/geological context provided for predicted heritage assets.

<sup>9</sup> Relevant record number and name provided for known heritage assets, whilst general asset type provided for predicted heritage assets.

<sup>10</sup> Degree to which an asset is predicted to occur within onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.

<sup>11</sup> Assessed heritage significance of predicted heritage assets within the proposed DCO Order Limits.

<sup>12</sup> Kilometre post measured along the centreline of the proposed onshore cable from landfall to the onshore substation at Oakendene.

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>traces of the submerged village including house foundations and walls said to be visible at very low spring tides.</p> <p>If present, archaeological remains of the DMV may contribute to understanding of the local and regional medieval rural settlement pattern during this period.</p>			
<b>Intertidal zone KM 00</b>	<p>Remains associated with site of Atherington DMV (MWS3385).</p> <p>HER record for Atherington DMV (MWS3385) lies below MHWS but potential for remains to extend into the proposed DCO Order Limits. Remains of Atherington DMV are said to be visible at very low tides, including graves which are now buried by sand and shingle. Anticipated poor state of preservation.</p> <p>If present, archaeological remains of the DMV may contribute to understanding of the local and regional medieval rural settlement pattern.</p>	Medieval	High	Medium
<b>Intertidal zone KM 00</b>	<p>Buried/submerged prehistoric landscapes.</p> <p>Changing coastline means areas now submerged would have been dry land. Where exposed by weathering the survival condition may be poor. Examples of in situ sites are rare and would of regional importance, while weathered / rolled material would be of more limited significance.</p>	Prehistoric	Low to medium	Low to medium
<b>General</b>	Geophysical anomalies of unclear origin	Undated	Medium to High	Uncertain/



Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>Geophysical survey has recorded numerous anomalies within the proposed DCO Order Limits (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). These range from discrete or linear areas of enhanced magnetism or linear/curvilinear trends of unclear origin. Generally, these anomalies are magnetically weak, fractured or isolated and their context is difficult to ascertain. Whilst an archaeological origin is possible, an agricultural, geological or modern origin is also likely. Where relevant, the predicted archaeological potential and heritage significance of these anomalies have been discussed within the context of other evidence within this table. Of those anomalies not discussed elsewhere within this table, the heritage significance of such potential archaeological features, whilst uncertain, is not predicted to be of high heritage significance given their indicative form and extent, location and the available baseline evidence.</p>			Very low to medium
<b>Climping beach KM 00</b>	<p>WWII coastal defence features</p> <p>Anti-tank blocks (MWS5228 and MWS7544), anti-tank wall (MWS8294), anti-tank artillery site (MWS7130).</p> <p>Elements of these structures are extant, but carry little archaeological interest, aside from as a group where collectively they represent coastal defence during WWII.</p>	Modern/WWII	Low	Medium
<b>Field behind Climping beach</b>	Former site of WW2 Anti-Aircraft Artillery (MWS7123).	Modern/WWII	Low	Very Low

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
<b>KM 00</b>	No extant remains observed during site walkover. Little to no archaeological interest. Historic interest relating to military defence of the coast in WWII.			
<b>Field behind Climping beach KM 00</b>	Site of former outfarm (MWS9869). Common Barn depicted on 19 <sup>th</sup> century OS mapping, no longer extant. Buried deposits may survive.	Post medieval	Medium to high	Low
<b>Field behind Climping Beach Temporary compound (TC) TC-01 KM 00</b>	<p>Undated possible enclosure (4_1)</p> <p>Potential remains of an undated enclosure within a field behind Climping Beach (Field 004), evidenced by geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Enclosure appears to have a well-defined southeast entrance and a pit-like feature in its northwest corner. No above ground traces of were observed during the site walkover. If the geophysical anomalies relate to a late prehistoric or Romano-British settlement and associated land-use features, they would be a regionally important heritage asset which holds medium significance for its archaeological interest.</p> <p>Where they may relate to medieval or post medieval land-use, this would be of local importance as a heritage asset holding low significance for its archaeological interest.</p>	Undated	High	Low to medium
<b>Field behind Climping beach KM00</b>	Undated possible enclosure (5_1) and other possible archaeological features	Undated	High	Low to medium

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
<b>TC-01a</b>	<p>Potential remains of an undated enclosure (5_1) measuring approximately 60m by 50m within a field behind Climping Beach (Field 005), evidenced by geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [<b>PEPD-031</b> and <b>PEPD-113</b> to <b>PEPD-120</b>] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission). Other geophysical anomalies of possible archaeological origin, including possible pit (5_2) and ditches (5_4) also recorded within the same field.</p> <p>No above ground traces of were observed during the site walkover. Roman pottery has been recovered from the beach 200m to the south (MWS34459).</p> <p>If the geophysical anomalies relate to a late prehistoric or Romano-British settlement and associated land-use features, they would be a regionally important heritage asset which holds medium significance for its archaeological interest. Where they may relate to medieval or post medieval land-use, this would be of local importance as a heritage asset holding low significance for its archaeological interest.</p>	Undated	High	Low to medium
	<p>Potential remains of an undetermined nature within a field near landfall (Field 006), evidenced by geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Uncertain nature but lies along a former field division depicted</p>			

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>on 19th century OS mapping and identified as a LiDAR feature (LDr_001) and could be associated with agricultural activity. No above ground traces of were observed during the site walkover.</p> <p>Based on the features form and extent and context within the available baseline, it is not predicted that this represents remains of high heritage significance.</p>			
<b>Operational access A-06</b>	Medieval earthworks east and southeast of St Mary's Church (NHLE 1005828; MWS3371)	Medieval	Very High	Low to high
<b>Vicinity of KM02 to KM03 and Operational access A-10</b>	<p data-bbox="483 783 1379 850">Bronze Age settlement deposits and features west of Courtwick Lane.</p> <p data-bbox="483 895 1379 1182">Potential for archaeological remains within the proposed DCO Order Limits evidenced by recorded ditches, pit and finds at a site off Courtwick Lane (MWS9428) (ANA Arun 049) and trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm (<a href="#">Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6)) which recovered multiple worked flints of probable Neolithic or Early Bronze Age date.</p> <p data-bbox="483 1227 1379 1406">Elsewhere within the proposed DCO Order Limits (between KM02 and KM03), very few geophysical anomalies were detected (Fields 021 to 023), none of which were ascribed a possible archaeological origin. A few weak trends and areas of magnetic enhancement of unclear origin in Field 021 are</p>	Bronze Age	Low to medium	Low to medium

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
<b>Vicinity of KM02 to KM03 and Operational access A-10</b>	<p>considered more likely to be due to natural variations or agricultural activity but an archaeological origin could not be ruled out (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p> <p>Where archaeological remains may be present which are not detected by geophysical survey, these are anticipated to be very low density discrete features and finds (e.g., flints and pottery).</p>	Early medieval	Low to medium	Low to medium
	<p>Early medieval settlement deposits and features west of Courtwick Lane.</p> <p>Potential for archaeological remains within the proposed DCO Order Limits evidenced by recorded pits containing early medieval pottery and a sunken featured building and possible timber post building at a site off Courtwick Lane (MWS9428) (ANA Arun 049).</p>			
	<p>Trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm recorded no early medieval features or finds (<a href="#">Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6)).</p>			
	<p>Geophysical survey within the Site on land adjacent to the Courtwick Lane, recorded only a few anomalies, none of which were ascribed a possible archaeological origin (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p>			

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
<b>Vicinity of KM02, TC-03</b>	Former section of the West Branch, Littlehampton Branch and Mid Sussex Line constructed and reroute in the 19th century (no HER ID).	Post medieval	Very High	Low
<b>Brook Barn Farm, close to TC-04 KM03</b>	<p>Iron Age and Roman settlement and land use.</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation by trial trenching within the proposed DCO Order Limits (<a href="#">Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</a> (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6)) recorded a series of ditches and pits, many of which were previously identified through geophysical survey (Field 27) (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) and which relate to Middle Iron Age field system and droveway and settlement enclosure dating to the Late Iron Age and Roman periods.</p> <p>Other trenches in the east and north of evaluation area recorded either no archaeological features and/or modern disturbance (resulting from landfill and/or modern landscaping activity), which correlates with results of the geophysical survey. These results suggest a low potential for archaeological remains to be present where large amorphous anomalies of magnetic disturbance or blanks areas are evident in the geophysical survey results within this vicinity.</p> <p>Elsewhere, between KM02 and KM03, very few geophysical anomalies were detected (Field 21 to 23), none of which are ascribed a possible archaeological origin.</p>	Iron Age and Roman	Very High	Medium

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
Vicinity of KM04, south of Lyminster	<p>Undated possible enclosures (34_1)</p> <p>Potential remains of an undated enclosure (34_1) within a field south of Lyminster village (Field 034), evidenced by geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [<b>PEPD-031</b> and <b>PEPD-113</b> to <b>PEPD-120</b>] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission). These features appear to extend northwards, beyond the DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>No above ground traces of were observed during the site walkover.</p> <p>As detailed in <a href="#">Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) [<b>APP-200</b>]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evidence for late prehistoric and Roman activity has been recorded in the area;</li> <li>• a Priory of Benedictine Nuns was founded in the 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> century in Lyminster and dissolved c. 1414;</li> <li>• the nave and chancel of the Parish Church of St Mary Magdalene, around 180m north of the Site, is thought to be of a late 10<sup>th</sup> century date (MWS3068); and</li> <li>• Lyminster is recorded in the Domesday book of 1086.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, the possible enclosure may relate to late prehistoric or Roman activity, or be medieval in date, possibly associated with the former Benedictine Priory.</p>	Undated	High	Low to medium

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
Vicinity of KM04, south of Lyminster	Undated possible archaeological remains (34_2), (34_3) and (34_4)	Undated	High	Low to medium
	<p>Geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [APP-203 to 210] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission) has detected a well-defined curving trend (34_2) which appears to enclose a series of well-defined discrete areas of enhanced magnetism (34_3) of possible archaeological origin.</p> <p>If archaeological in origin, these may relate to medieval and post medieval settlement or agricultural activity, given its proximity to Lyminster village. The pattern and form suggest a possible former orchard/wood or graveyard.</p>			
Vicinity of KM06	Undated possible enclosures or settlement (38_1, 38_2 and 38_3)	Undated	High	Low to high
	<p>Potential remains of undated enclosures or settlement within agricultural field west of Poling, as evidenced by geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [PEPD-031 and PEPD-113 to PEPD-120] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission). The complex of anomalies detected appear to continue to the east of the area surveyed, therefore likely to extend across the full width of the DCO Order Limits at this location and may also extend beyond.</p>			



Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>The anomalies do not correspond to any known HER, LiDAR, or AP features. The apparent layout and form of the anomalies suggest they could be of late prehistoric or Romano-British date.</p> <p>The projected route of a Roman road lies to the north along the A27 and Crossbush Road, with evidence of Roman settlement activity adjacent to the projected route within a field (MWS3541) approximately 850m north of the geophysical anomalies. The scheduled site of a Roman villa with traces of Iron Age occupation lies 1.5km to the east (NHLE 1015886). Earthwork remains of a deserted medieval village at Poling lies 550m east (MWS5761), whilst other medieval settlement is also known at Lyminster to the west and monastery to the northeast.</p> <p>The anomalies may indicate the presence of archaeological remains similar to those identified by geophysical survey and trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [PEPD-031 and PEPD-113 to PEPD-120] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission and <a href="#">Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6) [APP-066], which recorded multiple phases of field system and enclosures of Iron Age to Roman date surviving as a series of ditches.</p>			

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>Archaeological survival of similar sites may contribute to our understanding the rural economy and spatial organisation of settlement and land.</p> <p>Archaeological survival of environmental and faunal remains may contribute to an understanding of local vegetation and resource exploitation.</p> <p>Where the geophysical remains relate to agricultural and settlement evidence of late prehistoric to Romano-British date, these are likely to be of low to medium heritage significance depending on the exact nature, extent and condition of the remains.</p> <p>As the geophysical anomalies detected appear to extend beyond the narrow area surveyed, interpretation is limited. Therefore, whilst the form suggests that they may be of medium heritage significance, the available evidence does not exclude the potential for remains of national importance to be present.</p>			
<b>Immediately south of Vinery Industrial Estate, between KM07 and KM08</b>	<p>Late Bronze Age settlement and medieval field system at The Vinery (MWS14193).</p> <p>Potential for remains associated with known excavated site of Bronze Age settlement and land-use activity (specialised crop farming and potential small-scale pottery production) at The Vinery immediately adjacent to the proposed DCO Order Limits (MWS14193). Remains relating to probable medieval ridge and</p>	Bronze Age/ medieval	Low to medium	Medium

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>furrow along with undated postholes also recorded during excavations.</p> <p>Undated cropmarks (MWS3544 and MWS3545) within vicinity of the Vinery excavations could be associated.</p> <p>Geophysical survey has not identified any anomalies with possible archaeological origin within the fields (Fields 042 to 047) in this part of the proposed DCO Order Limited (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [PEPD-031 and PEPD-113 to PEPD-120] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission).</p>			
<b>KM 08</b>	<p>Cropmarks south of A27 Arundel Road (MWS3544 and MWS3545)</p> <p>Ovoid cropmark identified on aerial photograph within proposed DCO Order Limits (MWS3544). Could represent former settlement or land use. Further cropmarks (MWS3545) representing linear features of unknown date are also observed on an aerial photograph within the same field (HER record lies adjacent to the proposed DCO Order Limits). No earthworks were identified on LiDAR imagery in this area.</p> <p>Potential for association with Bronze Age settlement activity or medieval field system recorded within the vicinity (MWS14193).</p>	Undated	Low to medium	Low to medium

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
<b>TC-09</b>	<p>The geophysical survey (Field 046) did not detect any anomalies which might relate to these cropmarks (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [<b>PEPD-031</b> and <b>PEPD-113</b> to <b>PEPD-120</b>] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission).</p> <p>Possible site of post medieval brick kiln (MWS3543)</p> <p>“Kiln Field” identified on the Angmering Tithe map of 1838-9 within proposed DCO Order Limits, which may suggest presence of nearby brick kilns (MWS3543).</p> <p>The geophysical survey did not detect any anomalies within the field (Field 048) which might relate to the remains of a kiln (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [<b>PEPD-031</b> and <b>PEPD-113</b> to <b>PEPD-120</b>] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission).</p>	Post medieval	Low	Low
<b>TC-10 and TC-10a, Light construction &amp; operational access A-20, temporary construction accesses A-21 and A-22</b>	<p>Roman road from Chichester to Brighton.</p> <p>Broadly projected along that of the A27. No extant features observed. Potential archaeological survival within undeveloped areas of the adjacent to projected route of Roman road. If present, remains likely to have been truncated by road construction/improvements and ploughing.</p>	Roman	Low to Medium	Low

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>The geophysical survey (Fields 049 and 050) did not detect any anomalies which might relate to the remains of a Roman road (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [PEPD-031 and PEPD-113 to PEPD-120] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission).</p>			
<b>General – Coastal Plain and Arun floodplain</b>	<p>Palaeolithic flint artefacts.</p> <p>Single handaxe recovered from Climping beach (MWS3638).</p> <p>Archaeological potential and heritage significance is dependent on context of recovery. Alluvium and Raised Beach deposits have lower potential compared with River Terrace deposits.</p> <p>Finds recovered from secondary contexts would be of low heritage significance compared with those recovered from primary contexts (Medium for Alluvium and River Terrace deposits and High for Raised Beach deposits)</p>	Palaeolithic	Low/uncertain to medium	Low to high
<b>General – Zone 1</b>	<p>Mesolithic flint artefacts and scatters.</p> <p>Mesolithic flint scatter (MWS3463) found within 120m of the Site and other finds of Mesolithic flints within the Study Area.</p>	Mesolithic	Low	Low to high
<b>General – Zone 1</b>	<p>Neolithic flint artefacts, pottery sherds and artefact scatters.</p> <p>Trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm (<a href="#">Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) recovered</p>	Neolithic	Medium to high	Low to medium

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>multiple worked flints of probable Neolithic or Early Bronze Age date.</p> <p>A Neolithic flint scatter (MWS3118; EWS1125) recorded 20m east of the Site.</p> <p>Other findspots of flint and pottery sherds tentatively dated to Neolithic (MWS3396; MWS3895) within the Study Area.</p>			
<b>General – Zone 1</b>	<p>Bronze Age finds (isolated/residual).</p> <p>Trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm (<a href="#">Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6)) recovered multiple worked flints of probable Neolithic or Early Bronze Age date.</p> <p>Bronze Age activity evidenced within immediate vicinity of proposed DCO Order limits, indicating potential for residual Bronze Age finds elsewhere within Zone 1.</p>	Bronze Age	Medium to high	Low
<b>General – Zone 1</b>	<p>Iron Age and Roman finds and features.</p> <p>Iron Age and Roman activity evidence through archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm (<a href="#">Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6)) and elsewhere within Study Area, including remains recorded within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits. Remains of a</p>	Iron Age and Roman	Medium to High	Low to medium

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>Roman villa (NHLE 1015886) 800m south of the Site, (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)), indicating potential for residual Iron Age and Roman finds.</p> <p>Buried features, if present, are likely to be related to agricultural activity and land division.</p>			
<b>General – Zone 1</b>	<p>Medieval agriculture/land division features and finds.</p> <p>Medieval activity within the study area is evidenced in the desk study (<a href="#">Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)), indicating potential for as-yet unknown remains of agriculture and land division within Zone 1.</p> <p>Fields between TC-01 and light construction access A-03 may contain remains of agricultural activity associated with site of Islesham Church (MWS3104) and DMV (MWS3100, ANA Arun 042) within 80m of the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits. However, no features of this nature were identified by geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p> <p>Occurrence of residual finds possible generally across Zone 1.</p>	Medieval	Low to Medium	Low to medium
<b>General – Zone 1</b>	Post medieval features and finds.	Post medieval	High	Low

Location <sup>8</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/name) <sup>9</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>10</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>11</sup>
	<p>Potential remains of post medieval agricultural and land division features evidenced by geophysical survey which recorded anomalies indicating traces of ridge and furrow ploughing and buried ditches which may form elements of former field systems (Fields 004, 006, 012 and 016). Geophysical anomalies in Field 006 may be related to linear banks identified as earthworks on LiDAR imagery (LDr_001 to 003), which corresponds with field boundaries shown on historic OS mapping (<a href="#">Figure 3.1, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> (Document Reference 6.4.25.4)).</p> <p>There is potential for further post medieval agriculture/land division features elsewhere within Zone 1. Occurrence of residual finds possible generally across Zone 1.</p>			

## Zone 2: South Downs

- 25.6.43 Overall, there is potential for archaeological remains to occur relating to all periods within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 2: South Coast Plain, which are anticipated to form elements of the following assets groups or themes:
- prehistoric settlement and agriculture practices;
  - prehistoric flint mining activity;
  - prehistoric monumental funerary activity;
  - medieval settlement and agriculture;
  - post medieval settlement agriculture; and



- military activity.

25.6.44 Negative evidence and sources of post-depositional impact within Zone 2 are discussed in [Section 5, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2).

**Table 25-20 Zone 2: South Downs – Known and potential archaeological receptors within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits**

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<b>General - downland dry valleys</b>	<p>Palaeoenvironmental deposits.</p> <p>Medium potential within Head deposits as evidenced elsewhere in Southern England.</p> <p>Very low potential within clay-with-flints.</p> <p>See <a href="#">Sections 4 and 6, Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental</a></p>	Prehistoric	Very Low to Medium	Medium

<sup>13</sup> Specific location provided for known heritage assets within proposed DCO Order Limits, whilst general area or landscape/geological context provided for predicted heritage assets.

<sup>14</sup> Relevant record number and name provided for known heritage assets, whilst general asset type provided for predicted heritage assets.

<sup>15</sup> Degree to which an asset is predicted to occur within onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.

<sup>16</sup> Assessed heritage significance of predicted heritage assets within the proposed DCO Order Limits.

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p><b>assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3) for discussion on palaeoenvironmental potential.</p>			
<b>General</b>	<p>Palaeolithic and Mesolithic flint artefacts.</p> <p>No recorded Palaeolithic evidence within proposed DCO Order Limits, though Palaeolithic visitors on chalk upland theoretically possible, relating to activity recorded in the wider Sussex coastal plain.</p> <p>No recorded evidence within Zone 2, but evidence in Zone 3 reflects increased potential within the north of Zone 2, which lies adjacent to the Lower Green Sandstone, compared with elsewhere.</p> <p>See <b>Section 4</b> and <b>Section 6, Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference:</p>	Prehistoric	Low	Low to medium

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	6.4.25.3) for discussion on geoarchaeological potential			
<b>General – chalk upland</b>	<p>Neolithic flint artefacts</p> <p>Chance finds of worked flint have been recovered along the length of the Study Area in Zone 2 including stone axes or axe fragments at Blakehurst Farm (MWS2710 590m south of the Site), and west of Hallow Hill (MWS4613 700m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits). Flint mining activity evidence in the Study Area indicates potential for isolated finds of flint artefacts.</p>	Neolithic	Low to high	Low to medium
<b>General</b>	<p>Later prehistoric and Roman finds</p> <p>Potential for isolated and residual finds evidence by remains relating to these periods within the Site and Study Area in Zone 2.</p>	Bronze Age/Iron Age/Roman	Low to medium	Low
<b>General</b>	Early medieval settlement features and deposits	Early medieval	Very low	Medium to high

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>Very limited evidence in Zone 2 (<a href="#">Section 4.7</a> and <a href="#">Table 5-2</a> in <a href="#">Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).</p>			
<b>General</b>	<p>Agricultural and land division features, routeways and extraction pits.</p> <p>There is a general potential for archaeological remains of this nature in the proposed DCO Order Limits within Zone 2, in addition the specified occurrences detail in this table. Likely to take the form of buried ditches and pits.</p>	Medieval and post medieval	Medium to High	Very low to low
<b>General</b>	<p>Geophysical anomalies of unclear origin</p> <p>Geophysical survey has recorded numerous anomalies within the proposed DCO Order Limits (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). These</p>	Undated	Medium to High	Uncertain/ Very low to medium

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>range from discrete or linear areas of enhanced magnetism or linear/curvilinear trends of unclear origin. Generally, these anomalies are magnetically weak, fractured or isolated and their context is difficult to ascertain. Whilst an archaeological origin is possible, an agricultural, geological or modern origin is also likely. Where relevant, the predicted archaeological potential and heritage significance of these anomalies have been discussed within the context of other evidence within this table. Of those anomalies not discussed elsewhere within this table, the heritage significance of such potential archaeological features, whilst uncertain, is not predicted to be of high heritage significance given their indicative form and extent, location and the available baseline evidence,</p>			
<p><b>Vicinity of KM09, TC-10, temporary construction</b></p>	<p>Roman road from Chichester to Brighton and roadside activity.</p>	<p>Roman</p>	<p>Low to medium</p>	<p>Low</p>

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<p><b>accesses A-21 and A-22</b></p>	<p>Broadly projected along that of the A27. No extant features observed. Potential archaeological survival within undeveloped areas of the adjacent to projected route of Roman road. If present, remains likely to have been truncated by road construction/improvements and ploughing.</p> <p>The geophysical survey (Fields 049 and 050) did not detect any anomalies which might relate to the remains of a Roman road (<b>Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [<b>PEPD-031</b> and <b>PEPD-113</b> to <b>PEPD-120</b>] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission).</p>			
<p><b>North of A27, KM09 and TC-10</b></p>	<p>Site of a former brickyard in Hammer Pot Field (MWS5726)</p> <p>Depression identified on LiDAR imagery (LDr_022) may be related. Geophysical survey identified</p>	<p>Post Medieval</p>	<p>Very high</p>	<p>Low</p>

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>anomalies of possible archaeological origin (51_1) at the same location, which may also be related to remains of the brickworks (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [PEPD-031 and PEPD-113 to PEPD-120] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission).</p>			
<p><b>Between TC-10 and TC-12c, KM09 to KM13</b></p>	<p>Probable extraction pits</p> <p>Numerous LiDAR features (LDr_024-025, LDr_027, LDr_087, LDr_090-091, LDr_093) interpreted as probable extraction pits are located within proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>LDr_027 and LDr_087 are located in areas depicted as “Old Chalk Pit” on 19th century OS maps. LDr_027 also corresponds to an area of enhanced magnetism (55_4) in Field 055 (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical</a></p>	Undated	High	Very low

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>survey report, <b>Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4). LDr_087 is located in woodland, therefore no geophysical survey data is available, as is the case for LDr_090.</p>			
	<p>LDr_091 coincides with an area of enhanced magnetism (56_2 in Field 056, <b>Section 4.4, Table 5-2</b> and <b>Figures 3.8</b> and <b>6.45</b> in <b>Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4). LDr_093 correlates with only a few much smaller areas of enhanced magnetism (56_1) in the same field, which are thought likely to be due to natural variations in the geology.</p>			
	<p>LDr_087 and LDr_090 are located in woodland, therefore no geophysical survey data is available.</p>			



Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<b>Vicinity of KM10</b>	<p>LDr_024-025 correspond with two areas of strong geophysical response (53_1) and (53_2) identified by the geophysical survey (Field 053).</p> <p>Geophysical survey also identifies other areas of enhanced magnetism of unclear origin which may be indicative of extraction activity of unknown date in Field 081 (<b>Table 5-1, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [<b>PEPD-031</b> and <b>PEPD-113</b> to <b>PEPD-120</b>] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission).</p>	Undated	Medium to high	Uncertain/Low to medium
	<p>A curving linear trend (52_1) of probable archaeological origin identified through geophysical survey (<b>Figures 3.6-3.7</b> and <b>Figures 6.37-6.40, Appendix</b></p>			

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<b>Vicinity of KM10.5 to KM18.8</b>	<p><b>25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [<b>PEPD-031</b> and <b>PEPD-113</b> to <b>PEPD-120</b>] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission (Field 052). The geophysical survey report suggests it may be a ditch type feature forming part of an enclosure. Two anomalies (52_2) within 52_1 are also thought to have a possible archaeological origin. 52_3 to the south is on a similar alignment and may be related.</p> <p>The discrete areas of enhance magnetism of unclear origin (52_5) to the south are considered likely to be natural or associated with post medieval and modern extraction activity, evidenced within the vicinity, such as 52_9 in the same field.</p>	WWII	High	Low

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>Area extending across the South Downs used during WWII utilised for training purposes (<a href="#">Section 4.7, Plates 5 and 6, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) and subsequent EOC (explosive ordnance clearance) activity. Potential for related finds and features to be present within the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>Geophysical survey recorded numerous discrete, very strong ferrous anomalies of unclear origin in Fields 090 (90_1) and 091 (91_1), which may relate to WWII activities, including ordnance clearance.</p>			

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<b>Light construction and operational access A-25</b>	Possible former field boundaries (LDr_200-202)  Identified as linear banks on LiDAR imagery indicated possible former field boundaries. Located outwith the proposed DCO Order Limits but potential to extend within.	Undated	Low	Low
<b>TC-12, construction and operational access A-26</b>	Designed parkland/deer park at Michelgrove (MWS3065)  Associated with grade II listed ruins of Michelgrove House (NHLE 1353888) with extent shown on historic mapping. Land is now agricultural fields but Potential for surviving parkland features within the proposed DCO Order Limits, likely in the form of tree clumps and plantation.	Post medieval	Medium to high	Low
<b>Vicinity of KM12.7</b>	Undated barrow type feature (62_1)  Geophysical survey has identified a very weak curving anomaly (62_1) of possible archaeological	Undated	High	Low to medium

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>origin (Field 062) (<b>Figure 3.8 and 6.48, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The form of the anomaly suggests it could be a barrow approximately 18m in diameter. However, no other available data indicates the presence of a barrow or any other feature type at this location. The heritage significance of this feature is uncertain, though given the indicative form and extent, the location and the available baseline evidence, this is not expected to be of high heritage significance.</p>			
<b>Vicinity of KM13 to KM15</b>	<p>Bronze Age Settlement features and deposits.</p> <p>Scheduled remains of Itford style settlements known at New Barn Down (NHLE 1017446) adjacent to the Site and Cock Hill (NHLE 1015881) 80m west.</p> <p>Potential for associated archaeological remains within the</p>	Bronze Age	Medium to High	Medium to High

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>Geophysical survey results within surrounding fields (062 to 073) records only a few anomalies of possible archaeological origin and others which are unclear (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). These features are fragmented and dispersed.</p> <p>Relict field boundaries surviving as upstanding and buried remains in this area are undated but could relate to Bronze Age activity. Examples within the proposed DCO Order Limits (LDr_092, LDr_194-195).</p> <p>Heritage significance is assumed to be high where well preserved in situ settlement features may be present and medium where more ephemeral and/or fragmented land</p>			

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>division features could be recorded.</p> <p>Based on the available evidence anticipated features are more likely to represent elements of Bronze Age field systems of medium heritage significance.</p>			
<b>Vicinity of KM13 to KM-17</b>	<p>Neolithic flint mines and mortuary remains.</p> <p>No recorded remains within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>Known scheduled flint mining sites within the Study Area (NHLE 1015880 adjacent to proposed DCO Order Limits, NHLE 1015237 35m south, NHLE 1015238 600m south and NHLE 1015239 625m west). There is potential for as yet unknown archaeological remains of this nature to be present within the Site. Sites of flint mining largely confined to buried deposits comprising infilled shafts containing flint and pottery</p>	Neolithic	Medium to high	High

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>fragments, flint-knapping floors, hearths, traces of timber buildings, and human burials.</p> <p>Numerous undated pit-type anomalies recorded by geophysical survey within Fields 74 and 75, two interpreted as possible archaeology, others as unclear (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p>			
<b>Vicinity of KM13 to KM-17</b>	<p>Neolithic settlement features and deposits</p> <p>No recorded evidence specific to settlement activity within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>Neolithic artefacts found within a pit within the scheduled Itford Hill style settlement at New Barn Down (NHLE 1017446). There is potential for remains settlement activity associated with recorded</p>	Neolithic	Low to medium	High



Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	flint mining sites within the Study Area.			
<b>Vicinity of KM13 to KM-16</b>	<p data-bbox="504 456 819 483">Relict field boundaries</p> <p data-bbox="504 531 992 703">Numerous earthworks on LiDAR imagery (LDr_092, LDr_094 to 095, LDr_099, LDr_114, LDr_121) interpreted as probable former field boundaries.</p> <p data-bbox="504 751 992 1410">LDr_092 and LDr_094 to 095 do not correlate with boundary patterns depicted on historic mapping, so could relate to divisions relating to medieval or earlier land use, with possible association with remains within the scheduled Itford Hill style settlement (NHLE 1017446) immediately north of the proposed DCO Order Limits. Some correlation between LDr_094 and 095 and geophysical anomalies in Field 065 (65_2 trend of unclear origin) and 66_1 (linear trend interpreted as possible archaeology) appears to extend from LDr_092, which lies</p>	Undated	High	Uncertain/Low to medium

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>immediately south of the proposed DCO Order Limits (<b>Figures 3.8 and 6.49-6.50, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p> <p>LDr_099 broadly correlates with a probable track depicted on 19th century OS maps but could have earlier origins and survives an extant field boundary.</p> <p>LDr_114 and LDr_121 do not correlate with boundaries depicted on historic mapping nor has the geophysical survey detected any corresponding anomalies (<b>Figures 3.10 and 3.11, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p> <p>There are also two diffuse zones of elevated response (72_1) which have been mapped by geophysical survey in Field 072, one of which extends into the proposed DCO Order Limits. The origin of these is</p>			

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	unclear, but they are most likely to be associated with former footpaths and a marsh area indicated on 19 <sup>th</sup> century OS mapping.			
<b>Vicinity of KM 13 to KM 18 and operational access A-27</b>	<p>Early medieval mortuary remains.</p> <p>Potential in the form of barrows and inhumations.</p> <p>Known barrow examples within Site (MWS2804) and Study Area (<a href="#">Section 4.7</a> and <a href="#">Table 5-2</a> in <a href="#">Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).</p> <p>Multiple LiDAR features suggestive of barrow sites located within and outside the Site (LDr_130, LDr_132-133, LDr_134 and LDr_136). If barrows, these could contain early medieval mortuary remains.</p>	Early medieval	High	Low to Medium
<b>Vicinity of KM 13 to KM 18 and</b>	Bronze Age barrows	Bronze Age	High	Low to medium

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
operational access A-27	<p>A known barrow site (MWS6581) and a second possible barrow (MWS6581) within proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>LiDAR features within the Site close to the scheduled area may represent further barrows (LDr_130, LDr_132-133, LDr_136, LDr_144), near KM15, TC-15b and KM 17.</p> <p>Other known barrows in the Study Area and across the South Downs.</p>	Uncertain	Medium to High	Uncertain
Vicinity of KM13.5 and KM14.5	<p>Undated possible pits</p> <p>The geophysical survey has identified multiple dispersed pit-type anomalies (Field 075) or discrete areas of enhanced magnetism with unclear origins (Field 073 and 074) within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in the vicinity of known Neolithic flint mining sites (<a href="#">Section 4.3</a>, <a href="#">Table 5-1</a> and <a href="#">Figures 6.51 to 6.54</a>, <a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report</a>, <a href="#">Volume 4</a> of the</p>	Uncertain	Medium to High	Uncertain

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<b>Between KM15 and KM16</b>	<p>ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p> <p>Ridge and furrow</p> <p>Traces of possible ridge and furrow surviving as buried deposits identified by geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) (Fields 078 and 082).</p>	Medieval to Post medieval	High	Very low
<b>Vicinity of KM16 to 17 TC-15b</b>	<p>Circular mound features at Sullington Hill</p> <p>Features identified as circular mounds on LiDAR imagery within or partially extending into the proposed DCO Order Limits (LDr_130, LDr_132, LDr_133, LDr_136, LDr_144). No evidence of these features were observed during the site walkover. A preliminary interpretation as potential barrows was based on known barrow examples in the</p>	Uncertain/ Prehistoric/early medieval	High	Low to Medium

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>vicinity, both within and without the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>LDr_133, which partly falls within the proposed DCO Order Limits, lies 10m to the north of MWS6688, a known Bronze Age barrow with an early medieval burial recorded on the HER 10m from the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>LDr_132 aligns with location of MWS6690 and MWS6691, two known Bronze Age barrows, which the HER records as 10m and 4m from the proposed DCO Order Limits, respectively.</p> <p>LDr_132 and LDr_133 may therefore represent remains of previously excavated barrows, which partly extend into the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>The geophysical survey did not record any anomalies which clearly indicate possible barrows at these locations but LDr_130, LDr_132 and LDr_133 all appear</p>			

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>to correspond with areas of enhanced magnetism of unclear origin (86_1) (<b>Figure 3.11</b> and <b>Figure 6.65, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)), whilst LDr_144 lies within a linear area of enhanced magnetism extending along LDr_044 and corresponding linear trend (87_1). Such responses may be consistent with ground disturbance, which may be related to previous investigations and/or other activities (e.g., WW2 military training). However, it is not clear if the disturbance is masking response from possible barrows, the possible barrows have been re-used, or the barrows have been misinterpreted (<b>Table 5-1, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p>			

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<b>Between KM 16 and 17, west of TC-15b</b>	<p>Defended locality on Sullington Hill within the proposed DCO Order Limits (MWS7566).</p> <p>No above ground remains observed during walkover, and the nature of any archaeological remains is unknown.</p>	Modern/WWII	Uncertain/Low	Low
<b>KM 15 to KM 21 - downs scarp and chalk upland</b>	<p>Probable post medieval and modern extraction pits.</p> <p>May relate to the production of lime for the improvement of agricultural soils or the production of building materials. Features possibly relating to these activities have been identified on LiDAR imagery (LDr_128, LDr_134, LDr_140) and by geophysical survey (anomalies identified as definite/probable archaeology (Fields 086, 087) and others as having an unclear origin (Field 081, 082, 086, 087, 090, 091)) within the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p>	Uncertain/Post medieval and modern	High	Very Low



Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<b>Construction and operational access A-28</b>	<p>Iron Age and Roman-British remains associated with Muntham Court scheduled site (NHLE 1005850, MWS5598).</p> <p>Scheduled remains of Iron Age defended settlement and Roman shrine on Muntham Hill, adjacent to construction and operational access A-28. Remains comprise buried features and deposits including ditches, pits and post holes, along with associated small find assemblages. Potential for similar associated remains to be present within proposed DCO Order Limits.</p>	Iron Age to Romano-British	High	Medium to High
<b>Vicinity of KM17, between TC-15a and TC-15b</b>	<p>Relict field boundaries or trackways, some of which have been recorded as earthworks on LiDAR imagery within the proposed DCO Order Limits (LDr_131, LDr_135, LDr_137 to 139, LDr_145 to LDr_147, LDr_149 to LDr_150). Some of these correspond with existing tracks (LDr_135, LDr_145 to LDr_147</p>	Undated/Post medieval to modern	High	Low

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>LDr_131, LDr_135, LDr_137, LDr_139, LDr_145 and LDr_147 all appear to be trackways on the northern scarp of the South Downs, with some correlation with existing paths. LDr_146 is evident on satellite imagery.</p> <p>LDr_149 to LDr_150 intersect with Site of a World War II Military Firing Range (MWS11270) immediately adjacent to the proposed DCO Order Limits but any association is unclear. LDr_149 also correlates with a geophysical trend interpreted as natural variation in the subsoils within the proposed DCO Order Limits, and where it extends beyond, it aligns with weak linear trends on the geophysical data.</p>			
<b>KM18</b>	<p>Ridge and furrow.</p> <p>Potential remains of ridge and furrow surviving within the proposed DCO Order Limits as buried deposits identified through</p>	<p>Medieval to post medieval</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Very low</p>

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<b>Operation access route A-31</b>	<p>recent geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) (Fields 095).</p> <p>Hill Barn Historic Outfarm, Storrington and Sullington (MWS11506).</p> <p>Extant 19<sup>th</sup> century T-Plan regular courtyard outfarm or field barn partly within the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>Site also intersects existing farm track. Possible remains associated with historic farmstead.</p>	Post medieval	Low to medium	Low
<b>Temporary construction and operation access route A-32</b>	<p>Barns Farm Historic Farmstead, Storrington (MWS9337).</p> <p>19th century dispersed cluster farmstead suffered significant loss.</p> <p>Proposed DCO Order Limits intersects existing farm track. Possible remains associated with historic farmstead.</p>	Post medieval	Low to medium	Low

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
<b>KM 19, temporary construction and operation access route A-32</b>	<p>Site of a World War Two Army Camp at Barns Farm, Sullington (Site of a World War Two Army Camp at Barns Farm, Sullington) (MWS7547)</p> <p>The military camp which housed British and Canadian soldiers is situated to the north of Barns Farm visible on aerial photographs taken in 1946. Much has been demolished but some of the original buildings appear to have survived. No records are located within the proposed DCO Order Limits but there is potential for remains along the access route.</p>	Modern/WW2	Very Low	Low
<b>Between KM 19 and KM 20</b>	<p>Historic parkland associated with Rowdell House (MWS34).</p> <p>Rowdell park originally set around Rowdell House. A house at Rowdell was mentioned c. 1225 and in the 16<sup>th</sup> century but later demolished and replaced in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.</p>	Post medieval	Medium to high	Low

Location <sup>13</sup>	Receptor (Asset type/description) <sup>14</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>15</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>16</sup>
	<p>Extant pond feature identified on 1875 OS within proposed DCO Order Limits (MPi_006).</p> <p>Potential for other surviving parkland features associated.</p>			

### Zone 3: Low Weald

- 25.6.45 Overall, there is potential for archaeological remains to occur relating to all periods within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 3: Low Weald, which are anticipated to form elements of the following assets groups or themes:
- later prehistoric settlement and agriculture practices;
  - later prehistoric industrial activity;
  - Roman industry and communications
  - medieval settlement and agriculture;
  - post medieval settlement agriculture, and emparkment;
  - post medieval industry and communications; and
  - military activity.
- 25.6.46 Negative evidence and sources of post-depositional impact within Zone 3 are discussed in [Section 5, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2).

**Table 25-21 Zone 3: Low Weald – Known and potential archaeological receptors within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits**

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
<b>General - outside of the Adur floodplain</b>	<p>Palaeoenvironmental deposits.</p> <p>Medium potential for palaeoenvironmental remains preserved within or beneath the Head deposits, especially where they overlie the broad and gently sloping valley floors.</p> <p>Low potential that remains might also be preserved in fissures on some of the sandstone and limestone outcrops, though ideal conditions for the development of such fissures – steep valley side slopes - are rarely present.</p> <p>See <a href="#">Sections 5 and 6, Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3) for discussion on palaeoenvironmental potential.</p>	Prehistoric	Low to medium	Low to medium
<b>General</b>	Neolithic artefacts and scatters.	Neolithic	Low	Low

<sup>17</sup> Specific location provided for known heritage assets within proposed DCO Order Limits, whilst general area or landscape/geological context provided for predicted heritage assets.

<sup>18</sup> Relevant record number and name provided for known heritage assets, whilst general asset type provided for predicted heritage assets.

<sup>19</sup> Degree to which an asset is predicted to occur within onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.

<sup>20</sup> Assessed heritage significance of predicted heritage assets within the proposed DCO Order Limits.

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
	<p>No recorded evidence within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits and only few worked flints recorded within Study Area. Isolated/residual finds likely to be reworked and redeposited.</p> <p>Neolithic features are not anticipated.</p>			
<b>General</b>	<p>Bronze age features/deposits and finds</p> <p>Very limited evidence for Bronze Age activity within Zone 3 (<a href="#">Section 4.7</a> and <a href="#">Table 5-3</a> in <a href="#">Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).</p>	Bronze age	Low	Low to high
<b>General</b>	<p>Early to middle Iron Age finds.</p> <p>No evidence recorded within the Site.</p> <p>A single Iron Age findspot is recorded within the Study Area, a coin, (MWS5644), 240m northwest of the Site.</p>	Early to middle Iron Age	Low	Low
<b>General</b>	<p>Agricultural and land division features and finds.</p> <p>General potential through Zone 3, in addition to those specific areas containing known recorded evidence referred to in this table.</p> <p>Isolated/residuals finds of different object types.</p>	Medieval or Post Medieval	High	Low

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
<b>General</b>	<p>Geophysical anomalies of unclear origin</p> <p>Geophysical survey has recorded numerous anomalies within the proposed DCO Order Limits (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey reports, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). These range from discrete or linear areas of enhanced magnetism or linear/curvilinear and circular trends of unclear origin. Generally, these anomalies are magnetically weak, fractured or isolated and their context is difficult to ascertain. Whilst an archaeological origin is possible, an agricultural, geological or modern origin is more likely. Where relevant, the predicted archaeological potential and heritage significance of these anomalies have been discussed within the context of other evidence within this table. Of those anomalies not discussed elsewhere within this table, the heritage significance of such potential archaeological features, whilst uncertain, is not predicted to be of high heritage significance given their indicative form and extent, location and the available baseline evidence.</p>	Undated	Medium to High	Uncertain/ Very low to medium
<b>Vicinity of KM 22 to KM 24 and KM 27 to KM 28 - Lower Greensand</b>	<p>Mesolithic flint artefacts and scatters.</p> <p>No recorded finds within proposed DCO Order Limits, though numerous finds in Study Area (see <a href="#">Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).</p> <p>There is low potential for elsewhere on the Weald Clay within the Zone 3.</p>	Mesolithic	Low to medium	Low to medium



Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
	<p>Location of potential estimated based on BGS mapped superficial deposits.</p> <p>See <a href="#">Section 5</a> and <a href="#">Section 6</a>, <a href="#">Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3) for discussion on geoarchaeological deposits.</p>			
<b>KM 23, TC-19a and construction and operational access A-43</b>	<p>Hardham to Barcombe Mills Roman Road, the Greensand Way (ANA Horsham 078; Mid Sussex 044)</p> <p>This road connected with Stane Street and Brighton to London Road.</p> <p>Potential archaeological survival of the Roman road and roadside activity within undeveloped areas of the Site. Undated earthwork remains (MWS7031) within extent of ANA relating to Roman road.</p>	Roman	High	Low to medium
<b>TC-19</b>	<p>Potential archaeological features near Buncton (Field 136)</p> <p>Linear features of unknown date but possible archaeological origin surviving as buried deposits identified through geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) (Field 136). The geophysical survey interpreted these features as elements of possible former enclosures. No</p>	Unknown	Medium	Low to medium

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
<b>KM 23, TC-19a</b>	<p>correlation with boundaries on historic mapping. Possibly also of prehistoric date (proximity to Hardham to Barcombe Mills Roman Road Horsham 078; Mid Sussex 044) and possibility of medieval/post medieval date as Field 136 lies between Buncton chapel and graveyard (MWS1183, 60m to the north) and Medieval Moated Site at Buncton Manor Farm (ANA Horsham 054, MWS9593). Similar features may be present within adjacent Field 137 where enhanced magnetism resulting from probable green waste may be masking weaker responses.</p> <p>Undated earthwork remains (MWS7031) near Buncton</p> <p>Located within the proposed DCO Order Limits and may be associated with nearby known medieval settlement remains at Buncton (ANA Horsham 054, MWS5639) or former Butchers Farm (MWS9616).</p> <p>Settlement recorded at Buncton in Domesday Book, near to existing site of Buncton Manor. Possibility for archaeological survival of early medieval occupation within the vicinity, though none currently recorded.</p> <p>Potential also for association with route of Hardham to Barcombe Mills Roman Road (Horsham 078; Mid Sussex 044).</p> <p>No geophysical survey data available for this location (Field 133), though geophysical anomalies nearby in Field 136 suggest remains of possible undated enclosures (<a href="#">Appendix</a></p>	Unknown	Very High	Low to medium

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
	<p><b>25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4).</p>			
<b>Between KM 25 and KM 26</b>	<p>Relict field boundaries of unknown date within the proposed DCO Order Limits identified as earthworks on LiDAR imagery (LDr_156-158, LDr_160). These relate to boundaries depicted on 19<sup>th</sup> century OS mapping which have since been removed.</p>	Uncertain/post medieval	High	Low
<b>Adur floodplain and tributaries</b>	<p>Palaeoenvironmental deposits.</p> <p>Deep alluvium deposits present within the Adur floodplain have very high potential for environmental reconstruction of the Holocene.</p> <p>Low potential within Pleistocene River Terrace Deposits.</p> <p>Location of potential estimated based on BGS mapped superficial deposits.</p> <p>See <b>Section 5</b> and <b>Section 6, Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3) for discussion on palaeoenvironmental potential.</p>	Prehistoric	Low to very high	High
<b>KM 27 to 32 and 35 to 36</b>				
<b>Adur floodplain and tributaries</b>	<p>Palaeolithic flint artefacts.</p> <p>Low potential within Alluvium and medium potential within River Terrace deposits.</p>	Palaeolithic	Low to medium	Low to medium

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
<b>KM 27 to 32 and 35 to 36</b>	<p>There is low potential for elsewhere within the Zone 3.</p> <p>Location of potential estimated based on BGS mapped superficial deposits.</p> <p>See <a href="#">Sections 5 and 6, Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3) for discussion on geoarchaeological deposits.</p>			
<b>Between KM 27 and KM 28</b>	<p>Ridge and furrow</p> <p>Identified in the proposed DCO Order Limits on LiDAR (LDr_164, LDr_166).</p> <p>Located within land characterised as medieval to post medieval irregular piecemeal enclosure (HWS2120), immediately east of historic Wellen's Farm (MWS12613) and medieval hamlet of Ashurst (ANA Horsham 048).</p> <p>Traces of ridge and furrow are generally aligned with surrounding extant boundaries.</p>	Medieval to post medieval	High	Low
<b>Operational access A-48 and south of KM28</b>	<p>Blocques Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9446).</p> <p>A 19th century double sided loose courtyard farmstead with detached farmhouse having suffered significant loss (more than 50% alteration).</p>	Post medieval to modern	Low to medium	Low

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
<b>South of KM30</b>	Onshore part of proposed DCO Order Limits occupies track adjacent to farmstead.	Undated	Medium to High	Uncertain/ Low to Medium
	<p>Geophysical survey has identified two well-defined circular anomalies within adjacent fields (Field 185 and 186) (<a href="#">Section 4.3</a>, <a href="#">Table 5-1</a>, <a href="#">Figures 3.19, 6.112 and 6.114</a>, <a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The nature and form of the responses suggest possible ring ditch type features though there are no known examples within the proposed DCO Order Limits or study area in Zone 3. Broad natural anomalies have been noted within this area and it is possible that the postulated ring ditches are natural in origin indicating possible ox-bow type feature associated with palaeochannels. Other curving responses of enhanced magnetism of unclear origin are also recorded within the same field.</p> <p>The heritage significance of these features is uncertain, though given their indicative form and extent, their location and the available baseline evidence, these are not expected to represent features of high heritage significance.</p>			
<b>Vicinity of KM30</b>	Ridge and furrow	Medieval to post medieval	High	Low

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
<b>Temporary construction and operation access A-50b</b>	<p>Identified on LiDAR (LDr_169) and are aligned with surrounding extant boundaries. Located within land characterised as medieval cohesive assart (HWS3498).</p> <p>Brightham's Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9503).</p> <p>A U-plan regular courtyard farmstead with additional detached elements. Partial loss has occurred (less than 50%); demolished elements may survive as archaeological remains.</p> <p>HER polygon only extends slightly into the proposed DCO Order Limits. The farmhouse, and the cart shed are grade II listed buildings (NHLE 1354245; NHLE1181633).</p>	Medieval to modern	Low to medium	Low
<b>Operational access A-51</b>	<p>Homelands Historic Farmstead (MWS11752).</p> <p>Operational access intersects a track through farmstead. Homelands is a 19<sup>th</sup> century 4-sided loose courtyard farmstead with additional detached elements. Partial loss has occurred (less than 50%); demolished elements may survive as archaeological remains.</p>	Post medieval to modern	Low to medium	Low
<b>Between KM 30 and KM 31, Operational Access A-51</b>	<p>Shoreham to Horsham Railway (MWS5508).</p> <p>The route of the 19<sup>th</sup> century dismantled railway crosses the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits on a northwest-southeast alignment. It was opened in 1860 and closed 100 years later. Today it is maintained as a footpath.</p>	Post medieval	Low to medium	Low

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
<b>KM 32</b>	Potential for remains of former field boundaries in former agricultural fields prior to the emparkment of Shermanbury Grange recorded on West Grinstead tithe map of 1847 (MPi_008).	Low	Low	Low
<b>Between KM 32 and KM 33</b>	<p>Relict field system.</p> <p>Identified on LiDAR imagery (LDr_180 to 182). Located north of Home Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS11733). Possible association with tree lines representing former boundaries on 19<sup>th</sup> century Ordnance Survey maps.</p>	Medieval or Post Medieval	High	Low
<b>KM 34</b>	<p>Circular depression identified on LiDAR imagery (LDr_186).</p> <p>Indicating possible extraction activity, which may survive as archaeological remains.</p> <p>May relate to various industries operating across the Weald, including post medieval glass/brick making and lime production.</p>	Undated	High	Very Low
<b>KM 35, operational access route A-58</b>	<p>Crateman's Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9939, ANA Horsham 144).</p> <p>A 17<sup>th</sup> century 3-sided L-Plan loose courtyard farmstead with additional detached elements to the main plan. The farmstead has suffered partial loss (less than 50%); demolished elements may survive as archaeological remains.</p>	Post medieval	Medium	Low

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
	<p>Onshore part of proposed DCO Order Limits occupies western part of farmstead (and associated ANA) where former buildings are shown on historic mapping (MPi_012-013).</p> <p>Farmhouse is grade II listed (NHLE 1354155), lies within 20m of the operational access.</p>			
<b>KM 35, operational access route A-58</b>	<p>Dragons Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS10096).</p> <p>A scheduled 19<sup>th</sup> century 3- sided L-Plan loose courtyard farmstead with additional detached elements. The farmstead has suffered partial loss (less than 50%); demolished elements may survive as archaeological remains.</p> <p>Onshore part of proposed DCO Order Limits occupies access track adjacent to existing farmstead, where former building is identified on historic mapping (MPi_016).</p>	Post medieval to modern	Low to medium	Low
<b>KM 035 to KM 036</b>	<p>Ridge and furrow</p> <p>Potential for buried remains identified through recent geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) (Fields 220, 223 and 224).</p>	Medieval to Post medieval	High	Low
<b>TC27</b>	<p>Buried linear features of probable archaeological origin identified through recent geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) (Field 228). The geophysical survey</p>	Unknown	High	Low to medium



Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
	<p>interpreted these features as possible elements of a rectilinear enclosure.</p> <p>No correlation with HER, LiDAR features or boundaries on historic mapping.</p>			
<b>KM 0 (400kv)<sup>21</sup>, Oakendene Substation</b>	<p>Oakendene historic parkland (MWS96, HWS2285)</p> <p>Landscaped grounds of Oakendene Manor (MWS96, HWS2285), the former extent of which is depicted on 19th century Ordnance Survey mapping. The surviving manor house is grade II listed (NHLE 1027074).</p> <p>Earthwork remains of former field boundaries identified on LiDAR imagery (LDr_195 to 197) with corresponding geophysical anomalies (230_2, 230_1 and 233_1 respectively, <a href="#">Figure 3.23 and Figures 6.138 to 6.139, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) within former parkland associated with Oakendene (formerly Oakendean) (HWS2285). These largely correlate with boundaries and tree lines depicted on 19th century OS maps.</p> <p>Geophysical survey also detected an amorphous area of enhanced magnetism (232_4 in Field 232), which broadly corresponds to an area previously defined as a separate field on</p>	Post medieval	High	Low

<sup>21</sup>Kilometre post as measured along the 400kV onshore cable from onshore substation at Oakendene to the Bolney substation extension

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
	<p>the 1896 OS, 1912 OS and 1956 OS. There may have been landscaping or infilling at this location. Other geophysical anomalies were identified which do not correspond with any historic map feature or field observation (Fields 230, 231, 232, 233, 234 and 235). These include some linear features which appear to relate to land division, ploughing or other modern agricultural activity, and a couple of comparable weak circular anomalies of unclear origin with no known association with the former parkland.</p> <p>See <a href="#">Appendix 25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5).</p> <p>ANA Horsham 139 for Oakendene Medieval Manor Farmstead lies adjacent to the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p>			
<b>KM 0 to KM 1 (400kv)</b>	<p>Ridge and furrow</p> <p>Earthworks located within extant field boundaries identified on LiDAR imagery (LDr_189 to 190, LDr_193).</p> <p>Located within land characterised as medieval cohesive assart (HWS2296).</p> <p>Some linear trends may correspond in Field 240 may correspond to LDr_193 but this is not clear (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p>	Medieval to post medieval	High	Low

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
KMO (400Kv)	Rectangular field system, Bolney Substation (MWS15278).	Iron Age to Roman	Very High	Low to medium
	<p>Excavations prior to the construction of Bolney substation recorded a series of intercutting ditches which together delineate a rectangular field system oriented on a north-south/east-west axis. Dating evidence suggested a late Iron Age or Romano-British date for these features. Recent geophysical survey has recorded two linear anomalies of unclear origin within the proposed DCO Order Limits which could be related to the known features (248_1 and 249_1 in Fields 248 and 249 respectively (<a href="#">Figure 3.24</a> and <a href="#">Figures 6.144 to 6.145</a>, <a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Within the same fields, the geophysical survey recorded a very high level of isolated ferrous/fired responses due to modern debris in the topsoil which may be a result of green waste (<a href="#">Table 5-1</a>, <a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). This level of background response limits the ability to discern the presence of more subtle anomalies which might result from potential archaeological features. This is particularly evident where Field 247, which lies adjacent but outside of the proposed DCO Order Limits, where there is an absence of high level background noise and where a series of trends and areas of enhanced magnetism of unclear origin which have the potential to represent a series of enclosures (<a href="#">Table 5-1</a>, <a href="#">Figure 3.24</a> and <a href="#">Figures 5.144 to 5.145</a>, <a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).</p>			

Location <sup>17</sup>	Receptor (Asset type and description) <sup>18</sup>	Period	Potential <sup>19</sup>	Heritage Significance <sup>20</sup>
<b>Bolney Substation extension and KM02+ (400Kv)</b>	<p>Twineham Court historic parkland (HWS6298).</p> <p>400Kv cable corridor intersects an area of surviving informal parkland (HWS6298) associated with Twineham Court historic farmstead (MWS12965) and Bolney substation extension overlaps with historic extent of the parkland as shown in historic OS mapping.</p> <p>Potential buried remains of ridge and furrow recorded by geophysical survey (<a href="#">Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4</a>) in adjacent field (Field 250), within location for the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension.</p> <p>Former construction works at Bolney, relating to the existing National Grid Bolney substation and Rampion 1 are evidenced in Plates 5 to 8, Annex B of <a href="#">Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)), which will have impacted below ground deposits within the footprint of these works.</p> <p>There is existing hard standing where the temporary construction compound for the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension is proposed.</p>	Medieval and post medieval	High	Low

## Future baseline

- 25.6.47 There are no committed development(s) or other forecasted changes that will materially alter the historic environment baseline conditions within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits
- 25.6.48 **Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6), does not predict any trends in coastal change (beyond those predicted during the construction phase relating to installation of the export cable at landfall) that will give rise to adverse changes to the terrestrial historic environment.

## 25.7 Basis for ES assessment

### Maximum design scenario

- 25.7.1 Assessing using a parameter-based design envelope approach means that the assessment considers a maximum design scenario whilst allowing the flexibility to make improvements in the future in ways that cannot be predicted at the time of submission of the DCO Application. The assessment of the maximum adverse scenario for each receptor establishes the maximum potential adverse impact and as a result impacts of greater adverse significance would not arise should any other development scenario (as described in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4)) to that assessed within this Chapter be taken forward in the final scheme design.
- 25.7.2 A change request [**AS-046**] to the DCO Application was accepted by the Examining Authority on 24 July 2024 [**PD-018**]. These changes included minor reductions to the proposed DCO Order Limits (onshore only) where adjacent to areas of Ancient Woodland to provide a 25m buffer from these features. Further localised reductions to the extent of Works 9 and 19 were also made, assigning these areas to a class of work with lower impacts from those previously assessed as cable installation. The changes made result in no new or different effects from those reported in this chapter of the ES. The figures supporting this chapter of the ES have not been updated due to the minor nature of these changes, the final proposed DCO Order Limits and Works areas should be viewed on the **Onshore Works Plans** (Document Reference: 2.2.2 and [**AS-026**]).
- 25.7.3 The maximum parameters and assessment assumptions that have been identified to be relevant to historic environment are outlined in **Table 25-22** and are in line with the Project Design Envelope (**Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4)).

Page intentionally blank

**Table 25-22 Maximum parameters and assessment assumptions for impacts on historic environment**

Project phase and activity/impact	Maximum assessment assumptions	Justification
<b>Construction</b>	<p>Landfall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction compound area 120x100m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>• No open cut trenching works required;</li> <li>• Length of cable ducts up to 1.5km;</li> <li>• HDD burial depth maximum approximately 20m;</li> <li>• HDD burial depth minimum 5m; and</li> <li>• Duration of works for HDD installation - up to 24 months.</li> </ul> <p>Onshore cable corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typically 40m wide temporary construction corridor within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits with approximate length of 38.8km. The construction corridor may be expanded to accommodate working area for example for Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD);</li> <li>• Construction corridor area approximately - temporary 1,576,000m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>• Total installation duration up to 36 months, carried out in sections;</li> <li>• Up to four trenches with a minimum burial depth of 1.2m standard cover to top of duct;</li> </ul>	<p>These maximum assessment assumptions are relevant to the assessment of potential direct and indirect impacts on heritage assets undertaken in the ES. A worst-case scenario assumes that development may take place anywhere within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p>

Project phase and activity/impact	Maximum assessment assumptions	Justification
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typical trench depth approximately 1.8m;</li> <li>• Trench width at base 1.2m;</li> <li>• Trench width at surface. Soft soil: between 2m and 4m as maximum angle of trench depends on soil strength. Hard/solid ground: same as base trench width (1.2m);</li> <li>• HDD Burial depth maximum, approximately 25m, though most will be less than this;</li> <li>• Temporary access points; and</li> <li>• Temporary haul road width up to 6m, though with passing places up to 8m.</li> </ul> <p>Temporary construction compounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five temporary construction compound locations;</li> <li>• Compound use duration of up to three years and six months per temporary construction compound; and</li> <li>• Size of temporary construction compounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Climping: 6.13ha;</li> <li>▶ Washington: 3.91ha;</li> <li>▶ Oakendene: 25ha;</li> <li>▶ Oakendene West: 5ha; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



Project phase and activity/impact	Maximum assessment assumptions	Justification
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

- ▶ Existing National Grid Bolney substation: 0.35ha.

Trenchless crossing compounds:

- Trenchless crossing compound dimensions: 50m x 75m (length and width);
- Three to four months construction duration; and
- Joint Bay construction duration per compound (does not include cable pulling duration) 6 to 8 weeks.

Onshore substation at Oakendene:

- Overall site footprint for the onshore substation – 16.2ha (including temporary works area, drainage and landscaping);
- Operational area of onshore substation– Up to 6ha;
- Temporary works area – Up to 2.5ha;
- Maximum main operational building and other infrastructure height – 28.75m AOD;
- Maximum height of fire walls – 26.25m AOD;
- Lightning protection mast height – 34.25m AOD;
- Maximum number of buildings – 12;
- Maximum length of main operational building – 70m;
- Maximum width of main operational building – 20m;

Project phase and activity/impact	Maximum assessment assumptions	Justification
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

- Duration of construction – approximately three years;
- Heavy goods vehicle (HGV) construction traffic movements (two-way) 11,438; and
- Abnormal Indivisible Loads – 10.

Existing National Grid Bolney substation extension

- Overall footprint for the works to the existing National Grid Bolney substation (construction and operational) – GIS 1.072ha and AIS 1.352ha;
- Operational area of existing National Grid Bolney substation extension for all infrastructure – GIS approximately 0.35ha and AIS approximately 0.63ha;
- Temporary construction works area (temporary construction compound and accesses) – GIS and AIS approximately 0.72ha;
- Maximum building height – GIS 12m and AIS 3m;
- Maximum height of other infrastructure – GIS 6m and AIS 12m;
- Maximum number of buildings – GIS 1 and AIS 2;
- Maximum length building – GIS 35m and AIS 12m;
- Maximum width of building – GIS 20m and AIS 3m;
- Duration of construction – approximately 12 months for GIS and AIS;

Project phase and activity/impact	Maximum assessment assumptions	Justification
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heavy goods vehicle (HGV) construction traffic movements (two-way) – GIS 968 and AIS 968; and</li> <li>• LGV construction traffic movements (two-way) – GIS 7182 and AIS 7182.</li> </ul>	
<b>Operation and maintenance</b>	<p>The operational lifetime of the Proposed Development is expected to be around 30 years.</p> <p><b>Onshore landfall and cable corridor:</b></p> <p>All permanent elements of the landfall and onshore cable corridor will be below ground.</p> <p><b>Onshore substation at Oakendene:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational area of site (not including drainage or landscaping) – up to 6ha;</li> <li>• Maximum main building height – 12.5m;</li> <li>• Height of fire walls - 10m;</li> <li>• Lightning protection mast height - 18m;</li> <li>• Maximum number of buildings – 12;</li> <li>• Maximum length building – 70m; and</li> </ul>	<p>The maximum assessment assumptions are relevant to the assessment of potential indirect impacts on heritage assets undertaken in the ES. A worst-case scenario assumes that the onshore substation and associated infrastructure may be located anywhere within the chosen onshore substation, and the three offshore substations are located along the shoreward perimeter of the wind farm array area, as shown in <b>Figure 15.1, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15), where they will in theory be most visible from coastal viewpoints to the west, north and east. Offshore substations are shown in a selection of photomontage visualisations from the closest viewpoints from the wind farm array area, <b>Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact</b></p>

Project phase and activity/impact	Maximum assessment assumptions	Justification
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum width of building – 20m.</li> </ul> <p>Existing National Grid Bolney substation extension</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational area of existing National Grid Bolney substation extension for all infrastructure – GIS approximately 3,500m<sup>2</sup> and AIS approximately 6,300m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>• Maximum main building height - GIS 12m and AIS 3m;</li> <li>• Maximum height of other infrastructure - GIS 6m and AIS 12m;</li> <li>• Maximum number of buildings - GIS 1 and AIS 2;</li> <li>• Maximum length building - GIS 35m and AIS 12m; and</li> <li>• Maximum width of building - GIS 20m and AIS 3m.</li> </ul> <p>The establishment of areas of new planting within and around the onshore substation as described in <a href="#">Section 18.7, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18) and shown in the <a href="#">Indicative Landscape Plan Appendix A</a> of the <a href="#">Design and Access Statement (DAS)</a> (Document Reference: 5.8).</p> <p><b>WTGs and layout scenario:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum number of 65 WTG turbines of maximum blade tip height of 325m; or</li> <li>• Maximum number of 90 WTG turbines of maximum blade tip height of 285m.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">assessment, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15).</p>

Project phase and activity/impact	Maximum assessment assumptions	Justification
	<p>The assessment considers a single design scenario based on a maximum number of up to 65 WTG turbines of maximum blade tip height of 325m. The realistic maximum design scenario layout (as described in <b>Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15), and shown on <b>Figure 15.1, Volume 3</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)) has WTGs located to the full eastern and western extent of the Offshore Array Area, and in positions that are weighted towards the northern coastward perimeters of the Offshore Array Area, as close as possible to the coastline within the Offshore Array Area, to represent the maximum effect in terms of the proximity, scale and spread of the WTGs in coastal views from receptors around the coastline.</p> <p><b>Offshore substation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum number of offshore substations: 3</li> <li>• Topside – height (excluding helideck or lightning protection) – 65m above Lowest Astronomical Tide (LAT).</li> <li>• Topside – main structure length and width - 80 x 50m.</li> <li>• Height of lightning protection &amp; ancillary structures - 115m above LAT.</li> </ul>	
<b>Decommissioning</b>	<p>Landfall and the onshore electrical cables will be left <i>in-situ</i> with ends cut, sealed and buried.</p> <p>Onshore substation: if fully decommissioned, then as per construction phase.</p>	<p>These maximum assessment assumptions are relevant to assessment of potential historic environment effects as above.</p>



Page intentionally blank

- 25.7.4 In addition to the maximum parameters detailed in **Table 25-22**, the assessment assumes:
- construction of each temporary construction compounds will be up to 8 weeks and the deconstruction will be up to 8 weeks;
  - drilling durations varied between 2 to 7 weeks for trenchless crossings and 18 weeks for landfall;
  - likely duration of under a month for construction of each access with the temporary accesses used ranging from a month to almost a year; and
  - the entire temporary construction works for the onshore cable installation (trenched) is anticipated to move at a speed of 35m per day.
- 25.7.5 The trenchless crossings referred to in this Chapter are detailed in **Appendix 4.1: Crossing Schedule, Volume 4** (Document Number: 6.4.4.1). The Works No descriptions provide information on the works required in each part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, which may relate to construction or operational phase activities, or both (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)). In some instances, alternative trenchless crossing compounds (TCCs) have been identified in order to allow trenchless crossing operations to proceed in either direction.
- 25.7.6 Works No.12 (for temporary duct stringing), Works No.15 (for operational accesses only) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) do not require any intrusive construction activities. In addition, light construction accesses and light construction and operational accesses (which fall within Works No.14 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2))) also do not require intrusive construction activities.
- 25.7.7 All other areas identified on the Works Plans (Document Reference: 2.2.2) may require intrusive activities causing ground disturbance relating to land fall connection (Works Nos.7 and 8), onshore cable installation works (Works No.9), temporary construction compounds (Works No.10), temporary soil storage (Works No.11), temporary construction accesses (Works No.13), construction and operational accesses (Works No.14), onshore substation at Oakendene (Works No.16), environmental mitigation (Works No.17), permanent substation access (Works No.18), onshore connection works (Works No.19) and Bolney substation extension (Works No.20) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)).
- 25.7.8 The proposed DCO Order Limits, within which the Proposed Development and associated infrastructure will be located, comprises a degree of optionality in the design which is still to be refined for construction. This includes:
- multiple temporary construction compounds (TC) for trenchless crossings (HDD compounds) at landfall (**Figure 4.5, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.4)) and **Figures 25.2 to 25.6, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)) in Works No.8 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2));
  - other multiple trenchless Crossing compounds (e.g., HDD) along the onshore cable corridor (**Figure 4.5, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.4) and **Figures 25.2 to 25.6, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25));



- limits of deviation (LoD) for the HDD compounds within which the compound will be sited (**Figure 4.5** and **Figures 25.2 to 25.6, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.4 and 6.3.25));
- onshore cable routing options at Michelgrove (KM 11.7) and Sullington Hill (KM 16.7) via trenchless crossings (**Figure 4.3, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.4) and **Figures 25.2 to 25.6, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).

Whilst a number of these options will not be required in the final design of the Proposed Development, the assessment of onshore historic environment effects in this chapter assumes a worst-case scenario in which construction works will take place anywhere within the proposed DCO Order Limits (with the exception of Works Nos.12, 15 some of 14 where these are light construction accesses and light construction and operational accesses (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)). Whilst effects will be overstated in this approach, it will ensure any land within the proposed DCO Order Limits that may be directly impacted and where heritage assets may be impacted through changes to setting, will be appropriately assessed.

## Embedded environmental measures

- 25.7.9 As part of the Rampion 2 design process, a number of embedded environmental measures (**Table 25-23**) have been adopted to reduce the potential for impacts on historic environment. These embedded environmental measures have evolved over the development process as the EIA has progressed and in response to consultation.
- 25.7.10 These embedded environmental measures also include those that have been identified as good or standard practice and include actions that would be undertaken to meet existing legislation requirements. As there is a commitment to implementing these embedded environmental measures, and also to various standard sectoral practices and procedures, they are considered inherently part of the design of Rampion 2 and are set out in this ES.
- 25.7.11 **Table 25-23** sets out the relevant embedded environmental measures within the design and how these affect the historic environment assessment.

**Table 25-23 Relevant historic environment embedded environmental measures**

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-1	The onshore cable route will be completely buried underground for its entire length.	Scoping	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</b> Schedule 1, Part 1, The Authorised Development, Work No. 6, 7, 8, 9, 19.	<p>The measure will substantially reduce visual perception of the onshore cable, minimising indirect effects on historic environment receptors through changes to their setting.</p> <p>The measure will result in direct impacts on buried deposits of potential archaeological interest.</p>
C-5	Trenchless crossings will be provided for features where identified in Appendix A - Crossing Schedule of the Outline Code of Construction Practice.	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 6 (4), Cable Parameters  <b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22, Code of construction practice (CoCP) (4) (p)	<p>Depending on the depth of trenchless crossing, there may be direct impacts on buried deposits of potential archaeological interest, this includes deeply buried deposits preserving palaeoenvironmental remains.</p> <p>Potential opportunity for avoidance of shallower deposits of archaeological interest and / or extant historic environment receptors, where present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits.</p>

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
<b>C-6</b>	Where practical, sensitive sites will be avoided by the temporary and permanent onshore project footprint including SSSIs, Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, ancient woodland, areas of consented development, areas of historical and authorised landfills and other known areas of potential contamination, National Trust Land, Listed Buildings, Scheduled monuments, and mineral resources (including existing mineral sites, minerals sites allocated in development plans and mineral safeguarding areas).	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 1 The Authorised Development	C-17 refers to the need for relevant permits or consents where water courses require open cut crossings.  This measure will ensure direct impacts to Ancient Woodland, listed buildings and scheduled monuments are avoided.
<b>C-9</b>	Joint bays will be completely buried with the land above reinstated to pre-construction ground level, with the exception of link box chambers where access will be required from ground	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 6 Cable parameters (3)	The measure will minimise visual impacts of the joint bays on the setting of historic environment receptors but will result in direct

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	level (via manholes). Once constructed joint bays and link box chambers will be resilient to flooding.			impacts to buried deposits with potential archaeological interest.
<b>C-10</b>	No blasting is anticipated to be required and trenchless crossings will be undertaken by non-impact methods.	Scoping	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (g)	The measure will minimise audibility of the construction of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development within the setting of historic environment receptors.
<b>C-11</b>	During construction topsoil and subsoil will be stored within the temporary working corridor of the onshore cable. The topsoil and subsoil will be stored in separate stockpiles in line with Defra 2009 Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites PB13298, including guidance on utilising separate stockpiles and giving due consideration to adverse weather conditions. Any suspected or confirmed contaminated soils will be separated, contained and tested before removed.	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (e)	Stockpiles may introduce temporary visual changes to the setting of historic environment receptors, which may impact heritage significance.

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-12	During topsoil stripping, machinery with low ground pressure will be used to minimise soil compaction where the soil conditions indicate that compaction is possible. Storage time will be kept to the practicable minimum to prevent the soil deteriorating in quality. Topsoil stripped from different fields will be stored separately, as will soil from hedgerow banks or woodland strips.	Scoping	Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (e)	The measure will minimise direct impacts on buried deposits of potential archaeological interest.
C-19	The onshore cable will be constructed in discrete sections. The trenches will be excavated, the cable ducts will be laid, the trenches backfilled, and the reinstatement process commenced in as short a timeframe as practicable. At regular intervals (typically 600m – 1,000m) along the route joint bays/pits will be installed to enable the cable installation and jointing process. The stage specific CMS will set out a protocol for the reinstatement of land used temporarily for construction including the timing in accordance with C-103.	Scoping	Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 10 Programme of works (1), Requirement 22 (4) CoCP, Requirement 23 Onshore construction method statement (2) (h)	The measure will minimise indirect impacts on historic environment receptors by limiting the duration of construction activities at defined locations.

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-20	The typical construction working area will be 40m along the onshore cable corridor to minimise the construction footprint. At other discrete locations this may be expanded to accommodate working area for example for Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD).	Scoping	Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 (4) CoCP	The measure will minimise impacts on historic environment receptors.
C-21	Where vegetation removal is necessary, it will be scheduled over winter to avoid the bird breeding season. If not possible for all areas, any vegetation removal will be undertaken in line with British Standard (BS) 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction). This will be carried out under supervision and will be appropriately managed to remove the risk of damaging or destroying active nests, young or eggs. Suitable methods will also be used to ensure vegetation supporting other legally protected species is removed sensitively and in a legally compliant way.	Scoping- updated at PEIR	Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (f)	The measure to retain vegetation where possible will minimise the indirect impacts of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development on historic environment receptors and will minimise direct impacts to elements of the historic landscape character.

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-22	<p>Core working hours for construction of the onshore components will be 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday, and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. Apart from specific circumstances that are set out in the Outline COCP, where extended and continuous periods of construction are required. Prior to and following the core working hours Monday to Friday, a 'shoulder hour' for mobilisation and shut down will be applied (07:00 to 08:00 and 18:00 to 19:00). The activities permitted during the shoulder hours include staff arrivals and departures, briefings and toolbox talks, deliveries to site and unloading, and activities including site and safety inspections and plant maintenance. Such activities shall not include noise generating activity including use of heavy plant or activity resulting in impacts between objects resulting in loud noises, ground breaking or earthworks.</p>	Scoping	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (n)</p>	<p>The measure will minimise indirect impacts on historic environment receptors.</p>

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-24	Best practice air quality management measures will be applied as described in Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) (2024) guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction 2024, version 2.2.	Scoping- updated at PEIR	Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (h)	The measure will minimise indirect impacts on historic environment receptors.
C-25	All aspects of the construction work will be in accordance with the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015.	Scoping	Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015  Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP	The measure will ensure work undertaken to minimise effects on historic environment receptors are carried out by appropriately qualified and experienced persons.
C-26	Where noisy activities are planned and may cause disturbance, the use of mufflers, acoustic barriers and other suitable solutions will be applied.  For HDD work sites near to noise sensitive receptors where predicted levels may exceed the BS 5228 thresholds of significance, mud pumps that operate overnight will be shrouded and the drill will be fitted	Scoping	Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (g)	The measure will minimise indirect impacts on historic environment receptors.



ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	with acoustic (i.e. high mass) panelling and louvres as well as engine silencers where diesel powered drills are used.			
<b>C-27</b>	Following construction, construction compounds will be returned to previous conditions as far as reasonably possible. C-7 applies in this regard for reinstatement of soils.	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 12 Provision of landscaping (1), Requirement 13 Implementation and maintenance of landscaping (1)</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4)</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 23 Construction method statement (2) (h)</p>	The measure will minimise, or reverse, indirect effects on historic environment receptors.
<b>C-29</b>	A depth of cover of 1.2m is assumed. Deeper trenches may be required at specific crossing locations (such as watercourses).	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 23 Construction method statement (2) (e)</p>	The trench parameters will determine the extent of impact on buried deposits of potential archaeological interest. The measure will provide opportunity for minimising and / or avoiding

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
<b>C-37</b>	The Maximum blade tip height will be 325m from lowest astronomical tide (LAT) and the maximum rotor diameter will be 295m.	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 2 (1) (a) & (b) & Deemed marine licence, Schedule 11, Part 2, Condition 1 (2) (a) & (b)	direct impacts to archaeological sensitive areas. Maximum assessment assumptions relevant to worst-case scenario for SLVIA ZTV which is incorporated into the assessment for indirect effects.
<b>C-40</b>	There will be up to three offshore substations installed to serve the Proposed Development. The exact locations, design and visual appearance will be subject to a structural study and electrical design, which is expected to be completed post consent. The offshore substations will be installed on multi-leg or monopile foundations, similar to those described for the wind turbine generators (WTGs) themselves.	Scoping	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 3 (1) & (4) & Deemed Marine Licence, Schedule 12, Part 2, Condition 1 (4)	Defines the maximum number of offshore substations that could be installed and the foundation type, which is incorporated into the assessment for indirect effects.
<b>C-61</b>	Due regard will be given to design principles held in Rampion 1 Design Plan and design principles to be	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 1 The Authorised Development	This measure relates to the offshore development from the perspective of SLVIA. The

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	developed for Rampion 2, with consideration of the seascape, landscape and visual impacts on the South Downs National Park and Sussex Heritage Coast.			measure is aimed at ensuring where appropriate, the intentions of the design principles established for Rampion 1 are followed through to the Rampion 2 design plan and have informed the design principles developed for Rampion 2. <b>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) describes the design evolution up to DCO Application. The design principles applied to the design of Rampion 2, particularly in regard to the spatial extent of the wind farm array area component of the proposed DCO Order Limits and rationale for selection of the project design envelope for the wind farm array area is detailed in <b>Section 15.7, Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2</b> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15). The measure will address effects on historic environment receptors resulting from offshore

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
<b>C-66</b>	<p>The Proposed Development has sought to minimise effects on the special qualities of the South Downs National Park and High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) through careful design consideration in terms of scale, size and location, and taking account of the relevant policy and guidance. Further consideration of the special qualities during detailed design of the onshore cable corridor will be provided in accordance with C-292.</p>	Scoping	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 1 The Authorised Development Work Nos 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15,17</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 12 Provision of landscaping (1), (3), (4) Requirement 13, Implementation and maintenance of landscaping (1)</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 (4) (a) and Requirement 40 Vegetation Retention and Removal</p>	<p>elements of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The measure will contribute to minimising effects on heritage assets within the South Downs National Park.</p>
<b>C-67</b>	<p>The onshore cable route will avoid the brows of hills as far as is reasonably practical and is likely to follow the established pattern of the landscape i.e. routed to closely follow</p>	Scoping	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 1 The Authorised Development Work No's 7, 8, 9, 10</p>	<p>The measure will minimise indirect impacts on historic environment receptors.</p>

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	the line of existing field boundaries as far as is practicable.			
<b>C-68</b>	The final form of the onshore substation will be finished to a high standard of design, using quality materials and integrated into the surrounding environment through the adoption of a robust, sustainable landscape planting strategy, taking account of the West Sussex Landscape Land Management Guidelines and Landscape Character Assessment of West Sussex (West Sussex Council, 2003) detailed landscape plan will be developed to mitigate landscape and visual effects and where possible, protect landscape character, key characteristics and elements, and enhance landscape quality through use of sustainable landscape design techniques. The detailed landscape plan will be developed in accordance with the further principles and indicative landscape design included in the-Design and Access Statement.	Scoping- updated at ES	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 8 (1) (f)</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 12 Provision of landscaping (3)</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 30, 31 Control of artificial light emissions during operational phase (1) (2)</p>	The measure will minimise indirect impacts on historic environment receptors.

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-77	Dewatering of excavations will be undertaken in line with good practise. Effects of dewatering on potential receptors will be incorporated into the proposed approaches for each piece of infrastructure. Appropriate treatment will be installed before discharge to surface or groundwater, this will include the use of siltbusters (or similar) before discharge to surface waters. Appropriate licences and permits will be applied for if required.	Scoping	The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016  <b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (k)	The measure will minimise direct impacts on buried deposits with potential archaeological interest.
C-79	Where archaeological and paleoenvironmental mitigation involves preservation by record, this will entail an agreed programme of archaeological recording and dissemination to mitigate any significant adverse effects during construction. Provision will be made for appropriate curation/deposition of the site archive.	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 19 Onshore archaeology (6)	The measure will mitigate significant adverse effects on deposits of archaeological interest that may occur during construction.
C-80	Any loss of built heritage assets or historic landscape elements will be mitigated through a proportionate	Scoping- updated at PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 19 Onshore archaeology (6)	The measure will mitigate the loss of heritage significance that may result from direct impacts on built

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	level of survey and recording and dissemination, where avoidance or sensitive adaptation is not feasible.			heritage assets or historic landscape elements.
C-81	Loss or disturbance of historic landscape elements arising from temporary works will be mitigated, as far as possible, through sensitive design restoration and enhancements.	Scoping	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 8 Detailed design approval onshore substation (2), Requirement 9 Detailed design approval – extension to National Grid substation (2)</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 12 Provision of landscaping (1), Requirement 13 Implementation and maintenance of landscaping (1)</p>	The measure will mitigate the loss of heritage significance that may result from direct impacts on historic landscape elements.
C-82	Any significant effects on the settings of heritage assets, arising through change to setting, will be mitigated as far as possible through sensitive design, landscape planting or screening.	Scoping	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 12 Provision of landscaping (1), Requirement 13 Implementation and maintenance of landscaping (1)</p>	The measure will minimise indirect impacts on historic environment receptors.

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-103	<p>Areas of temporary habitat loss will be reinstated within 2 years of the loss, other than at the temporary construction compounds, cable joint bays, landfall and substation location where activities may take longer to complete. Habitat restoration (i.e. planting and seeding) will take place at an appropriate time of year dependent on habitat type. In general habitat restoration will seek to deliver the same habitat type as the baseline, unless there is an opportunity to deliver enhancements. Woodland cannot be replaced above the cable ducts and in these situations woodland ride habitats will be delivered</p>	Scoping - Updated at ES	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 12 Provision of landscaping (1), Requirement 13 Implementation and maintenance of landscaping (1), (2)</p>	<p>Where habitat restoration occurs in a different location to that of habitat loss, there is potential for impacts to heritage assets, such as impacts to buried deposits of archaeological interest and changes to setting, which could be either beneficial or adverse.</p>
C-104	<p>RED will deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of at least 10% for the onshore elements of the project, measured using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. BNG will be delivered in line with the Environmental Statement Appendix 22.15 - Biodiversity Gain Information. 70% of the deficit identified in section</p>	Scoping	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 14 Biodiversity Net Gain (1), (3)</p>	<p>Delivery of BNG may introduce potential impacts to historic environment, as well as present potential opportunities for enhancement which include beneficial effects to the historic environment.</p>



ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
<p>5.2 of Appendix 22.15 BNG information will be secured prior to commencement of construction for each stage.</p>				
C-115	<p>Hedgerows/tree lines crossed by the cable route will be ‘notched’ to reduce habitat loss and landscape and heritage impacts wherever possible. This is defined as removing one or more short sections (i.e. notches) within the same hedgerow/tree line. The removed sections will by default be replanted except where permanently lost on the Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan (see Figure 7.2.1 Vegetation Retention and Removal Plans - Hedgerows and tree lines in the Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan). Where appropriate, hedgerows will be temporarily translocated to maintain diversity and structure and result in more rapid reinstatement. Hedgerow/tree line losses will be kept to approximately 14m total width at each hedgerow crossing point where notching can take place. For</p>	PEIR – updated at ES	Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP	The measure will minimise direct impacts on potentially important hedgerows and mitigate any loss through restoration.

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	<p>hedgerows deemed "important" under the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 (or where there are other considerations), losses will be reduced to a 6m notch for the temporary construction haul roads only, by trenchless installation of the cable ducts under them wherever possible (see Figure 7.2.1 Vegetation Retention and Removal Plans - Hedgerows and tree lines in the Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan for the extent of hedgerow losses at each location).</p>			
	<p>Hedgerows subject to temporary translocation will be lifted using a tree spade to maintain diversity and structure and result in more rapid reinstatement. Where chances of success are questionable, notches will be made by removal and reinstatement through planting. The ECoW will justify the approach being taken in line with the responsibilities of implementing the Outline Vegetation retention and removal plan (see C-220).</p>			

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	Reinstated hedgerows and tree lines will be monitored over a period of 10 years, and remedial action taken rapidly where signs of failure are identified.			
<b>C-133</b>	Stockpiles will be present for the shortest practicable timeframe, with stockpiles being reinstated as the construction work progresses in order to minimise areas of exposed soil and any associated silt laden run-off. Stockpiles which are anticipated to remain for more than six months will be seeded as soon as practicable to encourage stabilisation, except where the existing seed bank is to be used in reinstatement.	PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (e)	The measure will minimise indirect impacts on historic environment receptors.
<b>C-157</b>	The proposed heavy goods vehicle (HGV) routing during the construction period to individual accesses will be developed to avoid major settlements such as Storrington, Cowfold, Steyning, Wineham, Henfield, Woodmancote and other smaller	PEIR	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 24 Construction traffic management plan (2 (a))	The measure will minimise indirect impacts on historic environment receptors.

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	settlements where possible. For Cowfold, this means that HGVs will only route through the village centre for trips related to accesses A-56 and A-57 or where use of local sourced materials / equipment makes its avoidance impracticable.			
C-174	Veteran trees are retained through design avoidance. Ground works within a buffer zone of 15 times the diameter of the tree or 5m from the edge of the tree's canopy will be avoided. Should transmission cables go under a veteran tree via a trenchless crossing a depth of at least 6m below ground within the buffer zone will be maintained to avoid root damage.	PEIR	Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (a)	Trees may form an element of HLC and/or form part of the setting of heritage assets. This measure will minimise impacts on historic environment receptors.
C-196	Stage specific LEMPs, developed in accordance with the Outline LEMP, will be developed to reinstate landscape elements such as trees, woodland and hedgerows, which have been removed as a result of construction, including construction / HDD compounds and construction	PEIR	Draft DCO, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 12 Provision of landscaping (1), Requirement 13 Implementation and maintenance of landscaping (1)	This measure will help mitigate the effects on HLC and important hedgerows.

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	<p>access. Attention will also be given to maintaining levels and types of vegetation and landscape patterns within each Landscape Character Area.</p>			
<b>C-199</b>	<p>A stage specific Landscape and Ecology Management Plan will be developed to ensure all reinstated habitats are effectively established. To ensure effective restoration, habitats will be subject to appropriate maintenance, management (including adaptive management) and monitoring for ten years from the completion of planting in the relevant stage.</p>	PEIR	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 12 Provision of landscaping (1), Requirement 13 Implementation and maintenance of landscaping (1)</p>	<p>This measure will help mitigate the effects on HLC and important hedgerows.</p>
<b>C-216</b>	<p>All ancient woodland will be retained. A stand-off of a minimum of 25m from any surface construction works will be maintained in all locations from cable installation works. Construction traffic may operate within 25m of an ancient woodland on existing tracks, with any track maintenance works being restricted to the current width. Works to provide safe access from the</p>	ES	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (f)</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 23 (2) (e)</p>	<p>This measure will help mitigate the effects on HLC.</p>

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-220	<p>highway are required in three locations within 25m of ancient woodland, being accesses A-42, A-56 and A-57. At these locations specific design measures including dust control shall be detailed in the Outline stage specific Code of Construction Practice that will manage any potential indirect effects on ancient woodland.</p> <p>Where ancient woodland is crossed via trenchless crossing a depth of at least 6m below ground will be maintained to avoid root damage and drill launch and retrieval pits will be at least 25m from the woodland edge.</p> <p>The Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan shows hedgerows, tree lines, woodland, scrub, calcareous grassland, semi-improved species-rich grassland and ponds which are to be retained or temporarily or permanently lost. Should any of these habitats shown as retained require removal due to unforeseen circumstances at the detailed design phase, they will be highlighted to the</p>	ES	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 22 CoCP (4) (a)</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 40 Vegetation Retention and Removal</p>	This measure will help mitigate the effects on HLC and important hedgerows.

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	<p>relevant competent authority with a reasoned justification provided. The stage specific Vegetation Retention and Removal Plans will require approval of the relevant planning authority via Requirement 40 of the DCO. Any unforeseen, additional losses would be accounted for through commitment C-104 covering the commitment to the provision of biodiversity net gain.</p>		<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 14 Biodiversity net gain</p>	
<b>C-225</b>	<p>Where previously unknown archaeological remains which are demonstrably of national heritage significance are identified within the onshore Order limits engineering and design solutions (e.g. narrowing of the construction corridor, divert cable route within DCO Order Limits, re-siting stockpiles, trenchless crossings) will be employed, subject to agreement by the relevant planning authority in consultation with WSCC. In the event that archaeological remains of national significance are deemed not suitable for preservation in situ on archaeological grounds, or</p>	ES	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 19 Onshore archaeology (1),  Requirement 22 CoCP</p>	<p>The measure will help mitigate adverse effects on deposits of archaeological interest that may occur during construction.</p>

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
	<p>necessary consent is not granted, an appropriate programme of mitigation will be undertaken to ensure preservation by record.</p> <p>In the event of the discovery of archaeological remains of high heritage significance which are not suitable for preservation in situ on archaeological grounds, or cannot be avoided due to technical constraints, an appropriate programme of mitigation will be undertaken to ensure preservation by record in accordance with onshore outline WSI.</p> <p>All measures for mitigation and preservation in situ will be reviewed in consultation with relevant stakeholders (WSCC Archaeologist, local planning authority and Historic England). An onshore outline WSI provides detail of appropriate methodologies to be implemented during the evaluation and mitigation stages of the archaeological works.</p>			



ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-231	<p>The detailed substation design will be built and operated such that the Rating levels (noise emissions plus any character correction) do not exceed the following noise levels at the private amenity space associated with the closest residential receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Southlands, Kent Street, RH13 8BA (assessment location at OSGB East 523168.9635, North 122661.931): Daytime limit of 38 dB(A), night-time limit of 35 dB(A);</li> <li>- Westridge, Kent Street, RH13 8BB (assessment location at OSGB East 523193.0601, North 122661.931): Daytime limit of 35 dB(A), night-time limit of 35 dB(A);</li> <li>- Taintfield Farmhouse, Kings Lane, RH13 8BD (assessment location at OSGB East 522570.7123, North 122015.784): Daytime limit of 35 dB(A), night-time limit of 35 dB(A); and</li> <li>- Oakendene Manor, Bolney Road, RH13 8AZ (assessment location at OSGB East 522771.0714, North 122524.3422): Daytime limit of 39 dB(A), night-time limit of 35 dB(A).</li> </ul>	ES	<p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 8 Detailed design approval onshore substation (2)</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b>, Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 29 Control of noise during operational phase (3)</p>	<p>The measure will help mitigate adverse indirect effects on heritage assets that may occur during operation of the onshore substation.</p>

ID	Environmental measure proposed	Project phase measure introduced	How the environmental measures will be secured	Relevance to historic environment assessment
C-261	An appropriate and proportional programme of public outreach will be developed and implemented by RED.	ES	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 19 Onshore archaeology (1)	This measure will contribute to delivery of public benefit.
C-278	Trenchless crossings of Climping Beach SSSI, Sullington Hill LWS, Atherington Beach and Littlehampton Golf Course LWS would be designed to ensure a minimum depth of 5m is maintained when passing beneath them to reduce the risk of drilling fluid breaking out to the surface and avoid archaeological remains of high heritage significance at Climping Beach (identified currently or during pre-commencement investigations).	ES	<b>Draft DCO</b> , Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 23 Onshore Construction Method Statement (1) (g)	This measure will avoid impacts to potential archaeological receptors where the trenchless crossing may pass under the Climping Beach SSSI and Sullington Hill LWS, or where trenchless crossings are implemented to avoid as yet unknown archaeological remains of high heritage significance which may be encountered by the proposed development.

Page intentionally blank

- 25.7.12 Further detail on the environmental measures in **Table 25-23** is provided in the **Commitments Register** (Document Reference: 7.22) which sets out how and where particular environmental measures will be implemented and secured.

## 25.8 Methodology for ES assessment

### Introduction

- 25.8.1 The project-wide generic approach to assessment is set out in **Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5). The assessment methodology for historic environment for the ES is consistent with that provided in the Scoping Report (RED, 2020) and no changes have been made since the scoping phase and original PEIR (RED, 2021) provided alongside the first statutory consultation exercise.
- 25.8.2 The methodology for establishing a detailed onshore historic environment baseline is provided in **Section 25.5**. To support the ES assessment, appropriate and proportionate assessments and surveys have been completed following refinement of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development.

### Assessment of effects and determining significance

- 25.8.3 NPS EN-1 (DECC, 2011a) requires change to the significance of heritage assets to be considered in developing an understanding of the potential effects of the Proposed Development.

#### Determining significance and contribution of setting

- 25.8.4 The significance of a heritage asset is a product of the value which it holds to this and future generations as a result of its historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interests. These interests are set out in NPS EN-1 (DECC, 2011a) and are discussed in more detail in Conservation Principles and Good Practice Advice 2 (Historic England, 2015):
- archaeological: the potential of a heritage asset to hold evidence about the past which can be retrieved through specialist investigation;
  - historical: which can be through association with past events or people, or where a heritage asset is illustrative of a particular asset type, theme or period; and
  - architectural/artistic: values which derive from a contemporary appreciation of a heritage asset's aesthetics.
- 25.8.5 NPS EN-1 (DECC, 2011a) notes that setting contributes to an asset's heritage significance and sets out policies regarding change to the setting of heritage assets but does not offer an explicit definition. Setting is defined in both the NPPF (MHCLG, 2021) and by Historic England in GPA 3 (Historic England, 2017a) as:
- “The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may*

*affect the ability to appreciate that significance, or may be neutral.” (MHCLG, 2021, 71).*

- 25.8.6 The assessment considers the contribution that setting makes to the overall heritage significance of an asset. A staged approach has been adopted, based on Historic England (2017a) guidance, to assess the potential for impacts on the significance of the settings of heritage assets:
- Stage 1: asset identification. The NPPF (MHCLG, 2021) requires an approach that is proportional to the significance of the asset, and for this reason only the settings of the most sensitive (i.e., designated) heritage assets are considered in this assessment. A scoping exercise filtered out those assets which would be unaffected (see **Section 25.4**);
  - Stage 2: assess the contribution of setting. This stage assesses how setting contributes to the overall significance of a designated asset;
  - Stage 3: assess change. This stage identifies the effects the proposals may have on setting and considers the resultant harm or benefit to the significance of the heritage asset. It is noted however that it can be difficult to quantify such change to the overall significance of a Designated Heritage Asset (for example, significance would rarely be downgraded from ‘high’ to ‘medium’ due to changes in setting). For this reason, the impact is reported in this assessment in terms of the extent to which the proposals would change how the asset is understood and experienced;
  - Stage 4: mitigation. This explores the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm. This is typically considered at the design stage (i.e., embedded mitigation); and
  - Stage 5: reporting. Making and documenting decisions and outcomes.
- 25.8.7 Stage 1 and 2 of the assessment is presented in **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) and **25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8), whilst Stage 3, 4 and 5 are included within this chapter.
- 25.8.8 Changes may occur to the settings of an asset that neither affect their contribution to the significance of the asset, nor the extent to which its significance can be experienced. In such instances it will be considered that there is no impact through changes in the setting.

## Assessment of effects

- 25.8.9 For the purposes of assessing the significance of effects, heritage significance (or sensitivity) is assigned to one of four classes, with reference to the heritage interests described above and relying on professional judgement as informed by policy and guidance. The hierarchy given in **Table 25-24** reflects the NPS EN-1 (DECC, 2011a) distinction between designated and non-designated heritage assets. NPS EN-1 distinguishes between designated assets of the highest heritage significance (i.e., scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* RPGs, and World Heritage Sites) and other designated heritage assets. This further distinction is

relevant to planning policy but has less influence on the establishment of the significance of an effect in EIA terms.

**Table 25-24 Establishing the heritage significance (or sensitivity) of receptors for onshore historic environment**

Heritage significance (Sensitivity)	Criteria	Receptor type
<b>High</b>	Assets of national importance, which have significance for an outstanding level of archaeological, architectural, historic and/or artistic interest. It is possible that low-moderate impacts upon these assets or their settings could lead to significant effects.	Designated heritage assets or non-designated assets of demonstrably schedulable quality.
<b>Medium</b>	The sensitivity of these assets will largely be dependent upon their current setting and their character. Asset has significance for a high level of archaeological, architectural, historic and/or artistic interest.	Non-designated heritage assets of regional importance.
<b>Low</b>	Assets of local interest, which have significance for elements of archaeological architectural, historic or artistic interest. Although these assets must be considered, and mitigation may be required, it is considered that significant effects will only exist if the assets were to be predominantly or totally destroyed as a result of the Proposed Development.	Non-designated heritage assets of local importance.
<b>Very Low</b>	Due to its nature of form/condition/survival, cannot be considered as an asset in its own right.	Non-extant HER record.

25.8.10 Magnitude of change is a measure of the extent to which the heritage significance of an asset will be disturbed or lost.

25.8.11 In respect of buried archaeological deposits, where no remains are visible above ground, this will arise from direct disturbance or removal of archaeological material resulting in the loss of archaeological interest. In certain instances, elements of architectural and historic interest can also be affected. Similarly, direct loss,

damage or alteration of a structure will primarily affect architectural interest, although historic and archaeological interests may also be affected.

- 25.8.12 The effects of change in the setting of a heritage asset depends on the contribution of that setting to the heritage significance of the asset, and assessments must be, by their nature, specific to the individual assets being considered.
- 25.8.13 The magnitude of change (or impact) is based on the extent to which the heritage significance of an asset is affected, which can be influenced by a number of factors:
- the permanence of the impact (temporary, permanent or reversible);
  - physical changes caused by the impact (both beneficial and adverse); and
  - the extent of the heritage asset or its setting that will be affected (for example, the whole or a very small part) and the contribution of that part to heritage significance.
- 25.8.14 Impacts on receptors, in this case heritage assets, are assigned to one of four classes of magnitude of change, defined in **Table 25-25**. Impacts can be adverse or beneficial and it is recognised that NPS EN-1 looks to developers to make, where possible, a positive contribution to the historic environment as part of its design response.

**Table 25-25 Establishing the magnitude of change**

<b>Magnitude of change</b>	<b>Criteria (Adverse)</b>	<b>Criteria (Beneficial)</b>
<b>High</b>	Loss of significance resulting from irreversible total or substantial demolition or disturbance of a heritage asset or from the disassociation of an asset from its setting.	Sympathetic restoration of an at-risk or otherwise degraded heritage asset and/or its setting. Bringing an at-risk heritage asset into sustainable use, with robust long-term management secured.
<b>Medium</b>	Loss of significance arising from partial disturbance or inappropriate alteration of asset which will adversely affect its importance. Change to the key characteristics of an asset's setting, which gives rise to lasting harm to the significance of the asset, but which still allows its archaeological, architectural or historic interest to be appreciated.	Appropriate stabilisation and/or enhancement of a heritage asset and, or its setting that better reveal the significance of the asset or contribute to a long-term sustainable use or management regime.
<b>Low</b>	Minor loss to, or alteration of, an asset which leaves its current significance largely intact. Minor and, or short-term changes to setting	Minor enhancements to a heritage asset and, or its setting that better reveal its significance or contribute

Magnitude of change	Criteria (Adverse)	Criteria (Beneficial)
	which do not affect the key characteristics and in which the historical context remains substantially intact.	to sustainable use and management.
<b>Very Low</b>	Minor alteration of an asset which does not affect its significance in any discernible way. Minor and, or short-term or reversible change to setting which does not affect the significance of the asset.	Minor alteration of an asset which does not affect its significance in any discernible way. Minor and, or short-term or reversible change to setting which does not affect the significance of the asset.
<b>No Change</b>	No change	No change

25.8.15 The matrix in **Table 25-26** has been prepared to guide the assessment of whether effects on the historic environment for the purposes of EIA are to be considered significant or not. The classification of the effect is judged on the relationship of the magnitude of impact to the assessed heritage significance of the resource. As a general rule, major and moderate effects are considered to be significant and minor and negligible effects are considered to be not significant. However, professional judgement is applied, where appropriate, to determine significance of effect. Where effects are assessed, according to the matrix in **Table 25-26**, to be Potentially Significant in EIA terms, professional judgement is applied to determine whether they are Significant or Not Significant.



**Table 25-26 Classification of effects**

Receptor heritage significance (Sensitivity)	Magnitude of Change			
	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
High	Major (Significant)	Major (Significant)	Moderate (Potentially Significant)	Minor (Not Significant)
Medium	Major (Significant)	Moderate (Potentially Significant)	Minor (Not Significant)	Minor (Not Significant)
Low	Moderate (Potentially Significant)	Minor (Not Significant)	Minor (Not Significant)	Negligible (Not Significant)
Very Low	Minor (Not Significant)	Minor (Not Significant)	Negligible (Not Significant)	Negligible (Not Significant)

- 25.8.16 In **Section 25.9 to 25.11**, all assessments are presented as narrative discussions, setting out the significance of the relevant heritage asset(s), and where appropriate contribution of their settings to heritage significance, providing a description of the anticipated change and setting out the magnitude of change in line with the definitions set out in **Table 25-25**.
- 25.8.17 NPS EN-1 further distinguishes between ‘harm’ and ‘substantial harm’ and sets out how development that gives rise to harm should be considered within the planning process.
- 25.8.18 For the purposes of this assessment, adverse change of very low to medium magnitude to a designated heritage asset or non-designated heritage assets of equivalent heritage significance will normally be considered to comprise harm, while a high magnitude of impact will normally be considered substantial harm. This follows *Hall vs City of Bradford 2019* that determined that even a negligible magnitude of change to a designated heritage asset would constitute harm (Royal Courts of Justice (2019)). The fact that the harm may be limited or negligible would contribute to the weight to be afforded to it as part of the planning balance and recognised in paragraph 5.8.15 in NPS EN-1.
- 25.8.19 Special consideration, however, needs to be given to the particular context in which the assessment is taking place. Comments on the magnitude of any harm accruing to designated heritage assets or non-designated heritage assets of equivalent heritage significance will be made in the narrative assessment.

## 25.9 Assessment of effects: Construction phase

### Landfall and onshore cable corridor

#### Introduction

25.9.1 As outlined in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4), the onshore cable installation works will take up to three years (carried out in stages), whilst construction of the temporary construction compounds will take between two months to four months and will be in use for up to three years and six months. Temporary construction activities will include activities such as site clearance, earthworks, access road construction, installation of temporary trenchless crossing (e.g., HDD) compounds, cable installation and vehicle movements. The maximum assessment assumptions relating to the landfall and onshore cable corridor are presented in **Table 25-22**. On completion of the construction phase, the land will be reinstated to its former condition wherever possible (embedded environmental measure C-27, **Table 25-23**). Where predicted effects are identified, an assessment of the predicted magnitude of change for each effect has been completed based on the definitions provided in **Section 25.8**. The magnitude of change, and hence the significance of potential effects, have been assessed on the assumption that the embedded environmental measures from **Table 25-23** have been implemented as part of the Proposed Development.

#### Effects arising through change to historic landscape character (HLC)

##### Overview

25.9.2 Effects to the heritage significance of HLC may arise through direct disturbance and changes to the settings of heritage assets. Within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, direct disturbance of elements of the historic environment may result from intrusive groundworks required for the construction of the onshore cable trenches and transitional joint bays (TJBs) together with associated infrastructure such as temporary construction compounds, temporary construction haul roads and temporary construction access routes. Temporary construction activity will introduce new visual and audible elements into the historic landscape. This is likely to have varying impact along the onshore construction corridor depending on the nature of the existing noise environment (for example traffic noise, natural wave sounds, industrial activity and active farmsteads), with a greater impact within the less developed agricultural landscape and where views across the landscape contribute to heritage significance.

##### Zone 1: South Coast Plain

25.9.3 The HLC of the coastal plain is described in **Section 25.6**. HLC and elements are generally considered to be of **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity) for the following historic and archaeological interests:

- medieval and post medieval historic settlement patterns;

- fragmented medieval and post medieval agricultural enclosure;
- historic reclamation of marshland;
- surviving historic farmsteads (though no built elements lie within the proposed DCO Order Limits);
- surviving hedgerows of historic importance (H521, H527, H549, H579, H181, H200, H228, H308, H507 and H515, as identified on the **Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plan** (Document Reference: 2.6) and discussed in **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)); and
- military coastal defences.

- 25.9.4 Where existing features of the historic landscape (for example potential historically important hedgerows (see **Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plan** (Document Reference: 2.6) and **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)), extant lynchets of former land boundaries) are crossed by the onshore elements of the Proposed Development, sections will be removed, altering the existing historic landscape character (see **Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan** (Document Reference: 8.87 [REP5-125])). This will not eliminate the overall landscape pattern or the ability to understand it. Their loss will therefore represent only a limited loss to historic interest. On completion of construction, the land will be reinstated to its former condition and lost boundaries will be reinstated (where identified on **Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan** (Document Reference: 8.87 [REP5-125])). In the long-term, this will partially mitigate loss of aesthetic and historic interest.
- 25.9.5 Construction of the Proposed Development will not physically change surviving elements of military coastal defences at Climping, and the perceptibility of temporary construction activities will not affect the historic military interest of the coastal landscape.
- 25.9.6 Overall, it is considered that the heritage significance (sensitivity) of historic landscape receptors is **Low** (**Table 25-24**). Following implementation of the relevant embedded environmental measures in **Table 25-23** (C-1, C-5, C-9, C-19, C-21, C-22, C-27, C-80, C-81, C-115, C-133, C-174, C-196, C-199 and C-220) the magnitude of change is **Low** (**Table 25-25**) resulting in a **Minor adverse effect**, which will be short-term, temporary and is **Not Significant** in EIA terms.

### *Zone 2: South Downs*

- 25.9.7 The HLC of the South Downs is provided in **Section 25.6**. The HLC and elements within Zone 2: South Downs are generally considered to be of **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) (**Table 25-24**) for historic and archaeological interests:
- extant features of the prehistoric downland landscape;
  - medieval and post medieval historic settlement patterns;

- medieval and post medieval agricultural landscape (enclosure and unenclosed downland);
- surviving historic farmsteads; post medieval landscape gentrification (Angmering Park and Michelgrove);
- surviving historic hedgerows (as identified on the **Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plan** (Document Reference: 2.6) and discussed in **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2));
- historic routeways across the landscape;
- historic functional and visual relationship between uplands landscape and coastal plain to south and Weald to the north; and
- isolated areas of surviving historic woodland.

- 25.9.8 Where existing features of the historic landscape (for example important hedgerows (as identified on the **Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plan** (Document Reference: 2.6) and discussed in **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) and surviving historic routeways) are crossed by the onshore elements of the Proposed Development, sections will be removed (see **Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan** (Document Reference: 8.87 [REP5-125])), altering the existing historic landscape character. This will not eliminate the overall landscape pattern or the ability to understand it. Their loss will therefore represent only a limited loss to historic interest.
- 25.9.9 Construction activities will introduce new visual and audible elements to the landscape which will be perceptible within long views across the downland, where prominent elevations preserve extant features of human activity from the prehistoric onwards, which may draw heritage significance from these views and/or interrelationship of extant sites and features. Whilst there is potential for change to views within this historically significant landscape, these will be time-limited.
- 25.9.10 On completion of construction, the land will be reinstated to its former condition (including hedgerows identified in **Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan** (Document Reference: 8.87 [REP5-125])). In the long-term, this will partially mitigate loss of aesthetic and historic interest.
- 25.9.11 Overall, it is considered that the heritage significance (sensitivity) of historic landscape receptors is **Low to Medium (Table 25-24)**. Following implementation of the relevant embedded environmental measures in **Table 25-23** (C-1, C-5, C-9, C-19, C-21, C-22, C-27, C-80, C-81, C-115, C-133, C-174, C-196, C-199, C-216 and C-220) the magnitude of change of **Low (Table 25-25)** resulting in a **Minor adverse effect**, which will be short-term, temporary and will be **Not Significant** in EIA terms (**Table 25-26**).

### Zone 3: Low Weald

- 25.9.12 The HLC and elements within the onshore part of proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 3: Low Weald are generally considered to be of **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity) (**Table 25-24**) for historic and archaeological interests:
- medieval and post medieval historic settlement patterns;
  - medieval and post medieval agricultural enclosure;
  - surviving historic farmsteads;
  - post medieval landscape gentrification (Oakendene Manor); and
  - surviving historic hedgerows (as identified on the **Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plan** (Document Reference: 7.2)) and discussed in **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.13 The heritage significance of the post medieval historic parkland at Oakendene Manor is considered in detailed in **Appendix 25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5).
- 25.9.14 Where existing features of the historic landscape (for example important hedgerows) are crossed by the onshore parts of the Proposed Development, sections will be removed (see **Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan** (Document Reference: 8.87 [REP5-125])), altering the existing historic landscape character. This will not eliminate the overall landscape pattern or the ability to understand it. Their loss will therefore represent only a limited loss to historic interest.
- 25.9.15 Whilst construction activity will introduce new visual and audible elements into the landscape, the relatively level topography, areas of woodland, and tall hedgerows which commonly form the field boundaries across this landscape in Zone 3: Low Weald, mean that visual perception of construction activities is expected to be relatively localised. Construction activities occurring on the northern scarp of the South Downs may impact longer views southward from within the Zone 3: Low Weald landscape.
- 25.9.16 On completion of construction, the land will be reinstated to its former condition (including hedgerows identified in **Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan** (Document Reference: 8.87 [REP5-125])). In the long-term, this will partially mitigate loss of aesthetic and historic interest.
- 25.9.17 Overall, it is considered that the heritage significance (sensitivity) of historic landscape receptors is **Low** (**Table 25-24**). Following implementation of the relevant embedded environmental measures in **Table 25-23** (C-1, C-5, C-9, C-19, C-21, C-22, C-27, C-80, C-81, C-115, C-133, C-174, C-196, C-199 and C-220) the magnitude of change across the onshore cable corridor in Zone 3 is **Low** (**Table 25-25**) resulting in a **Minor adverse effect**, which will be short-term, temporary and will be **Not Significant** in EIA terms (**Table 25-26**).

## Direct effects on heritage assets

### Overview

- 25.9.18 Direct effects on heritage assets for the entire onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits are considered within this section (including the onshore substation at Oakendene and the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension works). Known and potential archaeological receptors, together with an assessment of heritage significance, within onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits are listed in **Table 25-19**, **Table 25-20** and **Table 25-21**. Information within these tables is based on the following appendices:
- **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2);
  - **Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3);
  - **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4);
  - **Appendix 25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5); and
  - **Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6).
- 25.9.19 Within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, intrusive groundworks will take place during the construction phase of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development, including topsoil stripping and sub-soil disturbance. Invasive works of this nature will adversely affect any surviving sub-surface archaeological remains, reducing or removing their ability to be further interpreted, resulting in the loss of archaeological interest. This will result in impacts of up to high magnitude, which will be permanent.
- 25.9.20 Within the proposed landfall location, HDD installation techniques will be used to install ducts that will house the electrical cables under Climping Beach (see **Figure 4.3, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.4) and **Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2). This technique has been adopted to reduce the impact of the Proposed Development at landfall. Due to the anticipated depth of the HDD duct, it is unlikely that deposits of archaeological interest will be encountered, except where the duct rises to interface with the onshore cable corridor at the TJB. There is a potential for the HDD duct to encounter deposits of palaeoenvironmental interest at depth, but any impact on these deposits will be very localised. Potential impacts on groundwater levels, which may introduce dewatering effects, were scoped out by the water environment assessment (see **Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.26)). The magnitude of change of the landfall HDD is anticipated to be low but it will be permanent.
- 25.9.21 Trenchless woodland crossings will be at a minimum of 6m deep to avoid root damage (C-216) and therefore unlikely to encounter deposits of archaeological interest, whether buried or surviving as extant features.

- 25.9.22 The significance of potential effects has been assessed on the assumption that the embedded environmental measures from **Table 25-23** (C-6, C-12, C-13, C-79, C-225 and C-278) have been implemented as part of the Proposed Development. The embedded environmental measures are designed to mitigate or minimise adverse historic environmental effects. The limitations of the embedded environmental measures to mitigate effects are considered where relevant in the assessment of effects for different receptors.

### *Zone 1: South Coast Plain*

- 25.9.23 This Section presents the assessment of effects for the known and predicted archaeological remains within Zone 1: South Coast Plain.
- 25.9.24 Known and potential archaeological receptors within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 1: South Coast Plain are listed in **Table 25-19**.

### Palaeoenvironmental deposits

- 25.9.25 There is potential for the presence of deeply buried palaeoenvironment deposits within the Arun floodplain and at tributary crossings, which may be of medium to high heritage significance (sensitivity).
- 25.9.26 Intrusive construction activity associated with the onshore cable installation works, specifically deeper excavations, will result in partial loss/truncation of buried deposits with palaeoenvironmental potential. The extent of planned excavation in comparison to the extent of floodplain deposits, is predicted to result in a low to medium magnitude of change, which in the absence of any mitigation, would result in a major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.27 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20, archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore WSI** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Medium to High** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect, which based on the relative scale of the proposed development and the potential for recovery of information contributing to the understanding of the Holocene environment, would be **Not Significant**.

### Buried/submerged prehistoric landscapes

- 25.9.28 Whilst there is a potential for as yet unrecorded buried / submerged prehistoric landscapes in the intertidal zone within the proposed DCO Order Limits, intrusive construction activity in this location comprises buried HDD cables which will be at a depth that is not anticipated to encounter deposits of archaeological interest. In addition, where such receptors may extend across the MHWS, the embedded environmental measures listed in **Table 16-15, Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.16) will ensure the potential for

effects as a result of disturbance to sediment is avoided. No impacts to remains are predicted, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

#### Cudlow DMV (MWS3384)

- 25.9.29 There is high potential for archaeological remains associated with the Cudlow DMV (MWS3384) to be present within the proposed DCO Order Limits. However, intrusive temporary construction activity within the vicinity of this asset (Works No. 7) comprises buried HDD cables which will be at a depth that is not anticipated to encounter deposits of archaeological interest. No impact to remains of the Cudlow DMV (MWS3384) are anticipated, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

#### Atherington DMV (MWS3385)

- 25.9.30 There is high potential for archaeological remains associated with the Atherington DMV (MWS3385) to be present within the proposed DCO Order Limits. However, intrusive temporary construction activity within the vicinity of this asset (Works No.7) comprises buried HDD cables which will be at a depth that is not anticipated to encounter deposits of archaeological interest. No impact to remains of the Atherington DMV (MWS3385) are anticipated, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

#### WWII coastal defence features

- 25.9.31 Numerous surviving elements of WWII coastal defences which are present at Climping beach within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits will not be physical impacted by any construction activity, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

#### Site of former WW2 Anti-Aircraft Artillery (MWS7123)

- 25.9.32 The site of the former WW2 Anti-Aircraft Artillery (MWS7123) may be physically impacted by intrusive construction activities within Works No.8 (see [Works Plans Onshore](#) (Document Reference: 2.2.2)). However, there is little to no archaeological interest to this asset and so the magnitude of change is assessed as **Low**. The heritage significance (sensitivity) of this asset is **Very Low** and so this would result in a **Negligible** effect in EIA terms, which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Site of Common Barn Historic Outfarm (MWS9869)

- 25.9.33 There is a medium potential for archaeological remains relating to the former outfarm (no longer extant) to be present within the proposed DCO Order Limits. However, intrusive construction activity within the vicinity of this asset (Works No. 7 (see [Works Plans Onshore](#) (Document Reference: 2.2.2) comprises buried HDD cables which will be at a depth that is not anticipated to encounter deposits of archaeological interest. No disturbance to archaeological remains will result in **No Effect**.



#### Undated possible enclosure (4\_1)

- 25.9.34 There is high potential for archaeological remains which may relate to an undated enclosure which appears to have a well-defined southeast entrance within a field behind Climping Beach (Field 004 in [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)), together with a pit-like feature in its northwest corner. These potential remains are predicted to have a low to medium heritage significance.
- 25.9.35 Construction of HDD compound TC-01 (Works No. 8 ([Works Plans Onshore](#), (Document Reference: 2.2.2) could result in total loss of this feature (depending on siting of HDD compound within Limit of Deviation (LoD)). In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.
- 25.9.36 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20, archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the Outline WSI [REF]) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Undated possible enclosure (5\_1)

- 25.9.37 There is high potential for archaeological remains which may relate to an undated enclosure measuring approximately 60m by 50m within a field behind Climping Beach (Field 005 in [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [**PEPD-031** and **PEPD-113** to **PEPD-120**] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission), together with a possible pit (5\_2) and ditches (5\_4). These potential remains are predicted to have a low to medium heritage significance.
- 25.9.38 The identified archaeological remains are located within the area of the landfall cable installation (Works No. 7) and intrusive temporary construction activity within this area will comprise buried cables installed by HDD which would be unlikely to disturb archaeological remains. Where alternative HDD compound location TC-01 is used, the buried cables will avoid the area of identified features in Field 005, resulting in no impact. Where alternative HDD compound location TC-01a is used, buried cables are likely to cross the area where the identified features are located. However, the use of HDD will ensure buried cables are at a sufficient depth to avoid disturbance to archaeological remains within Field 005. This would lead to no change and would have **No Effect**.

#### Undated possible archaeology (6\_1)

- 25.9.39 There is high potential for archaeological remains related to an undated square/subcircular geophysical anomaly approximately 15m across, within Field 006 near landfall ([Section 4.3](#) and [Table 5-1, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference:

6.4.25.4)). These potential remains are predicted to have a low to medium heritage significance (see **Table 25-19**).

- 25.9.40 Construction of HDD compound TC-01a (Works No.8 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2) could result in total loss this feature (depending on siting of HDD compound within LoD). In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.
- 25.9.41 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore WSI** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Post medieval agriculture and land division features

- 25.9.42 LiDAR features (LDr\_001 to 003, **Figure 25.4, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)) and geophysical anomalies (in Fields 004, 006, 012 and 016 in **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) within fields south of the River Arun indicate a high potential for the presence of archaeological remains relating to post medieval agriculture and land division within proposed DCO Order Limits (between KM01 and KM02) (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) and **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Such remains are assessed as having low heritage significance (**Table 5-1, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.43 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, Climping construction compound, temporary trenchless crossing compounds and onshore cable installation works and soil storage (Works No. 8, 9, 10, 11 and 14 (see **Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2))) would result in the partial total loss these features. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as medium magnitude of negative change to a low significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.44 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore WSI** of the ES (Document Reference: 2.2.2) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Very Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Negligible** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

## Medieval earthworks E and SE of St Mary's Church (NHLE 1005828, MWS3371)

- 25.9.45 The scheduled monument (NHLE 1005828) has high heritage significance (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).
- 25.9.46 An operational access (A-06) ([Figure 25.2, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)) will utilise an existing farm track which crosses the scheduled medieval earthworks east and southeast of St Mary's Church (NHLE 1005828). Operational use of this access requires no upgrade works to the existing track. No disturbance of the scheduled archaeological remains will occur in the absence of intrusive works and as a result there will be **No Effect**.

## Early medieval settlement deposits and features west of Courtwick Lane

- 25.9.47 Proximity of proposed DCO Order Limits to archaeological remains identified in a previous archaeological evaluation (MWS9428) (ANA Arun 049) ([Figure 25.3, Volume 3](#) and [Figure 25.4, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)) indicates a low to medium potential for early medieval settlement deposits and features of to be present within the site. Operational access A-10 which intersects with extent of the ANA and HER record, will not impact archaeological remains which may be present (KM 2 and 3) because it will utilise an existing road and track and will not require additional construction. Intrusive temporary construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, between KM 2 and 3) would negatively impact below ground deposits with potential archaeological interest. Where deposits or features are present, temporary construction activities would result in truncation or total loss, with the potential for recovery of early medieval finds.
- 25.9.48 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium to high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.
- 25.9.49 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore WSI](#) (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance (sensitivity) heritage asset and resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

## Iron Age and Roman remains at Brook Barn Farm

- 25.9.50 Evidenced through geophysical survey ([Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) and archaeological trial trenching ([Appendix 25.6: Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6)), the remains of a mid/late Iron Age driveway and/or field system and a late Iron Age/Roman probable small enclosed Roman farmstead are assessed as having medium heritage significance.

- 25.9.51 Intrusive construction activities associated with the cable installation works (Works No.9) will adversely impact the surviving archaeological remains at this location, resulting in total or near total loss. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.52 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore WSI](#) (Document Reference: 7.9) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance (sensitivity) heritage asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Undated possible enclosures (34\_1)

- 25.9.53 Potential remains of an undated enclosure (34\_1) within a field south of Lyminster village (Field 034) have been identified by geophysical survey ([Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [**PEPD-031** and **PEPD-113** to **PEPD-120**] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission). These features appear to extend northwards, beyond the DCO Order Limits and may relate to late prehistoric or Roman activity, or be medieval in date, possibly associated with the former Benedictine Priory.
- 25.9.54 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9 (Works Plans Onshore, (Document Reference: 2.2.2) [**PEPD-005**])) would cause disturbance or the removal of part of the buried archaeological remains associated with these assets or other as-yet unrecorded assets (to be determined through intrusive investigation). In the absence of any mitigation, this this level of disturbance would result in the loss of part of the asset and potentially elements of related remains that would be considered a medium magnitude of negative change to a low/medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant. However, in accordance with commitment C-225 and the evaluation and mitigation strategy in [Section 4.4](#) of the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9) [**REP5-070**] there would be provision for avoidance if further survey established that these archaeological remains were of sufficient significance to merit the re-siting of the onshore cable within the cable corridor.
- 25.9.55 Also, in line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9) [**REP5-070**]) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance (sensitivity) heritage asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Undated possible archaeological remains (34\_2), (34\_3) and (34\_4)

- 25.9.56 Geophysical survey ([Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [**PEPD-031** and **PEPD113 - PEPD-120**] which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission) has detected a well-defined curving trend (34\_2) which appears to enclose a series of well-defined discrete areas of enhanced magnetism (34\_3) of possible archaeological origin which have been interpreted as a possible former orchard/wood or graveyard.
- 25.9.57 The identified archaeological remains would not be directly affected by cable construction but are within an area identified for temporary soil storage (Work No. 11). Any soil stripping required in preparation for soil storage would have the potential to result in disturbance to buried archaeological remains. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to a medium significance heritage asset, moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant. However, in accordance with commitment C-225 and the evaluation and mitigation strategy in [Section 4.4](#) of the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9) [**REP5-070**] there would be provision for avoidance if further survey established that these archaeological remains were of sufficient significance to merit the re-siting of the soil storage.
- 25.9.58 Also, in line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9) [**REP5-070**]) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance (sensitivity) heritage asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Undated possible enclosures or settlement (38\_1, 38\_2 and 38\_3)

- 25.9.59 Potential remains of undated enclosures or settlement were identified within an agricultural field west of Poling, by geophysical survey ([Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4) [**PEPD-031** and **PEPD-113 to PEPD-120**]) which has been updated at the Procedural Deadline A submission). The complex of anomalies detected appear to continue to the east of the area surveyed, therefore likely to extend across the full width of the DCO Order Limits at this location and may also extend beyond. Whilst only partially revealed within the survey area, the anomalies may indicate the presence of remains of late prehistoric to Romano-British agricultural and settlement activity similar to that identified at Brook Barn Farm ([Appendix 25.6 Archaeological trial trenching at Brook Barn Farm, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.6) [**APP-212**]). Such remains are likely to be of low to medium heritage significance but the available evidence does not exclude the potential for remains of high heritage significance to be present.
- 25.9.60 Intrusive construction activities associated with the cable installation works (Works No.9) will adversely impact the potential archaeological remains at this location,

resulting in total or near total loss of remains within the corridor directly affected by cable construction, though if the associated remains extend beyond the DCO Order Limits then the overall degree of loss may be more partial. Prior to application of mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of adverse change to a low to high significance heritage asset, resulting in a major adverse effect that would be significant. In accordance with commitment C-225 and the evaluation and mitigation strategy in **Section 4.4** of the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference:7.9) **[REP5-070]** there would be provision for avoidance or minimising impacts where possible (through measures such as narrowing of the cable corridor and/or re-routing the onshore cable within the proposed DCO Limits) which would be informed by results of further survey to establish the heritage significance and full extent of any archaeological remains.

- 25.9.61 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance should be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference:7.9) **[REP5-070]**) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. However, where there is loss of remains of national importance, preservation by record would lead to a **Medium** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low to High** heritage significance (sensitivity) heritage asset, resulting in a **Major** adverse residual effect which would be **Significant**. With provision for recording as set out in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9) **[REP5-070]** this would constitute less than substantial harm.

#### Cropmarks south of A27 Arundel Road (MWS3544 and MWS3545)

- 25.9.62 Cropmark evidence indicates a medium to high potential for undated archaeological remains possibly relating to settlement and land-use within a field south of the A27 Arundel Road to be present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits (vicinity of 8 KM). Such remains are assessed to be of low to medium heritage significance (**Table 5-1, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9 (**Works Plans Onshore**, (Document Reference: 2.2.2)), including TC-08a) would cause disturbance or the removal of part of the buried archaeological remains associated with these assets or other as-yet unrecorded assets.
- 25.9.63 In the absence of any mitigation, this this level of disturbance would result in the loss of a significant part of the asset and potentially elements of related remains that would be considered a medium magnitude of negative change to a low/medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate adverse effect that would be Significant.
- 25.9.64 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have

the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Possible site of post medieval brick kiln (MWS3543)

- 25.9.65 Documentary evidence indicating the possible site of a post medieval brick kiln within the proposed DCO Order Limits (TC-09). Such remains, if present, are assessed to be of low heritage significance ([Table 5-1, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, including TC-09) would cause disturbance or the removal of the buried archaeological remains of this as-yet unrecorded asset. This would lead to a Medium magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Roman road from Chichester to Brighton

- 25.9.66 There is a low to medium potential predicted for remains of the projected Roman road from Chichester to Brighton ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) to be present within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits, which are assessed to be of **Low to Medium** heritage significance. Intrusive construction activities associated with construction and operational accesses (A-21 and A-22) and cable installation works within Works Nos.9 and 14 may impact deposits of archaeological interest, if present. Based on relative scale of the development with that of a Roman road, the magnitude of change is predicted to be **Low**, resulting in a **Minor adverse** effect that would be **Not Significant**.

#### Other previously unrecorded archaeological remains

- 25.9.67 The potential for archaeological remains within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits is detailed in the desk study ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) and evidenced by the geophysical survey ([Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).

#### *Palaeolithic evidence*

- 25.9.68 There is a low/uncertain to medium potential for palaeolithic flint artefacts to present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone, which are assessed to be of low to high heritage significance dependant on the context in which they may be recovered ([Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3)).
- 25.9.69 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works will negatively impact deposits which may contain palaeolithic flint artefacts.

- 25.9.70 In the absence of any mitigation, loss of artefacts from primary contexts within would be assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a medium to high significance heritage asset, resulting in a major adverse effect that would be significant. Loss artefacts from secondary contexts would be assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to a low significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.71 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** of the ES (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to High** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor to Moderate adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Mesolithic evidence*

- 25.9.72 The desk study has predicted a low potential for previously unrecorded isolated Mesolithic flint artefacts and scatters to be present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, which are predicted to be of low to high heritage significance (**Table 5-1, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.73 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, landfall connection works, Climping construction compound, soil storage and onshore cable installation works (Works Nos.8, 9, 10, 11 and 14 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2))) have the potential to encounter such archaeological remains. Whilst the context from which the archaeological material might be recovered may be lost or truncated, the artefacts themselves will not.
- 25.9.74 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a low to high significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.75 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore WSI** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low to High** significance heritage (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor to Moderate adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Neolithic evidence*

- 25.9.76 The desk study has predicted a medium to high potential for previously unrecorded isolated Neolithic flint artefacts and pottery sherds to be present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, which are assessed to be of low to medium heritage significance (**Table 5-1, Appendix 25.2: Onshore**



**historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).

- 25.9.77 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, landfall connection works, Climping construction compound, soil storage and onshore cable installation works (Works Nos.8, 9, 10, 11 and 14 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2))) have the potential to encounter impact such archaeological remains. Whilst the context from which the archaeological material might be recovered may be lost or truncated, the artefacts themselves will not.
- 25.9.78 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor to moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.
- 25.9.79 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Bronze Age evidence*

- 25.9.80 The desk study (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) has predicted a medium to high potential for previously unrecorded remains associated with late Bronze Age settlement activity recorded at Courtwick Park (MWS9428), northeast of the River Arun, intersected by operational access A-10 and at The Vinery south of the A27 Arundel Road (MWS14193) adjacent to the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits. The potential for these remains, should they be present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, is therefore predicted to be focussed at the operational access A-10, between KM02 and 03 and between KM07 and KM08, though archaeological survival is significantly reduced around 03KM in areas of previous landfill and landscape activities and along operational access A-10 which is an existing road. There is also potential for other as yet unknown remains and finds to be present elsewhere within Zone 1.
- 25.9.81 The operational access A-10 requires no intrusive works and will therefore result in no direct impacts to archaeological remains, where present. Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2))), including TC-03 and TC-08a) may impact deposits of archaeological interest, which if present, are predicted to be of low to medium heritage significance.
- 25.9.82 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.

- 25.9.83 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeological features at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Iron Age and Romano-British evidence*

- 25.9.84 In addition to the Iron Age and Romano-British features identified at Brook Barn Farm, there is low to medium potential for as yet unknown features and finds to present elsewhere within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 1. Such remains, should they be present, are predicted to be of low to medium heritage significance (see **Table 5-1, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.85 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, landfall connection works, Climping construction compound and onshore cable installation works (Works Nos.8, 9, 10, 11 and 14 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2) have the potential to encounter and adversely impact such archaeological remains.
- 25.9.86 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.87 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeological features at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Medieval evidence*

- 25.9.88 The potential for archaeological remains of medieval activity is evidenced by the presence of numerous DMVs within the proposed DCO Order Limits (Arun 040) and the Study Area southeast of the River Arun and is generally considered to be of medium to high potential (see **Table 5-1, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). Archaeological survival within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits is likely to have been affected by post medieval and modern agricultural regimes within historically cultivated land (e.g., ploughing), adversely impacting shallower deposits.

- 25.9.89 Archaeological remains relating to medieval agricultural activity, should they be present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, are assessed to be of low to medium heritage significance (see [Table 5-1, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.90 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, landfall connection works, Climping construction compound and onshore cable installation works (Works Nos.8, 9, 10, 11 and 14 ([Works Plans Onshore](#) (Document Reference: 2.2.2))) have the potential to encounter and adversely impact such archaeological remains.
- 25.9.91 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.92 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeological features at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Post medieval evidence*

- 25.9.93 The desk study has predicted a medium to high potential for archaeological remains of post medieval agricultural activity in the form of remnant field boundary ditch. Such remains are assessed as being of very low heritage significance (see [Table 5-1, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). Archaeological survival within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits is likely to have been affected by modern agricultural regimes (e.g., ploughing) adversely impacting shallower deposits.
- 25.9.94 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, landfall connection works, Climping construction compound and onshore cable installation works (Works Nos.8, 9, 10, 11 and 14 ([Works Plans Onshore](#) (Document Reference: 2.2.2))) have the potential to encounter and adversely impact such archaeological remains.
- 25.9.95 This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Very Low** significance heritage (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Negligible** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### Zone 2: South Downs

- 25.9.96 This Section presents the assessment of effects for the known and predicted archaeological remains within Zone 2: South Downs.

- 25.9.97 Known and potential archaeological receptors within onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 2: South Downs are listed in **Table 25-20**.

### Palaeoenvironmental deposits

- 25.9.98 There is medium potential for palaeoenvironmental deposits within Head deposits which occur within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits in Zone 2. If present, these may be of medium heritage significance (sensitivity) (**Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3)).
- 25.9.99 Intrusive construction activity within the onshore cable installation works will result in partial loss /truncation of the geological deposits which have palaeoenvironment potential. The extent of planned excavation in comparison to the extent of geological deposits, is predicted to result in a low to medium magnitude of change, which in the absence of any mitigation, would result in a minor to moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.
- 25.9.100 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of an asset of **Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual adverse effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### Roman road from Chichester to Brighton

- 25.9.101 As assessed for Zone 1, there is a low to medium potential predicted for remains of the projected Roman road from Chichester to Brighton (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) to be present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits. If present, such remains would be of low to medium heritage significance.
- 25.9.102 Intrusive construction activities associated with construction accesses A-21 and A-22 (Works No.13 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) and onshore cable installation works (Works Nos.9 and 14, vicinity of KM09 and TC-10) will negatively impact archaeological deposits if present. Where remains of the Roman road are encountered these would be truncated or removed, representing partial loss of archaeological interest of this heritage asset. In the absence of any mitigation, the magnitude of change is predicted to be medium, resulting in a minor to moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.
- 25.9.103 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest This would lead

to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of an asset of **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Site of a former brickyard, Hammer Pot Field (MWS5726)

- 25.9.104 The site of a former brickyard is evidenced by historic mapping and a depression on LiDAR imagery (LDr\_022), which indicates a high potential for remains of associated with the former brickyard. Such remains are assessed as having a low heritage significance.
- 25.9.105 Intrusive construction activities associated with the temporary construction access A-22 and onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, vicinity of KM09 and TC-10 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will impact surviving archaeological remains at this location. In the absence of any mitigation, the magnitude of change is predicted to be high, resulting in a moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.
- 25.9.106 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of an asset of **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Probable post medieval and modern extraction pits in the vicinity of Angmering Park and Michelgrove Park

- 25.9.107 Numerous LiDAR features (LDr\_024-025, LDr\_027, LDr\_087, LDr\_090-091, LDr\_093) interpreted as probable extraction pits located within proposed DCO Order Limits are assessed as having very low heritage significance.
- 25.9.108 Intrusive construction activities associated with cable installation (Works No.9, vicinity of KM09 to KM13 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) would remove part or all of these features, except where the cable is installed via trenchless crossing at a depth which would not encounter these features (LDr\_087, LDr\_090 to 091). In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is the magnitude of change is predicted to be high, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.109 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of an asset of **Very Low** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Negligible** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### Undated possible archaeological features south of Angmering Park Farm (Field 052)

- 25.9.110 There is medium to high potential for archaeological features interpreted from geophysical survey, including possible enclosure ditches (Field 052) (**Figures 3.6-3.7** and **Figures 6.39-6.40, Section 4.3** and **Table 5-1, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). These are recorded within the same field as other discrete anomalies of unclear origin. Given the uncertain date and nature of these potential features, their heritage significance is also uncertain. However, the indicative form and extent of the anomalies, their location and available baseline evidence suggest that these are not expected to represent features of high heritage significance.
- 25.9.111 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, vicinity of KM10 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) would result in total loss of these potential archaeological features. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of change to assets of low to medium heritage significance, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.112 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of an asset of **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### Undated barrow type feature (62\_1)

- 25.9.113 Geophysical survey has identified a very weak curving anomaly (62\_1) of possible archaeological origin in Field 062 (**Figure 3.8** and **Figure 6.48, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The feature is predicted to represent remains low to medium heritage significance.
- 25.9.114 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, vicinity of KM12.7 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2))) would severely truncate or completely remove this feature resulting in a total loss of archaeological interest.
- 25.9.115 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.116 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low to**

**Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Undated probable field boundaries between KM13 and KM16

- 25.9.117 There is a potential for the presence of field boundaries of uncertain date as evidenced by LiDAR data (LDr\_092, LDr\_094 to 095, LDr\_099, LDr\_114, LDr\_121) (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) and geophysical survey data (Field 065, Field 066 and Field 072) (see **Table 25-19**). The heritage significance of these features is uncertain, though given their indicative form and extent, their location and the available baseline evidence, these are not expected to represent features of high heritage significance.
- 25.9.118 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, between KM13 and KM16 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) would truncate these linear features resulting in a partial loss of archaeological interest.
- 25.9.119 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor to moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.
- 25.9.120 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Early medieval mortuary remains MWS2804

- 25.9.121 Early medieval cremation remains (MWS2804) were previously recorded within an excavated Bronze Age barrow (MWS6581), within the proposed DCO Order Limits (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). Previous excavation is expected to have removed all traces of the early medieval cremation remains therefore no impacts as a result of construction activity are predicted resulting in **No Effect**.

#### Bronze Age barrow MWS6581

- 25.9.122 A previously excavated barrow (MWS6581) is within the proposed DCO Order Limits, with a high potential for surviving remains of this asset to be present, which is assessed as being of low heritage significance (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.123 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, west of TC-15c (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference:

2.2.2)) may result in the total loss of what remains of this asset, dependant on the route of onshore cable and relevant construction access tracks within the proposed DCO Order Limits. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as high magnitude of negative change to a low significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate adverse effect that would potentially be not significant.

- 25.9.124 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of an asset of **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Bronze Age barrow MWS6592

- 25.9.125 A possible barrow site (MWS6592) is identified on the HER, within the proposed DCO Order Limits, with a high potential for truncated and fragmented remains of asset to be present, which would be of low heritage significance.
- 25.9.126 Intrusive construction activities associated with cable installation works (Works No.9, between TC-15b and TC-15c ([Work Plans Onshore](#) (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) may result in the total loss of what remains of this asset, dependant on the route of onshore cable and relevant construction access tracks within the proposed DCO Order Limits. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as high magnitude of negative change to a low significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.127 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of an asset of **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Circular mound features at Sullington Hill

- 25.9.128 Features identified on LiDAR data (LDr\_130, LDr\_132, LDr\_133, LDr\_136 and LDr\_144) some of which correspond to known barrow sites and others which do not. The geophysical survey is not conclusive and identifies areas of modern disturbance across the same field, including within the same location as some of the LiDAR features and known barrows on the HER (see [Table 25-20](#)). If these features are barrows, existing evidence suggests these would be of Bronze Age and/or early medieval date, with potential for evidence of early medieval reuse of Bronze Age barrows as cremation burials ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic](#)



**environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). Such remains are predicted to be of low to medium heritage significance.

- 25.9.129 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, between KM16 and KM17) may result in the total loss of LDr\_130, LDr\_132, dependant on the route of onshore cable and relevant construction access tracks within the proposed DCO Order Limits. LDr\_133 and LDr\_136 are located within an area proposed for temporary duct stringing (Works No. 12) requiring no intrusive activities. LDr\_144 is within a location with proposed trenchless crossing between TC-15a and TC-15b, therefore no impact is predicted to this feature. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as high magnitude of negative change to low to medium significance heritage assets, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.130 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### WWII military features

- 25.9.131 Available evidence indicates known sites of WWII military activity within the proposed DCO Order Limits, relating to a defended locality on Sullington Hill (MWS7566), a military firing range (MWS11270 adjacent to proposed DCO Order Limits), an army camp at Barns Farm (MWS7547) and South Downs Training Area (SDTA). There is a high potential for remains relating to general use of the SDTA, and a very low to low potential for remains relating to those other specific sites referred to above. Where present, surviving archaeological remains are predicted to have low heritage significance (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.132 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works across the South Downs (Works No.9, vicinity of KM12 to KM17 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will truncate buried deposits with archaeological interest, if present. This would include WWII features and deposits that could provide information on WWII training activities within the area, further to that evidenced by the historic record. Impacts would be characterised as total loss of discrete features, such as pits, local gun emplacements or single slit trenches, or partial loss of more extensive features/deposits such as anti-tank ditches. The relative scale of the Proposed Development compared with the extent of the WWII training grounds, means that in the absence of any mitigation, the effect is assessed as medium magnitude of negative change to low significance heritage assets, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.133 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described

in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Undated probable field boundaries or trackways at Sullington Hill

- 25.9.134 Linear features identified on LiDAR imagery within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits which are interpreted as former field boundaries or trackways (LDr\_131, LDr\_135, LDr\_137 to 139, LDr\_145 to LDr\_147, LDr\_149 to LDr\_150). Such remains are assessed as having low heritage significance (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.135 The majority of these features fall within the area of the proposed DCO Order Limits where the onshore cable will be installed via trenchless crossing, therefore there will be no impact to archaeological interest. Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, vicinity of KM17, between TC-15a and TC-15b (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will truncate LDr\_149 and LDr\_150, resulting in partial loss of archaeological interest.
- 25.9.136 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as medium magnitude of negative change to a low significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.137 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest to **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Hill Barn Historic Outfarm MWS11506

- 25.9.138 The Hill Barn Historic Outfarm (MWS11506) is only intersected by an operational access A-31, with the onshore cable corridor located 270m to the southeast of the asset. The operational access requires no intrusive construction works, therefore no impact to remains of the Hill Barn Historic Outfarm (MWS11506) are anticipated and there will be **No Effect**.

#### Barns Farm Historic Farmstead, Storrington MWS9337

- 25.9.139 The Barns Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9337) is intersected only by operational access A-32, with the onshore cable corridor located 270m to the southeast of the asset. The operation access requires no intrusive construction works. No impact to

remains of the Barns Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9337) are anticipated, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

Iron Age and Roman-British remains associated with Muntham Court scheduled site (NHLE 1005850, MWS5598)

- 25.9.140 There is a high potential for Iron Age and Roman-British remains associated with the scheduled Muntham Court Roman-British site (NHLE 1005850) to be present within the proposed DCO Order Limits, along the route of the construction and operational access A-28. If present, such remains are predicted to be of medium to high heritage significance (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.141 Intrusive construction activities associated with access upgrade and installation works will truncate archaeological remains, if present, resulting in partial loss of archaeological interest. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as medium magnitude of negative change to a medium to high significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.142 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest to **Medium to High** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which taking into account the narrow width of the access works and relatively shallow depth of impact, would be **Not Significant**.

Other previously unrecorded archaeological remains

- 25.9.143 The potential for archaeological remains within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits is detailed in the onshore desk study (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)), the onshore geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental desk study (**Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3)) and evidenced by the geophysical survey (**Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).

*Palaeolithic and Mesolithic evidence*

- 25.9.144 There is a low potential for Palaeolithic and Mesolithic flint artefacts to be present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 2, which are assessed to be of low to medium heritage significance dependant on the context in which they may be recovered (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study** and **Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based archaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document References: 6.4.25.2; and 6.4.25.3)).

- 25.9.145 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works will negatively impact deposits which may contain Palaeolithic and Mesolithic flint artefacts. Whilst the context from which artefactual remains might be recovered may be lost or truncated, the artefacts themselves will not.
- 25.9.146 In the absence of any mitigation, this would be assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor to moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.
- 25.9.147 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the Outline WSI [REF]) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### *Neolithic evidence - Flint mining and mortuary remains*

- 25.9.148 There is a medium to high potential for archaeological remains relating to Neolithic flint mining and mortuary activity. This potential is predicted based on available evidence ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) and [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)), including the presence of known scheduled Neolithic flint mining sites within the Study Area, such as those on Blackpatch Hill (NHLE 1015880) and Harrow Hill (NHLE 1015239) ([Figure 25.2, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). Sites of flint mining generally comprise buried deposits within infilled shafts containing flint and pottery fragments, flint-knapping floors, hearths, traces of timber buildings, and human burials. The onshore cable corridor (within the vicinity of KM13 to KM16) and operational access A-27 fall within an ANA 031 which relates to multiperiod sites, including Neolithic flint mining, though no known remains have been previously identified within the proposed DCO Order Limits. There are no LiDAR features which are confidently interpreted as features which may relate to Neolithic flint mining ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). The geophysical survey has identified multiple dispersed pit-type anomalies (75\_1 in Field 075) or areas of enhanced magnetism with unclear origins (73\_2 in Field 073, 74\_3 and 74\_3 in Field 074 and 75\_2 in Field 075) within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in the vicinity of known Neolithic flint mining sites ([Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Whilst the dispersed nature of the pit-type anomalies does not resemble the dense pattern of shafts in the scheduled flint mining sites, an archaeological origin for these anomalies cannot be ruled out, and where these anomalies do not correspond with features on historic mapping, a prehistoric date is also possible.
- 25.9.149 If present, remains of Neolithic flint mining and mortuary activity are predicted to be of up to high heritage significance ([Table 5-2, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference:

6.4.25.2) and **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) because sites of this type are rare regionally and nationally, with well-preserved examples considered to be of national importance.

- 25.9.150 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses and onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, vicinity of MK13 to KM17 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) have the potential to encounter such archaeological remains. Where remains surviving as discrete features (e.g., pits and burials) are impacted, these would be severely truncated or totally lost. Where they survive as more extensive features such as deep and linear mineshafts or ditches, these would be partially truncated.
- 25.9.151 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a high significance heritage asset, resulting in a major adverse effect that would be significant. In accordance with commitment C-225 and the evaluation and mitigation strategy in **Section 4.4** of the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9) **[REP5-070]**, there would be provision for avoidance or minimising impacts where possible (through measures such as narrowing of the cable corridor and/or re-routing the onshore cable within the proposed DCO Limits) which would be informed by results of further survey to establish the heritage significance and full extent of any archaeological remains.
- 25.9.152 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. It is noted that LiDAR analysis and geophysical survey have not indicated the presence of archaeological features which indicate the presence of a flint mine or burial structures characteristic of the scheduled Neolithic flint mines nearby, within the proposed DCO Order Limits. However, where there is total loss of remains of national importance, preservation by record would lead to a **Medium** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Major adverse** residual effect which would be **Significant**. As noted at **paragraph 25.8.18**, adverse change of less than a high magnitude to a designated heritage asset or non-designated heritage assets of equivalent heritage significance will normally be considered to comprise less than substantial harm. In this case, a medium magnitude of change, with provision for recording as set out in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9) would constitute less than substantial harm.

#### *Neolithic evidence - Settlement remains*

- 25.9.153 There is a low to medium potential for archaeological remains relating to Neolithic settlement activity. Such remains, if present, are predicted to be of high heritage significance (**Table 5-2, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) and **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) because sites of this type are rare regionally and nationally, with well-preserved examples considered to be of national importance because they may

contribute to understanding of nature and organization of Neolithic occupation sites, economic regimes and social structures.

- 25.9.154 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses installation works (Works No.9, vicinity of MK13 to KM17 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will truncate buried deposits with archaeological interest. If present, remains are likely to be in the form of artefact scatters or possibly as pits containing Neolithic fill/objects. Construction impacts would result in severe truncation or total loss of individual discrete features, which may exist as group of dispersed remains. Where flint scatters are present, these would be displaced by intrusive construction activities.
- 25.9.155 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a high significance heritage asset, resulting in a major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.156 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. Surveys to date have not indicated the presence of Neolithic settlement within the proposed DCO Order Limits. However, where there is loss of remains of national importance, preservation by record would lead to a **Medium** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Major adverse** residual effect which would be **Significant**. In this case, any Neolithic features of national importance within the proposed DCO Order Limits would exist within a wider area of potential archaeological interest and a medium magnitude of change, with provision for recording as set out in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9) would constitute less than substantial harm.

#### *Neolithic evidence – Isolated and residual artefacts*

- 25.9.157 The desk study has also predicted a low to high potential for previously unrecorded isolated and residual Neolithic artefacts to be present within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits, which are predicted to be of low to medium heritage significance (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.158 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses installation works (Works No.9 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will truncate buried deposits with archaeological interest. Whilst the context from which the archaeological material might be recovered may be lost or truncated, the artefacts themselves would be displaced.
- 25.9.159 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor to moderate adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.160 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss

occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Bronze Age evidence*

- 25.9.161 There is a medium to high potential for archaeological remains relating to Bronze Age settlement activity (**Table 5-2, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) and **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)), particularly within the vicinity of New Barn Down and Cock Hill (see **Table 25-20**). Where geophysical survey has identified anomalies of possible archaeological origin within the vicinity (Fields 062, 065, 066, 074, 075, **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) or anomalies of unclear origin for which an archaeological origin cannot be ruled out, there is potential for these to be of Bronze Age date. These anomalies appear to represent possible isolated linear or curvilinear features, pits or possible material spreads or other undefined ground disturbance. There is no coherent pattern to the anomalies identified. Should remains be present, they are predicted to be of medium to high heritage significance.
- 25.9.162 Intrusive construction activities associated with cable installation works (Works No.9) have the potential to encounter such archaeological remains, likely resulting in their partial or total loss.
- 25.9.163 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a medium to high significance heritage asset, resulting in a major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.164 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Medium to High** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor to Moderate adverse** residual effect. Where there is permanent loss to heritage assets of national importance, this would be **Significant**. As noted at **paragraph 25.8.18**, adverse change of less than a high magnitude to a designated heritage asset or non-designated heritage assets of equivalent heritage significance will normally be considered to comprise less than substantial harm. In this case, a low magnitude of change, with provision for recording as set out in the **Outline Onshore WSI** (Document Reference: 7.9) would constitute less than substantial harm.

### *Early medieval evidence*

- 25.9.165 In addition to the assets already referred to in this section, there is generally a high potential on the upland areas of the South Downs for as yet unknown early medieval mortuary remains which are evidenced elsewhere within the proposed DCO Order Limits and Study Area. If present, such remains are predicted to be of medium to high heritage significance (see [Table 5-2, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.166 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, and cable installation works (Works Nos.9 and 13, in the vicinity of KM13 to KM17 ([Works Plans Onshore](#) (Document Reference: 2.2.2) have the potential to encounter impact such archaeological remains, likely resulting in their partial or total loss.
- 25.9.167 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a medium to high significance heritage asset, resulting in a major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.168 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore WSI](#) (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Medium to High** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor to Moderate adverse** residual effect. Where there is permanent loss affecting heritage assets of national importance, this would be **Significant**. As noted at [paragraph 25.8.18](#), adverse change of less than a high magnitude to a designated heritage asset or non-designated heritage assets of equivalent heritage significance will normally be considered to comprise less than substantial harm. In this case, a low magnitude of change, with provision for recording as set out in the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9) would constitute less than substantial harm.

### *Medieval and post medieval evidence*

- 25.9.169 The desk study ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) and geophysical survey ([Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) identify potential for medieval and post medieval remains within the DCO Order Limits in Zone 2 ([Table 25-20](#)). These include medium to high potential for archaeological remains predicted to be of very low to low heritage significance, relating to:
- agriculture and land division features (including possible ridge and furrow in Fields 078, 082 and 095, see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) and routeways;
  - probable extraction pits (LDr\_128, LDr\_134, LDr\_140 – some of which may have a modern date); and



- post medieval dated parkland features relating to historic parklands at Michelgrove (MWS3065) and Rowdell House (MWS34, including extant pond Mpi\_006).

- 25.9.170 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, and cable installation works (Works Nos.9, 10, 11, 13 and 14 (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) have the potential to encounter and adversely impact such archaeological remains. Elements of land division would be truncated whilst more discrete features would be lost. Overall, however, the loss to archaeological interest is considered to be limited where these features are of a common type (e.g., field boundary ditches and quarry pits), often existing as individual elements of wider landscape features/groups, and/or are evidenced as features on historic mapping.
- 25.9.171 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to very low to low significance heritage assets, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.172 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeological features at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Very Low to Low** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Zone 3: Low Weald*

- 25.9.173 This section presents the assessment of effects for the known and predicted archaeological remains within Zone 3: Low Weald.
- 25.9.174 Known and potential archaeological receptors within onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 3: Low Weald are listed in **Table 25-20**.

### Palaeoenvironmental deposits outwith Adur Valley

- 25.9.175 Within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits in Zone 3 there is a medium potential for the presence of palaeoenvironmental deposits within Head deposits and there is a low potential for deposits to be preserved in fissures on some of the sandstone and limestone outcrops (See **Section 5** and **Section 6, Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3)). The heritage significance of remains are predicted to be of medium heritage significance from within Head deposits and low heritage significance from within solution fissures.
- 25.9.176 Intrusive construction activity within the cable corridor will result in partial loss or truncation of geological deposits which have palaeoenvironment potential. The extent of planned excavation in comparison to the extent of geological deposits, will result in a low to medium magnitude of change, which in the absence of any

mitigation, would result in a minor to moderate adverse effect that would potentially be significant.

- 25.9.177 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Hardham to Barcombe Mills Roman Road, the Greensand Way (ANA Horsham 078; Mid Sussex 044)

- 25.9.178 The desk study has identified a high potential for remains relating to the Roman road to be present within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)), which are assessed to be of low to medium heritage significance.
- 25.9.179 Intrusive construction activities associated with cable installation works within Works No.9 (vicinity of TC-19a) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will impact deposits of archaeological interest, if present. Where remains of the Roman road are encountered these would be truncated or removed, representing a partial loss to archaeological interest of this heritage asset. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as medium magnitude of adverse change, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.180 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) assets, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Potential archaeological features near Buncton (Field 136)

- 25.9.181 Geophysical survey has identified a series of anomalies which have a possible archaeological origin of unknown date within Field 136 (**Section 4.3** and **Table 5-1, Figure 3.15** and **Figure 6.90, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)), which are predicted to be of low to medium heritage significance.
- 25.9.182 Intrusive construction activities associated with cable installation works within Works No.9 (vicinity of TC-19) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will negatively impact these potential archaeological features, which would be truncated or removed. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed

as high magnitude of adverse change, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.

- 25.9.183 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Undated earthwork remains (MWS7031) near Buncton

- 25.9.184 Earthwork remains have been recorded within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits ([Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)), potentially associated with the Hardham to Barcombe Mills Roman road or medieval settlement remains at Buncton (ANA Horsham 054, MWS5639) or former Butchers Farm (MWS9616). Such remains are assessed to be of low to medium heritage significance.
- 25.9.185 Intrusive construction activities associated with cable installation works within Works No.9 (vicinity of TC-19a) (Works Plans Onshore (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will adversely impact deposits of archaeological interest, where present. The undated earthwork remains would be severely truncated or removed. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as high magnitude of adverse change, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.186 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Palaeoenvironmental deposits within Adur Valley

- 25.9.187 Potential contexts for recovery of palaeoenvironmental deposits within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits in Zone 3 have been identified where it intersects with the Adur valley. This includes a high potential within alluvium deposits and a low potential in River terrace gravels ([Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3)). The heritage significance of remains are predicted to be of medium heritage significance from within River terrace gravels and high heritage significance from within the alluvium.
- 25.9.188 Where palaeoenvironmental deposits are encountered these would be truncated by intrusive construction activities associated with the onshore cable installation

works (Works No.9) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)), representing a partial loss to archaeological interest. The extent of planned excavation in comparison to the extent of floodplain deposits, will result in a low to medium magnitude of change, which in the absence of any mitigation, would result in a minor to major adverse effect that would be significant in the worst case.

- 25.9.189 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Medium to High** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor to Moderate adverse** residual effect, which based on the relative scale of the proposed development and the potential for recovery of information contributing to the understanding of the Holocene environment, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Brightham's Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9503)

- 25.9.190 Where the proposed DCO Order Limits intersects with the historic farmstead at Brightham's Farm (MWS9503), this will be via an operational access only (A-50b). This will result in no direct impacts to this asset, therefore there will be **No Effect**.<sup>22</sup>

#### Blocques Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9446)

- 25.9.191 A temporary construction and operational access A-48 narrowly intersects with the historic farmstead at Blocques Farm (MWS9446). The operational part of this access (Works No.15) will follow the existing farm track, involving no intrusive construction activities and therefore no direct impact to the asset. The construction part of this access utilises part of the same existing farm track (Works No.14) but diverts into the field north of the farmstead (Works No.13) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)). Whilst upgrade activities may directly impact part of the existing farm track, no other part of the historic farmstead will be impacted, and no archaeological remains of historic farmstead are predicted below the track. This would not result in any loss of heritage significance, therefore there would be **No Effect**.<sup>23</sup>

#### Undated circular features (184\_1 and 185\_1)

- 25.9.192 There is a medium to high potential for archaeological remains associated with two well-defined circular geophysical anomalies within adjacent fields (Field 185 and

---

<sup>22</sup> Assessment of effects on potential archaeological remains relating to medieval and post medieval agricultural activity within the vicinity of the farm is considered elsewhere in this section.

<sup>23</sup> Assessment of effects on potential archaeological remains relating to medieval and post medieval agricultural activity within the vicinity of the farm is considered elsewhere in this section.

186) (Section 4.3, Table 5-1, Figures 3.19, 6.112 and 6.114, Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The predicted heritage significance of these potential features is low to medium heritage significance.

- 25.9.193 Intrusive construction activities associated with cable installation works within Works No.9 (south of KM30) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will negatively impact these potential archaeological features, which would be totally removed. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as high magnitude of adverse change, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.194 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Homelands Historic Farmstead (MWS11752)

- 25.9.195 Where the proposed DCO Order Limits intersects with the historic farmstead at Homelands (MWS11752), this will be via an operational access only (A-50b). The onshore construction corridor will be sited approximately 330m to the east of the asset. This will result in no direct impacts to this asset, therefore there will be **No Effect**.<sup>24</sup>

#### Shoreham to Horsham Railway (MWS5508)

- 25.9.196 The proposed DCO Order Limits will intersect with the line of the former Shoreham to Horsham Railway (MWS5508), which has been retained as a feature within the landscape as a national trail, the Downs Link (3514) (See **Figure 18.56, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)). This asset is of low heritage significance, primarily derived from historic interest (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). The asset has very limited archaeological interest, where there is a low potential for traces of the former railway to be survive, which are expected to be truncated and would contribute very little to the understanding of the asset.
- 25.9.197 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.9, vicinity of KM 30 to KM 31) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will truncate the line of the former railway and therefore any buried traces that may be present. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as **Very Low** magnitude of adverse change to a **Low** heritage

<sup>24</sup> Assessment of effects on potential archaeological remains relating to medieval and post medieval agricultural activity within the vicinity of the farm is considered elsewhere in this section.

significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Negligible** effect that would be **Not Significant**.

#### Crateman's Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9939, ANA Horsham 144)

25.9.198 Crateman's Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9939, ANA Horsham 144), which is of low heritage significance, is intersected by operational access A-58 only (Works No.15) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)), which requires no intrusive construction works, with the onshore cable corridor located 40m to the east of the asset. No impact to remains of the Hill Barn Historic Outfarm (MWS11506) are anticipated, therefore there will be **No Effect**.<sup>25</sup>

#### Dragons Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS10096)

25.9.199 Dragons Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS10096), which is of low heritage significance (sensitivity), is intersected by operational access A-58 only (Works No.15) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)), which requires no intrusive construction works, with the onshore cable corridor located 620m to the east of the asset. No impact to remains of the Hill Barn Historic Outfarm (MWS11506) are anticipated, therefore there will be **No Effect**.<sup>26</sup>

#### Undated possible archaeological features near Oakendene (Field 228)

25.9.200 There is medium to high potential for archaeological features interpreted from geophysical survey, including possible ditches forming a rectilinear enclosure (228\_1 in Field 228) (**Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). These are recorded within the same field as other linear trends of unclear origin, which may be associated. Given the uncertain date and nature of these potential features, their heritage significance is also uncertain. However, their indicative form, extent and location, together with the available baseline evidence, suggests that these are not expected to represent features of high heritage significance.

25.9.201 Intrusive construction activities associated with cable installation (Works No.9, including TC-27) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) would truncate these features. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of change to assets of low to medium heritage significance, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.

25.9.202 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference:

---

<sup>25</sup> Assessment of effects on potential archaeological remains relating to medieval and post medieval agricultural activity within the vicinity of the farm is considered elsewhere in this section.

<sup>26</sup> Assessment of effects on potential archaeological remains relating to medieval and post medieval agricultural activity within the vicinity of the farm is considered elsewhere in this section.

7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Oakendene historic parkland (MWS96, HWS2285)

25.9.203 Direct effects on this heritage assets considered under the heading *Onshore cable corridor and onshore substation at Oakendene near Cowfold* in this section.

#### Late Iron Age to Roman rectangular field system, Bolney Substation (MWS15278)

25.9.204 There is a very high potential for remains of a Late Iron Age to Roman rectangular field system to be present within undisturbed areas of the proposed DCO Order Limits, specifically within the onshore cable corridor (for the 400Kv cable) within the vicinity of the existing National Grid Bolney extension works. Such remains would be of low to medium heritage significance.

25.9.205 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works No.13 and 19) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2.)) would severely truncate these features. In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a high magnitude of change to assets of low to medium heritage significance, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.

25.9.206 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Other previously unrecorded archaeological remains

25.9.207 The potential for archaeological remains within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits is detailed in the desk study (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)), the onshore geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental desk study (**Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3)) and evidenced by the geophysical survey (**Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).

#### Palaeolithic evidence

25.9.208 There is a low/uncertain to medium potential for palaeolithic flint artefacts to present within the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits in Zone 3, which are assessed to be of low to medium heritage significance, dependant on

the context in which they may be recovered (**Appendix 25.3: Onshore desk-based geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental assessment report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.3).

- 25.9.209 Intrusive construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works (Works Nos. 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will negatively impact deposits which may contain palaeolithic flint artefacts. Whilst the context from which artefactual remains might be recovered may be lost or truncated, the artefacts themselves will not.
- 25.9.210 In the absence of any mitigation, loss of artefacts from primary contexts within would be assessed as a high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a major adverse effect that would be significant. Loss of artefacts from secondary contexts would be assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to a low significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.211 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Mesolithic evidence*

- 25.9.212 The desk study has predicted a medium potential for previously unrecorded isolated Mesolithic flint artefacts and scatters to be present in areas of the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits underlain by Lower Greensand, whilst there is a low potential elsewhere within Zone 3 (**Table 5-3, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)). Such remains are predicted to be of low to medium heritage significance (sensitivity).
- 25.9.213 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, temporary construction compounds, soil storage, cable installation works, (Works Nos. 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) have the potential to encounter such archaeological remains. Whilst the context from which the archaeological material might be recovered may be lost or truncated, the artefacts themselves will not.
- 25.9.214 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium/high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a moderate to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.215 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9) ) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have



the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest, leading to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Neolithic evidence*

- 25.9.216 Where Neolithic remains are predicted to be present within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits in Zone 3, this relates to a low potential for worked flint which are likely to be unstratified. Such remains are assessed as being of low heritage significance (sensitivity) (**Table 5-3, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.217 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, temporary construction compounds, soil storage, cable installation works, Oakendene substation and existing National Grid Bolney extension works (Works Nos. 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) have the potential to encounter such archaeological remains. Whilst the context from which the archaeological material might be recovered may be lost or truncated, the artefacts themselves will not.
- 25.9.218 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to a low significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.219 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Bronze Age evidence*

- 25.9.220 There is a low potential for as-yet unknown archaeological remains relating to Bronze Age activity to be present within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits in Zone 3 (**Table 5-3, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) and **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). If present, such remains are predicted to range from low to medium heritage significance, whilst remains of high heritage significance are not anticipated.
- 25.9.221 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, temporary construction compounds, soil storage, cable installation works, Oakendene substation and Bolney extension works (Works Nos. 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will negatively impact below ground deposits with archaeological interest. Where as-yet unknown remains of Bronze Age activity are encountered, this would likely

result in the truncation or total loss of in situ features and deposits, and displacement of finds.

- 25.9.222 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium to high magnitude of negative change to a low to medium significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor to major adverse effect that would be significant.
- 25.9.223 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low to Medium** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Early to middle Iron Age*

- 25.9.224 There is low potential for finds of early to middle Iron Age date to present within the onshore part of the DCO Order Limits in Zone 3. Such remains, should they be present, are predicted to be of low heritage significance (see **Table 5-3, Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)).
- 25.9.225 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, temporary construction compounds, soil storage, cable installation works, Oakendene substation and Bolney extension works (Works Nos. 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20) (**Works Plans Onshore** (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) will negatively impact deposits which may contain artefacts of this period.
- 25.9.226 In the absence of any mitigation, loss of artefacts from secondary contexts would be assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to a low significance heritage asset, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.227 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the **Outline Written Scheme of Investigation** (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### *Medieval and post medieval*

- 25.9.228 The desk study (**Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2)) and geophysical survey (**Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) identify potential for medieval and post medieval remains within the DCO Order Limits in Zone 3 (**Table 25-21**). These include

medium to high potential for archaeological remains predicted to be of very low to low heritage significance, relating to:

- agricultural features (including possible ridge and furrow LDr\_164, LDr\_166, LDr\_189 to 190, LDr\_193 and in Fields 220, 223, 224, 250, see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)) and land division (undated LiDAR features LDr\_156-158, LDr\_160, LDr\_169, LDr\_180 to 182 corresponding with 19<sup>th</sup> century historic mapping);
- possible extraction pit (LDr\_186 – which may also have a modern date); and
- post medieval dated parkland features relating to historic parkland at Twineham Court (HWS6298).

- 25.9.229 Intrusive construction activities associated with temporary construction accesses, temporary construction compounds, soil storage, cable installation works, Oakendene substation and Bolney extension works (Works Nos.9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20) ([Works Plans Onshore](#) (Document Reference: 2.2.2)) have the potential to encounter and adversely impact such archaeological remains. Elements of land division would be truncated whilst more discrete features would be lost. Overall, however, the loss to archaeological interest is considered to be limited where these features are of a common type (e.g., field boundary ditches and quarry pits), often existing as individual elements of wider landscape features/groups, and/or are evidenced as features on historic mapping.
- 25.9.230 In the absence of any mitigation, this effect is assessed as a medium magnitude of negative change to very low to low significance heritage assets, resulting in a minor adverse effect that would be not significant.
- 25.9.231 In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeological features at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a **Low** magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest of a **Very Low to Low** heritage significance (sensitivity) asset, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Effects arising through change to setting of heritage assets

- 25.9.232 Construction activities could potentially affect the settings of designated heritage assets within the Study Area. An appraisal has been undertaken to identify heritage assets which have the potential to be affected by the onshore elements of the Proposed Development in accordance with Step 1 of the Historic England guidance GPA 3 ([Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7)). Where potential significant effects may arise, those assets have been taken forward for more detailed assessment within this chapter.
- 25.9.233 **Table 25-11** lists all of the effects arising through change to setting of heritage assets resulting from construction within the landfall and onshore cable corridor.

An indication is provided of the range of magnitude of change and heritage significance (sensitivity) definitions for each potential effect based on the definitions provided in **Section 25.8**. The magnitude of change, and hence the significance of potential effects, have been assessed in **Table 25-25** on the assumption that the embedded environmental measures from **Table 25-23** (C-1, C-9, C-11, C-19, C-21, C-22, C-24, C-26, C-27, C-61, C-80, C-81, C-82 and C-157) have been implemented as part of the Proposed Development. The assessment reflects the level of detail available for the construction phase, including the construction sequence, and has been undertaken on a worst-case basis. Where indirect effects through changes to setting are identified during the construction phase, these are expected to be varied according to the type of activity (e.g., temporary construction compound use, onshore cable installation) which will occur at different times and for different durations during the construction phase. These effects are expected to be short-term and temporary.

- 25.9.234 Construction activities relating to the landfall and onshore cable corridor (not including proposed onshore substation at Oakendene or the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension) are unlikely to impact the setting of other heritage assets within the Study Area not scoped into this assessment (see **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7)) due to the nature of the asset, topography, intervening planting and built infrastructure, and the relative distance from the onshore elements of the Proposed Development. No effects are anticipated and therefore they will not be considered for assessment in the ES.

#### Poling Conservation Area and Grade I and II Listed Buildings

- 25.9.235 Poling Conservation Area consists of two separate parts, one in the east focusing on the immediate surroundings of the church and medieval core of the village and in the west focusing on later postmedieval development. The conservation area is located 565m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 580m southwest of the limit of deviation for indicative trenchless crossing compound area TC-07 and 610m southwest of the limit of deviation for indicative trenchless crossing compound area TC-07a.
- 25.9.236 The conservation area contains six individual listed buildings, two in the eastern part, which are scoped out of the assessment (**Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)) and four in the western part (**Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)) including:
- grade II listed Christmas Cottage and Woodpecker Cottage (NHLE 1217134);
  - grade II listed Bacon Hall (NHLE 1027588);
  - grade II listed Thorn Tree Cottage (NHLE 1275562); and
  - grade II listed Little Oak, The Thatches and Waysend (NHLE 1353892)
- 25.9.237 The settings of the individual listed building assets in the western part of the conservation area (all grade II) contributed to their individual and collective architectural and historic interest and are largely contiguous with the character of the conservation area as set out in Arun District Council's characterisation

document (Arun District Council 2000, 38). The nature of the conservation area's setting can be effectively characterised by the presence of mature tree cover at the street level providing a sense of "country lane tranquillity" contrasting with the adjoining open fields visible in views to the west from the western part, a contrast in built styles with the visible modern range of houses separating the eastern and western parts and a general sense of rural character glimpsed in the approach to and movement through the conservation area.

- 25.9.238 Works associated with the construction phase may be perceptible through views and new audible elements orientated north from properties within the conservation area (primarily the western part) but the degree of separation between the proposed limits of deviation and the assets, reinforced by intervening planting producing a screening effect will ensure that there will be a **Low** magnitude of change. This assessment takes account of any effect of the approach to the conservation area from the north passing construction phase works, as the effect of their presence would be reduced by intervening planting and time limited. This **Low** magnitude of change on a group of heritage assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) is considered to be a **Moderate adverse** residual effect, which due to the temporary nature of the change would be **Not Significant**.

#### Sullington Conservation Area and Grade I and II Listed Buildings

- 25.9.239 Operational access A-31 extends into the south of Sullington Conservation Area, which itself lies c. 640m north of the onshore cable corridor and c. 905m north of the limit of deviation for HDD Compound TC-15a. The conservation area contains a single grade I listed building, The Parish Church of St Mary (NHLE 1354077), and two grade II listed buildings, Sullington Manor (NHLE 1285147) and Barn at Sullington Farm to the northeast of Sullington Manor House (NHLE 1027240). Another grade II listed building, The Old Rectory (NHLE 1181126), is located approximately 100m northeast of the conservation area and is considered in this section because of the similarity of the setting with other listed buildings and its association with Sullington. Each asset individually is of **High** heritage significance.
- 25.9.240 The setting of individual assets within the conservation area is contiguous with the conservation area itself, and heavily associated with the Sullington Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS13687) recorded in the HER. Views southward over open fields toward hills in the distance communicate a rural village character with the church and manor house at its core. These same views contribute to the historic value of The Old Rectory (NHLE 1181126), in association with the conservation area and church.
- 25.9.241 Construction activity within the onshore cable corridor may be visible from south part of the conservation area, though views south from the listed buildings within and The Old Rectory (NHLE 1181126) are interrupted or heavily screened by intervening buildings and planting. Visual changes to the setting of these assets represent a very limited loss to aesthetic interest, which would be temporary. The working farm that comprises part of the conservation area would detract from any changes in the noise environment associated with construction activity, which are predicted to be negligible. This is assessed as a **Very Low** magnitude of change is anticipated to these assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would result in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

## Lyminster Conservation Area and Grade I and II Listed Buildings

- 25.9.242 This group of designated heritage assets is located immediately north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 25m north of the HDD limit of deviation for indicative trenchless crossing compound area TC-05 and 75m north of Access Point A-12, marked for construction traffic. The conservation area is located 165m west of Access Point A-14 (to be used for construction and light operational traffic), 280m northwest of the limit of deviation for trenchless crossing compound area TC-06a and 410m northwest of the limit of deviation for trenchless crossing compound area TC-06. The conservation area contains a single grade I listed building (The Parish Church of St Mary Magdalene, NHLE 1027604) and six grade II listed buildings. These are:
- grade II listed Old Granary (NHLE 1237922);
  - grade II listed Lyminster Cottage (NHLE 1276262);
  - grade II listed Flint Cottage Paigles (NHLE 1276263);
  - grade II listed Church Farmhouse (NHLE 1276284);
  - grade II listed Lyminster House Old Lyminster House (NHLE 1353898); and
  - grade II listed The Corner Cottage (NHLE 1027605).
- 25.9.243 The settings of the individual listed building assets contributed to their individual and collective architectural and historic interest and are largely contiguous with the character of the conservation area as set out in Arun District Council's characterisation document (Arun District Council 2000, 34).
- 25.9.244 The key potential effect to the setting of the conservation area and individual assets therein is the close proximity of construction works to the south and the temporary addition of new visual and audible elements to the experience of the conservation area and buildings' setting during this phase. The conservation area incorporates part of the A284 Lyminster Road, which already generates a notable degree of traffic noise within the otherwise rural setting of the conservation area. Parts of this road would be utilised for construction traffic associated with the indicative onshore cable corridor and trenchless crossing compounds as points of access to the excavation and limit of deviation areas enabling these works. This would create an increase in associated noise and visual elements such as moving plant and construction work in views east from the A284 and south from individual buildings within the conservation area at the upper floor level.
- 25.9.245 The construction works will introduce new visible and audible elements to the immediate proximity of the conservation area, in contrast with the general sense of a rural, agricultural basis for the settlement and individual buildings. This would primarily be associated with the south-eastern quarter of the conservation area in which the grade II listed Lyminster Cottage (NHLE 1276262), Flint Cottage Paigles (NHLE 1276263) and The Corner Cottage (NHLE 1027605) are located. The views south from this area are influenced in part by the presence of mature trees providing a screening effect and focusing views from these buildings on the patchwork of garden plots to their immediate south and east. Mature trees are also present along the southern boundary of Orchard Lane at the conservation area's southern limit, providing some degree of screening for the more modern housing

along this street. Identified key characteristics associated with open space around The Paddock at the entrance to Church Lane, or key views north to Arundel Castle and Park would be unaffected.

- 25.9.246 The construction phase works to the east of the conservation area will have only a limited effect on the conservation area and the assets contained therein through change to setting. The boundary of the A284 road exiting the conservation area turning to the east and north is flanked by existing farm buildings and mature planting, creating a sense of separation by the time access A-14 is reached.
- 25.9.247 This assessment considers that the construction phase would result in a **Low** magnitude of change on this group of **High heritage** significance (sensitivity) heritage assets, which would be temporary. This would result in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect, which due to the temporary nature will be **Not Significant**.

### Washington Conservation Area

- 25.9.248 Washington Conservation Area and the grade II listed buildings therein have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage assets baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area overlaps with the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is a light construction access point (A-37), and cable installation works at its north-western extent. An operation access point is located 60m to the west and the proposed limit of deviation for two HDD compounds (TC-16 and TC-17) are located approximately 130m to the northeast of the conservation area.
- 25.9.249 The construction phase of the HDD compounds will result in minimal change to the heritage significance of the heritage assets within Washington Conservation Area. This is due to existing heavy screening provided by mature planting which encloses much of the village and which will heavily filter views and attenuate noise. The potential of construction and operational noise will also be limited by the existing baseline level of noise arising from traffic using the surrounding A-roads.
- 25.9.250 Cable installation works will be visible and audible from the northern fringe of the conservation area, although, views from listed buildings will be filtered by existing intervening planting and built forms. These works will not affect the visual and aesthetic relationship between the assets within the conservation area, which provides the primary contribution of their setting to their interests. While these works will detract from the rural and quiet experience of the conservation area during construction, this will be short-term, representing no lasting impact on the heritage significance of the assets.
- 25.9.251 Light construction traffic will travel along School Lane, through the northern extent of the conservation area, to reach A-37 and will introduce noise and visual elements that will minimally alter the setting of the nearby assets. This will present less than substantial harm to the heritage significance of these assets in this area because this alteration will be short-term and will not harm the key components of their interest.

- 25.9.252 The assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, with a resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect which is **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579)

- 25.9.253 See section *Onshore cable corridor and existing National Grid Bolney substation extension* in **Section 25.9** for assessment of this asset.

#### Grade II Listed Coombe House and attached terrace wall, steps, ha-ha, north wall, Gate and pond of sunken garden (NHLE 1025752)

- 25.9.254 Coombe House is located 435m southeast of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 760m southeast of the HDD limit of deviation for the TC-29 indicative trenchless crossing compound.
- 25.9.255 The principal contribution of the asset's setting to its interest is associated with its immediate surroundings, principally the garden in which it is set. Mature planting around the edges of the garden indicates screening of views to the west and northwest. The positioning of the house itself, away from the closest main roads and nucleated settlements grant a generally secluded character to the asset. This screening and positioning indicates that the construction phase works will be minimally perceptible from the asset and the key components of its setting and would not compromise the contribution of this setting to the understanding or appreciation of the asset. This would introduce a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Dawe's Farmhouse (NHLE 1025759)

- 25.9.256 Dawe's Farmhouse is located 365m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits with operational access A-65 at its closest point, whilst it lies 435m northeast of the onshore cable corridor and HDD limit of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-29.
- 25.9.257 The contribution of the asset's setting to its interest is principally characterised by vistas and short views of surrounding farmland, associating the building with historic agricultural development within the area in addition to intervisibility with immediately surrounding buildings. There is a clear visual separation between the asset and the proposed DCO Order Limits, with two agricultural fields with intervening planting providing a screening effect. Given these surroundings, the construction phase works will not encroach upon this setting or affect its contribution to the asset's interests. The construction phase works are anticipated to present a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Farmgate House (NHLE 1026866)

- 25.9.258 Farmgate House is located 50m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, and 330m southeast of the proposed access point A-51, to be used for operational traffic.



- 25.9.259 The contribution of setting to the interests of the asset are characterised as linked to the house's relationship with nearby farm buildings and vistas and short views of surrounding farmland placing the farmhouse firmly within a historic rural/agrarian context. As the closest active construction area (the HDD limit of deviation for trenchless crossing compound TC-23) is located 1.1km to the southwest, the nature of Farmgate House's setting will not be subject to notable change. The construction phase works would present a **Very Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and this would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Bines Farmhouse (NHLE 1026867)

- 25.9.260 Bines Farmhouse is located 105m to the southeast of the proposed DCO Order Limit, 405m northeast of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-23 and 250m south of access points access point A-50, to be used for construction (A-50a) and operational (A-50b) traffic.
- 25.9.261 The contribution of setting to the interests of the asset are characterised as linked to the house's relationship with nearby farm buildings and vistas and short views of surrounding farmland placing the farmhouse firmly within a historic rural/agrarian context, with views of the wider rural setting limited by trees, hedges and intervening farm buildings. Given the closest points of focus for construction phase work, noted above, would be located to the southwest (proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-23) and the north, east and south (assumed construction traffic entering from access points A-50 and A-50a, travelling south and west to the proposed trenchless crossing compound area), outward views from the asset in these directions may be subject to change. The presence of mature planting both within the immediate surroundings of the house and farm, and field divisions beyond would provide a screening effect, reducing perception of these construction phase works. This is not considered likely to impose on the general rural character comprising the asset's setting, either through its association with the farm complex or wider agricultural landscape. This would comprise a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and would produce a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which due to its temporary nature would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Old Priors (NHLE 1026871)

- 25.9.262 Old Priors is located 25m northeast of the proposed DCO Order Limits, which comprises the extent of the visibility splay associated with the construction and operational access A-53. The access itself is located 115m east of the asset and the onshore cable corridor lies approximately 320m east, at its closest point.
- 25.9.263 The contribution to Old Priors' interest made by setting is characterised as short visual links with the property's associated garden and outbuildings creating a sense of semi-rural context on the village "edge", with the B2116 making an existing negative contribution to this through noise and visual presence of existing traffic in spite of screening. Traffic along the B2116 may increase during the construction phase, associated with the use of access A-53. However, views of the road from the asset are largely screened by existing planting within the garden. Any filtered views of the road are further limited due to the asset's location on the

inside bend of the road. Perception of any passing traffic is therefore expected to be limited and would be temporary. Perception of the construction activities within the onshore cable corridor might be theoretically possible but these are expected to be limited to the upper floors of the asset and would be heavily filtered due to intervening planting within the garden of the asset, along successive field boundaries and the B2116. Perception of the construction activities would have a slight urbanising effect on the asset's "edge of village" setting. This would be a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Oakendene Manor (NHLE 1027074)

25.9.264 See section *Onshore cable corridor and onshore substation at Oakendene* in **Section 25.9** for assessment of this asset.

#### Grade II Listed Guessgate Farmhouse (NHLE 1207154)

25.9.265 Guessgate Farmhouse is located 65m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 190m southwest of access point A-44, to be used for operational traffic and 275m north of the onshore cable corridor.

25.9.266 The setting of this asset and its contribution to the asset's interest are characterised by its clear situation within a rural landscape, articulated through vistas and composite views from the asset with longer views also contributing. Construction activity within the onshore cable corridor may be visible from the asset in filtered views south, having an urbanising effect on the existing agricultural landscape associated with the asset. This would result in a very limited loss to aesthetic and historic interest, which would be temporary. This would constitute a **Very Low** magnitude of change on this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect and would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed 1-4, Stocks Hill (NHLE 1027155)

25.9.267 1-4 Stocks Hill is located 385m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits and HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-19. The asset is also location 450m northeast of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-19a.

25.9.268 The contribution to the asset's interest made by setting is characterised by its relationship with Spithandle Lane to the north, open and maintained gardens surrounded by low hedges to the south and visual links with both of these elements. The distance of the construction areas to the south and visual separation via field boundaries and intermittent screening through planting indicates that construction activity would not be perceptible in a way that interferes with the interests of this asset. This would present a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed Brook House (NHLE 1027161)

- 25.9.269 Brook House is located 120m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 150m southwest of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds TC-16 and TC-17 and a temporary construction compound, and 160m south of the proposed access point A-38, to be used for light construction traffic.
- 25.9.270 The contribution to this asset's interests made by setting is partly contiguous with its location in Washington Conservation Area and is characterised through its position at the edge of the village, intervisibility with other heritage assets within the conservation area and visibility of agricultural land to the east granting a sense of a being on the margins of the town and surrounding countryside. The proximity of the busy road in Washington Bostal to the immediate east is a negative factor. The new visual and audible elements associated with proposed trenchless crossing compounds and the larger temporary construction compound would be separated visually from the asset by mature planting to the northeast in addition to the existing modern feature of the Washington Bostal Road, with a further road (the A283) and planting separating the field in which they would be located from the Washington Bostal and mature planted area. This separation of perception would result in a **Low** magnitude of change through to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) through temporary construction works in this area, which would produce a **Moderate adverse** residual effect, which due to their temporary duration would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed the Frankland Arms Public House (NHLE 1027162)

- 25.9.271 The Frankland Arms Public House is located 155m southwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 195m southwest of a proposed temporary construction compound and the HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds TC-16 and TC-17.
- 25.9.272 The contribution to this asset's interests made by setting is partly contiguous with the Washington Conservation Area in which it is located, including intervisibility with other heritage assets within the conservation area. The new visual and audible elements associated with proposed trenchless crossing compounds and the larger site compound would be separated visually from the asset by mature planting to the northeast in addition to the existing modern feature of the Washington Bostal Road, with an additional road (the A283) and planting separating the field in which they would be located from the Washington Bostal and mature planted area. This separation of perception would in effect result in a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) through construction works in this area, which would produce a **Moderate adverse** residual effect, which due to their temporary duration would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II listed Tilleys Cottage (NHLE 1027163)

- 25.9.273 Tilleys Cottage is located 195m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 210m south of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds TC-16 and TC-17 and 230m southwest of the proposed access point A-39, to be used for construction and operational traffic. In addition, this asset is located 325m

southwest of an alternative proposed trenchless crossing compound location, TC-17a.

- 25.9.274 The contribution of setting to the interest of this asset is tied to views from the asset to its associated garden, through foliage to surrounding trees and fields reinforcing a rural character in its surroundings. The nearby tree density and built structures providing a screening effect, which with the focus on views from the asset to its immediate surroundings and associations with nearby buildings will ensure that the presence of construction activity would be sufficiently separated from the asset's setting to result construction phase works being a **Very Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Green Farmhouse (NHLE 1027190)

- 25.9.275 Green Farmhouse is located 55m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 155m north of the proposed access A-40 (to be used for construction and operational traffic), 300m northeast of a proposed alternative area for trenchless crossing compound TC-17a, 390m east of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds TC-16 and TC-17, and 380m east of a proposed temporary construction compound.
- 25.9.276 The contribution to the asset's interests provided by setting is characterised through short, visual links between the farmhouse and associated farm buildings to the north in addition to surrounding trees and a garden. This has been subject to heavy alteration with the presence of the operational Rock Common Quarry dominating land immediately to the west and likely noise effects associated with the A283 road in spite of screening to the southeast. The new visual and audible elements introduced by construction phase works would take place in a context of a setting already heavily affected by industrial, extractive activity in the immediate surroundings of the asset with an additional effect of screening through mature tree cover to the west and south of the asset. These elements would not be immediately perceptible in this context, would not interfere with the remnant of the asset's setting placing it in a historic farmland/domestic context and are anticipated to comprise a **Very Low** magnitude of change on a heritage asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Old Forge (NHLE 1027195)

- 25.9.277 Old Forge is located 105m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 110m east of the proposed access point A-37 (to be used for light construction traffic) and 195m southwest of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds TC-16 and TC-17.
- 25.9.278 The contribution made by setting to the interests of this asset is partly contiguous with the Washington Conservation Area and consists of visual links to its immediate surroundings, including other listed buildings placing the asset within historic and architectural context. As the setting contribution to interest is chiefly drawn from the asset's immediate surroundings, the construction phase works are not anticipated to result in a readily perceptible change to the asset's setting with the exception of light construction traffic associated with proposed access point A-

37. Taken in combination with the time-limited nature of the construction phase works, a **Very Low** magnitude of change is anticipated to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Fern Cottage (NHLE 1027196)

- 25.9.279 Fern Cottage is located 150m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 160m southwest of proposed access point A-37 (to be used for light construction traffic) and 400m southwest of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds TC-16 and TC-17 in addition to a proposed temporary construction compound.
- 25.9.280 The contribution of the asset's setting to its interest is drawn from short visual links between the building and other historic structures within the Washington Conservation Area and a sense of semi-rural character granted by long views northward to distant trees. This setting has been undermined by 20th century development. The new visual and audible elements introduced to this setting by the construction phase would primarily be a result of an increase in traffic associated with proposed access A-37. The general sense of semi-rural character and visual association with other buildings in the conservation area would remain largely unchanged from its baseline state. This would be a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II\* Listed The Parish Church of St Mary (NHLE 1027198)

- 25.9.281 The Parish Church of St Mary is located 145m south of the onshore cable corridor, 240m southwest of proposed light construction access A-37 and 500m southwest of the Washington construction compound (the extent of which includes the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds TC-16 and TC-17 and a temporary construction compound).
- 25.9.282 The asset is of high heritage significance derived from architectural and historic interests.
- 25.9.283 Cable installation to the north of the asset will be via trenchless crossing methodology, and to the northwest this will via open cut construction on the west side of the A24 London Road. Visibility of temporary construction activities and construction traffic are precluded by intervening dense planting, topography and built infrastructure. Perception of potential construction noise from the asset is predicted to be very limited, particularly within the context of nearby A-roads and existing traffic noise. Perceptibility of construction activity from within Washington Conservation Area, within which the asset is located, would be limited to temporary light construction traffic in the east of the conservation area (associated with access A-37), assessed as a very limited change to setting. Any change will not impact the asset's historic and architectural interest, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

### Grade II Listed Church House (NHLE 1027200)

- 25.9.284 Church House is located 175m south of the onshore cable corridor, 275m southwest of proposed light construction access A-36 and 520m from the Washington temporary construction compound (the extent of which includes the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds TC-16 and TC-17 and a site compound).
- 25.9.285 The asset is of high heritage significance derived from architectural and historic interests.
- 25.9.286 Cable installation to the north of the asset will be via trenchless crossing methodology, and to the northwest this will via open cut construction on the west side of the A24 London Road. Visibility of temporary construction activities and construction traffic are precluded by intervening dense planting, topography and built infrastructure. Perception of potential construction noise from the asset is predicted to be very limited, particularly within the context of nearby A-roads and existing traffic noise. Perceptibility of construction activity from within Washington Conservation Area, within which the asset is located, would be limited to temporary light construction traffic in the east of the conservation area (associated with access A-37), assessed as a very limited change to setting. Any change will not impact the asset's historic and architectural interest, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

### Grade II Listed Rose Cottage (NHLE 1027201)

- 25.9.287 Rose Cottage is located 235m south of the onshore cable corridor and proposed light construction access A-37 and 425m southwest of the Washington temporary construction compound (the extent of which includes the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds TC-16 and TC-17 and a temporary construction compound).
- 25.9.288 The asset is of high heritage significance derived from architectural and historic interests.
- 25.9.289 Perceptibility of construction activities within the onshore cable corridor and Washington temporary construction compound would be precluded by intervening built infrastructure (including houses and A-roads), planting and topography. Temporary light construction traffic associated within access A-37 may be perceptible as it passes along Washington Bostal/The Street. While this would impose on the relatively quiet character of The Street, the distance and separation of construction phase works to the north and northeast would present a **Very Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed Chanctonbury Lodge (NHLE 1027239)

- 25.9.290 Chanctonbury Lodge is located immediately south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 75m west of proposed access point A-33 (to be used for construction traffic) and 650m north of the onshore cable corridor.
- 25.9.291 The contribution of the asset's setting to its interest is chiefly associated with close views toward the Lodge's surrounding garden, with further views toward the south

through tree planting creating an impression of a rural landscape character through views of agricultural fields and distant hills. Setting components experienced through northerly views detract from these interests via the presence of the A283 road with lack of screening through plantation to the north compounding traffic noise, CEMEX sand quarry less than 100m to the northwest and more modern housing developments introducing residential and industrial components to the setting of the asset.

- 25.9.292 The new elements introduced to the asset's setting through the construction phase work would primarily be associated with construction traffic to the north and east of the asset, though as the A283 is already busy the degree of change will be minimal. Construction phase works to the south may be visible in long distance views but the minimum distance of approximately 650m to cable construction and the time limited nature of the works, in addition to existing components of the asset's setting indicate a **Very Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed King's Barn (NHLE 1027089)

- 25.9.293 King's Barn is located 40m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits and proposed access point A-60 (operational only) at its nearest point and 85m east of the onshore cable corridor. The asset is located 115m northeast of proposed access point A-59, to be used solely for operational traffic and 405m south of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-27. The asset is located 610m south of the onshore substation at Oakendene.
- 25.9.294 The contribution of setting to the interests of this asset is characterised by its situation within sculpted gardens and a sense of enclosure and isolation created by planting around the property boundary and curtilage. This is mainly articulated in short views granting a sense of a surrounding historic rural landscape with some longer views contributing further. While the construction phase works associated with the onshore cable installation would be within 85m of the asset and perceptible through associated noise and new visual elements, the largely enclosed and localised nature of the asset's setting would not be profoundly affected, particularly through the screening effect of mature planting at the south-eastern side of the road. The construction phase works associated with the Oakendene substation will not affect the asset's setting at all. Collectively, these construction phase works are anticipated to be a **Low** magnitude of change on an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would be a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which due to their temporary nature would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Horsebrook Cottage (NHLE 1027261)

- 25.9.295 Horsebrook Cottage is located 620m southeast of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 915m southeast of proposed access point A-43, to be used for construction and operational traffic. The contribution of setting to the interests of the asset is characterised by visual links to surrounding farmland and buildings associated with agriculture, with passing/glimpsed views through surrounding foliage illustrating

and consolidating a historic rural context. This is compromised by the presence of A283 Steyning Road, 250m west of the asset and associated traffic noise.

- 25.9.296 New visual and audible elements introduced by the construction phase works would be associated with temporary construction activities within the proposed DCO Order Limits boundary and associated traffic, approaching nearby access points along the A283 Steyning Road. Seasonal screening through mature tree cover to the north of the asset in the near and middle distance would create a visual separation between the asset and construction areas, with much of the sense of rural character in the asset's surroundings maintained. This would be a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed Pooks Farmhouse (NHLE 1027290) and Cottage In the grounds of Pooks Farmhouse to the southwest of the house (NHLE 1027291)

- 25.9.297 Pooks Farmhouse and the associated cottage are located 680m southeast of the proposed DCO Order Limits and the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-25, and 740m southeast of the HDD limit of deviation for alternative proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-25a. The contribution of setting to the interests of the two assets is characterised by passing/glimpsed views of surrounding farmland placing the assets firmly within a rural context, in addition to longer views of distant farmland looking south and west.
- 25.9.298 The construction phase works would introduce new visual and audible components at a minimum distance of 680m from the assets. The farmland comprising the immediate surroundings of these assets would provide a clearly perceptible separation from the proposed DCO Order Limits, reinforced by periodic mature tree planting along field boundaries, and the rural character of the assets' setting would not be compromised. The construction phase works would introduce a **Very Low** magnitude of change to two assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed Potts Farmhouse (NHLE 1027292)

- 25.9.299 Potts Farmhouse is located 345m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits. The contribution of setting to the interests of this asset are associated with a sense of a peaceful, serene, rural character rooted in visual links to its surroundings, incorporating the proximity of an existing farmyard and quiet country road (Kent Street, to the east), and mature tree planting enclosing the garden.
- 25.9.300 Perception of temporary construction activity from the asset will be precluded by intervening buildings, distance and mature planting. Whilst construction activity will introduce new visual and audible changes to the wider agricultural setting of the asset, this would be temporary and will not impact the architectural or historic interests of the asset, therefore there will be **No Effect**.



### Grade II Listed Vadgers (NHLE 1027293)

- 25.9.301 Vadgers is located 115m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits. The contribution of setting to the asset's interest consists of a sense of rural isolation tied in with peaceful seclusion, visual links with surrounding farmland, and intervisibility with nearby historic buildings communicating the historic residential development on Kent Street.
- 25.9.302 Perception of temporary construction activity from the asset will be precluded by intervening buildings, distance and mature planting. Whilst construction activity will introduce new visual and audible changes to the wider agricultural setting of the asset, this would be temporary and will not impact the architectural or historic interests of the asset, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

### Grade II Listed Morley (NHLE 1027330)

- 25.9.303 Morley is located 35m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 115m south of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-24 and 230m south of proposed access A-56, to be used for construction and operational traffic. The contribution of setting to the interests of this asset consists of visual links with the asset's rural context in addition to a sense of rural quietude communicated through the set back location from the nearby road and fenced enclosure.
- 25.9.304 The construction phase works would introduce new elements to the setting primarily through activity associated with trenchless crossing compound TC-24 and construction traffic associated with the access point A-56 to the north. Some visual separation between the asset and the proposed DCO Order Limits is maintained by mature planting along adjacent field boundaries. The construction phase works are considered to introduce a **Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Moderate adverse** residual effect, which due to their temporary nature would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed Eatons Farmhouse (NHLE 1027436) and Granary at Eatons Farm to South East of The House (NHLE 1192196)

- 25.9.305 Eatons Farmhouse is located 280m southeast of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 490m south of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound alternative location TC-22a and 690m east of proposed access point A-48, to be used for construction and operational traffic. The contribution of setting to the interests of these assets is characterised by the associated historic farmstead surrounding them, long views of farmland and visibility between the two listed buildings.
- 25.9.306 The construction phase works would introduce visual and audible elements in views to the west of the assets. Separation between the immediate surroundings of the assets and the proposed DCO Order Limits by intervening fields, enclosure and intermittent planting would be clear during the works and the immediate sense of the assets' situation within a working rural landscape would not be imposed on by the construction process. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change on assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Moderate**

**adverse** residual effect, which due to the temporary nature would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Binesfield (NHLE 1027451)

- 25.9.307 Binesfield is located 50m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits and proposed access point A-49, to be used for light construction and operational traffic. The HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-23 is located 295m east of the asset. The HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-22 and alternative location TC-22a are located 270m southeast of the asset and 405m southeast of the asset respectively.
- 25.9.308 The contribution of setting to the interests of Binesfield as a heritage asset consists of views of the rear garden and surrounding agricultural land including farm buildings, open spaces and trees. This is compromised somewhat by traffic on the B2135 road. The construction phase works in this area would introduce new audible and visual elements for the duration of the works in views south and southeast of the asset. This would be largely dependent on seasonal variation in the screening effect of intervening planting along field boundaries adjacent to the B2135 road, with an increase in traffic along the road stemming from light construction vehicle focused on access point A-59. This would present an increase to impositions to the asset's setting, counterbalanced somewhat by the asset's set-back location and enclosure relative to the road. This would present a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Southblows Farmhouse (NHLE 1027452)

- 25.9.309 Southblows Farmhouse is located 145m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits and proposed access point A-49 (to be used for light construction and operational traffic). The asset is located 270m west of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-23, 325m northwest of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-22 and 485m north of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed alternative trenchless crossing compound TC-22a.
- 25.9.310 The contribution of setting to the interests of Southblows Farmhouse as a heritage asset consists of views of the rear garden and surrounding agricultural land including farm buildings, open spaces and trees. This is compromised somewhat by modern traffic introduced by the B2135 road. The construction phase works in this area would introduce new audible and visual elements for the duration of the works in views south and southeast of the asset. This would be largely dependent on seasonal variation in the screening effect of intervening trees along field boundaries adjacent to the B2135 road. An increase in traffic along the road stemming from light construction vehicle focused on access point A-49 would have a slight effect on the asset's setting, counterbalanced somewhat by the asset's set-back location and enclosure relative to the road. This would present a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect and would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed Horsebridge House (NHLE 1027454)

- 25.9.311 Horsebridge House is located 20m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 155m east of the proposed access A-47, to be used for construction and operational traffic. The contribution made by setting to this assets' interests is characterised by short views of the rear garden, longer vistas and glimpsed views of surrounding agricultural and rural land and views of the asset from the rear garden and glimpsed from the B2135 road.
- 25.9.312 The introduction of construction traffic along Spithandle Lane to/from access A-47 during the construction phase would introduce an increased element of traffic noise, including HGVs, to the setting of this asset. This would be partly screened from the farmhouse by mature planting on the southern side of Spithandle Lane in addition to the intervening presence of outbuildings in the rear garden, to the northwest of the asset on the southern side of the lane. Temporary construction activities further north within the proposed DCO Order Limits area would be visually separated/screened from the asset's immediate surroundings by planting on the northern side of Spithandle Lane, with some seasonal variation driven by vegetation cover. Views from in other directions would remain unchanged in terms of communicating a rural character. The construction phase works are anticipated to introduce a **Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which, due to the temporary nature would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed The Fountain Inn (NHLE 1027457)

- 25.9.313 The Fountain Inn is located 20m southeast of the proposed DCO Order Limits, and 110m south of proposed access point A-48, to be used for construction and operational traffic. The contribution of setting to this asset's interests is primarily associated with its roadside location, views of the tree-enclosed rear garden, views of farmland opposite to the northwest and surrounding structures, granting a sense of the inn's association with early commercial development along the predecessor road of the B2135. Traffic associated with the modern B2135 is considered to compromise this contribution to historic interest through noise and vehicular pollution.
- 25.9.314 The key change introduced to this asset's setting by construction phase works would be the introduction of additional traffic to this stretch of the B2135 to access point A-48. While this would increase the presence of traffic and associated noise, this is not considered to present a marked change to, or imposition on the existing semi-rural roadside context of the inn. It is anticipated that the construction phase works would introduce a **Very Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed Barn at Newhouse Buildings (NHLE 1027589)

- 25.9.315 The Barn at Newhouse Buildings is located 325m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 365m south of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-07, 370m south of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed alternative trenchless crossing compound TC-07a. The contribution of setting to this asset's interests is associated primarily with its situation within a larger farm

complex, visual links with associated buildings and the associated farmyard, the location of Poling Street to the east and nearby tree planting creating a sense of historic agriculture and hushed, rural seclusion.

- 25.9.316 The distance from the proposed DCO Order Limits and trenchless crossing compounds from the asset and concentrated, localised character of its setting would create a sense of separation from any visual or audible elements during the construction phase works. Whilst construction activity will introduce new visual and audible changes to the wider agricultural setting of the asset, this would be temporary and will not impact the architectural or historic interests of the asset, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

#### Grade II Listed St John's Cottage (NHLE 1027590)

- 25.9.317 St John's Cottage is located 75m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 155m southeast of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-07 and 115m south of the HDD limit of deviation for proposed alternative trenchless crossing compound TC-07a. The contribution of setting to the interests of this asset consists of short views from and to Poling Street and the back garden of the property, vistas looking south and east toward surrounding farmland, and the enclosure of the asset's plot of land by planted trees and hedges granting a sense of rural seclusion.
- 25.9.318 As a result of the close proximity of the proposed DCO Order Limits and proposed trenchless crossing compound locations to the asset, the construction phase works would introduce new elements to the setting of this asset, visually and audibly. The screening effects of planting along the stretch of Poling Street immediately west of the asset would diminish this effect somewhat, in addition to visual separation created through intervening, non-designated residential buildings. Key longer views from the asset to the south and east in addition to much of the key setting relationship within the asset's immediate surroundings (the associated garden and adjacent road) will not be affected. The works would, however, be perceptible from the asset. The construction phase works are anticipated to introduce a **Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which would, due to their temporary nature would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Calceto (NHLE 1027606)

- 25.9.319 Calceto is located 535m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 785m north of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-06. The contribution of setting to the interests of this asset is characterised by a sense of semi-rural isolation and calm via the asset's spatial and visual relationship to the surrounding associated historic farmstead buildings and layout in addition to vistas of ploughed fields to the south.
- 25.9.320 The construction phase works would introduce new visual and audible elements in the long distance for the duration of works, beyond views from the asset of fields to the immediate south. Visual separation would be maintained in addition to partial screening by mature trees in the immediate surroundings of the asset in addition to the ploughed field to the south being unchanged. The construction phase works would introduce a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of

**High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Buildings at Kent's Farm (NHLE 1027674, NHLE 1233446, NHLE 1233447)

- 25.9.321 This asset group consists of the three above noted grade II listed buildings. The individual buildings' distances from the onshore component of the proposed DCO Order Limits are 215m to the east for Kent's Farmhouse (1027674), 250m to the southwest for Kent's Dairy Cottages (1233446) and 230m to the north for Barn at Kent's Farm to the southeast of the farmhouse and to the south of Nos 1 and 2 Brookpits Manor Cottages (1233447). The group is located 270m to the southwest of proposed access point A-03 (to be used for light construction traffic). Three HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compounds are located close to this asset group. These are 390m to the south for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-01, 425m southeast for proposed alternative trenchless crossing compound TC-01a and 495m to the east for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-02. The proposed Climping compound is located 225m north of the asset group.
- 25.9.322 The form of the historic farmstead within which these assets are situated create an enclosed setting with a sense of rural seclusion and tranquillity and an association with historic agriculture, with these elements of its setting contributing to its significance. The sense of enclosure is enhanced by trees and hedges forming a boundary between the farmstead and surrounding fields, short views toward the assets' respective gardens and outbuildings in addition to the visual concealment of fields outwith the farmstead.
- 25.9.323 Construction phase works would take place to the north, east and south. The nature of the asset group's setting being largely defined by enclosure and concealment would not be substantially changed by the visual or audible components associated with the Climping compound or proposed trenchless crossing compounds. Access Point A-03 near to the asset group would result in the presence of light construction traffic during the works. This traffic will not intrude on the assets' "enclosed" surroundings. The construction phase works would introduce a **Low** magnitude of change to these assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which, due to their temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Listed Buildings at North End (NHLE 1027627, NHLE 1233900, NHLE 1353871)

- 25.9.324 The three assets within this group are located close to an eastern spur of the proposed DCO Order limits: North End House (1233900) is 35m south of the DCO Order Limits, The Old Well House (1353871) is located 10m north of the limits and Ivy Cottage (1027627) is located 30m north.
- 25.9.325 The contribution of setting to the interests of these assets is characterised by their close spatial relationship to the A24 road, enclosure and screening from the west running lane through mature planting and visual relationships with their immediate surroundings. In the case of Old Well House and Ivy Cottage this comprises visual relationships with one another and with North End House this entails its set back location from the west-running lane and opening views to the south. Effects would

mainly be associated with operational phase traffic along A-29, with no meaningful construction phase effects predicted. The construction phase works would introduce a **Very Low** magnitude of change to these assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which will be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade I Listed The Parish Church Of St Mary (NHLE 1027640) and Grade II listed The Vicarage (NHLE 1027641)

- 25.9.326 The southernmost of these two assets, the Vicarage, is located 110m north of the proposed DCO Order limits, 320m north of the proposed Climping site compound, 225m north of proposed access point A-06 (light construction and operational traffic) and 310m north of proposed access point A-05 (construction and operational traffic). The contribution of setting to the interests of these assets is characterised by the visual relationship between the two buildings, the presence of trees, partial enclosure and open space creating a sense of tranquillity, standing in contrast to nearby built up industrial zones. This contribution is partly diminished by the presence of busy traffic on Church Lane to the west.
- 25.9.327 The proposed construction phase works would introduce new visual and audible elements to the setting of these assets for the duration of the phase in the form of traffic associated with access point A-06 and A-05 in addition to works associated with the Climping site compound. These would be added to the existing perception of Church Lane to the west of the assets and longer views to the south, separated from the assets by fields and intervening planting creating a partial screening effect. This would create a **Low** magnitude of change on these assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Barn to the west of nos 1 and 2 Church Farm Cottage (NHLE 1027642) and Church Farmhouse east and Church Farmhouse west (NHLE 1027643)

- 25.9.328 The Barn to the west of nos 1 and 2 Church Farm Cottage (NHLE 1027642) is located approximately 180m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits at its closest point, which is the operational access A-06. The Climping construction compound and the construction and operational access A-05 are located approximately 300m southeast of the asset. Due to the intervening distance, planting, buildings and topography, construction activities are not predicted to be perceptible from this asset, this includes any construction traffic along Church Road. There will be no impact to the asset's historic or architectural interests, therefore there will be **No Effect**.
- 25.9.329 Whilst Church Farmhouse east and Church Farmhouse west (NHLE 1027643) is located within 35m of the proposed DCO Order Limits at its closest point, this relates to operational access A-06. The asset is located approximately 165m northwest of the construction and operational access A-05 and 180m northwest of the proposed Climping site compound. Due to the intervening distance, planting, buildings and topography, construction activities within the proposed DCO Order Limits are not predicted to be perceptible from the asset. The increase in traffic levels during the construction phase along Church Lane is predicted to be negligible (see Receptor Highway Link 2 in [Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2](#) of

the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23) and **Chapter 32: ES Addendum, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.32 and **[REP5-038]**). Where construction traffic is perceptible from the asset, this would be limited to the upper floors on the east side of the property which faces Church Lane, this is due to the existing screening provided by the substantial boundary wall and mature planting. Changes to the existing noise environment as a result of construction traffic is not predicted. The limited visual perceptibility of the negligible increase in traffic would be a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect that would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Decoy Cottage (NHLE 1027713)

- 25.9.330 Decoy Cottage is located 150m southwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 155m southwest of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-09, 240m southwest of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed alternative trenchless crossing compound TC-09a, 190m south of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-08 and 245m southeast of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed alternative trenchless crossing compound TC-08a. The present contribution of Decoy Cottage's setting to its interests is characterised by a close visual relationship with associated historic farm buildings, longer views of ploughed fields from the western elevation and nearby associated features retaining a form visible in 19th century mapping, including an orchard to the east and ancillary features including decoy ponds and planting. Access to the Cottage via a long track from the A27 and its set back location from the main road also make a contribution.
- 25.9.331 The construction phase works would introduce new visual and audible elements to the asset's setting via the presence of trenchless crossing compounds in fields to the north and northeast, and the use of part of the lane by which the asset is accessed (immediately south of the A27, passing a small light industrial estate) for light construction traffic associated with proposed access point A-20. The visual separation of the asset from fields to the east and north through mature planting in addition to seasonal screening effects from the planting would reduce the effect to the asset's setting. The construction phase works are anticipated, through their position relative to the key setting aspects for the asset to introduce a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which, due to their temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed The Old Cottage (NHLE 1027714)

- 25.9.332 The Old Cottage (NHLE 1027714) is of high heritage significance drawn from historic and architectural interest (see **Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 35m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 95m northeast of proposed access point A-22 (construction traffic), 55m south of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-11 and 90m southwest of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed alternative HDD compound TC-11a. The present contribution made by setting to the interests of the asset are characterised by enclosure, associated garden and views of adjoining fields to the north.

25.9.333 The proposed construction phase works would introduce visual and audible change to the setting of the asset through the construction of the proposed trenchless crossing and onshore cable installation. Implementation of C-26 will mitigate noise levels to an acceptable level (see [Section 21.9, Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.21)). However, changes to the existing noise environment and visibility of construction activities within northward views from the asset will have an urbanising effect on its existing rural setting. This would be time-limited and will result in a temporary loss of historic and aesthetic interest. The magnitude of change will vary depending on the location of a proposed HDD compound and primarily its interaction with what appear to be open views to the north from the rear of the asset. If the proposed HDD compound location TC-11 is chosen, the magnitude of change would be **Low**, which would produce a **Moderate adverse** effect on this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), which given the temporary change to setting, would be **Not Significant**. The visual separation between the asset and the proposed alternative trenchless crossing compound TC-11a via intervening planting associated with the track to the east would ensure that, if this location is chosen, a **Very Low** magnitude of change would be introduced to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed The 6 Bells Public House (NHLE 1027819)

25.9.334 The 6 Bells Public House is located 215m south of the onshore component of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 290m south of proposed access point A-13 (construction and operational traffic) and 335m south of A-12 (construction traffic). The asset is also located 305m south of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-05. The contribution of setting to the interests of the asset is characterised by short views between the main pub building and its associated garden and the asset's historic siting on a crossroads. The original semi-rural setting of the asset has largely been removed with the exception of glimpsed views through boundary hedges into an open field to the north.

25.9.335 The proposed construction phase works would primarily introduce new visual and audible elements in any perceptible long views to the north, in addition to new traffic on the Lyminster Road A284 that runs south-north to the west of the asset. There would be visual separation between the asset and these works through the separating space of a field to the north in addition to intervening boundary planting. It is not anticipated that the addition of construction phase traffic on this already busy A-road would affect the setting of this asset. The construction phase works are considered to present a **Very Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Old Clayton (NHLE 1039953)

25.9.336 Old Clayton is located 20m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 155m east of proposed access point A-33 (construction traffic). The contribution of setting to the interests of this asset is largely characterised by a visual association with nearby historic farm buildings associated with the Clayton Historic Farmstead



and a near full enclosure of the asset and associated plot of land via mature tree-planting, including screening from Storrington Road to the south.

- 25.9.337 The proposed construction phase works would introduce change to the surroundings of this asset through construction traffic associated with access points A-33. Storrington Road is already fairly busy, and the addition of construction phase traffic will not notably affect the setting of this asset, particularly with the existing screening effect via planting to the south of the asset. The proposed construction phase works would introduce a **Very Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Pinland Farmhouse (NHLE 1181625)

- 25.9.338 Pinland Farmhouse (NHLE 1181625) is located 595m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits at its closest point, which is a construction and operational access A-50 and approximately 825m from the onshore cable corridor. The contribution of setting to the interests of this asset is characterised by short views of the historic farmyard and adjacent buildings associated with the Pinland Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS13330) and longer vistas of surrounding farmland, trees and hills creating a sense of rural isolation and associated tranquillity.
- 25.9.339 The proposed construction phase works are not anticipated to meaningfully interact with the surroundings or key setting components of Pinland Farmhouse, owing to separation and distance from the localised farmland setting it occupies through hard perceptual breaks like the B2135 road in addition to intermittent field boundaries, planting and buildings. This change would be temporary and will not impact the architectural or historic interests of the asset, therefore there will be **No Effect**.

#### Grade II Listed Clematis Cottage (NHLE 1182071) and Rose Cottage (NHLE 1354093)

- 25.9.340 Clematis Cottage (NHLE 1182071) and Rose Cottage (NHLE 1354093) are both located within a north-eastern spur of the Washington Conservation Area. Clematis Cottage is located 135m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, with Rose Cottage located 120m south of the same. Rose Cottage is located 180m southwest of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compounds TC-16 and TC-17 and the proposed Washington site compound, in addition to 145m east of proposed access point A-37 (light construction traffic). Clematis Cottage is 195m southwest of the HDD limits of deviation and proposed Washington site compound, and 150m southeast of proposed access point A-37. The contribution of setting to the interests of both these assets is primarily drawn from their spatial relationship to School Lane, with Rose Cottage being slightly set back from the street and Clematis Cottage situated directly behind Rose Cottage. Short views of surrounding low-density residential developments characterise this, with longer views eastward possible during the winter months to open farmland beyond Washington Bostal through a hedge boundary.
- 25.9.341 The change introduced by the proposed construction phase works is likely to be largely characterised by construction traffic passing near the assets to the north, approaching proposed access A-37 from Washington Bostal. This is not anticipated to be a substantial alteration to the character of the assets'

surroundings relative to noise and visual elements presently introduced by the existing road to the east. Longer views outwith the assets' immediate surroundings and setting would not meaningfully interact with construction phase work. The construction phase would amount to a **Very Low** magnitude of change to these assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed South Cottage (NHLE 1182076)

25.9.342 South Cottage is located within Washington Conservation Area and is 110m southwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits and proposed access point A-37 (light construction traffic). The contribution of setting to the interests of this asset is characterised by a semi-rural and historic village context granted by its location on a narrow road (School Lane) descending into a small valley and visual relationships with nearby historic buildings in contrast to modern residential development to the northeast.

25.9.343 The proposed construction phase works would introduce new elements to this setting via light construction traffic associated with access point A-37 if that traffic utilises School Lane. This is not considered likely to substantially alter the asset's setting by detracting from the illustrative impressions it creates. This would be a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Corner House How Man the Old Cottage (NHLE 1182115)

25.9.344 Corner House How Man the Old Cottage is a block of three cottages located in the south of Washington Conservation Area, 225m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits and proposed access point A-37 (light construction traffic). The contribution of setting to the interests of these assets are characterised by visual links to other nearby historic buildings, a spatial relationship set back from The Street, and long views eastward to rural surroundings contrasting with nearby modern housing development.

25.9.345 The proposed construction phase works would introduce new elements to this setting via light construction traffic associated with access point A-37 if that traffic utilises The Street. This is not considered likely to substantially alter the asset's setting by detracting from the illustrative impressions it creates. This would be a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed The Old Rectory (NHLE 1182442) and The Roundhouse, In The Grounds Of The Old Rectory (NHLE 1354110)

25.9.346 The Old Rectory is located 395m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits and The Roundhouse is located 445m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits. The assets are 525m and 545m southeast respectively of proposed access route A-43a and A-43b (construction and operational traffic, respectively). The contribution of setting to the interests of these assets is characterised by the enclosure provided by their respective gardens, mature tree planting and the presence of the

A283 road to the south providing a boundary to and contrasting with the enclosed parkland environment they occupy.

- 25.9.347 The proposed construction phase works will not affect the setting of these assets, owing to a screening and separation effect of planting to the west. The addition of construction traffic on the A283 road will not alter the assets' setting as the busy, modern nature of the road already stands in contrast to their immediate surroundings characterising setting. There would therefore be **No Effect** to the heritage significance of these assets.

#### Grade II Listed Michelgrove Cottages (NHLE 1217075) and The Ruins of Michelgrove (NHLE 1353888)

- 25.9.348 Michelgrove Cottages are located 65m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits and the Ruins of Michelgrove 40m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits. The assets are 290m and 320m respectively east of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-12. The contribution of setting to the interests of these assets is characterised by their rural locality, close visual relationships with one another and distance from busy modern roads.
- 25.9.349 The proposed construction works would introduce new visual and audible elements primarily through the construction of proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-12 likely glimpsed in views westward from The Ruins of Michelgrove through intervening planting. The use of the roads to the south and east of these assets for construction traffic would alter the aspect of their setting tied to rural quietude though this would be partly screened via mature tree planting to the south and east of the assets. In addition, grid connection excavation works would be perceptible to the west and north of the assets for the duration of the construction phase. Owing to the time limited nature of the works, this is considered to be a **Very Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect which, due to their temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II\* Listed Peckhams (NHLE 1217152)

- 25.9.350 Peckhams is located 310m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 355m south of the respective HDD limits of deviation for proposed trenchless crossing compound TC-07 and proposed alternative trenchless crossing compound TC-07a. The contribution of setting to the interests of this asset is characterised by associative views to and from its parkland, outbuildings and enclosed garden, relationship with Poling Street reflected in the arrangement of its garden enclosure and long views to the east and north creating an association with surrounding farmland.
- 25.9.351 The proposed construction phase works would introduce new visual and audible elements to the north of Peckhams for their duration as a result of cable construction and the proposed trenchless crossing compound. The clear visual separation reinforced by intervening agricultural fields and buildings in addition to closer setting associations of Peckhams with its surrounding estate indicate that this would be a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which, due to its temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

## Grade I Listed The Parish Church of St Andrew (NHLE 1233989)

- 25.9.352 The Parish Church of St Andrew is located 805m west of the onshore component of the proposed DCO Order Limits. The contribution of setting to the assets interests is characterised by the church's distinct, isolated position set back from Ford Road/Station Road, views of adjacent fields, visual relationship with its associated churchyard. This is caveated by historic alteration within the church's surroundings leaving it less central to the settlement of Ford, and with a former canal no longer forming part of its surroundings.
- 25.9.353 Due to the distance of the construction phase works from the asset, together with the churchyard and intervening planting, local topography and River Arun embankment, any new visual elements associated with the time-limited construction phase works would only be perceptible as long-distance features on the horizon against the backdrop of successive planting and modern development. There would be no audible perception of the construction works from the asset. Any changes in traffic levels along Ford Road during phase construction phase (see [Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) and [Chapter 32: ES Addendum, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.32 and **[REP5-038]**)) are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset. There would be no change to the asset's architectural or historic interests or to how the asset is experienced. This would introduce no change to the setting of the asset and would have **No Effect**.

## Grade II Listed Brookpits Cottage (NHLE 1276603) and Brookpits Manor (NHLE 1353858)

- 25.9.354 Brookpits Cottage (NHLE 1276603) and Brookpits Manor (NHLE 1353858) are of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests (see [Appendix 25. 8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located 40m and 85m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its closest point, which is a temporary construction access route (A-03). Noise associated with the access route will not tangibly alter the setting of the assets due to existing screening around the assets and the current contribution of vehicle noise from the A259 immediately to the north.
- 25.9.355 The temporary construction compound and temporary soil storage at Climping lie approximately 100m to the north. To the south and east are proposed cable installation works, trenchless crossing compounds, underground landfall connection works and landfall connection works.
- 25.9.356 The elements of the Proposed Development to the north are anticipated to be largely imperceptible from both assets because existing hedgerows and mature trees along the rear of their gardens provide significant screening. The planting currently screens the assets from the A259, blocking views of traffic and attenuating vehicle noise.
- 25.9.357 Cable installation works may be visible in long views looking south and southeast from the upper floors of the south elevation of Brookpits Manor across a large field. Though views are likely to be partial and filtered due to existing tall mature planting along Brookpits Lane and intervening hedgerows. Existing mature planting will heavily filter views of this element of the Proposed Development from Brookpits Cottage.

- 25.9.358 Where there is a perception of construction activities within the wider rural setting of these assets, this will result in a very limited loss of historic interest which would be temporary. The immediate garden setting of these assets will be unaffected.
- 25.9.359 Brookpits Cottage and Brookpits Manor are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change. The resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed Lower Chancton (NHLE 1284780) and Granary at Lower Chancton to south east of the house (NHLE 1354089)

- 25.9.360 Lower Chancton (NHLE 1284780) and Granary at Lower Chancton to south east of the house (NHLE 1354089) are of high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located 50m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its closest point, which is the proposed cable installation works corridor (see [Figure 18.52, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)). There is also a construction and operational access point (A-41) approximately 130m to the northwest and the limit of deviation for an indicative trenchless crossing compound (TC-18) approximately 450m to the northeast of the assets.
- 25.9.361 It is anticipated that the construction and operation of trenchless crossing compound TC-18 will not be visible from the assets due to intervening distance, topography and existing mature trees and hedgerows.
- 25.9.362 Views of the onshore cable corridor to the north will be filtered by the assets' existing enclosure (see [Figure 18.52, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)) but temporary construction will be visible in views looking north from the assets at points during construction. Ultimately, short views of surrounding agricultural buildings and short and long views of ploughed farmland from the assets will remain largely intact during cable installation. Therefore, their heritage significance will not be altered because the understanding of the assets' relationship with their surroundings will not be diminished.
- 25.9.363 The noise associated with cable installation will also temporarily alter the setting of the assets, further harming the rural elements that contribute to its interests. Whilst noise within the setting of the assets will increase, traffic noise from the A283 already features permanently.
- 25.9.364 The assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed Deans Cottage (NHLE 1284897)

- 25.9.365 Deans Cottage has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25. 8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 150m southwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits, the nearest element of new construction activity, which represents temporary construction access for construction and operational

traffic (A-53) along the B2116. The onshore cable corridor will be a minimum of 450m east of the asset.

- 25.9.366 Access point A-53's intended use as a focal point for construction and operational traffic may exacerbate the existing negative contribution made by B2116 traffic to the asset during the construction phase works. The existing negative contribution of the asset's setting comprises the introduction of noise and visual elements by the B2116 that are incongruous with the asset's historical setting. This predicted change is not considered sufficient to give rise to any discernible loss of the architectural or historic interest of the asset, however, because increases in traffic resulting from the Proposed Development would be short-term.
- 25.9.367 The perceptibility of construction activities associated with cable installation is not anticipated due to intervening planting, houses, and existing fields.
- 25.9.368 Deans Cottage is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed Church Farmhouse (NHLE 1354096) and Barn at Church Farm to South of The House (NHLE 1182122)

- 25.9.369 Church Farmhouse and Barn at Church Farm to South of The House have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located 130m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access point (A-36). The minimum distance of proposed cable installation works is approximately 170m to the north.
- 25.9.370 The proposed cable installation works will be screened from the assets in long views looking north by existing large mature planting. Consequently, visual elements are not anticipated to alter the setting of the assets and audible elements associated with construction activity will have a minimal impact due to the screening and distance. These elements will, therefore, not affect the significance of the assets.
- 25.9.371 **No Effects** are anticipated on these assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity).

Grade II Listed Brightham's Farmhouse (NHLE 1354245), Grade II Listed Cart Shed and Granary to East of Brightham's Farmhouse (NHLE 1181633)

- 25.9.372 This asset grouping has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located 30m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, which represents an operational access corridor (A-50b), and 80m north of a temporary construction access corridor (A50a). Operational traffic will not impact the assets during the construction phase.
- 25.9.373 Existing mature planting will screen Brightham's Farmhouse from traffic associated with heavier construction activity (A-50a), which will be confined to a road between

80m and 100m south of both assets. Increased noise is predicted, which will minimally impact the interests of the assets in the short term.

- 25.9.374 Cable installation will be a minimum of 250m from these assets and will be screened by existing large modern agricultural buildings (see [Figure 18.56, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)).
- 25.9.375 The assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed Upper Bargeham (NHLE 1353838) and Barn to Upper Bargeham to the west of the farmhouse (NHLE 1232897)

- 25.9.376 This asset grouping has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located 570m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits, the nearest element of temporary construction activity, a minimum distance of 570m west of onshore cable construction activity and 1km northwest of the limit of deviation for indicative trenchless crossing compound area TC-12.
- 25.9.377 There are four alternative trenchless crossing compound areas west of TC-12 (TC-12a to d). TC-12a and TC-12b are significantly screened from the assets by woodland, TC-12c is 580m east of the assets and TC-12d is 610m northeast of the assets.
- 25.9.378 A light construction and operational access route (leading from A-25) will also run west to east between 700m and 900m south of the assets but is screened from the assets by woodland.
- 25.9.379 TC-12c has the greatest potential to be visible from the assets, although their relative topography and an existing intervening hedgerow would screen views of the construction activity and compound from ground level (see LVIA VP H7c [Figure 18.44, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)). Cable construction activity would also be visibly screened by the hedgerow. Short views of surrounding farmland and pasture would remain intact.
- 25.9.380 Noise associated with construction may alter the tranquil rural setting of both assets, harming their historic interest and their relationship with their isolated and rural setting; although, the intervening distance, lower topography relative to the compounds and existing hedgerow will weaken this element.
- 25.9.381 Both assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade I Listed Buncton Chapel of All Saints (NHLE 1354113)

- 25.9.382 Buncton Chapel has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume](#)

4 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 60m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, the nearest element of new construction activity, which represents cable installation works. The limit of deviation for TC-19, an indicative trenchless crossing compound area, is situated 60m to the southeast and the limit of deviation for an alternative trenchless crossing compound area (TC-19a) is located 150m to the southwest.

- 25.9.383 LVIA VP J1 (**Figure 18.50, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)), looking southeast from outside the asset's churchyard enclosure, displays the spatial relationship and proximity of elements of the Proposed Development with the asset.
- 25.9.384 While TC-19 construction and operation, and cable installation works, may introduce noise into the setting of the chapel, the asset's existing enclosure will likely prevent significant visual alteration in views looking south. Construction and operational noise, however, may harm the chapel's quiet setting, which enhances its historic interest, by infringing upon its seclusion and elements of the religious pilgrimage experience. TC-19a is predicted to have no impact on the setting of the chapel due to intervening screening. These alterations to the asset's setting will, however, be short term and reversible.
- 25.9.385 Buncton Chapel is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Buncton Manor Farmhouse (LB1182594)

- 25.9.386 Buncton Manor Farmhouse has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see **Appendix 25. 8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 130m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, the nearest element of temporary construction activity, which represents the minimum distance of onshore cable installation works. The limit of deviation for TC-19, an indicative trenchless crossing compound area, is also situated 130m to the north. The limit of deviation for T19-a, an alternative trenchless crossing compound area to TC-19, is located 220m to the northwest.
- 25.9.387 Due to the existing enclosure around the asset, visible elements of the construction and operation associated with the proposed trenchless crossing and cable installation will be screened from the asset. See LIVA J1 (**Figure 18.50 Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)) for an illustration of this screening effect, whereby the farmhouse is not visible.
- 25.9.388 Audible elements, however, may alter the setting of the asset, harming its sense of enclosure and drawing focus from the asset, although the existing screening may attenuate the noise.
- 25.9.389 Buncton Manor Farmhouse is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.



## Grade II Listed Post Office Wiston Stores (1182621)

- 25.9.390 Wiston Post Office has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 215m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, the nearest element of temporary construction activity, which represents the minimum distance of onshore cable installation works. The limit of deviation for TC-19, an indicative trenchless crossing compound area, is situated 220m to the southeast and the limit of deviation for an alternative trenchless crossing compound area (TC-19a) is located 230m to the southwest.
- 25.9.391 The impact of the onshore cable installation works and the potential trenchless crossing compounds on the asset are limited by distance and intervening screening provided by trees, woodland, built forms and hedgerows. While these elements of the Proposed Development will be filtered in views from the asset, noise from construction activities will alter its setting slightly, however, this impact will not be significant.
- 25.9.392 Post Office Winston Stores is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

## Grade II Listed Butchers Farmhouse Water Lane (NHLE 1182603)

- 25.9.393 Butchers Farmhouse has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 80m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which represents the minimum distance of onshore cable installation works. The limit of deviation for TC-19, an indicative trenchless crossing compound area, is also situated 200m to the northeast and the limit of deviation for T19-a, an alternative trenchless crossing compound area to TC-19, is located 80m to the north. A temporary construction access point is also located along the A283, 140m to the southwest.
- 25.9.394 The northern compounds and onshore cable installation works to the north and west, will be screened visually from the asset by mature planting and farm buildings, as will the access point along the A283 (see [Figure 25.6, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). These elements may, however, introduce audible alterations to the setting of the asset, which would harm its sense of isolation and historic interest, to an extent, although, existing screening may attenuate this impact.
- 25.9.395 Butchers Farmhouse is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change. The resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect would be **Not Significant**.

## Grade II Listed The Old School (NHLE 1284545)

- 25.9.396 The Old School has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 10m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access route only. Other elements are proposed, including onshore cable installation works approximately 80m north of the asset, and a temporary construction access corridor a further 80m east of the operational access route. Finally, a limit of deviation for indicative trenchless crossing compound TC-19 is proposed approximately 350m northwest of the asset.
- 25.9.397 The perceptibility of the temporary construction access route to the east is anticipated to be minimal due to screening by existing planting.
- 25.9.398 TC-19 construction and operation and the onshore cable route will introduce visible and audible elements into the setting of The Old School. Elements of construction and operation will be visible from the west and north elevations of the asset across open fields due to a lack of screening. It is anticipated that these elements of the Proposed Development will present a short-term negative contribution to the setting of the asset, with minimal harm to its interests by detracting from the tranquillity of its rural setting. While the setting of the asset will be less tranquil, many of the views of farmland from the asset will remain largely intact.
- 25.9.399 The Old School is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change. The resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect would be **Not Significant**.

## Grade II Listed Yew Tree Cottage (NHLE 1354114)

- 25.9.400 Yew Tree Cottage has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 90m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which represents the minimum distance of onshore cable installation works. The limit of deviation for TC-19, an indicative trenchless crossing compound area, is also situated 200m to the northeast and the limit of deviation for T19-a, an alternative trenchless crossing compound area to TC-19, is located 90m to the northwest. A temporary construction access point (A-42) is also located along the A283, approximately 160m to the southwest.
- 25.9.401 There will be little perceptible visual impact from construction works within the setting of the asset due to the asset's enclosure, which surrounds the asset at its south, west, and north elevations. Views from the east elevation of the asset, however, over a hedgerow, towards TC-19 may be possible but will be filtered by intervening rows or trees (see [Figure 25.6, Volume 3](#) (Document Reference: 6.3.25.6)).
- 25.9.402 Noise introduced into the setting of the asset by the Proposed Development may harm elements of Yew Tree Cottage's "quiet domesticity" by altering its

relationship with its quiet garden, although existing screening around the garden would attenuate this impact.

- 25.9.403 Yew Tree Cottage is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Polecats (NHLE 1284507)

- 25.9.404 Polecats has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 60m northeast of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which comprises a temporary construction access along the A283.
- 25.9.405 There are two indicative trenchless crossing compound areas (TC-18 and TC-19) and one alternative trenchless crossing compound area (TC19a) within a 300m radius of the asset. Perceptibility of these from the asset will be negligible due to intervening existing heavy planting surrounding the asset.
- 25.9.406 Cable installation is proposed at a minimum distance of 160m from the asset, although the above-mentioned screening and existing traffic noise will limit perceptibility to minimal levels.
- 25.9.407 An increase in traffic frequency, associated with the proposed temporary construction access point along the A283, will have a minimal impact on the setting of the asset due to intervening trees which screen Polecats from the road and attenuate noise.
- 25.9.408 Polecats is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed College Wood Farmhouse (NHLE 1191847)

- 25.9.409 College Wood Farmhouse has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 200m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is a proposed cable installation corridor.
- 25.9.410 Views of temporary construction activity associated with the cable installation corridor will have little effect on the interests of the asset. This is partly because the asset will be partially screened by trees and associated farmyard buildings from installation. Remaining views of installation activity will not harm the asset's relationship with its associated historic farmstead, or significantly harm its relationship with the surrounding fields, and consequently, its historic interest will remain intact. Architectural interest will be unaffected because the appreciation of the asset will still be possible on approach along the track from the north as views of installation activities will not figure in these views.

- 25.9.411 Cable installation may introduce noise to the setting of the asset, although any audible alteration would be temporary and would not impact its interests.
- 25.9.412 College Wood Farmhouse is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed The Shieling (LB1181595)

- 25.9.413 The Shieling has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 200m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access point (A-51). Onshore cable installation works are located at a minimum distance of 710m east of the asset, across fields.
- 25.9.414 The onshore cable installation works will not affect the interests of the asset due to intervening distance and existing planting which retain the asset's key relationships with its setting, including its position relative to the B2135 and surrounding residential developments.
- 25.9.415 The Shieling is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the construction phase of the Proposed Development would result in **No Effect**.

#### Grade II Listed Yew Tree Cottage, Partridge Green (NHLE 1181605)

- 25.9.416 Yew Tree Cottage has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 45m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits at its closest point, an access point for operational traffic (A-51) and is 700m west of the onshore cable corridor. Onshore cable installation works are located at a minimum distance of 710m east of the asset, across fields.
- 25.9.417 Views east from the asset are screened by mature tree planting along road and field boundaries, with the arable field to the east of the asset largely defining middle-long distance views. The construction phase of the Proposed Development would not diminish the contribution of the asset's historic rural setting to its significance, as this contribution is made by adjacent fields, the asset's set-back location from the road, contrasting neighbouring buildings and short views of the cottage's associated garden.
- 25.9.418 The predicted changes are not considered sufficient to give rise to any discernible loss of the architectural or historic interest of the asset.
- 25.9.419 No loss of heritage significance is anticipated and consequently **No Effect** would arise on Yew Tree Cottage.

#### Grade II Listed Muttons (NHLE 1025758)

- 25.9.420 Muttons has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES

(Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located approximately 450m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access point (A-65). A temporary light construction and operational access point (A-66) and a construction access point (A-67) are situated further south, approximately 670m southwest of the asset. The access points are situated along Wineham Lane. A proposed onshore cable installation works corridor runs north to south approximately 590m to the west of the asset.

- 25.9.421 It is anticipated that temporary construction activities associated with the installation of cables will not affect the asset's interests due to intervening distance and screening by buildings and mature planting.
- 25.9.422 Increased levels of traffic, associated with temporary construction activity from the Proposed Development, along Wineham Lane, will ultimately alter the setting of the asset minimally. For example, vehicles would temporarily be present in short views looking west from the asset's west elevation as they pass the asset, and they will introduce slightly higher levels of noise. It is therefore anticipated that the architectural interest of the house will remain intact because the appreciation of the asset in short views from the road, including the lack of neighbouring structures, will not be affected. Historic interest will also be minimally affected.
- 25.9.423 Muttons is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Court Wick Park (LB1027813) and Court Wick Park Stables (LB1293605)

- 25.9.424 Court Wick Park and Court Wick Park Stables have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The assets are located 180m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access route that runs through a neighbouring residential development. A proposed cable installation works corridor also runs at a minimum distance of 510m to the southwest and to the north at a distance of approximately 650m. A temporary duct stringing area is proposed 400m to the southwest, and two indicative trenchless crossing compound areas (TC-03 and TC-04) are proposed within 550m to the southwest and northwest.
- 25.9.425 All of the elements of the Proposed Development mentioned above will have a minimal impact on the interests of the assets because intervening mature planting and residential development heavily screen them. Construction and operation noise will alter the setting of the assets slightly, however, this is in the context of noise currently introduced by nearby railway lines, residential roads and the A259 to the south.
- 25.9.426 The assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed buildings on Climping Street: Virginia Cottage, Dove Cottage, The Cottage and The Black Horse Public House (NHLE 1027675, NHLE 1233449, NHLE 1353859, NHLE 1353860)

- 25.9.427 The assets in this asset grouping have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). Each asset is situated along Climping Street and are located within 500m of one another. The primary contribution of their setting to their interests is their location within a loose, linear settlement along Climping Street.
- 25.9.428 The assets are located between 330m and 540m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access corridor, which runs north to south through fields along a small lane. A temporary construction compound is proposed within 640m to the northeast of the assets and cable installation works are proposed at a minimum distance of approximately 560m east of the assets. Underground landfall connection works are also proposed approximately 610m southeast of the assets.
- 25.9.429 These construction phase of the Proposed Development will not visually alter the setting of the assets due to intervening distance and screening by multiple rows of existing mature planting. Also, temporary levels of noise above the baseline will minimally alter their setting. Ultimately, neither of these elements will impact the significance of the assets.
- 25.9.430 The assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in **Minor adverse** residual effects which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed The Lodge of St Hugh's Monastery (NHLE 1193051)

- 25.9.431 The Lodge of St Hugh's Monastery has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 190m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is temporary construction and operational access point A-57, along the A28. The proposed onshore cable installation works corridor is at a minimum distance of 470m to the southeast.
- 25.9.432 The cable installation works will have no impact on the setting of the asset because of the intervening distance and because the asset is heavily screened by mature planting.
- 25.9.433 Increased levels of traffic along the A28, associated with A-57 to the south, may minimally alter the setting of the asset by introducing noise and visual elements; however, these possible impacts will be weakened by the partial screening provided to the asset by the existing trees and fence.
- 25.9.434 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

## Grade II Listed Bankfield Farmhouse (NHLE 1193164)

- 25.9.435 See section *Onshore cable corridor and onshore substation at Oakendene* in this Chapter for assessment of this asset.

## Grade II\* Listed Newplace Farmhouse (NHLE 1232882)

- 25.9.436 Newplace Farmhouse has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 100m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at the limit of deviation for alternative trenchless crossing (TC-10a). The cable installation works corridor runs to the west and north of the asset. The indicative trenchless crossing compound is located approximately 230m to the north, across the A27. The limit of deviation for an alternative trenchless crossing (TC-9a) is proposed approximately 170m to the west.
- 25.9.437 If selected for construction, the construction and operation of trenchless crossing compound TC-10a would alter the setting of the asset by introducing higher levels of noise; although this may not represent a departure from baseline noise associated with the farmyard immediately to the north and the A27. It is unlikely that there would be a visual alteration to the asset's setting due to screening provided by large mature trees and large farm buildings in views northwards from the north elevation of the asset (LVIA VP H3a, [Figure 18.39, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)). Also, views from the asset's main, south and east elevations would be unaffected.
- 25.9.438 If selected for construction, trenchless crossing compound TC-09a and TC-10 would produce less of an impact than TC-09 and TC10a because of the greater distance from the asset, screening by mature planting and lack of windows at the asset's west elevation.
- 25.9.439 Cable installation works would contribute noise to the setting of the asset, although, this would be temporary and any increase in noise would be experienced in the context of existing farmyard activities and vehicle noise from the A27.
- 25.9.440 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

## Grade II Listed The Royal Oak Inn (NHLE 1285777)

- 25.9.441 The Royal Oak Inn has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 390m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is temporary construction access along Wineham Lane, associated with access point A-69. The proposed cable installation works corridor also runs at a minimum distance of 470m to the southeast. A proposed extension to the existing National Grid Bolney Substation is located 720m to the northeast and onshore connection works are

also proposed at the existing National Grid Bolney Substation at an approximate distance of 730m northeast from the asset.

- 25.9.442 The increase in the frequency and number of construction vehicles using Wineham Lane may be experienced within the rural setting of the asset by introducing greater levels of noise and visual elements (see [Appendix 23.2: Traffic generation technical note, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.23.2)). However, because the asset is set back from the road by 30m and screened by multiple small-scale elements in its front garden and yard, both the visual and noise components of construction traffic will be weakened and will not notably affect the asset's interests.
- 25.9.443 The construction of the existing National Grid Bolney Substation extension is unlikely to significantly alter the setting of the asset due to the distance between the assets and screening by rows of mature trees and woodland ([Figure 25.8, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.9.444 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Park Farmhouse (NHLE 1285831)

- 25.9.445 Park Farmhouse has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)).
- 25.9.446 The asset is located 500m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits, with the cable installation works corridor being the nearest point. The limit of deviation for two indicative compounds (TC-25 and TC26) and one alternative HDD compound (TC-25a) are located within 600m of the asset, within the cable installation corridor.
- 25.9.447 The construction and operation of the HDD compounds and the installation of cables will not alter the setting of the asset and will, therefore, not impact its interests. This is due to intervening distance, the temporary nature of the works and the screening provided by nearby and distant mature planting, which will block views and attenuate noise.
- 25.9.448 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would result in **No Effect**.

#### Grade II Listed Wineham Cottage (NHLE 1286203)

- 25.9.449 Wineham Cottage has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 140m northeast of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is a light construction and operational access route (A-66) along Wineham Lane. A few meters further southwest is a proposed construction access point (A-65). The proposed onshore cable installation works corridor is at a minimum distance of 280m to the southwest of the asset.



- 25.9.450 Construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works will not affect the asset's interests due to intervening distance and screening by buildings and mature planting.
- 25.9.451 The most pronounced impact of the Proposed Development will come from increased levels of traffic, associated with temporary construction activity along Wineham Lane, although this will ultimately alter the setting of the asset minimally. For example, vehicles would temporarily be present in short views looking west from the asset's west elevation and they may introduce slightly higher levels of vehicle noise. The cottage is set back and does not front onto Wineham Lane and does not consequently derive key elements of its interest from its relationship to the lane. It is therefore anticipated that both the architectural and historic interests of the cottage will experience a temporary less than substantial loss to their heritage significance.
- 25.9.452 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Gratwicke (NHLE 1286335)

- 25.9.453 Gratwicke has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 360m southeast of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access route (A-58). The proposed onshore cable corridor is located at a minimum distance of 650m to the southeast of the asset. The limit of deviation of the proposed indicative HDD compound (TC-25) and alternative HDD compound (TC-25a) are both located approximately 650m southeast of the asset. A construction access corridor is also situated at a minimum distance of 530m east of the asset.
- 25.9.454 Construction activities associated with onshore cable installation works and the HDD compounds will not affect the asset's interests due to intervening distance and screening by multiple rows of mature planting.
- 25.9.455 The vehicle traffic associated with the construction vehicles to the east will not alter the setting of the asset to a degree that would affect its interests. This is due the intervening distance and significant screening created by multiple rows of mature planting between the asset and the access route.
- 25.9.456 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would have **No Effect** on the significance of this asset.

#### Grade II Listed Hill's Farmhouse (NHLE 1353944)

- 25.9.457 Hill's Farmhouse has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 180m northeast of the proposed DCO Oder Limits, at its nearest point, which is a temporary construction access route (A-48). A proposed cable installation works corridor runs at a minimum distance of 260m to the southeast of the asset. The limit of deviation

for two proposed HDD compounds is situated northeast of the asset. The indicative HDD compound (TC-22) is approximately 390m from the asset and the alternative HDD compound (TC-22a) is located approximately 350m from the asset.

- 25.9.458 Activities associated with cable installation works and the construction and operation of either of the HDD compounds will not visually alter the setting of the asset due to intervening distance and screening by multiple rows of mature planting. These activities, may, however, introduce an increase in noise into the asset's setting, although, this change would be temporary and attenuated by screening.
- 25.9.459 Due to the mature planting that almost wholly screens the asset from the B2135, it is anticipated that construction vehicle traffic associated with the A-48 access point will minimally alter the setting of the asset. While views of the tops of these vehicles may be visible from the upper storey windows of the asset's south elevation, they will remain largely screened in views from the asset. Any increase in noise will also be offset by the screening and is not anticipated to be significant enough to alter the interests of the asset.
- 25.9.460 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed 1 and 2 Corner House (NHLE 1285826) and Toll Cottage (NHLE 1354042)

- 25.9.461 The assets in this asset grouping have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are both located along the A281, within 110m of one another. They are located within 200m to the east of the proposed DCO Oder Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access route (A-55). A proposed cable installation works corridor runs at a minimum distance of 210m to the northwest of the asset. A construction and operational access route (A-52) runs along an unnamed road of the A281 within 500m south of both assets.
- 25.9.462 Cable installation works will not visually alter the setting of the assets due to intervening screening by mature planting and residential developments, the introduction of increased levels of noise could result; however, this alteration would be temporary and attenuated by the intervening distance and screening.
- 25.9.463 The most direct impact of the Proposed Development will be as a result of the visual and audible impact of the construction traffic, associated with A-52, passing by the assets along the A281. The construction traffic may contribute more noise and larger visual elements in views from the assets, however, this would be filtered by existing hedgerows and trees, particularly at Toll Cottage where screening from the road is more substantial.
- 25.9.464 The assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed Allfreys (NHLE 1354152)

- 25.9.465 See section *Onshore cable corridor and onshore substation at Oakendene* in this Chapter for assessment of this asset.

### Grade II Listed Crateman's Farmhouse (NHLE 1354155)

- 25.9.466 Crateman's Farmhouse has high heritage significance deriving from historic and architectural interest (See [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 20m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 175m west of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD Compound TC-26, 255m north of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed alternative HDD Compound TC-25a and 455m north of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD Compound TC-25 and approximately 130m northwest of the cable construction corridor.
- 25.9.467 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor and HDD compounds will be visible to the east, southeast and south of the asset with a partial screening effect and visual separation provided by intervening fields and boundary planting. While the compounds and cable-associated works would introduce construction activities and result in some disturbance to the broader farmland surroundings of the asset, the farmhouse's principal setting relationship to the associated historic farmstead (MWS9939) buildings would remain undisturbed. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed Eastlands Farm (NHLE 1381153)

- 25.9.468 See section *Onshore cable corridor and onshore substation at Oakendene* in this Chapter for assessment of this asset.

### Grade II Listed Doves Cottages (NHLE 1191816)

- 25.9.469 Doves Cottages (NHLE 1191816) is an asset of high heritage significance deriving from historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 230m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 240m west of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-22 and cable construction corridor, and 240m northwest of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed alternative HDD compound TC-22a. Proposed access point A-49 (light construction and operational traffic) is located 260m north of the asset.
- 25.9.470 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor and HDD compounds will be visible to the east, southeast and south of the asset with a partial screening effect and visual separation provided by intervening fields and boundary planting. While the compounds and cable-associated works would have an urbanising effect and result in disturbance to the rural surroundings of the asset, the road to the northwest and paddocks to the southeast would remain undisturbed. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change, to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed Blakes Farmhouse (NHLE 1353943)

- 25.9.471 Blakes Farmhouse (NHLE 1353943) is of high heritage significance derived from architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 65m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 75m southeast of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-21 and cable construction corridor.
- 25.9.472 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor and HDD compounds will be visible to the west and northwest of the asset with a partial screening effect and visual separation provided by the intervening B2135 road and boundary planting. While the compounds and cable-associated works would introduce construction activities and result in disturbance to the broader farmland surroundings of the asset, the farmhouse's chief setting relationship, to the associated historic farmstead (MSW9444) buildings would remain undisturbed. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect on an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade II Listed Bergen-Op-Zoom Cottage (NHLE 1393335)

- 25.9.473 Bergen-Op-Zoom Cottage (NHLE 1393335) is of high heritage significance, derived from architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 50m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits and the cable construction corridor, and 355m south of the HDD order limits for proposed HDD compound TC-21.
- 25.9.474 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor will be visible to the west and northwest of the asset with a partial screening effect and visual separation provided by the intervening B2135 road and boundary planting. The cable-associated works would introduce construction activities and result in disturbance to the broader farmland surroundings of the asset, though the asset's chief setting relationship, to the former common land to the south, would remain unaffected. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change, producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect on an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

### Grade I Listed St John's Priory (NHLE 1217172)

- 25.9.475 St John's Priory (NHLE 1217172) is of high heritage significance derived from historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 260m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-07 and HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD alternative compound TC-07a.
- 25.9.476 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor will be visible to the south of the asset with a partial screening effect and visual separation provided by the intervening built environment and intermittent planting. The cable and HDD compound-associated works would introduce construction activities and

result in disturbance to the wider rural surroundings of the asset, though the asset's principal setting relationship, to its surrounding buildings, the lawn and the road, would be unaffected. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect on an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Keepers Mead (NHLE 1354279)

- 25.9.477 Keepers Mead (NHLE 1354279) is of high heritage significance derived from architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 380m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits.
- 25.9.478 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor will be visible and audible to the south and southeast of the asset with a partial screening effect and visual separation provided by the intervening built environment and intermittent planting. The cable-associated works would introduce construction activities resulting in disturbance to the wider rural surroundings of the asset, though the asset's principal setting relationship, to its surrounding buildings, the lawn and fields to the north and west, would be unaffected. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect on an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and due to the temporary nature, this would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Northblows Farmhouse (NHLE 1191818)

- 25.9.479 Northblows Farmhouse (NHLE 1191818) is of high heritage significance derived from architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 250m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits and HDD limits of variation for proposed HDD compound TC-23 and cable construction corridor. The asset is also located 370m north of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-22, and 220m northeast of proposed access point A-49 (light construction and operational traffic).
- 25.9.480 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor, proposed HDD compounds and light construction traffic toward proposed access A-49 will be visible and audible to the south and southeast of the asset with a partial screening effect and visual separation provided by the B2135 road, intervening fields and boundary planting. The cable-associated works would introduce construction activities resulting in disturbance to the wider rural surroundings of the asset, though the asset's chief setting relationships, to its rear garden, nearby buildings and the road would be unaffected. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect on an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Hollybush Cottage (NHLE 1191821)

- 25.9.481 Hollybush Cottage (NHLE 1191821) is of high heritage significance based on architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset](#)

**baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 110m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits and the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-23 and cable construction corridor, in addition to 225m north of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-22. The asset is located 150m northeast of proposed access point A-49 (light construction and operational traffic).

- 25.9.482 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor and proposed HDD compounds will be visible and audible to the south and southeast of the asset in addition to an increase in traffic accommodating the construction phase along the B2135 road to the northwest. The core construction activities would be separated and partially screened from the asset through intervening fields and boundary planting. The cable-associated works would introduce construction activities resulting in disturbance to the wider rural surroundings of the asset, though the asset's chief setting relationships, to its rear garden, nearby buildings and the road would be unaffected. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change introduced to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect and due to the temporary nature, this would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Granary Cottage (NHLE 1191885)

- 25.9.483 Granary Cottage (NHLE 1191885) is of high heritage significance derived from architectural and historic interest (see **Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 100m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits and cable construction corridor, and 260m southwest of proposed access point A-48 (construction and operational traffic).
- 25.9.484 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor would be screened from the asset in views to the east via mature roadside planting and intervening buildings, though construction phase works may be audible. An increase in traffic accommodating the construction phase along the B2135 road to the east of the asset would be perceptible. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Bloques Farmhouse (NHLE 1191892)

- 25.9.485 Bloques Farmhouse (NHLE 1191892) is of high heritage significance derived from architectural and historic interest (see **Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 40m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 75m south of proposed access point A-48 (construction and operational traffic).
- 25.9.486 Construction phase works activities associated with the onshore cable corridor would be screened from the asset via mature planting at the eastern and northeastern edges of its associated garden and would not impose on the asset's core setting in its relationship with the remainder of the 19th-century Blocques (Blocks) Farm Historic Farmstead, Ashurst (MWS9446). An increase in traffic associated with construction phase operations at access point A-48 would be

perceptible from the asset principally through associated noise, though the asset's set-back location from the associated road and track would limit this. This would introduce a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Martinsland (NHLE 1353980)

- 25.9.487 Martinsland (NHLE 1353980) is of high significance, derived from architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). This asset is located 205m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits and HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-23, as well as the cable construction corridor. In addition, the asset is located 375m northeast of proposed access point A-49 (light construction and operational traffic) and 455m north of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-23.
- 25.9.488 Construction activities associated with the onshore cable corridor, proposed HDD compounds and light construction traffic toward proposed access A-49 may be visible and audible to the south and southeast of the asset with a partial screening effect and visual separation provided by the B2135 road, intervening fields and boundary planting. Construction traffic would be added to the B2135 road, adding new visual and audible components to the surroundings of the asset. The cable-associated works would introduce construction activities resulting in disturbance to the wider rural surroundings of the asset, though the asset's principal setting relationships, to its rear garden and the associated historic farmstead layout (MWS12345) would be unaffected. This would introduce a **Low** magnitude of change, producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect on an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Tilleys Farmhouse (NHLE 1354090)

- 25.9.489 Tilleys Farmhouse (NHLE 1354090) is assessed as of high heritage significance based on architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 260m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 280m south of the proposed Washington site compound, HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compounds TC-16 and TC-17, the cable construction corridor and proposed access point A-39 (construction and operational traffic) and 290m southwest of proposed alternative HDD compound TC-17a.
- 25.9.490 Construction phase works would be located over 250m away from the asset to the north and northeast, in the case of the northern orientation separated from the asset by the existing A283 road. This distance, intermittent screening through mature planting at field boundaries and the enclosed nature of the asset's immediate surroundings would ensure visual and audible perception would be minimal from the asset. The asset's key setting relationship with its associated garden and the layout of the associated historic farmstead to the south (MWS12953) would not be affected. This would introduce a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity). This would produce

a **Moderate adverse** residual effect, which, due to the temporary nature, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Green Common Farmhouse (NHLE 1284745)

- 25.9.491 Green Common Farmhouse (NHLE 1284745) is of high heritage significance drawn from historic interest and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 90m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its closest point, which relates to a temporary duct stringing out area (Work No. 12). The asset lies 120m south of the proposed alternative HDD compound TC-17a and onshore cable corridor, and 250m southeast of the proposed Washington site compound (also comprising TC-16 and TC-17).
- 25.9.492 Construction phase works associated with the onshore cable corridor and TC-17a south of the A283 road would introduce visual and audible change to the setting of the asset. Visibility of construction activity from the asset would be through filtered views due to existing planting on the asset's garden boundary and ancillary buildings. Changes to the noise environment would be mitigated to an acceptable through implementation of C-26 (see [Section 21.9, Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.21) Construction activity north of the A283 would be screened seasonally by intervening mature tree growth and visually separated by the road and fields to the south. Key components of the asset's setting in long views to the south and short spatial relationships with the associated historic farmstead layout (MWS10974) would not be affected. Overall, perception of construction activity would have an urbanising effect on the existing rural character of the asset's setting, resulting in temporary limited loss to its historic and aesthetic interest.
- 25.9.493 In the event of use of the proposed HDD alternative site for HDD compound TC-17a would introduce additional visual elements and an increase in noise changes within the setting of the asset, associated with construction of the trenchless crossing, compared with the use of TC-17. However, given the proximity of onshore installation works for the trenched cable and the temporary nature of the onshore cable installation works, the choice of HDD compound would not result in a difference of impact that would be sufficient to affect the assessed magnitude of change. The magnitude of change introduced to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) would be **Low**, resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect, which based on the temporary nature of the works, would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Fair Oak Farmhouse (NHLE 1354112)

- 25.9.494 Fair Oak Farmhouse (NHLE 1354112) is of high heritage significance derived from historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 395m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, 450m northeast of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed HDD compound TC-19 and cable construction corridor, and 625m northeast of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed alternative HDD compound TC-19a.



- 25.9.495 Construction phase works associated with trench corridor excavation may be visible and audible in long-distance views south from the asset, introducing construction activities to the long vistas component of the asset's rural surroundings. This would not impose on the asset's association with its historic farmstead surroundings (MWS10195), garden with partial enclosure or shorter views of surrounding farmland and rows of planted trees. The magnitude of change introduced to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) would be **Very Low** resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Clipping Mill (NHLE 1027639)

- 25.9.496 The Clipping Mill has high heritage significance for historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). Multiple elements of the Onshore Proposed Development are located within the vicinity of the asset. The nearest extent of the DCO Order Limits is underground landfall connection works, launch pit and jointing. Temporary soil storage is proposed 120m northwest of the asset, but western views from the asset will be heavily filtered by existing intervening mature planting. Finally, three proposed indicative HDD compounds (TC-01, TC-01a and TC-02) are situated within 400m of the asset, to the west and northwest. Of these, only TC-01 will be clearly visible from the asset. While the construction and operation activities associated with the above will alter the setting of the asset, this will not harm the understanding of its historic and architectural interests.
- 25.9.497 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and, overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude because the alterations to the asset's setting would be short term reversible and views of many of its elements will be filtered by existing mature planting. The resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed The Old Vicarage (NHLE 1284693) and Stables of the Old Vicarage to the west of the House (NHLE 1027199)

- 25.9.498 The Old Vicarage and Stables of the Old Vicarage to the west of the House have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located approximately 190m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access point (A-36). The minimum distance of proposed cable installation works is approximately 120m to the north.
- 25.9.499 The proposed cable installation works will be screened from the assets in long views looking north by existing large mature planting. Consequently, the visual elements of the proposed development will not alter the setting of the assets and audible elements associated with construction activity will have a minimal impact due to the screening and distance. These elements will, therefore, not affect the heritage significance of the assets.
- 25.9.500 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would have **No Effect** on the significance of this asset.

### Scheduled monument Itford Hill style settlement on Cock Hill (NHLE 1015881)

- 25.9.501 Itford Hill style settlement on Cock Hill has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 150m southwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is the minimum distance of cable installation works which runs southeast to northeast of the asset. This is illustrated in part through LVIA VP LD5 ([Figure 18.69, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)). A proposed operational access corridor also runs 190m to the south.
- 25.9.502 Cable installation works are anticipated to change the setting of the asset to some degree as they will introduce visual and audible components that have the potential to negatively alter its historic interest. Visual components, taking the form of construction activity in the field to the east of the asset, would be visible in short views looking east. This, along with an increase in noise, would infringe upon the asset's peaceful rural setting. Any change, however, not substantially detract from an understanding of the asset's historic interest. The asset's archaeological interest will not be affected.
- 25.9.503 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Low** magnitude of change. The resulting **Moderate adverse** residual effect will be **Not Significant** due to the temporary nature of the construction works.

### Scheduled monument Itford Hill style settlement and an Anglo-Saxon barrow field at New Barn Down, 850m north west of Myrtle Grove Farm (NHLE 1017446)

- 25.9.504 This asset has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 5m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is the minimum distance to the onshore cable corridor. The proposed onshore cable corridor is also situated to the southwest and east of the asset. For an illustration of this, see LVIA VP LD4 ([Figure 18.68, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18)). A construction and operation access route would be located 70m to the south and an operational access route 160m to the northeast. Four proposed HDD compounds, one indicative and three alternatives, are also situated within 1km of the asset, to the west and southwest, although only TC-12 and TC-12d have the potential to impact the asset.
- 25.9.505 Cable installation works, alongside the increased traffic along the access routes, are anticipated to have some effect on the setting of the asset as a result of the introduction of noise and visual elements related to construction. This will temporarily alter an appreciation of the asset and the historical visual dominance of the Itford Style settlement in relation to its immediate surroundings. The increase in noise and traffic will also temporarily harm the asset's tranquil and isolated setting which enhances the understanding of the funerary and religious context of the early medieval barrows within the asset.
- 25.9.506 The potential impact of the proposed HDD compounds (TC-12 and TC-12d) is limited by their distance to the asset and some screening offered by existing

mature planting and topography. TC-12 would result in a marginally lesser effect on the setting of the asset than TC-12d because it would be less visible from across the asset; whilst the effect of TC-12c or TC-12b will be negligible because they will be heavily screened from the asset in long views by existing woodland.

- 25.9.507 The archaeological interest of the asset will not be affected by the construction phase of the Proposed Development.
- 25.9.508 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Low** magnitude of change. The resulting **Moderate adverse** residual effect will be **Not Significant** due to the temporary nature of the effects and because the historic interest of the asset will remain substantially comprehensible.

#### Scheduled monument Muntham Court Romano-British Site (NHLE 1005850)

- 25.9.509 Muntham Court Romano-British Site (NHLE 1005850) is of high significance, owing to historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 300m north of proposed access point A-28 (construction and operational traffic) and immediately adjacent to the proposed DCO Order Limits where the associated access route would be located to the west of the asset. The onshore cable corridor would be located a minimum of approximately 1.6km to the west.
- 25.9.510 The construction phase works would be perceptible from this asset via the addition of construction traffic to the track at the monument's western boundary. Any visual or audible elements associated with the construction phase outside of traffic would be limited by intervening topography. As no intrusive construction works are proposed within the associated Archaeological Notification Area (SDNPA 041) the construction phase would not affect the contribution of the asset's setting to archaeological interest. The construction phase works would introduce a **Very Low** magnitude of change to this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Scheduled monument Prehistoric flint mine and a Martin Down style enclosure on Harrow hill, 850m south east of Lee Farm (NHLE 1015239)

- 25.9.511 Prehistoric flint mine and a Martin Down style enclosure on Harrow hill, 850m south east of Lee Farm (NHLE 1015239) is of high heritage significance drawn from historic and archaeological interest (See [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 625m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 1.1km northeast of the HDD limits of deviation for proposed alternative HDD compound TC-12d (the northernmost of four alternative HDD compound proposals for TC-12). The onshore cable corridor would be located a minimum of approximately 750m to the southeast.
- 25.9.512 The proposed works would introduce new visual elements in views to the south and southwest of the asset (partly illustrated in [Figures 18.43 and 18.68, Volume 3](#), though neither of the viewpoints involved are located within the scheduled area). These would introduce construction activities into views outward from the

Martin Down enclosure, compromising the rural context in which it presently sits. The effect would partially depend on the location chosen for a proposed HDD compound, with proposed alternative compound TC-12d having the greatest potential visibility.

- 25.9.513 Part of the ANA covering Multi-Period Archaeological Features on Harrow Hill, Angmering (SDNPA 030), in which the asset is located and which is largely contiguous with the contribution of setting to the archaeological significance of the monument would be cut through by the onshore cable corridor, 1.1km southeast of the asset. This would cover an area 570m east to west and would potentially remove archaeological remains associated with the monument. The potential for archaeological remains contemporary with the Martin Down Enclosure within the ANA area is demonstrated through the field system to the east of the asset (MWS3057). In the event of loss of contemporary features that may add to understanding or appreciation of either of the constituent features of this asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), the Martin Down Enclosure or the flint mine, the construction phase works would present a **Medium** magnitude of change resulting in a **Major adverse** residual effect, which would be **Significant**. As noted at **paragraph 25.8.18**, adverse change of less than a high magnitude to a designated heritage asset or non-designated heritage assets of equivalent heritage significance is considered to comprise less than substantial harm. In the event of the change introduced solely through visual or audible effects, the magnitude of change would be **Low** resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Scheduled monument settlement site in Chantry Bottom (NHLE 1005823)

- 25.9.514 Settlement site in Chantry Bottom has high heritage significance for historic and architectural interest (see **Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 270m southwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access route (A-30). A proposed cable installation works corridor runs at a minimum distance of 440m to the northeast of the asset. The limit of deviation for a proposed alternative HDD compound (TC-15b) is also situated approximately 680m to the northeast of the asset.
- 25.9.515 The impact of the cable installation works, and the construction of the HDD compound will introduce minimal levels of noise and visual elements to the asset due to the intervening distance and screening by existing trees and topography. The asset's relationship with its setting, primarily through long views south and shorter views of surrounding farmland, will not be affected by the Proposed Development.
- 25.9.516 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Scheduled monument Group of four bowl barrows at the Chantry Post (NHLE 1015713)

- 25.9.517 The Group of four bowl barrows at the Chantry Post has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see **Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage**

**asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located immediately adjacent to the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access route (A-30). The onshore cable corridor would be located a minimum distance of 400m east of the asset. The limit of deviation for a proposed alternative HDD compound (TC-15b) is also situated approximately 420m east of the asset. The limit of deviation for the proposed indicative HDD compound (TC-15a) is located 920m to the east.

- 25.9.518 Cable installation works will introduce visual and noise elements to the setting of the asset that will affect its significance during the construction phase, although its historic interest will remain substantially comprehensible.
- 25.9.519 The impact of the HDD compound on the interests of the asset is dependent upon which compound is chosen for construction. TC-15b, if constructed at the western extent of its limit of deviation, would factor into long views looking east from the asset. This would present an industrial element, detracting from the rural setting of the asset and overlooking it from the hill to the east, harming its sense of eminence in views from the asset over downward sloping hills to the south. If selected, TC-15 and TC-15c would have no effect of the significance of the asset.
- 25.9.520 The construction phase works will not affect the archaeological interest of the asset.
- 25.9.521 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact construction phase of the cable installation works and TC-15b would be of a **Low** magnitude. The resulting **Moderate adverse** residual effect will be **Not Significant** due to the temporary nature of these construction phase works and because the asset's historic interest will remain substantially intact.

#### Scheduled monument Medieval earthworks E and SE of St Mary's Church (NHLE 1005828, MWS3371)

- 25.9.522 The asset has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see **Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is crossed by the proposed DCO Order Limits on the route of an operational access (A-06), where it will utilise an existing track. A construction and operational access point (A-05) would be located 160m to the south of the asset, with a temporary construction compound further south, at approximately 180m. A temporary soil storage area would be approximately 320m southeast of the asset. The onshore cable corridor would be located a minimum distance of approximately 560m east of the asset.
- 25.9.523 The temporary construction compound and soil storage, to the south, and cable onshore cable corridor to the east, will predominantly contribute negative audible change to the setting of the asset through construction noise. Visual elements of the construction phase, on the other hand, will be screened by existing mature planting, large farming buildings and residential buildings. These changes to the asset's setting will negatively affect the significance of the asset to a small degree, although the asset's historic interest will remain substantially intact. Further to this, the key contribution of the asset's setting to its historic interest through long and short views of the village and church, from the asset, will not be affected.

- 25.9.524 There will also be an alteration to usage of the land to the southeast of the asset, within the south-eastern portion of the ANA (DWS8486) in which the asset is located, whereby it will be used by construction traffic. This represents a negative effect of the construction phase on the contribution of the surrounding land use to the asset's archaeological interest because it is not reflective of how that land was historically used. The asset is of **High** sensitivity and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development will be of a **Low** magnitude of change. The resulting **Moderate adverse** residual effect will be **Not Significant** because of the temporary nature of these construction phase activities and because the key characteristics of the asset's historical context will remain substantially intact. Scheduled monument Prehistoric flint mine and part of a round barrow cemetery at Blackpatch, 400m north east of Myrtle Grove Farm (NHLE 1015880)
- 25.9.525 This asset has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8). The asset is located 3m west of the proposed DCO Oder Limits, at its nearest point, which is an operational access route (A-27). The onshore cable corridor would be located a minimum distance of approximately 490m east of the asset.
- 25.9.526 Whilst the construction works associated with the onshore cable corridor would be perceptible from the asset in views to the west, this will be limited by the intervening distance, topography and planting (LVIA H7f [Figure 18.46, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.18). This alteration to the setting of the asset would temporary and result in a very limited loss of historic interest.
- 25.9.527 The asset is of **High** sensitivity and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development would be of a **Very Low** magnitude, with a resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect which will be **Not Significant**.

Scheduled Monument Deserted medieval settlement at Lower Barpham Farm (NHLE 1015883)

- 25.9.528 This asset has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 310m northwest of the proposed DCO Oder Limits, at the location of the alternative HDD compounds TC-12d and the nearest point of the onshore cable corridor. The limit of deviation for the proposed indicative HDD compound (TC-12) is situated 870m to the southeast of the asset, although this compound will be screened by existing woodland.
- 25.9.529 The selection of alternative HDD compound TC-12d would affect the setting of the asset through the encroachment of construction activities upon the quiet isolation that its setting contributes. This will distract somewhat from an appreciation of the historic interest of the medieval settlement, although its historic interest would remain substantially intact. Construction activities associated with cable installation to the west will further introduce visual and noise change into the setting of the asset.
- 25.9.530 The asset is of **High** sensitivity and overall, the impact of the construction phase of the Proposed Development will be of a **Low** magnitude, with a resulting **Moderate**

**adverse** residual effect, and due to the temporary nature, this would be **Not Significant**.

## Onshore cable corridor and onshore substation at Oakendene near Cowfold

### Introduction

- 25.9.531 Direct effects to archaeological heritage assets associated with construction of the onshore substation at Oakendene and existing National Grid Bolney extension works are included within on the assessment of direct effects in *Landfall and onshore cable corridor, Zone 3: Low Weald* in **Section 25.9** of this Chapter, with the exception of direct effects on the historic parkland at Oakendene, which is assessed in this section of the Chapter.
- 25.9.532 In addition, this section of the assessment considers heritage assets which are identified as being scoped in for effects arising due to change to setting as a result of both the onshore cable corridor and the onshore substation at Oakendene west of Cowfold (**Table 25-15** and **Table 25-16** and **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7)). The indicative construction programme (**Chapter 4: The Proposed Development** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4)) indicates that construction of these onshore elements of the Proposed Development are likely to be undertaken in parallel and the settings of designated heritage assets may be affected by a combination of these onshore elements, as a result of activities such as site clearance, earthworks, landscaping, construction and vehicle movements. These changes will be experienced to varying degrees throughout the construction phase and any effects will be time-limited. The maximum assessment assumptions for these onshore elements are presented in **Table 25-22**.
- 25.9.533 As outlined in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4), the installation of the onshore cable corridor will take up to three years (carried out in sections), whilst construction of the temporary construction compounds will take between two months to four months and will be in use for up to three years and six months. An exception to this is the compound at Oakendene which will only be used for construction of the onshore substation at Oakendene west of Cowfold, which will take up to four years.
- 25.9.534 On completion of the construction phase, where land is not allocated for above ground operational elements of the Proposed Development (as assessed in **Section 25.10**), the land will be reinstated to its former condition, wherever possible (see embedded environmental measures **Table 25-23**).
- 25.9.535 Where potential effects are identified, an indication is provided of the range of magnitude of change and heritage significance (or sensitivity) definitions for each potential effect based on the definitions provided in **Section 25.8**. The magnitude of change, and hence the significance of potential effects, have been assessed on the assumption that the embedded environmental measures from **Table 25-23** have been implemented as part of the Proposed Development.

### Oakendene historic parkland (MWS96, HWS2285)

- 25.9.536 Oakendene onshore substation site largely comprises the historic designed parkland (not designated) of the grade II listed Oakendene Manor (NHLE



1027074), which provides an important visual and historic setting for the surviving manor house (assessment of effects through change to setting of the manor is given in **paragraphs 25.9.543 to 25.9.547**). The historic development and character of the parkland is detailed in **Appendix 25.5: Oakendene parkland: historic landscape assessment, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.5), together with an assessment of heritage significance (sensitivity), which is considered to be Low, for historic and archaeological interests. Former boundaries and footpath/track within the historic extent of the parkland are identified in LiDAR and geophysical data along with geophysical anomalies of unclear origin which no known association with the parkland (see **Table 25-21**, and **Appendix 25.2: Onshore historic environment desk study** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.2) and **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)).

- 25.9.537 The existing topographic conditions, planting and the industrial estate, all preclude the visual connectivity between the historic parkland and the surrounding landscape to the west, north and east. The relative openness and higher elevation of the northwest part of the former parkland allow longer views south toward the boating lake and Taintfield Wood.
- 25.9.538 Construction activities associated with the onshore substation at Oakendene (including Oakendene construction compound, associated access and drainage) is expected to take approximately four years. Potential effects to the heritage significance of historic landscape character may arise through physical change to, or removal of, elements of the historic landscape may result from intrusive groundworks required for the construction of the onshore substation and associated infrastructure; and through change to setting.
- 25.9.539 Construction activities will entirely change the existing agricultural use of the land and will affect the historic and archaeological interests of the historic parkland through:
- removal of surviving relic parkland boundary;
  - removal of surviving parkland trees;
  - impact to potential archaeological remains associated with the former parkland, anticipated to be of low heritage significance; and
  - introduction of new visual and audible elements to the landscape.
- 25.9.540 Embedded environmental measures to minimise the impacts of construction of Oakendene substation on historic landscape character, include the design of appropriate landscape proposals (**Design and Access Statement** (Document Reference: 5.8)) developed in line with embedded environmental commitments (**Table 25-23**). These include:
- Retention of 19<sup>th</sup> century extent of parkland;
  - Retention of hedgerow and trees along east and west boundary, minimising perception of construction activity;
  - Avoiding construction of built elements within part of proposed DCO Order Limits directly south of Oakendene Manor, to preserve relatively open parkland character which permits long framed views south; and

- In line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.20 (DECC, 2011a), archaeology at risk of loss or disturbance would be recorded before any loss occurs. This recording would be provided for in a WSI (site-specific, as described in the [Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (Document Reference: 7.9)) to be approved with the relevant local authority in advance and would have the effect of partially mitigating any loss of archaeological interest. This would lead to a Low magnitude of adverse change to archaeological interest.

25.9.541 Direct impacts to the asset during the construction phase will be permanent, but the effects arising due to change to setting will be short-term temporary.

25.9.542 Overall, this would lead to a **Medium** magnitude of adverse change to an asset of **Low** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Oakendene Manor (NHLE 1027074)

25.9.543 Oakendene Manor (NHLE 1027074) has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Oakendene Manor is located 90m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits. During the construction phase of the Proposed Development there is predicted visual, audible and physical change to the setting of the heritage asset:

- construction activities associated with the onshore substation and HDD cable installation at Oakendene would introduce new visible and perceptual elements to the setting of the asset:
  - ▶ heavily filtered views of the Oakendene substation compound (205m to the west) and HDD construction compounds (TC-27 TC-27a and TC-28), which are partially screened by the presence and retention of existing hedgerow and tree planting;
  - ▶ filtered views toward the onshore substation at Oakendene, 225m to the southeast of the asset, with construction activities in the south-western extent of the substation site expected to be more clearly visible; and
  - ▶ construction activity would be perceptible in long filtered views of the asset from the south in the vicinity of Taintfield Wood, such as when moving along the Public Right of Way (PRoW) (1786) on the hillside to the south from Taintfield Wood (see LVIA VP SA3, [Figure 18.12, Volume 3](#) (Document Reference: 6.3.18)) and through a gap in the hedgerow from the PRoW to the east of Taintfield Wood (1787) (see LVIA VP SA12, [Figure 18.78, Volume 3](#) (Document Reference: 6.3.25) **[REP4-032]** (updated at deadline 4)). Perception of construction activity would become more prominent as the construction phase progressed on the built form of the substation. This would detract from filtered views of the asset in which its architectural interest can be appreciated within its rural parkland setting.
- Change in the noise environment as experienced at Oakendene Manor as a result of construction of the Oakendene substation is assessed in [Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.21). A

very low magnitude of change is predicted as the predicted construction noise will exceed the existing background noise to only a limited degree, and as a result, this change to the aspect's setting will not affect its significance;

- construction activities will change elements the historic parkland associated with Oakendene Manor (as described in [Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7)), through the removal of parkland trees and a relic parkland boundary; and
- construction activities will have an urbanising effect on the rural setting of Oakendene Manor.

25.9.544 The gardens, the 19th century extent of the historic parkland with parkland trees and key views southward toward the boating lake will not be affected.

25.9.545 Due to existing screening and topography, construction activities east of Kent Road, north of Taintfield Wood and east of the gardens and industrial estate at Oakendene, will not be perceptible from the heritage asset. Due to existing screening to the north and west of the asset, construction traffic along the A272 is not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

25.9.546 Whilst embedded measures provide for planting to mitigate the visibility of the substation from the heritage asset, this will not be established for the construction phase and therefore will not mitigate the initial loss of trees to the southeast of the asset and the change to views southeast from the asset.

25.9.547 Predicted changes described would diminish the contribution of the setting to the heritage significance of the asset. Physical changes to the historic parkland will be permanent, whilst other changes to the asset will be short-term temporary. The architectural interest of the asset will be unaffected. This would be an impact of **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of high heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in **Moderate adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Bankfield Farmhouse (NHLE 1193164)

25.9.548 Bankfield Farmhouse (NHLE 1193164) has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 170m from the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its closest point, which is an operational access (A-60), whilst it lies approximately 280m from the onshore cable corridor and 450m from the onshore substation at Oakendene.

25.9.549 Whilst there is theoretical visibility from the asset of the construction activities within the onshore cable corridor and onshore substation ([Figure 25.7, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)), in reality views north and east from the asset are heavily screened due to intervening planting and topography. It is possible that taller elements of construction infrastructure may be visible through or over the tree cover.

25.9.550 Construction activities will not diminish the contribution that the farmstead setting, provided by the proximity and relationship with agricultural buildings, contributes to the asset's heritage significance, though construction activities will have an urbanising effect on the agricultural land associated with the asset.

- 25.9.551 The predicted changes are not considered sufficient to give rise to any discernible loss of the architectural or historic interest of the asset.
- 25.9.552 No loss of heritage significance is anticipated and consequently **No Effect** would arise on Bankfield Farmhouse.

#### Grade II Listed Allfreys (NHLE 1354152)

- 25.9.553 Allfreys (NHLE 1354152) has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located immediately north of the A272, approximately 220m from the proposed DCO Order Limits. Views from the asset toward the proposed DCO Order Limits are largely screened due to the presence of the A272 and intervening planting. Construction activities associated with the Oakendene west construction compound, are predicted only to be perceptible through filtered views from the upper floor of the south elevation of the asset.
- 25.9.554 Whilst construction traffic along the A272 will pass in front of the asset, views of the road are screened due high dense hedge planting. Any increase in noise from increase vehicle movements would be short-term temporary.
- 25.9.555 No other activity associated with the construction phase is predicted to result in change to the setting of the heritage asset.
- 25.9.556 Any perceptible change resulting from construction of the Proposed Development is not expected to result in the loss of heritage significance, with the architectural and historic interests of the asset unaffected, and consequently there would be **No Effect**.

#### Grade II Listed Eastlands Farm (NHLE 1381153)

- 25.9.557 Eastlands Farm (NHLE 1381153) has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 570m from the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its nearest point, which is the Oakendene west construction compound. Due to intervening planting and topography, perceptibility of construction activities associated with the compound is not anticipated. The onshore substation at Oakendene site is located over 1km from the asset. It is predicted that only the taller elements of construction infrastructure may be visible through or over the tree cover, and a such a distance any perceptibility would not change the historic or architectural interests of the asset, nor the ability to appreciate these interests.
- 25.9.558 Construction activity associated with any other element of the onshore part of the Proposed Development is not predicted to result in change to the setting of the heritage asset.
- 25.9.559 The Proposed Development is not expected to result in the loss of heritage significance and consequently there would be **No Effect**.

## Onshore cable corridor and existing National Grid Bolney substation extension

### Introduction

- 25.9.560 This section of the assessment considers heritage assets which **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) identified as being scoped in for effects arising due to change to setting as a result of both the onshore cable corridor and the Bolney substation extension. The indicative construction programme (**Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4)) indicates that construction of these onshore elements of the Proposed Development are likely to be undertaken in parallel and the settings of designated heritage assets may be affected by a combination of these onshore elements, as a result of activities such as site clearance, earthworks, landscaping, construction and vehicle movements. These changes will be experienced to varying degrees throughout the construction phase and any effects will be time-limited. The maximum assessment assumptions for these onshore elements are presented in **Table 25-22**.
- 25.9.561 As outlined in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4), the installation of the onshore cable corridor will take up to three years (carried out in sections), whilst construction of the temporary construction compounds will take between two months to four months and will be in use for up to three years and six months. An exception to this is the compound at Bolney which will only be used for construction of the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension, which will take up to two years.
- 25.9.562 On completion of the construction phase, where land is not allocated for above ground operational elements of the Proposed Development (as assessed in **Section 25.10**), the land will be reinstated to its former condition wherever possible (embedded environmental measures **Table 25-23**).
- 25.9.563 Where potential effects are identified, an indication is provided of the range of magnitude of change and heritage significance (or sensitivity) definitions for each potential effect based on the definitions provided in **Section 25.8**. The magnitude of change, and hence the significance of potential effects, have been assessed on the assumption that the embedded environmental measures from **Table 25-23** have been implemented as part of the Proposed Development.

### Grade II Listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579)

- 25.9.564 Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579) has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 205m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits, though it lies 270m east of the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension and 540m from the associated construction compound. Due to the asset's distance from the proposed DCO Order Limits, together with its enclosed setting defined by adjacent agricultural buildings, the dense woodland to the west and north, and the existing electrical infrastructure to the north, construction activities relating to the onshore

cable corridor and existing National Grid Bolney substation extension, are not anticipated to be perceptible from the asset.

- 25.9.565 Construction activity associated with the onshore cable corridor and the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension will contribute to the effects of existing electrical infrastructure, which adversely contributes to the heritage significance of the asset as it erodes the rural character of the asset's wider agricultural setting. However, this change is relatively limited being confined to a limited extent outside of the existing electrical infrastructure and would be short-term temporary. This would be an impact of **Very Low** magnitude of change, resulting in **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

## Offshore substation and wind turbine generators

Effects arising through change to setting of heritage assets

- 25.9.566 Whilst temporary construction activities relating to the offshore elements of the Proposed Development may be perceptible from onshore designated heritage assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) (listed in **Table 25-18**), any effect on setting over and above those presented by the complete structures will be considered temporary and short-lived. Therefore this will lead to a **Very Low** (**Table 25-25**) magnitude of change resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which will be **Not Significant** in EIA terms (**Table 25-26**).

## 25.10 Assessment of effects: Operation and maintenance phase

### Onshore substation at Oakendene near Cowfold

Overview

- 25.10.1 On completion of the construction phase, operational elements of the onshore substation such as the building/s to house electrical components and equipment, security fencing, compensatory flood features and mitigation planting will remain, with an operational lifetime of around 30 years. Resulting effects on the settings of heritage assets would be long-term and reversible on decommissioning. Any disturbance of archaeological heritage assets within the proposed DCO Order Limits will occur during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. No further effects are anticipated during the operation of the Proposed Development.

Effects arising through change to historic landscape character

- 25.10.2 Magnitude of change, and hence the significance of potential effects, have been assessed on the assumption that the embedded environmental measures from **Table 25-23** have been implemented as part of the Proposed Development.
- 25.10.3 At the onshore substation site at Oakendene, change to the historic landscape character, which is of **Low** (**Table 25-24**) heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting from a loss of historic interest will be permanent, giving rise to a **Medium**

(**Table 25-25**) magnitude of change. This results in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which is **Not Significant** in EIA terms (**Table 25-26**).

## Effects arising through change to setting of heritage assets

### Introduction

- 25.10.4 On complete of the construction phase, impacts resulting from the operational elements of the onshore substation at Oakendene will persist. The maximum design parameters are provided in **Table 25-22**. The onshore substation will introduce new physical and audible elements to the setting of heritage assets. Planting and landscaping (as detailed in the **Design and Access Statement** (Document Reference: 5.8) and **Outline LEMP** (Document Reference: 7.10)) will aim to minimise the impact of the physical appearance of the onshore substation, though this represents a potential source of change to the setting of heritage assets, which may affect heritage significance.
- 25.10.5 Magnitude of change, and hence the significance of potential effects, have been assessed on the assumption that the embedded environmental measures from **Table 25-23** have been implemented as part of the Proposed Development.
- 25.10.6 An appraisal has been undertaken, with reference to the relevant LVIA ZTVs, to identify designated assets which have the potential to be affected by the onshore substation, in accordance with Step 1 of the Historic England (2017a) guidance (GPA 3) (see **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7)). Where potentially significant effects may arise, those assets are subject to a more detailed assessment in this ES chapter.

### Grade II Listed Oakendene Manor (NHLE 1027074)

- 25.10.7 Oakendene Manor (NHLE 1027074) is assessed as having high heritage significance for architectural and historic interests (see **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). Oakendene Manor is located 90m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits. The built elements of the onshore substation will be located to the southeast of the asset partially behind an existing hedgerow and trees, with an operational access leading from the A272. Proposed mitigation planting of parkland trees will be to the northwest of the onshore substation, together with wet woodland to the south. During the operation and maintenance phase of the Proposed Development, physical changes to the setting of the asset (as described in **Section 25.9**), which occur as a result of the construction phase, will persist, though reducing as the new planting grows and matures.
- 25.10.8 To visually illustrate change to setting, reference is made to relevant LVIA visualisations including:
- Viewpoint SA10 located at the edge of the garden area to the south of Oakendene Manor (**Figure 18.76, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.18) [**REP5-043**] (updated at Deadline 5)). This viewpoint illustrates the character of views permitted southeast from within the garden setting of Oakendene Manor toward the onshore substation site. However, it is considered supplementary to

viewpoint SA11, as it is located away from the manor house on a garden boundary;

- Viewpoint SA11 at the patio area immediately adjacent to Oakendene Manor (**Figure 18.77, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.18) **[REP5-043]** (updated at Deadline 5)). This viewpoint is considered representative of views southeast from the manor house itself, in the direction of the onshore substation site;
- Viewpoint SA3 on PRow 1786 south of Taintfield Wood (**Figure 18.12, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.18) **[REP5-041]** (updated at Deadline 5)). Oakendene Manor is revealed in views from this location when leaving Taintfield Wood and walking southwest down the hill in the direction of the manor itself. From here the architectural interest of Oakendene Manor can be appreciated within the context of the former parkland, though this is at a distance with views of the manor filtered through existing intervening trees; and
- Viewpoint SA12 on PRow 1787 to the east of Taintfield Wood (**Figure 18.78, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.18) **[REP5-043]** (updated at Deadline 5)). Incidental views of Oakendene Manor are possible through a gap in a hedge when walking along PRow 1787, which is considered secondary to the revealed views permitted south of Taintfield Wood (shown in VP SA3). In this view the manor is visible at a greater distance than that shown in VP SA3, with its architectural definition appearing much less prominent within the context of the former parkland setting, which becomes less distinguishable from the surrounding trees on the horizon due to the elevation of the viewpoint.

25.10.9 There is predicted visual change to the setting of the heritage asset during the operation and maintenance phase:

- heavily filtered distant views of the onshore substation from the asset looking southeast. On completion of the landscape and planting mitigation, views toward the onshore substation from the manor house would become less prominent (see illustrative views from LVIA VP SA11, **Figure 18.77c to h, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.18) **[REP5-043]** (updated at Deadline 4)). This is also the case in views toward the onshore substation from the edge of garden to the south of Oakendene Manor (see illustrative views from LVIA VP SA10, **Figure 18.76c to e, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.18) **[REP5-043]** (updated at Deadline 5));
- the onshore substation would be perceptible in views of the asset from elevated ground to the south near Taintfield Wood (LVIA VP SA3, **Figure 18.12, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.18) **[REP5-041]** (updated at Deadline 5) and (LVIA VP SA12, **Figure 18.78c to e, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.18) **[REP5-043]** (updated at deadline 4)). The local topography and existing and proposed planting are anticipated to partly diminish the appearance of the onshore substation. The onshore substation would be perceptible in long filtered views of the asset afforded when moving along the Public Right of Way (PRow) (1786) on the hillside to the south from Taintfield Wood (LVIA VP SA3, **Figure 18.12, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.18) **[REP5-041]** (updated at Deadline 5)). The onshore substation would also be perceptible from more distant, partially filtered views of the asset from PRow 1787, which are afforded through an existing gap in a hedgerow on the eastern approach to Taintfield Wood (LVIA VP SA12, **Figure 18.78c to e, Volume 3**



(Document Reference: 6.3.18) **[REP5-043]** (updated at Deadline 5). In this instance, elements of the onshore substation (primarily the firewalls) may partially obscure views of the manor house itself. The onshore substation is likely to become more prominent in views when moving downhill north-eastwards, closer to the asset. However, at the same time, visibility of the asset itself is diminished due the change in topography and screening provided by existing planting along the south edge of the proposed DCO Order Limits; and

- the presence of the onshore substation will have an urbanising effect on the rural setting of Oakendene Manor.

25.10.10 The gardens, the 19th century extent of the historic parkland with parkland trees and key views southward toward the boating lake will not be affected.

25.10.11 Predicted changes described would diminish the contribution of the setting to the heritage significance of the asset. Physical changes to the historic parkland will be permanent. The architectural interests of the asset, from which primarily derives its heritage significance, will not be affected. Where perception of the onshore substation would detract from filtered views of the asset in which its architectural interest can be appreciated within its rural parkland setting, sensitive design in line with embedded environmental measure C-68 will seek to minimise visual effects. This would be an impact of **Medium** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in **Major adverse** residual effect which would be **Significant**. As noted at **paragraph 25.8.18**, adverse change of less than a high magnitude to a designated heritage asset or non-designated heritage assets of equivalent heritage significance will normally be considered to comprise less than substantial harm. In this case, a medium magnitude of change would constitute less than substantial harm. This is because the listed building itself will be physically unaltered and important elements of its setting, including its relationship with the immediately surrounding gardens and the view to the south, will be preserved.

#### Grade II Listed Bankfield Farmhouse (NHLE 1193164)

25.10.12 Bankfield Farmhouse (NHLE 1193164) has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see **Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 170m from the proposed DCO Order Limits, at its closest point, which is an operational access (A-60), whilst it lies approximately 450m from the onshore substation at Oakendene.

25.10.13 Whilst there is theoretical visibility from the asset of the onshore substation (**Figure 25.7, Volume 3** (Document Reference: 6.3.25)), in reality, views north and east from the asset are heavily screened due to intervening planting and topography. It is possible that taller elements of construction infrastructure may be visible through or over the tree cover.

25.10.14 Operation of the onshore substation will not diminish the contribution that the farmstead setting, provided by the proximity and relationship with agricultural buildings, contributes to the asset's heritage significance, it will have an urbanising effect on the agricultural land associated with the asset.

- 25.10.15 The predicted changes are not considered sufficient to give rise to any discernible loss of the architectural or historic interest of the asset.
- 25.10.16 No loss of heritage significance is anticipated and consequently **No Effect** would arise on Bankfield Farmhouse.

#### Grade II Listed Eastlands Farm (NHLE 1381153)

- 25.10.17 Eastlands Farm (NHLE 1381153) has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 570m from the proposed DCO Order Limits, though the proposed onshore substation at Oakendene is located over 1km from the asset. Whilst the upper element of the substation buildings may be visible through or over the tree cover, at this distance, any perceptibility of the Proposed Development would not change the historic or architectural interests of the asset, nor the ability to appreciate these interests.
- 25.10.18 The Proposed Development is not expected to result in the loss of heritage significance and consequently there would be **No Effect** on this asset.

## Existing National Grid Bolney substation extension

### Introduction

- 25.10.19 This section of the assessment considers heritage assets which [Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7) identified as being scoped in for effects arising due to change to setting as a result of operation and maintenance of the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension. On completion of the construction phase, operational elements of the National Grid Bolney substation extension, will remain, with an operational lifetime of around 30 years.
- 25.10.20 Where potential effects are identified, an indication is provided of the range of magnitude of change and heritage significance (or sensitivity) definitions for each potential effect based on the definitions provided in [Section 25.8](#). The magnitude of change, and hence the significance of potential effects, have been assessed on the assumption that the embedded environmental measures from [Table 25-23](#) have been implemented as part of the Proposed Development. Noise effects as a result of the operation of the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension were assessed as negligible in the existing National Grid Bolney Extension PEI (RED, 2023).

#### Grade II Listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579)

- 25.10.21 Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579) has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.4: Onshore geophysical survey report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.4)). The asset is located 205m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits and 270m east of the proposed operational built elements of the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension. As assessed in the existing National Grid Bolney Extension PEI (RED, 2023), Bolney substation extension operational noise effects are negligible.

- 25.10.22 Operation of the National Grid Bolney substation extension will contribute to the effects of existing electrical infrastructure, which adversely contributes to the heritage significance of the asset as it erodes the rural character of the asset's wider agricultural setting. However, this change is relatively limited being confined to a limited extent outside of the existing electrical infrastructure and would be short-term temporary. This would be an impact of **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**. This would constitute less than substantial harm to heritage significance of the asset.

## Offshore substation and wind turbine generators

### Effects arising through change to setting of heritage assets

- 25.10.23 On completion of the construction phase, operational elements of the offshore elements of the Proposed Development, including the offshore substations and WTGs will remain, with an operational lifetime of around 30 years. The effects on heritage assets are likely to arise through visual perception of the operational offshore elements of the Proposed Development extending from LAT.
- 25.10.24 In applying the principals for selection of heritage assets, as described in **Appendix 25.7: Settings assessment scoping report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.7), the majority of the heritage assets within the Seascape Study Area are considered unlikely to be impacted due to the nature of the asset, topography, intervening planting and built infrastructure, and the relative distance from the wind farm array area. This also includes some heritage assets with views out to sea but where those views do not make an important contribution to the asset's heritage significance, therefore any perceptibility of the offshore elements of the Proposed Development is unlikely to impact that heritage significance. Example heritage asset types include field systems and bowl barrows dotted along on the chalk ridge of the South Downs, where views of the sea are likely to be circumstantial to the primary character of the asset. Those heritage assets which are not listed in **Table 25-27** have not been considered for more detail assessment as part of the ES, unless to reflect any substantial change in the maximum assessment assumptions.
- 25.10.25 This section describes the effects arising through change to setting of heritage assets during the operation and maintenance phase of the offshore substation and WTGs. The magnitude of change and heritage significance (sensitivity) for each affected asset is described, based on the definitions provided in **Section 25.8**. Magnitude of change, and hence the significance of effects, have been assessed on the assumption that the embedded environmental measures from **Table 25-23** have been implemented as part of the Proposed Development, including the design principles (as set out in **Section 15.7, Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15)) applied to the design of Rampion 2 particularly in regard to the spatial extent of the wind farm array area component of the proposed DCO Order Limits. Implementation of these principles have typically reduced the visible horizontal field of view (HFoV) and the proximity of the wind farm array area to certain SLVIA receptors (see **Table 15-27, Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15)) since

the design of the Proposed Development provided in the original PEIR (RED, 2021), and therefore minimising the magnitude of change assessed at PEIR (see [paragraphs 15.7.53, Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15)). The SLVIA receptors overlap with historic environment receptors or view from which can be considered representative of other historic environment receptors within a similar location and landscape setting.

- 25.10.26 The assessment of effects has been completed with reference to illustrations including ZTV and photomontages, as referenced in the text below. These illustrate the number and relative scale of WTGs which would be visible, with the assessment also taking account of the movement of the blades. Where photomontages show that offshore sub-stations will also be visible, it is apparent that these will appear relatively small in comparison and will not have any additional effect on the settings of any of the assets being assessed. These are therefore not considered any further in the assessment.

Scheduled monument Napoleonic Barracks 480m south-west of Foxhole Farm Cuckmere Haven (NHLE 1002201)

- 25.10.27 Napoleonic Barracks 480m south-west of Foxhole Farm Cuckmere Haven (NHLE 1002201) has high heritage significance for archaeological and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [APP-214]). The asset is located 26.5km northeast of the wind farm array area. The offshore substation and WTGs are likely to be partially visible in distant sea views from the heritage asset during the operation and maintenance phase, as indicated by SLVIA VP 28 taken from Cuckmere Haven Beach ([Figure 15.5, Figure 15.87 and Figure 15.106, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15) and would be more visually prominent than the existing Rampion 1. Offshore elements of Rampion 2 would be viewed in direct context of the dramatic white cliffs of the coast, occupying the western aspect of the seaward views. The juxtaposition of the cliffs and offshore development on the horizon would have the effect of diminishing the apparent scale of the offshore development as it would be viewed from the asset. Whilst the offshore development would likely detract from seaward views which contribute to the asset's significance, this would not affect the overall understanding of the asset's relationship with the sea and wider defensive coastal landscape, resulting in a limited loss of historic interest, which would be long-term and reversible. The archaeological interest of the asset will be unaffected. Overall, this results in an impact of **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**. This would constitute less than substantial harm to heritage significance of the asset.

Scheduled monument Newhaven military fort and lunette battery (NHLE 1002242)

- 25.10.28 Newhaven military fort and lunette battery (NHLE 1002242) has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [APP-214]). The asset is located 21.8km northeast of the wind farm array area.

- 25.10.29 The offshore substation and WTGs would be visible in panoramic views from the elevated areas of the heritage asset (such as the gun emplacements) during the operation and maintenance phase, as illustrated by SLVIA VP 5 ([Figure 15.30, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)) on Castle Hill 155m to the southwest of the asset. Where the existing Rampion 1 wind farm is present in the southwest views from the asset, the proposed offshore development would be more prominent due to the scale contrast of the proposed WTGs compared to the smaller Rampion 1 WTGs and the lateral spread of WTGs extending the WTG developed skyline.
- 25.10.30 At the lowest elevations within the asset, views of the offshore development are predicted to be significantly less prominent due to the relative scale and screening of the existing infrastructure within the foreground of seaward views (such as the breakwater and lighthouse).
- 25.10.31 Whilst the offshore development would likely detract from south-westerly seaward views which contribute to the asset's significance, this would not affect the overall understanding of the asset's relationship with the sea and wider defensive coastal landscape, resulting in a limited loss of historic interest, which would be long-term and reversible. The archaeological interest of the asset will be unaffected. Overall, this results in an impact of **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**. This would constitute less than substantial harm to heritage significance of the asset.

#### Scheduled monument Camp near Belle Tout lighthouse Birling Gap (NHLE 1002288)

- 25.10.32 The Camp near Belle Tout lighthouse Birling Gap (NHLE 1002288) has high heritage significance for archaeological and historic interest. The asset is located 28.8km northeast of the wind farm array area (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [**APP-214**]).
- 25.10.33 The offshore substation and WTGs would be visible in panoramic views from the cliff top on which the heritage asset is located during the operation and maintenance phase. This is represented by SLVIA VP 2 ([Figure 15.27](#) and [Figure 15.94, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)) at Birling Gap, 140m to the northwest of the asset at a lower elevation. Views of the offshore development from the asset would be seen as distinct from, but within the context of, the existing Rampion 1 wind farm as well as passing shipping traffic and smaller vessels. Due to distance, visibility of the offshore development from the asset is likely to vary according to weather conditions at sea and on the coast. When conditions permit, the relative scale of the offshore development on the distant horizon within long sweeping views of the sea and coastline is predicted to detract to a relatively minor degree, resulting in a limited loss of historic interest. this would not affect the overall understanding of the asset's relationship with the sea and wider defensive coastal landscape, resulting in a limited loss of historic interest, which would be long-term and reversible. The archaeological interest of the asset will be unaffected. Overall, this results in an impact of **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**. This would constitute less than substantial harm to heritage significance of the asset.

Scheduled monument A 19th century artillery fort known as Littlehampton Fort 317m southwest of the Windmill Theatre (NHLE 1005809)

- 25.10.34 The 19th century artillery fort known as Littlehampton Fort 317m southwest of the Windmill Theatre (NHLE 1005809) has high heritage significance for archaeological and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [APP-214]). The asset is located 15.3km north of the wind farm array area. Whilst the coastal setting makes a positive contribution to the asset's heritage significance, this is not experienced though a visual connection with the sea due the height of surrounding grassed dunes which effectively screens views out to sea from the asset, and which would also preclude visibility of the offshore substation and WTGs. Whilst the offshore development may be visible in views towards the asset, these views are not considered to contribute to the asset's significance, due to its sand and grassed covered condition which effectively camouflages it with the surrounding dunes and it does not appear as distinctive feature in horizontal views across the landscape. Whilst the offshore development introduces new electrical infrastructure into the sea, directly south and southeast of the asset, which is intrinsically link to asset's historic function and architectural interest, this is not expected to affect how the asset is experienced or result in a loss of heritage significance. Consequently, there would be no effect on this asset. Scheduled monument Shoreham Fort 120m SSE of East House (NHLE 1005824)
- 25.10.35 The Shoreham Fort 120m SSE of East House (NHLE 1005824) has high heritage significance for historic, architectural and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [APP-214]). The asset is located 17.6km north of the wind farm array area. The offshore substation and WTGs would be visible in views from the heritage asset during the operation and maintenance phase, and in views of the asset from the surrounding area of the beach and promenade. This is illustrated to some degree in SLVIA VP 9 ([Figure 15.34, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)), which is located at Shoreham-by-Sea promenade, 375m inland and includes views of the asset. Visibility of the proposed offshore development would introduce new electrical infrastructure into the setting of the asset which would be perceptible in views from and of the asset and would contribute to the existing developed character of its setting defined by the surrounding urban and industrial infrastructure.
- 25.10.36 Whilst the offshore development would likely detract from seaward views which contribute to the asset's significance, this would not affect the overall understanding of the asset's relationship with the sea and wider defensive coastal landscape, resulting in a limited loss of historic interest, which would be long-term and reversible. The archaeological interest of the asset will be unaffected. Overall, this results in an impact of **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**. This would constitute less than substantial harm to heritage significance of the asset.

Scheduled monument Arundel Castle (NHLE 1012500), Grade II\* Listed Arundel Castle Registered Park and Garden (NHLE 1000170) and Grade I, II\* and II Listed Buildings at Arundel Castle (List entry nos. 1027926, 1027928, 1248038, 1353747 1414107)

- 25.10.37 The assets in this grouping have high heritage significance for historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [APP-214]) and are located 21.2km north of the Offshore Array Area.
- 25.10.38 There is variability across the assets in this grouping as to the amount of WTG blade tips that will be theoretically visible from them in southern seaward views. (see [Figure 15.56a, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)). For example, between 53 and 65 blade tips are predicted from the highest points of this grouping, from high topographical points within Arundel Park and from atop Arundel Castle. Whilst in lower areas, which forms the majority of views from these assets, zero blade tips are predicted to be visible. Ultimately, many of the views from and to these assets will be short and a combination of topography, built forms and screening will screen the blade tips completely. For an illustration of the number of blade tips theoretically visible and for a depiction of their relative scale, see SLVIA VP 33, which was taken from the castle ([Figure 15.56, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.39 The impact of the Offshore Array Area is anticipated to be small due to the intervening distance, lack of visibility from certain assets and because the primary contribution of setting to the interests of the assets is not necessarily dependent on views of the sea. For example, the interest of the assets within this grouping are more enhanced by views of their immediate surroundings, including their topographical dominance, and through views between them. However, an element of this dominance includes long views of the coast, which would include views of the Offshore Array Area from key illustrative vantage points, particularly from atop the castle and from high points within the historic park. From most views the Offshore Array Area will not be visible.
- 25.10.40 The assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Low** magnitude of change, with the resulting **Moderate adverse** residual effect arising from the visibility of WTGs in key views from high points within the asset grouping. Overall, the impact would be **Not Significant** because the majority of views to and from the assets, which form most of the contribution of their setting to their interests, will be unaffected.

Scheduled monument Long Barrow on Beacon Hill (NHLE 1013067) and Long barrow on Beacon Hill 160m north west of the windmill (NHLE 1015229)

- 25.10.41 The Long Barrow on Beacon Hill (NHLE 1013067) and Long barrow on Beacon Hill 160m north west of the windmill have high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [APP-214]). They are located 18.7km northeast of the Offshore Array Area.
- 25.10.42 It is predicted that between 53 and 65 WTG blade tips will be theoretically visible from the entirety of both assets (see [Figure 15.32a, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)). It is also predicted that the Offshore Array Area

WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. Three offshore substations will also be theoretically visible, although the easternmost substation will appear as the largest. For an illustration of this, see SLVIA VP 7 ([Figure 15.32e, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).

- 25.10.43 The Offshore Array Area would detract minimally from seaward views from the asset by eroding the understanding of the experience of the prehistoric peoples who historically utilised both assets, specifically their relationship with the sea. This would affect the historic interest of both assets, while their archaeological interest would remain wholly intact. The impact of the Offshore Array Area is minimised to an extent by existing modern elements which will draw focus from the WTGs and offshore substations. This includes vehicle traffic along Marine Drive, which severs views towards the sea to an extent, and marine vessels visible towards the horizon. Ultimately, the understanding of the assets' historic interest as relating to agriculture and funerary rites in the area will remain intact.
- 25.10.44 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change. The resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect will be **Not Significant**.

#### Scheduled monument Hillfort and a bowl barrow on Seaford Head (NHLE 1014523)

- 25.10.45 The Hillfort and a bowl barrow on Seaford Head has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [**APP-214**]). It is located 24.1km northeast of the Offshore Array Area.
- 25.10.46 Within the boundary of the monument, there is variability regarding the number of WTG blade tips that will theoretically be visible (see [Figure 15.29a, Volume 3](#), of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)). It is predicted that between 53 and 65 WTG blade tips will be visible from the western and southern portions of the asset in south westerly views and that none will be visible from its northern extent. It is also predicted that the Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. For an approximate illustration of the number of blade tips theoretically visible and for a depiction of their relative scale, see SLVIA VP 4 ([Figure 15.29, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.47 The Offshore Array Area would detract from south-westerly seaward views which contribute towards the asset's heritage significance and will alter to some extent our understanding of historical utilisation of the asset. However, it would not affect the overall understanding of the asset's possible role in sea defence, agriculture, and funerary practice because its relationship with the surrounding headland will not be altered and views of the sea will be readily accessible. The archaeological interest of the asset would remain unaffected.
- 25.10.48 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, with a resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect which is **Not Significant**.



Scheduled monument Hillfort, the possible remains of a Romano-Celtic temple and a group of three bowl barrows at Hollingbury (NHLE 1014526)

- 25.10.49 The Hillfort, the possible remains of a Romano-Celtic temple and a group of three bowl barrows at Hollingbury has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [APP-214]). It is located 22.4km northeast of the Offshore Array Area.
- 25.10.50 Between 53 and 65 WTG blade tips will be theoretically visible from within the majority of the monument, with this number rapidly falling to zero at its northeastern extent. Tree and bush cover will also filter some views of the WTGs looking seawards (see [Figure 15.50a, Volume 3](#), of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)). It is also predicted that the Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. For an illustration of this, see SLVIA VP 27 ([Figure 15.50, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.51 The Offshore Array Area would detract minimally from seaward views from the asset by eroding the understanding of the experience of the prehistoric peoples who historically utilised the asset. Although, this erosion is lessened by the existing modern anthropogenic activity that also detracts from these views, for example, large transitory vessels visible on the horizon. The intervening and prevalence of the trees and bushes within the monument that filters seaward views also lessen the impact. The archaeological interest of the asset would remain unaffected.
- 25.10.52 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, with a resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect which is **Not Significant**.

Scheduled monument Cissbury Ring hillfort, prehistoric flint mine and associated remains (NHLE 1015817)

- 25.10.53 Cissbury Ring hillfort, prehistoric flint mine and associated remains has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [APP-214]). It is located 18.9km northeast of the Offshore Array Area.
- 25.10.54 Between 53 and 65 WTG blade tips are theoretically visible from within the majority of the asset's boundary, although, mature tree planting and bushed filter some seaward views containing the blade tips (see [Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25) [APP-114]). No blade tips are theoretically visible from the northern and western fringes of the asset. It is also predicted that the Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. For an illustration of this, see SLVIA VP 18 ([Figure 15.43, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.55 The Offshore Array Area will be prominent in southward vistas looking from the asset towards the seascape, impacting the understanding of the asset's historic interest. The asset, will, however, retain its dominance through long southwards

views and the understanding of its role as occupying a strategic position will regardless remain largely intact. Ultimately, the introduction of more electrical infrastructure into the setting of the asset will distract from the existing understanding of historical utilisation of the asset through its phases of occupation and its historical interest will remain substantially whole. Despite this alteration, archaeological interest will remain wholly intact.

- 25.10.56 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Low** magnitude of change, with a resulting **Moderate adverse** residual effect arising from the extent of the array visible in key southern vistas. Overall, the impact will be **Not Significant** because the asset's historic interest will be retained through its relationship with its immediate surroundings, which will not be affected.

Scheduled monument Highdown Hill Camp: A Ram's Hill type enclosure an Anglo-Saxon cemetery and associated remains (NHLE 1015877)

- 25.10.57 Highdown Hill Camp: A Ram's Hill type enclosure an Anglo-Saxon cemetery and associated remains has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [**APP-214**]). It is located 16.6km north of the Offshore Array Area.
- 25.10.58 Between 53 and 65 WTG blade tips are theoretically visible from within the majority of the asset's boundary, although this number approximately halves at its northern extent (see [Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). It is also predicted that the Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. For an illustration of this, see SLVIA VP 19 ([Figure 15.44, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.59 The Offshore Array Area will be prominent in southwards views of the seascape from the asset, harming the contribution of its setting to its heritage significance, by introducing new elements of the electrical infrastructure. This is likely to distract from the understanding of the historical utilisation of the asset, while retaining substantial elements, including the overall comprehension of the asset's historic interest. Archaeological interest will be unaffected.
- 25.10.60 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Low** magnitude of change, with a resulting **Moderate adverse** residual effect. Due to the distance and the existing presence of modern coastal development visible from the asset, this will be **Not Significant**.

Scheduled monument Martello tower no 74 on Seaford Esplanade (NHLE 1017359)

- 25.10.61 The Martello tower no 74 on Seaford Esplanade has high heritage significance for historic and archaeological interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8) [**APP-214**]). It is located 23.7km northeast of the Offshore Array Area.
- 25.10.62 Between 53 and 65 WTG blade tips are theoretically visible from within the majority of the asset's boundary, although none are predicted to be visible from its lower levels (see [Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference:

6.3.25)). It is also predicted that the Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. For an illustration of this, see SLVIA VP 4 (Figure 15.29, Volume 3 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)), which was taken approximately 550m to the southeast, along Seaford Head West.

- 25.10.63 Whilst the Offshore Array Area is anticipated to detract from south-westerly seaward views which contribute to the asset's heritage significance, this would not affect the overall understanding of the asset's relationship with the sea and wider defensive coastal landscape. Consequently, a limited loss of historic interest is predicted, which would be long-term and reversible. The archaeological interest of the asset will be unaffected.
- 25.10.64 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, with the resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Selsey Old Town Conservation Area

- 25.10.65 Selsey Old Town Conservation Area and the listed buildings located therein have high heritage significance drawn from historic and architectural interest (See [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located approximately 14.9km northwest of the Offshore Array Area. The lack of clear views toward the sea in the conservation area owing to the beach being built up higher than street level at Albion Road restricts the appearance of visual elements of Rampion 2 to outward views from upper floor levels in Fishers Cottage (NHLE 1354552) and other, non-designated residential buildings within the conservation area. This minimised setting relationship with longer sea views from the conservation area would not be meaningfully affected by the Rampion 2 wind farm's operation. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Sidlesham Quay Conservation Area

- 25.10.66 Sidlesham Quay Conservation Area is assessed as being of high heritage significance drawn from historic and architectural interest. The conservation area is located approximately 18km northwest of the Offshore Array Area. Views from Mill Lane southward across Pagham Harbour and south of a field in the southeastern extent of the conservation area have theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. While these would form a distinctively modern visual component in long-distance views the contribution of a seaward view to the significance of the conservation area would not be substantially affected. The sea would still be perceptible from the asset with WTGs as a component and the illustrative links to the hamlet's maritime development would be maintained. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

## Aldwick Bay Conservation Area

25.10.67 Aldwick Bay Conservation Area and the grade II listed buildings contained therein are assessed as being of high heritage significance drawn from historical and architectural interest. The asset is located within an area of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. These would appear in long-distance seaward views to the south at a distance of approximately 16km (illustrated in [Figure 15.37, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15), Viewpoint 12 and [Figure 15.38, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15), Viewpoint 13 though these viewpoints are outwith the conservation area). The operational Offshore Array would appear far enough out into the bay to create a sense of visual separation and maintain the visual sense of a link between the conservation area and the sea. The panoramic and vista views from the upper floors of beach-adjacent properties would be minimally affected, though the WTGs would create a new, unambiguously modern, visual component to these views. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

## Craigweil House, Aldwick Conservation Area

25.10.68 Craigweil Conservation Area is assessed as being of high heritage significance drawn from historic and architectural interest. The asset is located approximately 15.9km from the Offshore Array Area. The asset is located within an area of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. These would appear in long-distance seaward views to the south at a distance of approximately 15km (illustrated in [Figure 15.37, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15), Viewpoint 12 and [Figure 15.38, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15), Viewpoint 13 though these viewpoints are outwith the conservation area). The operational Offshore Array would appear far enough out into the bay to create a sense of visual separation and maintain the visual sense of a link between the conservation area and the sea. The panoramic and vista views from the upper floors of Beach Terrace (NHLE 1434491) and surrounding buildings would be minimally affected, though the WTGs would create a new, unambiguously modern, visual component to these views. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

## Aldwick Road, Bognor Conservation Area

25.10.69 Aldwick Road (Bognor Regis) Conservation Area and the listed buildings contained therein are assessed as being of high heritage significance, associated with architectural and historic interest. The Offshore Array would appear in long views to the south at a distance of approximately 15.5km from within the conservation area, and the assets are in a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs (as illustrated in [Figure 15.37, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15), Viewpoint 12, from Bognor Regis promenade). While visual links to and from the seascape are crucial to the understanding of the context of the area's development as a seaside resort town, the appearance of WTGs would be far enough out into the bay to create a sense of visual separation and maintain the visual sense of a link between the conservation area and the sea. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance

(sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

#### The Steyne, Bognor Conservation Area

25.10.70 The Steyne (Bognor Regis) Conservation Area and the listed buildings contained therein are assessed as of high heritage significance drawn from historic and architectural interest. The Offshore Array would appear in long views to the south at a distance of approximately 15.3km from within the conservation area, and the assets are in a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs (as illustrated in **Figure 15.37, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15), Viewpoint 12, from Bognor Regis promenade). The contribution of seaward views to the significance of the conservation area particularly through Waterloo Square itself and listed buildings such as Bognor Pier (NHLE 1353808) is clear. The presence of new, clearly modern visual elements in long distance views would not, however compromise this, as a clear visual relationship between the assets and the sea would be maintained. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Littlehampton (River Road) Conservation Area

25.10.71 Littlehampton (River Road) Conservation Area and the listed buildings contained therein are assessed as of high heritage significance owing to historic and architectural interest. The conservation area is located approximately 16.1km north of the Offshore Array Area.

25.10.72 Seaward views contributing to the historic interest of the conservation area have been identified, associated with the grade II listed Cairo Club (NHLE 1027797). In addition, views of the sea are possible from the upper-storey balconies and windows of the non-designated riverfront terraces. The conservation area is located within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs at blade tip height. The introduction of the Offshore Array Area to long southward views associated with properties on the Arun riverfront would do little to compromise the association between these properties and the sea linked by the river, framing rather than disrupting the seascape as viewed from here. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Littlehampton (Sea Front) Conservation Area

25.10.73 Littlehampton (Sea Front) Conservation Area and the listed buildings located therein are assessed as of high heritage significance, drawn from historic and architectural interest. The conservation area is located approximately 15.3km north of the Offshore Array Area. The assets are located within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 of the proposed WTGs at blade tip height. The Offshore Array would appear in long distance vista and panoramic views of the sea from the conservation area, but the WTGs are not considered likely to impose on the contribution of these seaward views to the assets' historic interest via setting, contributing a "framing" to seaward views rather than interruption. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage

significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area

25.10.74 Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area and the contiguous listed buildings are assessed as of high heritage significance drawn from historic and architectural interest. The conservation area is located 13.5km from the Offshore Array Area. The assets are located in a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. The Offshore Array would appear in long distance views to the south and southwest. The distance of this new and distinctly modern, utilitarian visual component would not impose on visual links between the conservation area and associated assets and the seascape, given the WTGs would not interrupt views toward the sea. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Steyne Gardens Conservation Area

25.10.75 Steyne Gardens Conservation Area and the contiguous listed buildings therein are assessed as assets of high heritage significance derived from historic and architectural interest. The conservation area is located 13.7km from the Offshore Array Area and is within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. The new visual element provided by the Offshore Array would appear in the long distance limit of ubiquitous sea views from the conservation area's southern half. The WTGs would appear in the view but would not impose on the seascape's contribution to the significance of the assets. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

#### South Street Conservation Area

25.10.76 South Street Conservation Area and the contiguous listed buildings therein have high heritage significance for historic and architectural interest. The conservation area is located 13.4km from the Offshore Array Area. The assets are located within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. The Rampion 2 offshore array would appear in long distance seaward views as illustrated in **Figure 15.35, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15) south from the southern edge of the conservation area, from Marine Parade and particularly from the grade II listed pier (NHLE 1263242). These would appear beyond the horizon as viewed from these areas. While the existing Rampion 1 WTGs are already noted as a negative, though not significant, contribution through setting to asset significance and the presence of new visual elements through Rampion 2 would produce a similar effect they would not interrupt or obscure the seascape as viewed from the asset. The conservation area's architectural interest will be unaffected, and there would be no effect on outside of the southern edge of the conservation area. This would be a **Very Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect. While the offshore array would produce a clear visual element this would appear beyond the horizon, ensuring that the resulting effect would be **Not Significant**.

## Sackville Gardens Conservation Area

25.10.77 Sackville Gardens Conservation Area and the contiguous listed buildings therein are of high heritage significance drawn from historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area is located 18.8km northeast of the Offshore Array Area and the assets are located within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs despite being more distant elements (see [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)) illustrating a comparable view from further to the east along Brighton and Hove sea front). The Offshore Array would appear in long-distance seaward views to the south and be visible in long views from Kingsway and in panoramic views from the upper floor windows of the conservation area's southern residential terraces. This will not impose on the association of sea views with the historic interest of the assets reflecting the development and expansion of the Brighton and Hove seaside and will not affect an appreciation of the mix of architectural styles characterising the three principal residential streets of the conservation area. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

## Pembroke and Princes Conservation Area

25.10.78 Pembroke and Princes Conservation Area and the contiguous listed buildings therein are of high heritage significance drawn from architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area is located 18.7km to the northeast of the Offshore Array Area. The assets are located within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines despite being more distant elements (see [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)) illustrating a comparable view from further to the east along Brighton and Hove sea front). The Offshore Array would be visible in long-distance views from the southern edge of the conservation area, along Kingsway. However, No. 157 Kingsway (NHLE 1298639) is set well back from the sea front behind tree planting and a high perimeter wall (NHLE 1280502) and will not be affected. This will not affect the association of sea views with the historic interest of the assets reflecting the development and expansion of the Brighton and Hove seaside. An appreciation of the Victorian and Edwardian red brick residential development beyond the sea front will also not be affected. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

## Old Hove Conservation Area

25.10.79 Old Hove Conservation Area and the contiguous listed buildings therein are of high heritage significance based on historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area is located 18.8km

northeast of the Offshore Array Area, within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs despite being more distant elements (see [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15) illustrating a comparable view from further to the east along Brighton and Hove sea front). The Offshore Array would appear in long-distance seaward views the southwestern edge of the conservation area along Kingsway, but not from the core of the conservation area along Church Road where listed buildings such as the grade II\* listed Church of St Andrew (NHLE 1205303) are located. Seaward views from the southeastern part of the conservation area, including from the area of the grade II listed terraces at nos. 2-6 St Aubyns (NHLE 1292549) are constrained by the presence of seafront developments including the King Alfred Leisure Centre and tall residential development to the east. As a result of this there will be **No Effect** on the significance of these assets.

### Cliftonville Conservation Area

25.10.80 Cliftonville Conservation Area and its contiguous listed buildings are assessed as assets of high heritage significance drawn from historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area boundary is located 18.6km northeast of the Offshore Array Area and the assets are located within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs blade tips. The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs despite being more distant elements (see [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15) illustrating a comparable view from further to the east along Brighton and Hove seafront). The addition of the Offshore Array will be evident in long-distance seaward views from the southern edge of the conservation area. While the seascape setting is integral to southern views from many of the listed buildings below Kingsway and vistas of the seascape are possible from the grade II listed terraces at Courtney Terrace, past their gardens and over Hove Beach the new visual element would frame a sense of the seascape rather than obscuring it. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

### The Avenues Conservation Area

25.10.81 The Avenues Conservation Area and the contiguous listed buildings are of high heritage significance drawn from historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area boundary is located 18.6km northeast of the Offshore Array Area. The assets are located within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines despite being more distant elements. The Offshore Array would appear in long-distance views to the south from the conservation area (Viewpoint 8, [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document



Reference: 6.3.15) illustrating a comparable view from further to the east along Brighton and Hove sea front). While clear views of the seascape from the seafront are key to the assets' historic interest, the visual separation effect created by the distance of the turbines would ensure against a more substantial alteration of the visual contribution of the seaward view. Views from wide avenues to the sea would be largely unchanged as these are restricted presently. An appreciation of the character of the broad avenues and mixed architectural styles would be unaffected. This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Minor adverse** residual effect. Due to the distance to the WTGs, they would be seen to be over the horizon and so this would be **Not Significant**.

### Brunswick Town Conservation Area

25.10.82 Brunswick Town Conservation Area and the contiguous listed buildings are of high heritage significance for historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area boundary is located 18.5km northeast of the Offshore Array Area, and the assets are located within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 turbines (Viewpoint 8, [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15) illustrating a comparable view from slightly further to the east along Brighton and Hove sea front). The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs despite being more distant elements (see [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)). These would introduce an additional modern visual element to longer-distance seaward views, though the general sense of the seascape as a visual component would be preserved. The open spaces including Brunswick Square and Adelaide Crescent Gardens' relationship to the surrounding houses would be unaffected. While these spaces are designed to open up views to the sea, the presence of trees and mature landscape filter views and WTGs would not be apparent in views from these areas. This results in a **Low** magnitude of change introduced to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. Due to the distance to the WTGs, they would be seen to be over the horizon and so this would be **Not Significant**.

### Regency Square Conservation Area

25.10.83 Regency Square Conservation Area and its contiguous listed buildings are of high heritage significance based on historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area boundary is located 18.2km northeast of the Offshore Array Area and the assets are within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs despite being more distant elements (see [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)). The Offshore Array would be visible in long-distance seaward views from the conservation area. While the seascape makes a key contribution to the conservation area's architectural interest, particularly via vistas from Preston Street and views from the grade I

listed West Pier (NHLE 482018) and Hove Beach, the distance and visual separation of the visible turbine array would result in a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), producing a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. Due to the distance to the WTGs, they would be seen to be over the horizon and so this would be **Not Significant**.

### Old Town Conservation Area

25.10.84 Old Town Conservation Area and the contiguous listed buildings are of high heritage significance based on historic and architectural interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area boundary is located 18.3km northeast of the Offshore Array Area and the assets are within a zone of theoretical visibility for 53-65 WTGs. The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs despite being more distant elements. The Offshore Array would appear in long-distance seaward views to the south from the conservation area (illustrated in Viewpoint 8, [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)). Of the four character areas identified in the Old Town Conservation Area Character Statement, only the Seafront area would be affected by visibility of the larger scale and more numerous unambiguously modern visual element in the long-distance view of the. The dense network of narrow streets forming the bulk of this conservation area including The Lanes and The Centre character areas would be unaffected. Seaward views along Middle Street, Ship Street, Back Lion Street and East Street are tightly framed and would generally not be affected. This would be a **Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) creating a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. Due to the distance to the WTGs, they would be seen to be over the horizon and so this would be **Not Significant**.

### Valley Gardens Conservation Area

25.10.85 Valley Gardens Conservation Area and its contiguous listed buildings are of high heritage significance based on architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area boundary is located 17.9km northeast of the Offshore Array Area. The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs despite being more distant elements (see [Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)). The Offshore Array would be visible in long-distance seaward views from the south of the conservation area, including panoramic views from the grade II\* listed Palace Pier (NHLE 482063) and seafront. Views looking south from the assets at the northern extent of the conservation area will be restricted by intervening built forms, and the Offshore Array Area WTGs would generally not be visible from the northern assets, Royal Pavilion or the sequence of gardens forming the spine of this conservation area. The sense created in affected views of a historic link with the sea central to Brighton's past development would not be substantially degraded by the presence of the array, owing to distance and visual separation. In addition, the Offshore Array will not be visible from the gardens and open spaces

leading inland from the seafront, which form the spine of the conservation area. This results in a **Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. Due to the distance to the WTGs, they would be seen to be over the horizon and so this would be **Not Significant**.

East Cliff Conservation Area, including Grade II\* Listed Madeira Terrace, Madeira Walk (NHLE 1381696)

25.10.86 Valley Gardens Conservation Area and its contiguous listed buildings are of high heritage significance based on architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area boundary is located 18.2km northeast of the Offshore Array Area. The Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs despite being more distant elements. For an illustration of this see SLVIA VP 8 ([Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)), which was taken from approximately 500m west of the western edge of the conservation area. The Offshore Array will be visible in long-distance seaward views to the south of the conservation area, including panoramic views from the grade II\* listed Madeira Terrace (NHLE 1381696) and seafront in addition to passing and glimpsed views from assets further north. The sense created in these views of a historic link with the sea central to Brighton's past development would not be substantially degraded by the presence of the array, owing to distance and visual separation. This results in a **Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. Due to the distance to the WTGs, they would be seen to be over the horizon and so this would be **Not Significant**.

Kemp Town Conservation Area, including Registered Park and Garden Kemp Town Enclosures (RPG 1001313)

- 25.10.87 The assets in this grouping have high heritage significance for historic and architectural interests arising from their listed buildings (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). Kemp Town enclosure is located 18.3km northeast of the Offshore Array Area and Kemp Town Conservation Area is located approximately 18.2km to the northeast. Between 53 and 65 blade tips associated with the Offshore Array Area will be visible from some assets within the conservation area in long views looking southwest during the operation and maintenance phase (see [Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.10.88 It is predicted that the Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs. For an approximate illustration of this see SLVIA VP 8, which was taken approximately 1.7km to the northwest of the asset, from Brighton Beach ([Figure. 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.89 It is anticipated that the Offshore Array Area would present less than substantial harm to the heritage significance of the listed buildings within the conservation area and garden. While views of the seascape from these assets illustrate their

historic relationship with the sea and the growth of the eastern portion of Brighton as an extension of the seaside resort, intervening distance and existing visual elements, such as marine traffic and Brighton Marina, are predicted to draw focus from the Offshore Array Area.

- 25.10.90 The assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change, with a resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Rottingdean Conservation Area

- 25.10.91 Rottingdean Conservation Area and its listed buildings have high heritage significance for historic and architectural interests (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The conservation area is located 18.6km northeast of the Offshore Array Area. Up to approximately 30 blade tips associated with the Offshore Array Area will be visible from a handful of listed buildings in the eastern portion of the conservation area. Zero to one blade tips will be visible in southwestern views, however, from the majority of listed buildings, in the western extent of the conservation area (see [Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.10.92 It is predicted that the Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs in views from some of the listed buildings. Three offshore substations within the Rampion 2 array are also predicted to appear in these views, with the easternmost substation appearing as the largest. For an approximate illustration of these changes, see SLVIA VP 7, which was taken approximately 150m to the west of the conservation area, from the adjacent chalk hills ([Figure. 15.32, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.93 Rottingdean Conservation Area's historic interest is primarily derived from its agricultural past, although it does also have historical associations with fishing. This, combined with the fact that the majority of key views of the sea from within the conservation area face southeast, away from the Offshore Array Area, limits its anticipated impact. From the eastern extent of the conservation area, where views of the WTGs are most prevalent, it is predominantly the blade tips which will be visible.
- 25.10.94 The assets are of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Very Low** magnitude of change with a resulting **Minor adverse** residual effect which would be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Band Stand (NHLE 1027780), The Esplanade

- 25.10.95 The Band Stand has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 15.4km north of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 Rampion 2 WTG blade tips will be visible from the asset in long panoramic views looking south and southeast during the operation and maintenance phase ([Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). See SLVIA VP 12 for an illustration of

the view and appearance of Rampion 2 WTGs (**Figure 15.37c, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).

- 25.10.96 Where the existing Rampion 1 Wind Farm punctuates views from the asset, the Offshore Array Area would be more prominent due to the scale contrast between the proposed WTGs and the smaller Rampion 1 WTGs and the lateral spread of WTGs extending the field of view on the horizon in which WTGs may be seen (see **Figure 15.37c, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.97 The Offshore Array Area would detract from the asset's historic interest by harming its relationship with the seascape somewhat, whereby views of the sea reflect the asset's summer holiday and pleasure usage; however, the asset's visual and aesthetic relationship with surrounding seafront buildings would not be affected. Ultimately, it is anticipated that the asset's heritage significance will remain largely intact because while the seascape views that the asset was designed to take advantage of will be harmed, its historic interest will remain substantially comprehensible.
- 25.10.98 The asset is of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity) and overall, the impact of the Offshore Array Area would be of a **Low** magnitude of change, with a resulting **Moderate adverse** residual effect. Due to the distance to the WTGs, they would be seen to be over the horizon and so this would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II\* and II Listed Buildings in Bailiffscourt (NHLE 1027676, NHLE 1027637, NHLE 1027638, NHLE 1027677, NHLE 1233450, NHLE 1274459, NHLE 1276596, NHLE 1353879, NHLE 1353880)

- 25.10.99 The assets in this grouping have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see **Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located 16km north of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 Rampion 2 WTG blade tips will be visible from the asset in long panoramic views looking south during the operation and maintenance phase (**Figure 25.10, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.10.100 It is likely that the Offshore Array Area will not be visible from the majority of assets at Bailiffscourt due to their one-storey size and screening provided by intervening mature planting, buildings and hedgerows. It may be visible in views looking towards the seascape from the upper storeys of Bailiffscourt Hotel and Country Club (NHLE 1027676); however, this view is of little importance to the asset's heritage significance. While the coastal setting makes a positive contribution to the heritage significance of the assets, key views within the estate and between the assets will remain unaffected and their historic rural and leisure context will remain intact.
- 25.10.101 This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in **Minor adverse** residual effects, which would be **Not Significant**

Grade II Listed Climping Mill (NHLE 1027639)

- 25.10.102 The Climping Mill has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest see (**Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume**

4 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 15.7km north of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 Rampion 2 WTG blade tips will be visible from the asset in long panoramic views looking south and southeast during the operation and maintenance phase (see [Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).

- 25.10.103 It is anticipated that the Rampion 2 WTGs will have little effect on the heritage significance of the mill. This is because the asset derives its interests primarily from its relationship with its rural setting, which provides context for its historical usage as a mill. The understanding of the asset's later residential usage, may, however, be minimally impacted by the appearance of the Offshore Array Area in vistas looking south from its upper south elevation window by detracting from the seascape views it was intended to capture.
- 25.10.104 This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II listed Rustington Convalescent Home (NHLE 1274038) and Ancillary Building at Rustington Convalescent Home (NHLE 1274012)

- 25.10.105 The assets in this asset grouping have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located 15.2km north of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 Rampion 2 WTG blade tips will be visible from the asset in long panoramic views looking south and southwest during the operation and maintenance phase ([Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.10.106 Where the existing Rampion 1 Wind Farm punctuates views from NHLE 1274038, the offshore development would be more prominent due to the scale contrast between the proposed WTGs and the smaller Rampion 1 WTGs and the lateral spread of WTGs extending the field of view on the horizon in which WTGs may be seen. This would slightly harm the understanding of the contribution of seascape views to patient recovery which forms a key component of the asset's historic interest, although, visual links to its sculpted gardens and the ancillary building (NHLE 1274012) would be unaffected. Ultimately, no impact is predicted to the heritage significance of the ancillary building because seascape views contribute much less prominently to its interests.
- 25.10.107 Much like with the Rampion 1 Wind Farm, the impact of the Offshore Array Area is anticipated to be limited by the existing severing effect of the B2140 on the relationship between the home and the seascape.
- 25.10.108 This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in **Minor adverse** residual effects, which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed Vista Point, including Garages and Attached Walls (NHLE 1396577)

- 25.10.109 Vista Point has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 15.2km north of the

Offshore Array Area. Many of the Rampion 2 WTG blade tips associated with the western extent of the Offshore Array Area will be visible from the asset in long views looking south during the operation and maintenance phase.

- 25.10.110 It is predicted that the Proposed Development WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. SLVIA VP E (**Figure 15.78, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)) is illustrative of this, although it was taken from the beach approximately 2.5km to the east of the asset.
- 25.10.111 This represents long-term reversible minor harm to the heritage significance of the asset due to Rampion 2 WTGs appearing in southern vistas of the seascape, which were intended to be appreciated from the asset's balcony. While this view provides a key element of the contribution of the asset's setting to its heritage significance, its historic interest will remain substantially intact because these WTGs will appear on the horizon and will not dominate coastal views. Specifically, the association of the asset with renowned architect Patrick Gwynne will remain unaffected and thus the key component of its historic interest will remain intact. Also, the visual impact of the Rampion 2 WTGs will be offset by the ridges of sand that appear in southern views from the asset as the tide drops. This will draw focus from the Rampion 2 WTGs and lessen their impact.
- 25.10.112 This results in a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. This will be **Not Significant** because the asset's historical context will remain substantially intact.

#### Grade II Listed Runnymede (NHLE 1419211)

- 25.10.113 Runnymede has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see **Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 14.2km north of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 Rampion 2 WTG blade tips will be visible from the asset in long panoramic views looking south during the operation and maintenance phase (**Figure 25.10, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.10.114 It is predicted that the Rampion 2 WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs. SLVIA VP E is illustrative of this, although the images were taken from the beach approximately 740m to the east of the asset (see **Figure 15.78, Volume 3** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.115 This represents long-term reversible minor harm to the heritage significance of the asset due to Rampion 2 WTGs appearing in southern panoramas of the seascape, which were intended to be appreciated from the asset's south-facing balconies. Despite this, key components of the asset's historic and architectural interest will remain substantially intact. For example, the association between the asset and its renowned architect, Wells Coates, and its relationship with Sea Lane House (NHLE 1353897), including the appreciation of Runnymede's architecture in short views from Kingston Beach and Coastal Road, would not be impacted.

- 25.10.116 This results in a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. This will be **Not Significant** because the asset's historical context will remain substantially intact.

#### Grade II Listed 205-211, Brighton Road (NHLE 1025809)

- 25.10.117 205-211, Brighton Road has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 14.1km north of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 Rampion 2 WTG blade tips will be visible from the asset in long views looking south during the operation and maintenance phase ([Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.10.118 It is predicted that the Rampion 2 WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs. SLVIA VP 10, approximately 1.9km to the southwest and SLVIA VP F, approximately 2.2km to the northeast, provide illustrations of this ([Figures 15.35 and 15.79, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.119 The Offshore Array Area, therefore, is anticipated to negatively contribute to the interests of the asset, primarily by detracting from seaward views which reflect the design intentions of the architect and the historic utilisation of the asset. However, the asset's relationship with the seascape is not the key characteristic of the contribution of its setting, for example, views of Worthing Pier from the asset, which illustrates the association between both assets and their architect, Stanley Adshead, forming a key component of the asset's historical significance, will not be affected.
- 25.10.120 It is also anticipated that existing visual elements associated with traffic along the A259 will minimise this impact by drawing focus from the Offshore Array Area.
- 25.10.121 This results in a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. This would be **Not Significant** because the historical context of the asset will remain substantially intact.

#### Grade II listed Shelters at TQ 273 044 (NHLE 1292365) and TQ 270 045 (NHLE 1210002)

- 25.10.122 The assets in this asset grouping have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located 18.9km northeast of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 Rampion 2 WTG blade tips will be visible from the assets in long views looking south and southwest during the operation and maintenance phase ([Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.10.123 It is predicted that the Rampion 2 WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs.



- 25.10.124 The Offshore Array Area is anticipated to minimally detract from existing south-westerly seaward views from the assets' sea-facing seating, which positively contributes to their historic interest. This is because the shelters' siting along the seafront, which creates many intentional opportunities for panoramic views of the seascape, is illustrative of the design intentions and historical usage of the assets. The Offshore Array Area will, however, not feature in views looking from the north and east-facing shelter seating as these are angled away from the sea, thus restricting the impact on seaward views to half of each asset. Ultimately, the assets will retain their existing relationship with the seascape through views of the beach and promenade, despite the minimal intrusion of the Offshore Array Area.
- 25.10.125 Their architectural interest will also remain intact because the strong aesthetic and visual links formed with the similarly styled lampposts and the lido will not be affected by the Offshore Array Area. It will not affect the heritage significance of the assets.
- 25.10.126 This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

Grade II Listed Ian Fraser House, St Dunstons (NHLE 1380546), Chapel to Ian Fraser House, St Dunstons (NHLE 1380547), Walls to Ian Fraser House, St Dunstons (NHLE 1380548)

- 25.10.127 The assets in this asset grouping have high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The assets are located 18.7km northeast of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and Rampion 2 WTG 65 blade tips will be visible from Ian Fraser House and the chapel in long views looking southwest during the operation and maintenance phase ([Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)). Between 27-39 Rampion 2 WTG blade tips will be visible from the western extent of the walls (NHLE 1380548).
- 25.10.128 It is predicted that the Rampion 2 WTGs will be slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 WTGs.
- 25.10.129 Views of the seascape contribute positively to an extent to the interests of the assets, particularly Ian Fraser House (NHLE 1380546), but are not central to understanding their heritage significance. For example, while the Offshore Array Area will detract from the seaward panoramic views that the asset's architecture was designed to take advantage of, it is the understanding of its historical usage and association with renowned architects that is more significant. The Chapel (NHLE 1380548) and Walls (NHLE 1380548) possess fewer views of the sea and therefore, their interests are enhanced less by the seascape and subsequently there will be no impact on their heritage significance.
- 25.10.130 The impact of the Offshore Array Area will be limited by the existing severing effect of Brighton Road, which contributes transitional visual traffic to views of the seascape, by taking focus from the WTGs. Brighton Marina and the associated seaborne traffic are also anticipated to draw focus from the WTGs.

- 25.10.131 For Ian Fraser House, this results in a **Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. While the Offshore Array Area will affect its significance to an extent, its historical context will remain substantially intact, leading to an effect that will be **Not Significant**. For the Chapel and Walls, this results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to assets of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect that is **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed Roedean School Main Buildings (NHLE 1380831)

- 25.10.132 Roedean School Main buildings has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 18.7km north of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 WTG blade tips associated with the Offshore Array Area will be visible from the asset in long views looking southwest during the operation and maintenance phase ([Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) (Document Reference 6.3.25)).
- 25.10.133 It is predicted that the Proposed Development WTGs will appear slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. For an approximate illustration of this see SLVIA 6, which was taken approximately 4.6km to the southeast of the assets ([Figure. 15.31, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.134 The Offshore Array Area will detract from the desolate coastal character of the school by appearing within long views of the seascape from the asset, although they will appear over the horizon. It will also harm the understanding of the design intentions of the architect to incorporate panoramic views of the seascape from the asset's south elevation; however, the comprehension of the asset's historic interest as a school, the key element of its heritage significance, will remain intact. The changes will be long-term reversible and will ultimately not affect the key characteristics of the asset's heritage significance.
- 25.10.135 The impact of the Offshore Array Area in these views will also be offset by the dominating presence of Brighton Marina and the associated seaborne vessels which are anticipated to draw focus from the WTGs and offshore substation.
- 25.10.136 This results in a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect. While the Offshore Array Area will affect the significance of the asset to an extent, its historical context will remain substantially intact, leading to an effect that will be **Not Significant**.

#### Grade II Listed French Convalescent Home (NHLE 1380152)

- 25.10.137 The French Convalescent Home has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#), of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 18.4km northeast of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 Rampion 2 WTG blade tips will be visible from the south elevation of the asset in

long views looking southwest during the operation and maintenance phase (see [Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).

- 25.10.138 It is predicted that the Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. For an approximate illustration of this see SLVIA VP 8, which was taken approximately 2.5km to the northwest of the asset, from Brighton Beach ([Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.139 It is anticipated that the proposed WTGs will cause less than substantial harm to the heritage significance of the asset. This is because, while the asset's visual relationship with the seascape provides a key contribution of its setting towards its interests, existing intervening busy visual elements create a severing effect which will draw focus from the smaller scale of the proposed WTGs. The key characteristics of the asset will also remain intact, for example, its associations with British military history, which form the core of its historic interest.
- 25.10.140 This results in a **Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect. This will be **Not Significant** because the asset's historical context will remain substantially intact.

#### Grade II Listed 17<sup>th</sup> Century House (NHLE 1222778)

- 25.10.141 17<sup>th</sup> Century House has high heritage significance for architectural and historic interest (see [Appendix 25.8: Onshore heritage asset baseline report, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.25.8)). The asset is located 19.2km northeast of the Offshore Array Area. Between 53 and 65 WTG blade tips associated with the Offshore Array Area will be visible from the asset in long views looking southwest during the operation and maintenance phase (see [Figure 25.10, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.25)).
- 25.10.142 It is predicted that the Offshore Array Area WTGs will appear more numerous, slightly larger in scale and will occupy a broader extent of the horizon than the current Rampion 1 turbines. For an approximate illustration of this see SLVIA VP 8, which was taken approximately 1.1km to the southeast of the asset, from Telscombe Beach ([Figure 15.33, Volume 3](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.3.15)).
- 25.10.143 The Offshore Array Area will cause less than substantial harm to the heritage significance of the asset because views from the asset to the sea are not key to understanding its historic interest. Views of the asset from the surrounding roads, which include the seascape in the background, are more important and further the understanding of its relationship with the sea. These views would be minimally impacted due to intervening distance, topography, and the asset.
- 25.10.144 This results in a **Very Low** magnitude of change to an asset of **High** heritage significance (sensitivity), resulting in a **Minor adverse** residual effect, which would be **Not Significant**.

## 25.11 Assessment of effects: Decommissioning phase

- 25.11.1 It is anticipated that, during the decommissioning phase, the potential removal of the onshore substation, Bolney substation extension and the offshore substation and wind turbine generators will be the only works likely to be required. The onshore electrical cables will be left in-situ with ends cut, sealed and buried.

### Onshore substation

- 25.11.2 Potential impacts during the decommissioning of the onshore substation will be expected to be the same as those effects identified for the construction phase (**Section 25.9**). Removal of infrastructure will mitigate any visual and audible impacts arising during the operation and maintenance phase (as described in **Section 25.10**). Where mitigatory planting is retained, any effects on heritage significance through change to setting of heritage assets, as assessed for the operation and maintenance phase, will persist following decommissioning.

### Bolney substation extension

- 25.11.3 Potential impacts during the decommissioning of the Bolney substation extension will be expected to be the same as those effects identified for the construction phase (**Section 25.9**). Removal of infrastructure will mitigate any visual and audible impacts arising during the operation and maintenance phase (as described in **Section 25.10**). Where mitigatory planting is retained, any effects on heritage significance through change to setting of heritage assets, as assessed for the operation and maintenance phase, will persist following decommissioning.

### Offshore substation and wind turbine generators

- 25.11.4 Potential impacts during the decommissioning of the offshore substation and WTGs will be expected to be the same as those effects identified for the construction phase (**Section 25.6, Table 25-18 and Section 25.9**). Removal of infrastructure above sea level will mitigate any visual impacts arising during the operation and maintenance phase (as described in **Section 25.10**).

## 25.12 Assessment of cumulative effects

### Approach

- 25.12.1 A cumulative effects assessment (CEA) examines the combined impacts of Rampion 2 in combination with other developments on the same single receptor or resource and the contribution of Rampion 2 to those impacts. The overall method followed in identifying and assessing potential cumulative effects in relation to the onshore environment is set out in **Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) and **Appendix 5.3: Cumulative effects assessment detailed onshore search and screening criteria, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.3).
- 25.12.2 The onshore screening approach follows the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine (Planning Inspectorate, 2018) and Advice Note Seventeen (Planning

Inspectorate, 2019) which is an accepted process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and follows the four-stage approach set out in the guidance.

## Cumulative effects assessment

- 25.12.3 For historic environment, a Zone of Influence (ZOI) in line with the study areas described in **Section 25.4** has been applied for the CEA to ensure direct and indirect cumulative effects can be appropriately identified and assessed.
- 25.12.4 A short list of ‘other developments’ that may interact with the Rampion 2 ZOIs during their construction, operation or decommissioning is presented in **Appendix 5.4: Cumulative effects assessment shortlisted developments, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.4) and on **Figure 5.4.2 to 5.4.4, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.4). This list has been generated applying criteria set out in **Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) and **Appendix 5.3: Cumulative effects assessment detailed onshore search criteria, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.3) and has been collated up to the finalisation of the ES through desk study, consultation and engagement.
- 25.12.5 Only those ‘other developments’ in the short list that fall within the historic environment ZOI have the potential to result in cumulative effects with the Proposed Development on historic environment. All ‘other developments’ falling outside the historic environment ZOI are excluded from this assessment.
- 25.12.6 A tiered approach to the CEA has been set out in **Table 5-6** in **Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) and can be summarised as follows:
- Tier 1: developments under construction, permitted applications, and submitted applications;
  - Tier 2: Other developments on the Planning Inspectorate Programme of Projects where a Scoping Report has been submitted; and
  - Tier 3: Other developments on the Planning Inspectorate Programme of Projects where a Scoping Report has not been submitted, or where developments are identified in Development Plans or other plans as appropriate.
- 25.12.7 On the basis of the above, the following specific other developments contained within the short list in **Appendix 5.4: Cumulative effects assessment detailed onshore search and screening criteria, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.4) are scoped into CEA and are listed in **Table 25-27**.

**Table 25-27 Developments considered as part of the historic environment CEA**

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
1	Highways A new dual carriageway bypass	A27 Arundel Bypass	TR010045	Pre-application: Scoping Opinion published 14/04/2010	Medium	2	892
11	Leisure Golf course including associated buildings and infrastructure	Bognor Regis Golf Club	M/16/22/PL	Application pending a decision: submitted 11/02/2022	High	1	457
12	Mixed use Residential and commercial development.	46a & 47 Pier Road & Land north of Clifton Road	LU/287/17/PL	Application approved 19/12/2017	High	1	650

<sup>27</sup> ID reference as stated in Table 2-1 in [Appendix 5.4: Cumulative effects assessment shortlisted developments, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.4) and on [Figures 5.4.2 to 5.4.4, Volume 4](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.4).

<sup>28</sup> [Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.5) sets out the full definitions of the tiers.

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
13 / 14 / 63	Mixed Use 300 dwellings and ancillary infrastructure	Land at Climping Arun Local Plan (2018) Reference Site SD10 Policy H SP2c	CM/48/21/RES / CM/1/17/OUT / Local Plan site (SD10)	Application pending a decision: submitted 31/08/2021 / Application approved (after appeal) 28/09/2018 / Allocated in Local Plan	High	1	Within proposed DCO Order Limits
16	Mixed Use Demolition of existing treatment works and redevelopment to provide up to 105 homes	Land west of Bridge Road Roundabout	LU/238/20/OUT	Application approved 22/04/2022	High	1	146
17	Industrial (waste) Change of use of existing hangar	Rudford Industrial Estate	WSCC/015/22	Application pending a decision: submitted 10/06/2022	High	1	375

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
	building from industrial / storage to a combined heat and power plant						
20	Industrial (materials) Construction (concrete batching plant)	Unit H6 Rudford Industrial Estate	CM/56/19/PL	Application approved 29/05/2020	High	1	392
21	Energy generation (solar) Installation of a Solar Photovoltaic (PV) generation system.	HM Prison Ford Road	F/16/21/PL	Application approved 23/11/2021	High	1	199
24 / 61	Mixed use	Land at former Ford Airfield -Local Plan	F/4/20/OUT Local Plan site SD8	Application approved 30/05/2023 /	Yes	1	732



ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
	Construction of 1,500 residential dwellings, 60-bed care home, employment, local centre, retail and commercial floorspace, community and leisure centre.			Allocated within Arun District Council Local Plan			
26	Highways  Construction of a new access road	Ford Circular Technology Park	WSCC/027/18/F	Application approved 15/08/2019	High	1	967
32	Mixed use development  600 dwellings and multi-functional	Development of land at Courtwick	LU/355/10/	Application approved 23/02/12	High	1	Within proposed DCO Order Limits

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
	green infrastructure						
33	Residential development  Construction of 114 dwellings and associated works	Land North of Toddington Lane	LU/347/14/RES	Application approved 01/09/2015	High	1	425
34	Residential  84 dwellings and public open space	Land at Dappers Lane	A/76/20/PL	Application approved 09/02/2021	High	1	551
35	Mixed use  Housing and commercial development	Land north of Water Lane	A/40/18/OUT	Application approved 27/08/19	High	1	412
36	Mixed Use  160 dwellings with public open space	Land off Arundel Road	A/122/19/OUT	Application approved 17/03/2020	High	1	211

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
38	Mixed use  Demolition of existing equestrian and agricultural buildings and extension of existing winery to provide additional farm/shop facilities.	North Farm London Road	SDNP/18/04995/FUL	Application approved 14/03/2019	High	1	891
39	Industry (resource extraction)  The continued winning, working and processing of sand from the existing Rock Common Quarry.	Rock Common Quarry	WSCC/028/21	Application pending a decision: submitted 14/07/2021	High	1	Within proposed DCO Order Limits

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
40 / 41	Residential  Construction of up to 85 dwellings and associated infrastructure	Land West of Ravenscroft	SDNP/20/02655/SC REEN / SDNP/21/04702/OUT	Negative screening decision (EIA not required): decision 15/06/2020 / Application refused: decision 22/04/2022 - appeal in progress (awaiting decision)	High	1	810
42	Industry (resource extraction)  Continuation of working the mineral (sand extraction), but with an enhanced restoration scheme for nature	Sandgate Park Quarry	WSCC/044/18/SR	Application approved 08/01/2020	High	1	79

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
	conservation and informal recreation						
43	Residential Construction of 90 dwellings and associated infrastructure	Thakeham Tiles Ltd	DC/18/2095	Application approved 28/02/2020	High	1	982
47	Residential Construction of 81 dwellings and associated infrastructure	Land North of The Rosary	DC/20/1697	Application refused: decision 19/02/2021 - appeal in progress (awaiting decision)	High	1	757
48	Energy storage Battery Energy Storage Facility	Battery Energy Storage Facility at Bolney	DM/21/0792	EIA Not Required 19/03/2021	Low	3	62

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
49	Energy storage Battery Energy Storage Facility at Bolney	Battery Energy Storage Facility at Bolney #2	DM/21/2276	Application pending a decision: submitted 14/06/2021	High	1	59
50	Energy storage Battery Energy Storage Facility	Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #3	DM/22/3228	Negative screening decision (EIA not required): decision 18/11/2022	Low	3	293
51	Energy storage Proposed energy storage system and associated equipment	Ghyll Farm	DM/20/2554	Negative screening decision (EIA not required): decision 06/08/2020	Low	3	Within proposed DCO Order Limits
52	Energy storage	Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #2	DM/22/0807	Negative screening decision (EIA not required):	Low	3	Within proposed DCO Order Limits

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
	Battery Energy Storage Facility			decision 29/03/2022			
53	Energy storage  Battery Energy Storage Facility	Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm	DM/21/1668	EIA Not Required 25/05/2021	Low	3	Within proposed DCO Order Limits
54	Energy generation (solar)  Solarvoltaic panels and associated infrastructure	Land at Coombe Farm	DM/15/0644	Application approved 17/02/2017	High	1	21
56	Energy storage  Battery Energy Storage Facility	Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #4	DM/23/0769	Application pending a decision: submitted 20/03/2023	High	1	Within proposed DCO Order Limits

ID <sup>27</sup>	Development type	Development name	Application reference	Status	Confidence in assessment	Tier <sup>28</sup>	Distance to Rampion 2 (m)
57	Utilities infrastructure (energy) Grid stability infrastructure	Grid Stability Infrastructure at the existing National Grid Bolney Substation	DM/21/4285	Negative screening decision (EIA not required): decision 14/01/2022	Low	3	Within proposed DCO Order Limits
58	Energy generation (solar) Solar PV system for domestic use	The Barns Solar System	DM/22/2749	Application approved 08/12/2022	High	1	98
60	Mixed use Proposed site that could provide up to 1,000 dwellings.	Littlehampton	LEGA/SD4 Site at West Bank (Policy H SP2b)	Allocated in Local Plan – No application at present.	Low	3	Within proposed DCO Order Limits



Page intentionally blank

25.12.8 The cumulative Project Design Envelope is described in **Table 25-28**.

**Table 25-28 Cumulative Project Design Envelope for historic environment**

<b>Project phase and activity/impact</b>	<b>Scenario</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>Cumulative permanent effects on archaeological receptors during the construction phase of landfall and onshore cable corridor.</b>	<p>Tier 1: Construction phase. Land at Climping, Land West of Church Lane &amp; South of Horsemere Green Lane Climping, Development of land at Courtwick, Rock Common Quarry, and Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #4.</p> <p>Tier 3: Construction phase. Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #2, Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm and Grid Stability Infrastructure at Bolney Substation, and Littlehampton (LEGA/SD4).</p>	<p>The projects identified will directly impact subsurface deposits with potential archaeological interest, which lie adjacent to, or overlap with, the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2 only.</p>
<b>Cumulative temporary effects on significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets through changes to setting during construction phase.</b>	<p>Tier 1: A27 Arundel Bypass project, Bognor Regis Golf Club, Land at Climping, Land West of Church Lane &amp; South of Horsemere Green Lane Climping, Land west of Bridge Road Roundabout, Rudford Industrial Estate, Unit H6 Rudford Industrial Estate, HM Prison Ford Road, Land at Ford Airfield Ford, Ford Circular Technology Park, and North Farm London Road.</p>	<p>The projects identified will potentially overlap in temporal scope with Rampion 2. Potential for additional changes to the setting of heritage assets, which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2 only.</p>

Project phase and activity/impact	Scenario	Justification
<p><b>Cumulative temporary effects on significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets through changes to setting during operation and maintenance phase of the onshore substation.</b></p>	<p>Tier 3: Ford (SD8)</p> <p>Tier 1: Battery Energy Storage Facility at Bolney #2, Land at Coombe Farm, Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #4, and The Barns solar system.</p> <p>Tier 3: Battery Energy Storage Facility at Bolney, Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #3, Ghyll Farm, Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #2, Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm, Grid Stability Infrastructure at Bolney Substation, and Ford (SD8).</p>	<p>The projects identified will potentially overlap in temporal scope with Rampion 2. Potential for additional changes to the setting of heritage assets, which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2.</p>

25.1.1 The CEA for historic environment is set out in **Table 25-29**.

**Table 25-29 Cumulative effects assessment for historic environment**

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
1	A27 Arundel Bypass	TR010045	The alignment of the bypass lies over 890m northwest of the onshore cable corridor, at its nearest point. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the bypass which currently has a planned construction between 2024 and 2030. However, due to the distance of development and potential receptors, a greater magnitude of impact than for Rampion 2 is not predicted, therefore there will be no cumulative effects.	-
11	Bognor Regis Golf Club	M/16/22/PL	Project comprises laying out of an 18 hole golf course, a nine hole golf course, practice greens, and a driving range including a buggy compound with associated access and infrastructure, 457.25m west of the proposed DCO Order Limits. This development may overlap in temporal scope with Rampion 2. However, there is unlikely to be a cumulative visual or audible impact to the setting of heritage assets (listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> ) given the relative distance between the project and the proposed DCO Order Limits and the intervening planting and topography.	-
12	46a & 47 Pier Road & Land north of Clifton Road	LU/287/17/PL	Project lies over 650m east of onshore cable corridor. There is no anticipated overlap in temporal scope of construction phase works with Rampion 2. Unlikely to be a cumulative visual or audible impact to the setting of heritage assets (listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> ) during operational and	-

<sup>29</sup> ID reference as stated in Table 2-1 in **Appendix 5.4: Cumulative effects assessment shortlisted developments, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.4) and on **Figures 5.4.2 to 5.4.4, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.5.4).

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			<p>maintenance phase given the relative distance between the project and the proposed DCO Order Limits and the intervening buildings, planting, and topography.</p>	
13 / 14 / 63	<p>Land at Climping</p> <p>Arun Local Plan (2018) Reference Site SD10</p> <p>Policy H SP2c</p>	<p>CM/48/21/RES / CM/1/17/OUT / Local Plan site (SD10)</p>	<p>Residential development comprising erection of 300 dwellings and a building within use Class E, together with other associated infrastructure. The project overlaps with the onshore part of the proposed DCO Order Limits, though only with the extent of a visibility splay associated with construction and operational access A-05. The project lies on the opposite side of the road from the Climping construction compound. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2024 and 2030.</p> <p>Potential for cumulative effects on archaeological receptors during the construction phase. The development will directly impact subsurface deposits with potential archaeological interest, which lie adjacent/very near to the proposed DCO Order Limits, which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2. Unknown remains of high heritage significance (sensitivity) are not anticipated within area where the project and Rampion 2 onshore cable corridor meet.</p> <p>Temporary effects on significance of heritage assets through changes to setting during construction phase. There is a potential for additional changes to the setting of heritage assets (listed in <b>Table 25-15</b>), which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2. However, this would not result in a significant cumulative effect</p>	<p>Proposed environmental measures as described in C-79 and C-225 would seek to limit the magnitude and overall effect on archaeological receptors.</p>

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
16	Land west of Bridge Road Roundabout	LU/238/20/OUT	<p>Mixed use development 2.30ha in size within 145m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits, on the opposite side of the River Arun. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2022 and 2027.</p> <p>Cumulative effects not anticipated due to distance of project from heritage assets assessed within <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b>.</p>	-
17	Rudford Industrial Estate	WSCC/015/22	<p>Project involves change of use of an existing hangar building for a heat and power plant 375m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2023 and 2028.</p> <p>Temporary effects on significance of heritage assets through changes to setting during construction phase. There is a potential for additional changes to the setting of heritage assets (listed in <b>Table 25-15</b>) where there is perception of with Rampion 2 construction traffic along Church Lane, though this is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p>	-
20	Unit H6 Rudford Industrial Estate	CM/56/19/PL	<p>Project lies adjacent to ID17 and comprises erection and operation of concrete batching plant 392m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2023 and 2028.</p>	-

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			<p>Temporary effects on significance of heritage assets through changes to setting during construction phase. There is a potential for additional changes to the setting of heritage assets (listed in <b>Table 25-15</b>) where there is perception of with Rampion 2 construction traffic along Church Lane, though this is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p>	
21	HM Prison Ford Road	F/16/21/PL	<p>Project to install a 239.2MWh solar photovoltaic generation system approximately 200m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2022 and 2027.</p> <p>Temporary effects on significance of heritage assets through changes to setting during construction phase. There is a potential for additional changes to the setting of heritage assets (listed in <b>Table 25-15</b>) where there is perception of with Rampion 2 construction traffic along Church Lane, though this is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p>	-
24 / 61	Land at Ford Airfield Ford	F/4/20/OUT Local Plan site SD8	<p>Mixed use development including up to 1500 dwellings covering an area of 89.88ha, 732m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2025 and 2035.</p>	-

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			<p>Temporary effects on significance of heritage assets through changes to setting during construction phase. There is a potential for additional changes to the setting of heritage assets (listed in <b>Table 25-15</b>) where there is perception of with Rampion 2 construction traffic along Church Lane, though this is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p>	
26	Ford Circular Technology Park	WSCC/027/18/F	<p>Proposed access road for Ford Circular Technology Park, 967m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits. No cumulative impacts as construction phase is complete and no additional changes to setting of heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b>.</p>	-
32	Development of land at Courtwick	LU/355/10/	<p>Mixed use development including up to 600 residential dwellings within an area of land which lies adjacent to the proposed DCO Order Limits. Construction phase complete.</p> <p>Findings from archaeological investigations associated within this project have already been incorporated into the baseline (<b>Section 25.6</b>) and assessment (<b>Section 25.9</b>) presenting in this chapter for Rampion 2. No further cumulative effects anticipated.</p> <p>No cumulative effects anticipated to heritage assets identified in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> during the operational and maintenance phase due to intervening distance, built infrastructure, topography and nature of the development.</p>	-



ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
33	Land North of Toddington Lane	LU/347/14/RES	Residential development for 114 dwellings 425m south of the proposed DCO Order Limit. Construction complete. All existing development considered as part of baseline for heritage assets which may be impacted through change to setting in and assessed in <b>Section 25.10</b> .	-
34	Land at Dappers Lane	A/76/20/PL	Residential development including 84 dwellings, 550m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2021 and 2027. However, no cumulative effects anticipated due to intervening distance, planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> .	-
35	Land north of Water Lane	A/40/18/OUT	Residential development including 525 dwellings, 412m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2021 and 2029. However, no cumulative effects anticipated due to intervening distance, planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> .	-
36	Land off Arundel Road	A/122/19/OUT	Mixed use development including 160 dwellings 210m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2020 and 2025. However, no cumulative effects anticipated due to intervening distance, planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> .	-

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
38	North Farm London Road	SDNP/18/04995/ FUL	Mixed use development 890m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2020 and 2032. However, no cumulative effects anticipated due to intervening distance, planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> .	-
39	Rock Common Quarry	WSCC/028/21	This is change to existing quarrying operation will not introduce additional change to the setting of heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> .	-
40 / 41	Land West of Ravenscroft	SDNP/20/02655/ SCREEN/SDNP/ 21/04702/OUT	Residential development for up to 78 homes, 809m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2024 and 2030. However, no cumulative effects anticipated due to intervening distance, planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> .	-
42	Sandgate Park Quarry	WSCC/044/18/S R	This is change to existing mineral extraction operation will not introduce additional change to the setting of heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> .	-
43	Thakeham Tiles Ltd	DC/18/2095	Residential development for 90 dwellings, 982m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2020 and 2025. However, no cumulative effects anticipated due to intervening distance,	-

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> .	
47	Land North of The Rosary	DC/20/1697	Residential development for 81 dwellings, 757m northwest of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2024 and 2029. However, no cumulative effects anticipated due to intervening distance, planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-18</b> .	-
48	Battery Energy Storage Facility at Bolney	DM/21/0792	Energy storage facility 62m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits. Overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project are currently unknown. However, no cumulative effects anticipated due to intervening distance, planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-17</b> , except where increased potential construction traffic along Wineham Lane may be perceptible from heritage assets on this road. However, this change would be temporary and is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.	-
49	Battery Energy Storage Facility at Bolney #2	DM/21/2276	Energy storage facility 28m south of the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2024 and 2030. However, no cumulative effects anticipated due to intervening distance, planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets	-

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			<p>listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-17</b>, except where increased potential construction traffic along Wineham Lane may be perceptible from heritage assets on this road. However, this change would be temporary and is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p>	
50	Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #3	DM/22/3228	<p>Proposed 99.9 MW battery energy storage system and associated infrastructure 292m east of the proposed DCO Order Limits. Overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project are currently unknown. Where construction phase may overlap there is potential for additional changes to the setting of grade II listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579). However, due to scale and nature of the development and existing screening, this is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p>	-
51	Ghyll Farm	DM/20/2554	<p>Proposed energy storage facility adjacent to the proposed DCO Order Limits, only where a visibility splay associated with construction accesses A-68 and A-69, along Wineham Lane. Overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project are currently unknown. However, no cumulative effects are anticipated due to intervening distance, planting, built infrastructure and topography, no additional changes to setting of those heritage assets listed in <b>Table 25-15</b> and <b>Table 25-17</b>, except where increased potential construction traffic along Wineham Lane may be perceptible from heritage assets on this road. However, this change would be temporary and is not expected</p>	-

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.	
52 / 53	Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #2 / Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm	DM/22/0807 / DM/21/1668	<p>Proposed battery energy storage facility adjacent which overlaps with the proposed DCO Order Limits in the vicinity of the Bolney substation extension. Overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project are currently unknown.</p> <p>Potential for cumulative effects on archaeological receptors during the construction phase. The development will directly impact subsurface deposits with potential archaeological interest, which lie within the proposed DCO Order Limits, which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2. Unknown remains of high heritage significance (sensitivity) are not anticipated within area where the project and Rampion 2 onshore cable corridor meet. No significant cumulative effect is predicted.</p> <p>Where construction phase may overlap there is potential for additional changes to the setting of grade II listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579). However, no cumulative effects are anticipated due to scale and nature of the development and existing screening, this is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p>	Proposed environmental measures as described in C-79 and C-225 would seek to limit the magnitude and overall effect on archaeological receptors.
54	Land at Coombe Farm	DM/15/0644	Installation of solar photovoltaic panels and associated infrastructure across a 43.57ha area, within 20m of the proposed DCO Order Limits.	Proposed environmental

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			<p>There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2023 and 2025.</p> <p>Potential for cumulative effects on archaeological receptors during the construction phase. The development will directly impact subsurface deposits with potential archaeological interest, which lie very near to the proposed DCO Order Limits, which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2. Unknown remains of high heritage significance (sensitivity) are not anticipated within area where the project and Rampion 2 onshore cable corridor meet. No significant cumulative effect is predicted.</p> <p>Where construction phase may overlap there is potential for additional changes to the setting of grade II listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579) and Coombe House (1025752). However, no cumulative effects are anticipated due to scale and nature of the development and existing screening, this is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p>	<p>measures as described in C-79 and C-225 would seek to limit the magnitude and overall effect on archaeological receptors.</p>
56	Battery Energy Storage System at Coombe Farm #4	DM/23/0769	<p>Installation of battery energy storage and associated infrastructure across a 11.47ha area, which overlaps with the proposed DCO Order Limits. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2024 and 2027.</p>	<p>Proposed environmental measures as described in C-79 and C-225 would seek to limit the magnitude</p>

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			<p>Potential for cumulative effects on archaeological receptors during the construction phase. The development will directly impact subsurface deposits with potential archaeological interest, which lie within the proposed DCO Order Limits, which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2. Unknown remains of high heritage significance (sensitivity) are not anticipated within area where the project and Rampion 2 onshore cable corridor meet. No significant cumulative effect is predicted.</p> <p>Where construction phase may overlap there is potential for additional changes to the setting of grade II listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579) and Coombe House (1025752). However, no cumulative effects are anticipated due to scale and nature of the development and existing screening, this is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.</p>	and overall effect on archaeological receptors.
57	Grid Stability Infrastructure at Bolney Substation	DM/21/4285	<p>Development of grid stability infrastructure at land north of Bolney substation across a 11.47ha area, which overlaps with the proposed DCO Order Limits. Overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project are currently unknown.</p> <p>Potential for cumulative effects on archaeological receptors during the construction phase. The development will directly impact subsurface deposits with potential archaeological interest, which lie within the proposed DCO Order Limits, which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2. Unknown remains of high heritage</p>	Proposed environmental measures as described in C-79 and C-225 would seek to limit the magnitude and overall effect on archaeological receptors.

ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			significance (sensitivity) are not anticipated within area where the project and Rampion 2 onshore cable corridor meet. No significant cumulative effect is predicted.	
58	The Barns solar system	DM/22/2749	Installation of a 10 kWh ground mounted solar photovoltaic system for domestic use, 98m north of the proposed DCO Order Limits, which is an operational access A-65. Project lies 290m north of the onshore cable corridor. There is likely to be an overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project which currently has a planned construction between 2023 and 2025. However, due to scale and nature of the development and existing screening, this is not expected to result in a greater magnitude of impact to heritage assets than predicted for Rampion 2 and therefore would not result in a significant cumulative effect.	-
60	Arun Local Plan - reference site SD4: Littlehampton - West Bank  Policy H SP2b	Local Plan site - no reference	Allocated in Local Plan as proposed mixed use development site with 1,000 dwellings, which overlaps with the proposed DCO Order Limits. Overlap in timescales for the construction and operational phases of the project are currently unknown as no application for the development has yet come forward.  Potential for cumulative effects on archaeological receptors during the construction phase. The development will directly impact subsurface deposits with potential archaeological interest, which lie within the proposed DCO Order Limits, which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2. Unknown remains of high heritage significance (sensitivity) are not anticipated within area where the project	Proposed environmental measures as described in C-79 and C-225 would seek to limit the magnitude and overall effect on archaeological receptors.



ID <sup>29</sup>	Development name	Application reference	Assessment discussion	Environmental measures
			<p>and Rampion 2 onshore cable corridor meet. No significant cumulative effect is predicted.</p> <p>Temporary effects on significance of heritage assets through changes to setting during construction phase. There is a potential for additional changes to the setting of heritage assets (listed in <b>Table 25-15</b>), which may result in a greater magnitude of impact than predicted for Rampion 2. There is also potential for effects on significance of heritage assets (listed in <b>Table 25-18</b>) through changes to setting during the operational and maintenance phase. However, significant cumulative effects are not predicted.</p>	

Page intentionally blank

## 25.13 Transboundary effects

- 25.13.1 Transboundary effects arise when impacts from a development within one European Economic Area (EEA) state affects the environment of another EEA state(s). A screening of transboundary effects has been carried out and is presented in Appendix B of the Scoping Report (RED, 2020).
- 25.13.2 Based on the knowledge of the baseline environment (and in particular that there are no internationally designated sites of importance), the nature of planned works and the wealth of evidence on the potential for impact from such projects more widely, there are not considered to be any transboundary effects on historic environment receptors from Rampion 2.

## 25.14 Inter-related effects

- 25.14.1 The inter-related effects assessment considers likely significant effects from multiple impacts and activities from the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of Rampion 2 on the same receptor, or group of receptors.
- 25.14.2 Inter-related effects could potentially arise in one of two ways. The first type of inter-related effect is a Proposed Development lifetime effect, where multiple phases of the Proposed Development interact to create a potentially more significant effect on a receptor than in one phase alone. The phases for Rampion 2 are construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning. All Proposed Development lifetime effects are assessed in [Chapter 30: Inter-related effects, Volume 2](#) of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.30).
- 25.14.3 The second type of inter-related effect is receptor-led effects. Receptor-led effects are where effects from different environmental aspects combine spatially and temporally on a receptor. These effects may be short-term, temporary, transient, or longer-term.
- 25.14.4 Receptor-led effects have been considered, where relevant, in this chapter for potential interactions between historic environment and the following environmental aspects:
- [Chapter 6: Coastal processes, Volume 2](#) (Document Reference: 6.2.6) of the ES;
  - [Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2](#) (Document Reference: 6.2.15) of the ES;
  - [Chapter 16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2](#) (Document Reference: 6.2.16) of the ES;
  - [Chapter 18: Landscape and visual assessment, Volume 2](#) (Document Reference: 6.2.18) of the ES;
  - [Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2](#) (Document Reference: 6.2.21) of the ES;
  - [Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2](#) (Document Reference: 6.2.23) of the ES;

- **Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2** (Document Reference: 6.2.26) of the ES; and
- **Chapter 32: ES Addendum, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.32 and **[REP5-038]**)

25.14.5 Full results of the receptor-led effects assessment can be found in **Chapter 30: Inter-related effects, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.30).

## 25.15 Summary of residual effects

25.15.1 **Table 25-30** and **Table 25-31** present a summary of the assessment of significant impacts and residual effects on historic environment receptors, taking account of mitigation and any relevant embedded environmental measures.

**Table 25-30 Summary of assessment of residual effects for construction phase**

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
<b><u>Landfall and onshore cable corridor</u></b>				
Historic landscape character	Partial loss or disturbance to historic landscape features	Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b>Direct effects on heritage assets</b>				
<i>Zone 1: South Coast Plain</i>				
Palaeoenvironmental deposits	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Medium to High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Buried/submerged prehistoric landscapes	None	Low to Medium	None	No effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Cudlow DMV (MWS3384)	None	Medium	None	No effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Atherington DMV (MWS3385)	None	Medium	None	No effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
WWII coastal defence features	None	Medium	None	No effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Site of former WW2 Anti-Aircraft Artillery (MWS7123)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Very Low	Low	Negligible adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Site of Common Barn Historic Outfarm (MWS9869)	None	Very Low	None	No effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated possible enclosure (4_1)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b>Undated possible enclosure (5_1)</b>	None	Low to Medium	No change	No effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated possible archaeology (6_1)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Post medieval agriculture and land division features	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Very Low	Negligible adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Medieval earthworks E and SE of St Mary's Church (NHLE 1005828, MWS3371)	None	High	None	No effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Early medieval settlement deposits and features west of Courtwick Lane	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Iron Age and Roman remains at Brook Barn Farm	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Undated possible enclosures (34_1)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated possible archaeological remains (34_2), (34_3) and (34_4)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated possible enclosures or settlement (38_1, 38_2 and 38_3 )	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to High	Medium	Major adverse <b>(Significant)</b>
Roman road from Chichester to Brighton	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Cropmarks south of A27 Arundel Road (MWS3544 and MWS3545)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Possible site of post medieval brick kiln (MWS3543)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Medium	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Roman road from Chichester to Brighton	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

*Other previously unrecorded archaeological remains in Zone 1: South Coast Plains*

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Palaeolithic evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to High	Low	Minor to Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Mesolithic evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to High	Low	Minor to Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Neolithic evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Bronze Age evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Iron Age and Romano-British evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Medieval evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Post medieval evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Very Low	Low	Negligible adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<i>Zone 2: South Downs</i>				
Palaeoenvironmental deposits	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>



Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Roman road from Chichester to Brighton	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Site of a former brickyard, Hammer Pot Field (MWS5726)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Probable post medieval and modern extraction pits in the vicinity of Angmering Park and Michelgrove Park	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Very Low	Negligible adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated possible archaeological features south of Angmering Park Farm (Field 052)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated barrow type feature (62_1)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated probable field boundaries between KM13 and KM16	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Early medieval mortuary remains MWS2804	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Bronze Age barrow MWS6581	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Bronze Age barrow MWS6592	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Circular mound features at Sullington Hill	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
WWII military features	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated probable field boundaries or trackways at Sullington Hill	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Hill Barn Historic Outfarm MWS11506	None	Low	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Barns Farm Historic Farmstead, Storrington MWS9337	None	N/A	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b>Iron Age and Roman-British remains associated with Muntham Court</b>	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
<b>scheduled site (NHLE 1005850, MWS5598)</b>				
<i>Other previously unrecorded archaeological remains in Zone 2: South Downs</i>				
Palaeolithic and Mesolithic evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Neolithic evidence - Flint mining and mortuary remains	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	High	Medium	Major adverse <b>(Significant)</b>
Neolithic evidence - Settlement remains	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	High	Medium	Major adverse <b>(Significant)</b>
Neolithic evidence - Isolated and residual artefacts	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Bronze Age evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Medium to high	Low	Minor to Moderate adverse <b>(Significant)</b>
Early medieval evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate adverse <b>(Significant)</b>
Medieval and post medieval evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Very Low to Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
<i>Zone 3: Low Weald</i>				
<b>Palaeoenvironmental deposits outwith Adur Valley</b>	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Hardham to Barcombe Mills Roman Road, the Greensand Way (ANA Horsham 078; Mid Sussex 044)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Potential archaeological features near Buncton (Field 136)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated earthwork remains (MWS7031) near Buncton	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Palaeoenvironmental deposits within Adur Valley	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Brightham's Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9503)	None	Low	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Blocques Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9446)	None	Low	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated circular features (184_1 and 185_1)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Homelands Historic Farmstead (MWS11752)	None	Low	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Shoreham to Horsham Railway (MWS5508)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Very Low	Negligible adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Crateman's Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS9939, ANA Horsham 144)	None	Low	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Dragons Farm Historic Farmstead (MWS10096)	None	Low	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Undated possible archaeological features near Oakendene (Field 228)	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Late Iron Age to Roman rectangular	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
field system, Bolney Substation (MWS15278)				
<i>Other previously unrecorded archaeological remains in Zone 3: Low Weald</i>				
Palaeolithic evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Mesolithic evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Neolithic evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Bronze Age evidence	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low to Medium	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Early to middle Iron Age	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Medieval and post medieval	Loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains	Very Low to Low	Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b>Effects arising through change to setting of heritage assets</b>				
Poling Conservation Area and Grade I and II Listed Buildings	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Sullington Conservation Area and Grade I and II Listed Buildings	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Lyminster Conservation Area and Grade I and II Listed Buildings	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Washington Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Dawe's Farmhouse (NHLE 1025759)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Farmgate House (NHLE 1026866)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Bines Farmhouse (NHLE 1026867)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade II Listed Old Priors (NHLE 1026871)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Guessgate Farmhouse (NHLE 1207154)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed 1-4, Stocks Hill (NHLE 1027155)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Brook House (NHLE 1027161)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed the Frankland Arms Public House (NHLE 1027162)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Tilleys Cottage (NHLE 1027163)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Green Farmhouse (NHLE 1027190)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Old Forge (NHLE 1027195)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>



Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade II Listed Fern Cottage (NHLE 1027196)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II* Listed The Parish Church of St Mary (NHLE 1027198)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Church House (NHLE 1027200)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Rose Cottage (NHLE 1027201)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Chanctonbury Lodge (NHLE 1027239)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b>Grade II Listed King's Barn (NHLE 1027089)</b>	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Horsebrook Cottage (NHLE 1027261)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Pooks Farmhouse (NHLE 1027290) and Cottage	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
In the grounds of Pooks Farmhouse to the southwest of the house (NHLE 1027291)				
Grade II Listed Potts Farmhouse (NHLE 1027292)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Vadgers (NHLE 1027293)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b>Grade II Listed Morley (NHLE 1027330)</b>	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Eatons Farmhouse (NHLE 1027436) and Granary at Eatons Farm to South East of The House (NHLE 1192196)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Binesfield (NHLE 1027451)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade II Listed Southblows Farmhouse (NHLE 1027452)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Horsebridge House (NHLE 1027454)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed The Fountain Inn (NHLE 1027457)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Barn at Newhouse Buildings (NHLE 1027589)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed St John's Cottage (NHLE 1027590)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Calceto (NHLE 1027606)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Buildings at Kent's Farm (NHLE 1027674, NHLE 1233446, NHLE 1233447)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Listed Buildings at North End (NHLE 1027627, NHLE 1233900, NHLE 1353871)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade I Listed The Parish Church Of St Mary (NHLE 1027640) and Grade II listed The Vicarage (NHLE 1027641)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Barn to the west of nos 1 and 2 Church Farm Cottage (NHLE 1027642) and Church Farmhouse east and Church Farmhouse west (NHLE 1027643)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Decoy Cottage (NHLE 1027713)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed The Old Cottage (NHLE 1027714)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low to Low	Minor to Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade II Listed The 6 Bells Public House (NHLE 1027819)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Old Clayton (NHLE 1039953)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Pinland Farmhouse (NHLE 1181625)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Clematis Cottage (NHLE 1182071) and Rose Cottage (NHLE 1354093)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed South Cottage (NHLE 1182076)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Corner House How Man the Old Cottage (NHLE 1182115)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed The Old Rectory (NHLE 1182442) and The	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Roundhouse, In The Grounds Of The Old Rectory (NHLE 1354110)				
Grade II Listed Michelgrove Cottages (NHLE 1217075) and The Ruins of Michelgrove (NHLE 1353888)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II* Listed Peckhams (NHLE 1217152)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade I Listed The Parish Church of St Andrew (NHLE 1233989) TBC	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Brookpits Cottage (NHLE 1276603) and Brookpits Manor (NHLE 1353858)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Lower Chancton (NHLE 1284780) and Granary	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
at Lower Chancton to south east of the house (NHLE 1354089)				
Grade II Listed Deans Cottage (NHLE 1284897)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Church Farmhouse (NHLE 1354096) and Barn at Church Farm to South of The House (NHLE 1182122)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Brightham's Farmhouse (NHLE 1354245), Grade II Listed Cart Shed and Granary to East of Brightham's Farmhouse (NHLE 1181633)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Upper Bargeham (NHLE 1353838) and Barn to Upper Bargeham to the	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
west of the farmhouse (NHLE 1232897)				
Grade I Listed Buncton Chapel of All Saints (NHLE 1354113)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Buncton Manor Farmhouse (LB1182594)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Post Office Wiston Stores (1182621)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Butchers Farmhouse Water Lane (NHLE 1182603)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed The Old School (NHLE 1284545)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Yew Tree Cottage (NHLE 1354114)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>



Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade II Listed Polecats (NHLE 1284507)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed College Wood Farmhouse (NHLE 1191847)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed The Shieling (LB1181595)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Yew Tree Cottage, Partridge Green (NHLE 1181605)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Muttons (NHLE 1025758)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Court Wick Park (LB1027813) and Court Wick Park Stables (LB1293605)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed buildings on Climping Street: Virginia Cottage, Dove Cottage, The Cottage and The	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Black Horse Public House (NHLE 1027675, NHLE 1233449, NHLE 1353859, NHLE 1353860)				
Grade II Listed The Lodge of St Hugh's Monastery (NHLE 1193051)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II* Listed Newplace Farmhouse (NHLE 1232882)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed The Royal Oak Inn (NHLE 1285777)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Park Farmhouse (NHLE 1285831)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Wineham Cottage (NHLE 1286203)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade II Listed Gratwicke (NHLE 1286335)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Hill's Farmhouse (NHLE 1353944)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed 1 and 2 Corner House (NHLE 1285826) and Toll Cottage (NHLE 1354042)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Crateman's Farmhouse (NHLE 1354155)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Doves Cottages (NHLE 1191816)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Blakes Farmhouse (NHLE 1353943)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Bergen-Op-Zoom Cottage (NHLE 1393335)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade I Listed St John's Priory (NHLE 1217172)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Keepers Mead (NHLE 1354279)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Northblows Farmhouse (NHLE 1191818)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Hollybush Cottage (NHLE 1191821)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Granary Cottage (NHLE 1191885)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Bloques Farmhouse (NHLE 1191892)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Martinsland (NHLE 1353980)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade II Listed Tilleys Farmhouse (NHLE 1354090)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Green Common Farmhouse (NHLE 1284745)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Fair Oak Farmhouse (NHLE 1354112)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Climping Mill (NHLE 1027639)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed The Old Vicarage (NHLE 1284693) and Stables of the Old Vicarage to the west of the House (NHLE 1027199)	Alteration to setting	High	None	<b>No Effect</b>
Scheduled monument Itford Hill style settlement on Cock Hill (NHLE 1015881)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Itford Hill style	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
settlement and an Anglo-Saxon barrow field at New Barn Down, 850m north west of Myrtle Grove Farm (NHLE 1017446)				
Scheduled monument Muntham Court Romano-British Site (NHLE 1005850)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Prehistoric flint mine and a Martin Down style enclosure on Harrow hill, 850m south east of Lee Farm (NHLE 1015239)	Alteration to setting	High	Low to Medium	Moderate to Major adverse <b>(Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument settlement site in Chantry Bottom (NHLE 1005823)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Group of four bowl barrows at the Chantry Post (NHLE 1015713)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Scheduled monument Medieval earthworks E and SE of St Mary's Church (NHLE 1005828, MSW3371)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Prehistoric flint mine and part of a round barrow cemetery at Blackpatch, 400m north east of Myrtle Grove Farm (NHLE 1015880)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled Monument Deserted medieval settlement at Lower Barpham Farm (NHLE 1015883)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b><u>Onshore cable corridor and onshore substation at Oakendene near Cowfold</u></b>				
<b>Oakendene historic parkland (MWS96, HWS2285)</b>	Intrusive construction activities and alteration to setting	Low	Medium	Minor residual <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b>Grade II Listed Oakendene Manor (NHLE 1027074)</b>	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade II Listed Bankfield Farmhouse (NHLE 1193164)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect (Not Significant)
<b>Grade II Listed Allfreys (NHLE 1354152)</b>	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect (Not Significant)
Grade II Listed Eastlands Farm (NHLE 1381153)	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect (Not Significant)
<b><u>Onshore cable corridor and Bolney substation extension</u></b>				
Grade II Listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse (Not Significant)



**Table 25-31 Summary of assessment of residual effects for operational and maintenance phase**

<b>Receptor</b>	<b>Summary of predicted effects</b>	<b>Heritage significance (sensitivity)</b>	<b>Magnitude of change</b>	<b>Significance of effect</b>
<b>Onshore substation at Oakendene near Cowfold</b>				
Historic Landscape Character	Partial loss or disturbance to historic landscape features	Low	Medium	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b>Grade II Listed Oakendene Manor (NHLE 1027074)</b>	Alteration to setting	High	Medium	Major adverse <b>(Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Bankfield Farmhouse (NHLE 1193164)	Alteration to setting	High	None	<b>No Effect</b>
<b>Grade II Listed Eastlands Farm (NHLE 1381153)</b>	Alteration to setting	High	None	<b>No Effect</b>
<b>Existing National Grid Bolney substation extension</b>				
Grade II Listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b><u>Offshore substation and wind turbine generators</u></b>				

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Scheduled monument Napoleonic Barracks 480m south-west of Foxhole Farm Cuckmere Haven (NHLE 1002201)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Newhaven military fort and lunette battery (NHLE 1002242)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Camp near Belle Tout lighthouse Birling Gap (NHLE 1002288)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument A 19 <sup>th</sup> century artillery fort known as Littlehampton Fort 317m southwest of the Windmill Theatre (NHLE 1005809)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Arundel Castle (NHLE 1012500), Grade II* Listed Arundel Castle Registered Park and	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Garden (NHLE 1000170) and Grade I, II* and II Listed Buildings at Arundel Castle (List entry nos. 1027926, 1027928, 1248038, 1353747 1414107)				
Scheduled monument Long Barrow on Beacon Hill (NHLE 1013067) and Long barrow on Beacon Hill 160m north west of the windmill (NHLE 1015229)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Hillfort and a bowl barrow on Seaford Head (NHLE 1014523)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Hillfort, the possible remains of a Romano-Celtic temple and a group of three bowl barrows at Hollingbury (NHLE 1014526)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Scheduled monument Cissbury Ring hillfort, prehistoric flint mine and associated remains (NHLE 1015817)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Highdown Hill Camp: A Ram's Hill type enclosure an Anglo- Saxon cemetery and associated remains (NHLE 1015877)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Scheduled monument Martello tower no 74 on Seaford Esplanade (NHLE 1017359)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Selsey Old Town Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Sidlesham Quay Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Aldwick Bay Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Craigweil House, Aldwick Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Aldwick Road, Bognor Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
The Steyne, Bognor Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Littlehampton (River Road) Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Littlehampton (Sea Front) Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Steyne Gardens Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
South Street Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Sackville Gardens Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Pembroke and Princes Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Old Hove Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	None	No Effect <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Cliftonville Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
The Avenues Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Brunswick Town Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Regency Square Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Old Town Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Valley Gardens Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
East Cliff Conservation Area, including Grade II* Listed Madeira Terrace, Madeira Walk (NHLE 1381696)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Kemp Town Conservation Area, including Registered Park and Garden Kemp Town Enclosures (RPG 1001313)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Rottingdean Conservation Area	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Band Stand (NHLE 1027780), The Esplanade	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II* and II Listed Buildings in Bailiffscourt (NHLE 1027676, NHLE 1027637, NHLE 1027638, NHLE 1027677, NHLE 1233450, NHLE 1274459, NHLE 1276596, NHLE 1353879, NHLE 1353880)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Climping Mill (NHLE 1027639)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
Grade II Listed Rustington Convalescent Home (NHLE 1274038) and Ancillary Building at Rustington Convalescent Home (NHLE 1274012)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Vista Point, including Garages and Attached Walls (NHLE 1396577)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
<b>Grade II Listed Runnymede (NHLE 1419211)</b>	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed 205-211, Brighton Road (NHLE 1025809)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Shelters at TQ 273 044 (NHLE 1292365) and TQ 270 045 (NHLE 1210002)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed Ian Fraser House, St Dunstons (NHLE	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low to Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>



Receptor	Summary of predicted effects	Heritage significance (sensitivity)	Magnitude of change	Significance of effect
1380546), Chapel to Ian Fraser House, St Dunstons (NHLE 1380547), Walls to Ian Fraser House, St Dunstons (NHLE 1380548)				
Grade II Listed Roedean School Main Buildings (NHLE 1380831)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed French Convalescent Home (NHLE 1380152)	Alteration to setting	High	Low	Moderate adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>
Grade II Listed 17 <sup>th</sup> Century House (NHLE 1222778)	Alteration to setting	High	Very Low	Minor adverse <b>(Not Significant)</b>

## Summary of assessment of residual effects for decommissioning phase

25.15.2 As described in **Section 25.11**, it is anticipated that, during the decommissioning phase, the potential removal of the onshore substation and the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension will be the only onshore works likely to be required. The onshore electrical cables will be left in-situ with ends cut, sealed and buried. The offshore substation and wind turbine generators will also be removed. The residual effects during the decommissioning of the onshore substation, the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension and the offshore substation and wind turbine generators will be expected to be the same as those effects identified for the construction phase in **Table 25-30**.

Page intentionally blank

## 25.16 Glossary of terms and abbreviations

Table 25-32 Glossary of terms and abbreviations – historic environment

Term (acronym)	Definition
<b>ADC</b>	Arun District Council
<b>ANA</b>	Archaeological Notification Area
<b>Anno Domini (AD)</b>	Used to refer to the year of the calendar era reckoned from the year of the birth of Jesus of Nazareth.
<b>Archaeological Notification Area (ANA)</b>	This is an area identified by the local authority as having a high potential for archaeological remains to be present.
<b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</b>	Land protected for conservation and preservation under section 82 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 for its natural beauty.
<b>Baseline</b>	Refers to existing conditions as represented by latest available survey and other data which is used as a benchmark for making comparisons to assess the impact of development.
<b>Baseline conditions</b>	The environment as it appears (or would appear) immediately prior to the implementation of the Proposed Development together with any known or foreseeable future changes that will take place before completion of the Proposed Development.
<b>Before Present (BP)</b>	Used to refer to the number of years before the present time.
<b>BEIS</b>	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
<b>BGS</b>	British Geological Survey
<b>BNG</b>	Biodiversity Net Gain
<b>Bronze Age</b>	This period follows on from the Neolithic and is characterized by the increasing use of Bronzework. It is subdivided in the Early, Middle and Late Bronze Age.  Archaeological period lasting from 2,600-700 BC
<b>CDC</b>	Chichester District Council
<b>Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA)</b>	CIfA is the leading professional body representing archaeologists working in the UK and overseas.
<b>CDM</b>	Construction (Design and Management)

Term (acronym)	Definition
<b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b>	The code sets out the standards and procedures to which developers and contractors must adhere to when undertaking construction of major projects. This will assist with managing the environmental impacts and will identify the main responsibilities and requirements of developers and contractors in constructing their projects.
<b>Cumulative effects</b>	Additional changes caused by a Proposed Development in conjunction with other similar developments or as a combined effect of a set of developments.
<b>Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA)</b>	Assessment of impacts as a result of the incremental changes caused by other past, present and reasonably foreseeable human activities and natural processes together with the Proposed Development.
<b>Construction Effects</b>	Used to describe both temporary effects that arise during the construction phases as well as permanent existence effects that arise from the physical existence of development (for example new buildings).
<b>Decommissioning</b>	The period during which a development and its associated processes are removed from active operation.
<b>Defra</b>	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
<b>Development Consent Order Application</b>	An application for consent to undertake a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project made to the Planning Inspectorate who will consider the application and make a recommendation to the Secretary of State (SoS), who will decide on whether development consent should be granted for the Proposed Development.
<b>Development Consent Order (DCO)</b>	This is the means of obtaining permission for developments categorised as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, under the Planning Act 2008.
<b>DMV</b>	Deserted Medieval Village
<b>DTM</b>	Digital Terrain Model
<b>Early Medieval</b>	<p>This dates from the breakdown of Roman rule in Britain to the Norman invasion in 1066 and is to be used for monuments of post Roman, Saxon and Viking date.</p> <p>Archaeological period lasting from 1066 to 410</p>
<b>Early Prehistoric</b>	For monuments which are characteristic of the Palaeolithic to Mesolithic but cannot be specifically assigned.

Term (acronym)	Definition
EEA	European Economic Area
Embedded environmental measures	Equate to 'primary environmental measures' as defined by Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2016). They are measures to avoid or reduce environmental effects that are directly incorporated into the preferred masterplan for the Proposed Development.
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	The process of evaluating the likely significant environmental effects of a proposed project or development over and above the existing circumstances (or 'baseline').
Environmental Statement (ES)	The written output presenting the full findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment.
Event Unique Identification (EvUID)	This is the reference number or code for previous archaeological events recorded within the respective Historic Environment Records.
Evidence Plan Process (EPP)	A voluntary consultation process with specialist stakeholders to agree the approach and the information required to support the EIA and HRA for certain aspects.
Expert Topic Group (ETG)	As part of the Evidence Plan Process, the ETGs are formed of experts from relevant organisations relative to the topics considered. These groups are established to discuss and agree the evidence and assessment requirements for each EIA and HRA topic area identified.
Statutory consultation	Statutory consultation refers to statutory consultation that is required under Section 42 and Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008 with the relevant consultation bodies and the public on the preliminary environmental information.
Future Baseline	Refers to the situation in future years without the Proposed Development.
Good Practice in Planning Advice (GPA) 2	Good Practice in Planning Advice 2 (GPA 2) Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2015)
Good Practice in Planning Advice (GPA) 3	Good Practice in Planning Advice 3 (GPA 3) The Setting of Heritage Assets 2nd Edition (Historic England, 2017a)

<b>Term (acronym)</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Habitats Regulations</b>	EC Council Directive 92/43/EEC, known as the Habitats Directive, was transposed in the UK by the Habitats Regulations 1994 (as amended). The Habitats Regulations apply to UK land and territorial waters and act to ensure biodiversity of natural habitats and of wild flora and fauna through a range of measures including designation of Special Areas of Conservation.
<b>HDC</b>	Horsham District Council
<b>HER</b>	Historic Environment Record
<b>Heritage</b>	The historic environment and especially valued assets and qualities such as historic buildings and cultural traditions.
<b>HGV</b>	Heavy Goods Vehicle
<b>Historic England</b>	The public body that champions and protects England's historic places.
<b>Historic Landscape Character (HLC)</b>	The identification and interpretation of the varying historic character within an area that looks beyond individual heritage assets providing understanding of the whole landscape and townscape area into HLC Types.
<b>Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD)</b>	A trenchless crossing engineering technique using a drill steered underground without the requirement for open trenches. This technique is often employed when crossing environmentally sensitive areas, major water courses and highways. This method is able to carry out the underground installation of pipes and cables with minimal surface disruption.
<b>IAQM</b>	Institute of Air Quality Management
<b>Impact</b>	The changes resulting from an action.
<b>Indirect effects</b>	<p>Effects that result indirectly from the Proposed Development as a consequence of the direct effects, often occurring away from the site, or as a result of a sequence of interrelationships or a complex pathway. They may be separated by distance or in time from the source of the effects.</p> <p>Often used to describe effects on landscape character that are not directly impacted by the Proposed Development such as effects on perceptual characteristics and qualities of the landscape.</p>

Term (acronym)	Definition
<b>Non-statutory consultation</b>	Non-statutory consultation refers to the voluntary consultation that RED undertake in addition to the statutory consultation requirements.
<b>Iron Age</b>	<p>This period follows on from the Bronze Age and is characterized by the use of iron for making tools and monuments such as hillforts and oppida. The Iron Age is taken to end with the Roman invasion.</p> <p>Archaeological period lasting from 800 BC to 43 AD.</p>
<b>km</b>	kilometres
<b>KP</b>	Kilometre Point
<b>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)</b>	A tool used to identify and assess the likely significance of the effects of change resulting from development both on the landscape as an environmental resource in its own right and on people's views and visual amenity.
<b>LAT</b>	Lowest Astronomical Tide
<b>Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR)</b>	A surveying method that measures distance to a target by illuminating the target with laser light and measuring the reflected light with a sensor. Differences in laser return times and wavelengths can then be used to make digital 3-D representations of the target.
<b>Likely Significant Effects</b>	It is a requirement of Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations to determine the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on the environment which should relate to the level of an effect and the type of effect.
<b>LPA</b>	Local Planning Authority
<b>Listed Building (LB)</b>	A building which is for the time being included in a list compiled or approved by the SoS, any object or structure fixed to the building; any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building, forms part of the land and has done so since before 1 July 1948 shall be treated as part of the building.
<b>Magnitude (of change)</b>	A term that combines judgements about the size and scale of the effect, the extent of the area over which it occurs, whether it is reversible or irreversible and whether it is short term or long term in duration'. Also known as the 'degree' or 'nature' of change.



Term (acronym)	Definition
<b>Medieval</b>	<p>The Medieval period or Middle Ages begins with the Norman invasion and ends with the dissolution of the monasteries.</p> <p>Archaeological period lasting from 1066-1540 AD.</p>
<b>Mesolithic</b>	<p>The Middle Stone Age, falling between the Palaeolithic and the Neolithic; marks the beginning of a move from a hunter gatherer society towards food producing society.</p> <p>Archaeological period lasting from 10,000-4,000 BC.</p>
<b>MHWS</b>	Mean High Water Springs
<b>MMO</b>	Marine Management Organisation
<b>Monument Unique Identification (MonUID)</b>	This is the reference number or code for known assets, sites and artefacts contained within the Historic Environment Records.
<b>MSDC</b>	Mid Sussex District Council
<b>National Heritage List for England (NHLE)</b>	is the only official, up to date, register of all nationally protected historic buildings and sites in England - listed buildings, scheduled monuments, protected wrecks, RPG, and battlefields.
<b>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP)</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects are major infrastructure developments in England and Wales which are consented by DCO under the Planning Act 2008. These include proposals for offshore wind farms with an installed capacity over 100MW.
<b>NCAP</b>	National Character Area Profiles
<b>Neolithic</b>	<p>This period follows on from the Palaeolithic and the Mesolithic and is itself succeeded by the Bronze Age. This period is characterized by the practice of a farming economy and extensive monumental constructions.</p> <p>Archaeological period lasting from 4,000-2,600 BC.</p>
<b>NHLE</b>	National Heritage List for England
<b>NPPF</b>	National Planning Policy Framework
<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>Onshore part of the PEIR Assessment Boundary</b>	An area that encompasses all planned onshore infrastructure.

Term (acronym)	Definition
<b>Ordnance Survey (OS)</b>	Ordnance Survey is the national mapping agency for Great Britain. Since 1 April 2015 part of Ordnance Survey has operated as Ordnance Survey Ltd, a government-owned company, 100% in public ownership.
<b>Palaeolithic</b>	<p>The period is defined by the practice of hunting and gathering and the use of chipped flint tools. This period is usually divided up into the Lower, Middle and Upper Palaeolithic.</p> <p>Archaeological period lasting from 50,000-10,000 BC</p>
<b>Planning Inspectorate</b>	The Planning Inspectorate is the government agency supervising the planning process for NSIPs under the Planning Act 2008. The purpose of the Planning Inspectorate is to provide expertise on planning appeals, national infrastructure planning applications, examinations of local plans and other planning-related and specialist casework in England and Wales.
<b>Post medieval</b>	<p>Begins with the dissolution of the monasteries and ends with the death of Queen Victoria. Use more specific period where known.</p> <p>Archaeological period lasting from 1540-1901 AD.</p>
<b>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)</b>	The written output of the Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken for the Proposed Development. It is developed to support formal consultation and presents the preliminary findings of the assessment to allow an informed view to be developed of the Proposed Development, the assessment approach that has been undertaken, and the preliminary conclusions on the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development and environmental measures proposed.
<b>Proposed Development</b>	The development that is subject to the application for development consent, as described in <a href="#">Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2</a> of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4).
<b>Proposed DCO Order Limits</b>	The proposed DCO Order Limits combines the search areas for the offshore and onshore infrastructure associated with the Proposed Development. It is defined as the area within which the Proposed Development and associated infrastructure will be located, including the temporary and permanent construction and operational work areas.

Term (acronym)	Definition
<b>Receptor</b>	These are as defined in Regulation 5(2) of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and include population and human health, biodiversity, land, soil, water, air, climate, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape that may be at risk from exposure to pollutants which could potentially arise as a result of the Proposed Development.
<b>RED</b>	Rampion Extension Development Limited (the Applicant)
<b>Roman</b>	Traditionally begins with the Roman invasion in 43AD and ends with the emperor Honorius directing Britain to see to its own defence in 410AD.  Archaeological period lasting from 43-410 AD.
<b>RPG</b>	Registered parks and garden
<b>Scoping Opinion</b>	A Scoping Opinion is adopted by the SoS for a Proposed Development.
<b>Scoping Report</b>	A report that presents the findings of an initial stage in the Environmental Impact Assessment process.
<b>Seascape</b>	Landscapes with views of the coast or seas, and coasts and adjacent marine environments with cultural, historical and archaeological links with each other.
<b>Secretary of State (SoS)</b>	The SoS of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy oversees the planning system and decision making with regards to development consent. This agent works within the relevant government department relating to the application.
<b>Sensitivity</b>	A term applied to specific receptors, combining judgements of the susceptibility of the receptor to the specific type of change or development proposed and the value associated to that receptor.
<b>Significance</b>	A measure of the importance of the environmental effect, defined by criteria specific to the environmental aspect.
<b>Significant effects</b>	It is a requirement of the EIA Regulations to determine the likely significant effects of the development on the environment which should relate to the level of an effect and the type of effect. Where possible significant effects should be mitigated.

Term (acronym)	Definition
	<p>The significance of an effect gives an indication as to the degree of importance (based on the magnitude of the effect and the sensitivity of the receptor) that should be attached to the impact described.</p>
	<p>Whether or not an effect should be considered significant is not absolute and requires the application of professional judgement. Significant – ‘noteworthy, of considerable amount or effect or importance, not insignificant or negligible’. The Concise Oxford Dictionary.</p>
	<p>Those levels and types of landscape and visual effect likely to have a major or important / noteworthy or special effect of which a decision maker should take particular note.</p>
<b>SLVIA</b>	Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
<b>SM</b>	Scheduled Monument
<b>SDNP</b>	South Downs National Park
<b>SDNPA</b>	South Downs National Park Authority
<b>SERF</b>	South East Historic Environment Research Framework
<b>SLVIA</b>	Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
<b>Temporal Scope</b>	<p>The temporal scope covers the time period over which changes to the environment and the resultant effects are predicted to occur and are typically defined as either being temporary or permanent.</p>
<b>Temporary or permanent effects</b>	<p>Effects may be considered as temporary or permanent. In the case of wind energy development, the application is for a 30 year period after which the assessment assumes that decommissioning will occur and that the site will be restored. For these reasons the development is referred to as long term and reversible.</p>
<b>The Applicant</b>	Rampion Extension Development Limited (RED)
<b>The Proposed Development / Rampion 2</b>	<p>The onshore and offshore infrastructure associated with the offshore wind farm comprising of installed capacity of up to 1200 MW, located in the English Channel in off the south coast of England.</p>
<b>TJB</b>	Transitional Joint Bay

<b>Term (acronym)</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>UKHO</b>	UK Hydrographic Office
<b>VP</b>	Viewpoint
<b>West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER)</b>	This record collection provides details of all known archaeological assets, sites and former archaeological events within West Sussex.
<b>WSCC</b>	West Sussex County Council
<b>WTG</b>	Wind Turbine Generator
<b>Zone of Influence</b>	The area surrounding the Proposed Development which could result in likely significant effects.
<b>Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)</b>	A computer-generated tool to identify the likely (or theoretical) extent of visibility of a Proposed Development.

## 25.17 References

- Arun District Council, (2018). *Adoption Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (July 2018)*. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.arun.gov.uk/download.cfm?doc=docm93jjm4n12844.pdf&ver=12984> [Accessed 11 July 2023].
- Bannister, N.R., (2010). *Sussex Historic Landscape Characterisation. Volume 1-5* [Online] Available at: <https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/land-waste-and-housing/landscape-and-environment/sussex-historic-landscape-characterisation/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].
- Champion, T., (2019). *Middle Bronze Age to Iron Age*. [Online] Available at: [https://www.kent.gov.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0020/93170/South-East-Research-Framework-Resource-Assessment-and-Research-Agenda-for-the-Middle-Bronze-Age-and-Iron-Age.pdf](https://www.kent.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0020/93170/South-East-Research-Framework-Resource-Assessment-and-Research-Agenda-for-the-Middle-Bronze-Age-and-Iron-Age.pdf) [Accessed 11 July 2023]
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, (2014). *Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment. December 2014*. [Online]. Available at: [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GCommissioning\\_1.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GCommissioning_1.pdf) [Accessed 11 July 2023]
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, (2017). *Standard and guidance for desk-based assessment*. [Online]. Available at: [https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA\\_4.pdf](https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA_4.pdf) [Accessed 11 July 2023].
- Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), (2011a). *Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)*. [online]. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/47854/1938-overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47854/1938-overarching-nps-for-energy-en1.pdf) [Accessed 25 August 2021].
- Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), (2011b). *National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)*. [Online] Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/47856/1940-nps-renewable-energy-en3.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47856/1940-nps-renewable-energy-en3.pdf) [Accessed 14 December 2022].
- Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), (2023a). *DRAFT Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)*. [Online] Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1147380/NPS\\_EN-1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1147380/NPS_EN-1.pdf) [Accessed 11 July 2023].
- Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), (2023b). *DRAFT National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)*. [Online] Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1147382/NPS\\_EN-3.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1147382/NPS_EN-3.pdf) [Accessed 11 July 2023].
- English Heritage, (2005). *Wind Energy and the Historic Environment*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.michaelhornsby.co.uk/assets/Uploads/documents/wind-energy-in-the-historic-environment.pdf> [Accessed 11 July 2023].
- English Heritage, (2007). *Climate Change and the Historic Environment*.
- Environmental Protection Act 1990 (c.43). [Online] Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/43/section/43> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2008). *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance*. [Online]. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-principles-sustainable-management-historic-environment/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2011). *Geoarchaeology: Using earth sciences to understand the archaeological record* [Online]. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/geoarchaeology-earth-sciences-to-understand-archaeological-record/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2015). *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2. 2015*. [Online]. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa2-managing-significance-in-decision-taking/gpa2/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2017a). *The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3, 2nd Edition. 2017*. [Online]. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2017b). *Conservation Principles for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment - consultation draft. 10<sup>th</sup> November 2017* [online]. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/guidance/conservation-principles-consultation-draft-pdf/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2018). *Advice Note 10 Listed Buildings and Curtilage*. [Online] Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/listed-buildings-and-curtilage-advice-note-10/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2019). *Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets. Historic England Advice Note 12*. [Online]. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/statements-heritage-significance-advice-note-12> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2020). *Deposit Modelling and Archaeology. Guidance for Mapping Buried Deposits*. [online]. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2021). *Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment. Historic Environment Advice Note 15*. [online]. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/commercial-renewable-energy-development-historic-environment-advice-note-15/heag302-commercial-renewable-energy-development-historic-environment/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Historic England, (2022). *The National Heritage List for England (NHLE)*. [online] Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/heritage-assets/nhle/> [Accessed 11 July 2023]

Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government, (2021). *National Planning Policy Framework*. [online] Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/810197/NPPF\\_Feb\\_2019\\_revised.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf) [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Horsham District Council, (2015). *Horsham District Planning Framework*. [online] Available at: [https://www.horsham.gov.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0016/60190/Horsham-District-Planning-Framework-November-2015.pdf](https://www.horsham.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/60190/Horsham-District-Planning-Framework-November-2015.pdf) [Accessed 11 July 2023]

- Kent County Council, (2019). *South East Research Framework*. [online] Available at: <https://www.kent.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-and-heritage/south-east-research-framework> [Accessed 11 July 2023]
- Marine Management Organisation (MMO), (2014). *Seascape assessment for south marine plan areas: technical report*. [Online] Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/488992/Seascape assessment for the South inshore and offshore marine plans MMO 1037 final report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/488992/Seascape_assessment_for_the_South_inshore_and_offshore_marine_plans_MMO_1037_final_report.pdf) [Accessed 11 July 2023].
- Mid Sussex District Council, (2018). *Mid Sussex District Plan 2014 – 2031* [online] Available at: <https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/3406/mid-sussex-district-plan.pdf> [Accessed 11 July 2023]. Rampion Extension Development Limited (RED), (2021). *Preliminary Environmental Information Report 2021*. [Online] Available at: <https://rampion2.com/consultation-2022/documents/#documents2021> [Accessed 11 July 2023].
- Rampion Extension Development (RED), (2020). *Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report* [Online]. Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010117/EN010117-000006-EN010117%20-%20Scoping%20Report.pdf> [Accessed 11 July 2023]
- Royal Courts of Justice (2019). *Neutral Citation Number: [2019] EWHC 2899 (Admin)*. Royal Courts of Justice; Bradford.
- RPS, (1999). *Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Transfer Pipelines. An Archaeological Evaluation near Bilsham Corner*. [Online] Available at: <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/library/browse/issue.xhtml?recordId=1020020&recordType=GreyLit> [Accessed 11 July 2023]
- South Downs National Park Authority (2019). *South Downs Local Plan*. [online] Available at: [https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/SD\\_LocalPlan\\_2019\\_17Wb.pdf](https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/SD_LocalPlan_2019_17Wb.pdf) [Accessed 11 July 2023]
- South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), (2020). *South Downs Landscape Character Assessment*. [online] Available at: <https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/landscape-design-conservation/south-downs-landscape-character-assessment/south-downs-landscape-character-assessment-2020/> [Accessed 11 July 2023].
- The Planning Inspectorate (2020). *Scoping Opinion: Proposed Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm* [online]. Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010117/EN010117-000045-EN010117%20Scoping%20Opinion.pdf> [Accessed 11 July 2023]
- The Planning Inspectorate, (2020). *Advice Note Seven: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements, version 7* [Online]. Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/advice-note-seven-environmental-impact-assessment-process-preliminary-environmental-information-and-environmental-statements/> [Accessed 11 July 2023]



The Planning inspectorate, (2018). *Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope* [Online]. Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/advice-note-nine-rochdale-envelope/> [Accessed 11 July 2023]

The Planning Inspectorate, (2019). *Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects, Version 2*. [Online]. Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/advice-note-17/f> [Accessed 11 July 2023]

UK Government (1990). *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990* [online]. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

UK Government (1979). *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979* (c.46) [online] Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

UK Government (1997). *The Hedgerows Regulations 1997* [online] Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1997/1160/contents/made> [Accessed 11 July 2023].

Page intentionally blank

