

Cottam Solar Project

Environmental Statement Appendix 13.9: Consultation Response Tables

Prepared by: Lanpro Services
January 2023

PINS reference: EN010133
Document reference: APP/C6.3.13.9
APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)



Consultation Response Tables

Table App 13.9.1.1: Consultation Prior to PEIR

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
Public engagement events, November 2021	<p>Series of meetings with the general public to introduce the Scheme and the archaeological and heritage specialists.</p> <p>Discussions largely focused on Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, as well as local history and archaeology.</p> <p>The following Heritage Assets were raised as being of particular interest:</p> <p>St. Mary's Church at Stow, the Church of St. Edith at Coates by Stow, and the Thorpe Medieval Settlement Scheduled Monument.</p>	<p>An assessment of impacts to the setting of designated assets has been undertaken within the Heritage Statement (Appendix 13.5).</p>
Meeting with Historic England and the applicant 29th Nov 2021	<p>Initiation meeting to brief Historic England on the scope of the Scheme, assessment approach and potential archaeological survey, evaluation and mitigation strategies.</p> <p>Historic England highlighted need to avoid impacts to designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>An assessment of impacts to designated assets has been undertaken within a Heritage Statement (Appendix 13.5).</p>
Historic England, Scoping Opinion, 25th February 2022	<p>Welcomed the inclusion of heritage matters in the submitted scoping report and looked forward to ongoing discussions with the applicants in respect of both setting effects upon heritage assets and direct impacts upon archaeological remains.</p> <p>Noted the iterative approach to investigations set out in the report and looked forward to early sight of the results of cartographic, geophysical survey, lidar and aerial photographic analysis and the results of the Applicant's detailed consultation with County Archaeological Curators and Historic Environment Records and Portable Antiquities Scheme Records.</p> <p>Welcomed the early inclusion of a palette of mounting techniques to allow for the avoidance of some physical impacts upon buried remains. In addition to the focus upon the impact of the panel arrays, fencing, substations etc., Historic England noted that this and related schemes include significant cable infrastructure for connection to grid. The significance / character / importance of assets on these cable routes will need to be well understood from an early stage such that route options can effectively be weighed and risks managed. Historic England noted that "It is important both that opportunities for reduction in harm are realised and that the time required for archaeological evaluation and reporting is allowed for. Areas of heightened risk (burial sites / wet deposits / former water</p>	<p>An assessment of impacts to designated assets has been undertaken within a Heritage Statement (Appendix 13.5).</p> <p>The results of various desk-based assessments, surveys and archaeological evaluation trenching are detailed in appendices: Desk-Based Research (13.1) Geophysical Surveys (13.2), Geoarchaeological Surveys (13.3), Air Photo and LiDAR Assessment (13.4), Heritage Statement (13.5) and Evaluation Trial Trenching (13.6).</p> <p>Consultation was undertaken with the Lincolnshire County Council Historic Places Team, as well as the Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire County and Historic Environment Records, and the Finds Liaison Officer for the Portable Antiquities Scheme</p>

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
	<p>courses etc) should be afforded early attention as should resources requiring particular methodological approaches such for instance as battlefields or air crash.”</p> <p>The following sites and their setting were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade I listed Church of St Mary, Stow • Scheduled Site of college and Benedictine abbey of St Mary, Stow • Grade I listed Church of St Laurence, Corringham • Scheduled Medieval Settlement and Moated Site, Coates • Grade I listed Church of St Edith, Coates by Stow • Scheduled Medieval Settlement, Thorpe • Grade II* Church of Andrew, Fillingham and Conservation Area • Grade I listed Fillingham Castle and GII Registered Park 	
<p>The Planning Inspectorate, Scoping Opinion, March 2022</p>	<p>“The Inspectorate considers that the potential for direct impacts on heritage assets should be considered. The extent of trial trenching activity should be agreed as part of a Written Scheme of Investigation with Lincolnshire County Council, where possible.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that indirect impacts on designated heritage assets should be scoped in as potential for impact remains from changes in drainage patterns, compaction and piling during construction and operation.</p> <p>The baseline information presented in the Scoping Report does not include the baseline information for the cable search area. Whilst the Inspectorate acknowledges that the cable route search areas are not finalised, geophysical surveys should be used to inform the design evolution of route corridors, where possible.</p> <p>Operational impacts upon the settings of heritage assets should be scoped into the assessment.</p> <p>The ES should provide evidence to demonstrate that there would be no direct or indirect impact upon designated heritage assets before they can be scoped out of the assessment. Where possible, the evidence base should be agreed with the local planning authority.</p> <p>Direct impacts to designated assets should be assessed unless the potential for effects can be ruled out through relevant surveys.</p>	<p>A programme of archaeological evaluation trial trenching was undertaken in accordance with a WSI agreed with Lincolnshire County Council Historic Places Team, and in line with national guidance and the Lincolnshire Archaeology Handbook (2019). The results of which are detailed in Appendix 13.6.</p> <p>Baseline information has successfully identified the presence, absence, extent, form and significance of potential concentration of archaeological features—including within the cable route corridor—which could be impacted upon by the Scheme.</p> <p>Baseline information has been used to inform the design phases of the scheme. Where possible, impacts on identified heritage assets have been mitigated by design, either through the removal of sensitive areas from the Scheme or by using construction methodologies that enable the avoidance of ground disturbance.</p> <p>An assessment on any impacts to the setting of designated assets has been undertaken within a Heritage Statement (Appendix 13.5).</p> <p>Decommissioning is addressed in Section 13.7 of the ES chapter</p>

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
	<p>The ES should define an appropriate study area based on the extent of views to and from the Proposed Development and potential impacts on all heritage assets. This should inform the cumulative assessment.</p> <p>There is significant overlap between the cultural heritage and archaeology chapters of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>The assessment of significant effects is proposed to be undertaken for the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development, but decommissioning is not mentioned. The ES should clearly set out if and how decommissioning is to be assessed and any components which may remain following decommissioning."</p>	
<p>Lincolnshire County Council (Historic Environment Officer) 25th February 2022</p>	<p>Lincolnshire County Council Stated they had not been consulted prior to submission of this scoping report and that they had significant concerns on the Cultural Heritage section (section 12) of the submitted documents.</p> <p>They were disappointed that the Applicant has not engaged prior to this submission or to undertaking / commissioning geophysical survey work, which may not meet the standards and quality control requirements expected.</p> <p>They noted that, as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process, a scoping report should set out the proposed approach regarding Cultural Heritage, and that they were concerned by the submitted suite of documents with respect to the Archaeology and Built Environment.</p> <p>They stated that "an approach is needed with sufficient evaluation in order to understand the archaeological potential and to inform a reasonable appropriate mitigation strategy which will need to be submitted with the DCO application. The full suite of available desk-based information needs to be competently assessed including all available records, air photos, LiDAR and local sources. This understanding and the geophysical survey results then inform a robust programme of trial trenching to provide evidence for the site-specific archaeological potential of the development."</p> <p>They further stated that "the ES will require further desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact areas. The results should be used to minimise the impact on the historic environment through informing the Scheme design and an</p>	<p>Full consultation was undertaken with Lincolnshire County Council between March and December 2022. This included the submission and approval of WSIs for geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation, which were produced in accordance with national guidance and the Lincolnshire Archaeology Handbook (2019).</p> <p>Numerous site visits were undertaken across all sites within the Scheme during the trial trench evaluation between July and November 2022. Lincolnshire County Council were in approval of the quality of works being undertaken and in agreement of the validity of the results of the non-intrusive survey works (in particular the geophysical survey), which had been used to inform the evaluation trial trenching.</p> <p>A full suite of baseline information was assessed and used to inform a programme of trial trench evaluation. The various baseline assessments are detailed in appendices: Desk-Based Research (13.1) Geophysical Surveys (13.2), Geoarchaeological Surveys (13.3), Air Photo and LiDAR Assessment (13.4), Heritage Statement (13.5) and Evaluation Trial Trenching (13.6).</p> <p>An appropriate mitigation strategy is provided in a detailed Written Scheme of Investigation (Appendix 13.7), which is in line with national guidance and consistent with other solar-based developments of a similar nature</p>

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
	<p>appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation secured in the Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>Regarding desk-based sources, the Environmental Statement will require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full LiDAR coverage and assessment; full aerial photo coverage and assessment; • archaeological reports; relevant documents from the Record Office covering each site; and • the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) data must also be consulted. • Map regression should include all available maps to provide a reasonable understanding of the development and time depth of the sites. <p>The HER search should be for at least 5km for visual impact on designated assets.</p> <p>Regarding guidance documents, the Lincolnshire Archaeology Handbook (2019) should be included which lays out the requirements for undertaking archaeological work in the County.</p> <p>EIA regulations should also be included in the Reference section and in the Legislation, Policy and Guidance section and should be used as the basis for the EIA Environmental Statement.”</p>	
<p>Online meeting with Lincolnshire Council Archaeologists representing Lincolnshire and Bassetlaw and the applicant</p> <p>31st March 2022</p>	<p>Discussion that evaluation trenching would focus on areas assessed to have archaeological potential.</p> <p>Discussion of production of overarching written scheme of investigation (WSI), the trench plans for which would be provided in stages for agreement and appended to WSI.</p> <p>Discussion of overarching geophysical survey WSI methodology for cable route.</p>	<p>Non-intrusive survey (i.e. desk-based research, LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, geophysical survey etc.) have successfully identified the presence, absence, extent, form and significance of potential concentrations of archaeological features.</p> <p>The archaeological evaluation trenching needed to be sufficient to understand the archaeological potential of features identified through non-intrusive survey techniques, as well as the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.</p>
<p>Online meeting with Lincolnshire Council Archaeologists representing Lincolnshire and Bassetlaw and the applicant</p> <p>28th April 2022</p>	<p>Understanding reached that Lincolnshire County Council were happy with methodology of the overarching WSI.</p> <p>Requested additional trenches in areas in which geophysical survey or other available sources had not identify archaeological remains</p> <p>Stated that they were going to undertake a site visit in May to further their knowledge of the sites.</p>	<p>Agreed that the trial trench evaluation would include a sample of 'blank' areas where non-intrusive surveys had identified a low potential for archaeological features to be present. However, blanket trenching across whole of the Scheme was considered to be disproportionate and unreasonable given the high quality of information attained through non-intrusive surveys.</p>

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
<p>Site Visit with Historic England and the applicant 13th May 2022</p>	<p>Visit to Cottam 1 to initially assess the Thorpe le Fallows Scheduled Monument (deserted medieval village earthworks).</p> <p>Historic England confirmed that they would have no objection to the proposals within Cottam 1, but they might request some offset of development from immediately adjacent to the northern edge of the Scheduled Monument (SM). This would be subject to further assessment of the nature and significance of the relationship between SM remains and the fields and field boundaries to the immediate north.</p> <p>No other objections were stated in relation to the Cottam 2 and 3 sites.</p>	<p>The results of the discussion with Historic England informed the Scheme design consultation process.</p> <p>An assessment of impacts to designated assets has been undertaken within a Heritage Statement (Appendix 13.5).</p>

Table App 13.9.1.2: Consultation Post-PEIR

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
<p>Online meeting with Historic England's Science Advisor and the applicant 25th May 2022</p>	<p>General discussion regarding assessment and evaluation work being undertaken to understand the archaeological potential of the Scheme. The Historic England Science Advisor was happy with the baseline information that was being collated, and in agreement that the results of the geophysical survey had been successful in identifying concentrations of archaeological remains. They were also pleased that paleoarchaeology was being considered for the Scheme. They advised that archaeological works should be considered as part of other ground investigations i.e. archaeological monitoring of boreholes.</p>	<p>Comments from the Historic Science advisor used to inform subsequent fieldwork programmes.</p>
<p>Email discussion with Lincolnshire County Council and the applicant April / June 2022</p>	<p>Series of emails regarding the scope of work required for the evaluation trenching. Original proposal of targeting trenches on potential concentrations of buried archaeological deposits identified from baseline information was rejected by Lincolnshire County Council.</p> <p>Instead Lincolnshire County Council expected what was considered by the applicant to be disproportionate blanket trenching across the whole site (suggested minimum of 3% and 1% contingency as a bottom line for ensuring sufficient coverage).</p>	<p>Blanket trenching across whole of the Scheme considered to be disproportionate and unreasonable given the high quality of information attained through non-intrusive surveys.</p> <p>It was agreed between Lincolnshire County Council and the Applicant on the 17th June 2022 that a 2% sample (+2% contingency as required) was undertaken focused on areas containing concentrations of archaeological deposits and adjacent 'blank' areas.</p> <p>No agreement was made regarding areas that are considered to have a negligible/low potential i.e. where baseline information had not identified any possible buried archaeological deposits.</p>
<p>Meeting with The Planning Inspectorate, Lincolnshire County Council and the Applicant 9th June 2022</p>	<p>Discussion on Trial Trench Requirements. Due to the disagreement regarding evaluation trial trenching sample in 'blank' areas no trenching works were able to commence prior to the meeting with PINS, which caused an unnecessary delay to the commencement of intrusive archaeological works.</p> <p>"The Applicants prefaced the discussion with reference to the British Energy Security Strategy and the pressing need for new energy generation infrastructure. They outlined discussions to date with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) regarding a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and trial trenching approach. The Applicants suggested that the approach had evolved from an initial agreement on a targeted, evidence-led approach, focusing on features identified through desk-based assessment and geophysical survey, into a more generic and costly percentage area-based approach. The geophysical survey results were noted to be of</p>	<p>There was a continued desire to quickly seek agreement for the scope of evaluation trial trenching for the Scheme.</p> <p>Although, a large-scale programme of untargeted evaluation trenching across 'blank' areas was considered unnecessary and unreasonable. The scope of evaluation trial trenching would be extended to include a sample of 'blank' areas to test the validity of the non-intrusive survey results. A staged approach was considered imperative to allow investigations to be informed by live data and ensure that an efficient programme of works was established.</p> <p>Applicant committed to providing quality baseline information that could be used to inform the extent and location of evaluation trial trenching. Welcome working closely with Lincolnshire County Council Historic Places Team to ensure an effective and responsive</p>

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
	<p>good quality to inform the evidence-led approach. The Applicants explained that LCC did not consider that geophysical survey data would fully identify the extent of archaeology present and therefore LCC required more trenches to be placed in 'blank' areas rather than identified areas of archaeology from the survey. LCC has requested 3+1% of trenching on site which the Applicants do not consider is proportionate to the potential impact of the development which it suggested was approximately 0.07% of the land area subject to the Cottam and West Burton developments. The Applicants suggested that the level of trenching was more consistent with the requirements for a housing development.</p> <p>It was noted finally, that due to the disagreement regarding the amount of trenching required in blank areas, the Applicant did not have an agreed WSI and could not commence trial trenching in any areas, even where there was agreement regarding the need for such trenching.</p> <p>The Inspectorate questioned whether cable trenches would be focused within the array sites or at the field margins. The Applicant confirmed that it would generally be in field margins and suggested that work with the greatest potential to interfere with archaeological remains was associated with features such as the battery storage element. The Applicant explained that methods of construction such as concrete footings could be used to avoid impacts but highlighted that these were generally not preferred."</p> <p>"LCC confirmed that it had requested 3+1% trenching, which it considered was required in order to ensure that impacts on unknown buried archaeological remains would be avoided. It particularly highlighted the impact of piling on burials. LCC suggested that its approach was proportionate to characterise the baseline to inform decision making. It also highlighted the limitations of magnetometry surveys in the Trent Valley area, which it emphasised was very sensitive archaeologically. LCC stated that the very large sites should not be treated differently from other sites and that their size did not remove the need for comprehensive evaluation.</p> <p>LCC confirmed that it is broadly content with the draft WSI for trenching in areas of archaeological sensitivity identified by geophysical survey. It stated that here is no need to delay work for these agreed trenching locations. The Applicant welcomed this approach. LCC remained of the view that</p>	<p>programme of evaluation trial trenching is achieved.</p> <p>Agreement reached with LCC that trial trenching works should commence in areas identified as containing buried deposits by the geophysical survey and that a staged approach would be undertaken to submitting trench plans.</p>

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
	<p>trenching in blank areas would require further discussion and potentially remain an area of disagreement and a matter for examination.</p> <p>LCC expressed disappointment that discussions with the Applicant had not commenced until after publication of the Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion. The Applicant responded that the availability of geophysical survey data in March 2022 had dictated the engagement programme.</p> <p>The Inspectorate questioned whether there were any means of focussing the survey approach for trenching activity in blank areas. LCC suggested that features such as geology and other desk-based/survey data could be used to focus trenching activity but could not fully be relied upon and that staged approaches to trenching were possible, e.g. using soil strip rather than full trial trenching.</p> <p>The Inspectorate also queried whether some works could be undertaken post-consent drawing on examples such as the Cleeve Hill and Triton Knoll projects. LCC highlighted the need to provide sufficient information on baseline, impacts and mitigation to satisfy the requirements of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, however it acknowledged that some works could be undertaken post-consent. The Applicant's legal representative supported this position.</p> <p>The Inspectorate questioned whether the Applicant had had similar discussions with other host authorities including West Lindsey District, Bassetlaw District and Nottinghamshire County Councils on this matter. LCC explained that these councils are either represented by LCC's archaeology officers or else defer to LCC. The Applicant stated that there was great variability between local authorities regarding archaeological requirements and it would be helpful to have a consistent National position. The Inspectorate summarised the national policy position on archaeological investigations as set out in the Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1) and the draft NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3). It was noted that the NPS do not specify percentage area excavation requirements and emphasise the need for proportionality."</p> <p>"Both parties acknowledged that whilst they anticipated that there may be some continued disagreement, their goals are to achieve common ground and move forward. LCC emphasised that provided the Applicant can</p>	

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
	<p>provide further detail in relation to the impacts of the Proposed Development, this would enable LCC to work with them to develop a targeted survey approach for blank areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCC agreed that work could commence on trenching of sensitive locations identified by the geophysical survey; • Applicant committed to provide additional information on specific locations of intrusive works required for the Proposed Development; and • LCC and Applicant agreed to consider a staged approach for assessment of blank areas and works that could be delayed post consent." 	
<p>Public engagement events June / July 2021</p>	<p>Series of meeting with the general public to discuss initial finds of baseline assessments within the Scheme.</p> <p>Discussions largely focused on Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, as well as local history and archaeology. No major Archaeology or Heritage concerns were raised.</p>	<p>An assessment on any impacts to the setting of designated assets has been undertaken within a Heritage Statement (Appendix 13.5).</p>
<p>Site Visit – Cottam 1, Fields F and G with Lincolnshire County Council and the applicant 11th July 2022</p>	<p>Burials identified in Parcel G. Lincolnshire County Council requested that burials be recorded and lifted.</p>	<p>Agreed there was a good correlation between results of the non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Requests from Lincolnshire County Council were fulfilled. A burial license was issued on the 12th July, and all inhumations encountered were recorded and lifted as required.</p>
<p>Site Visit – Cottam 1, ~Fields F and G and Cottam 2, Fields H5 and H8 with Lincolnshire County Council, Historic England and the applicant 21st July 2022</p>	<p>Agreed there was a good correlation between results of the non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council pleased with quality of work being undertaken.</p> <p>Request that sondages were dug in every trench to test natural geology.</p> <p>Trenches in Parcel F signed off from further investigation by Lincolnshire County Council and could be backfilled.</p>	<p>Comments from Lincolnshire County Council applied, and level of quality maintained for duration of fieldwork programme.</p>
<p>Email to Lincolnshire Council from the applicant 2nd August 2022</p>	<p>Submission of additional trench plan to Lincolnshire County Council to further understanding of the burial site identified in Cottam 1, Parcel G.</p>	<p>Considered that insufficient information attained to fully understand the extent, character and significance of the possible Anglo-Saxon cemetery that had been unearthed. Additional trenches deemed necessary to better understand the archaeological remains and inform appropriate mitigation and agreed with LCC.</p>

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
<p>Site Visit – Cottam 2, Field H5 with Lincolnshire County Council and the applicant</p> <p>3rd August 2022</p>	<p>Agreed there was a good correlation between results of the non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Blank trenches signed off from further investigation by Lincolnshire County Council and could be backfilled. Lincolnshire County Council requested the involvement of a local pottery expert with the scheme i.e. they would be used for specialist work, included in site visits and employed to provide a series of workshops for site staff.</p> <p>Discussion regarding burial site identified in Cottam 1, Parcel G. Lincolnshire County Council preference to open up a small area around burials and considered undertaking mitigation in this areas as part of evaluation phase. Lanpro specified that the additional trenches were aimed at understanding the boundary ditch around burials.</p>	<p>The archaeological contractors undertaking the evaluation trial trenching would also deliver post-excavation assessment works, including the production of any specialist reports (i.e. pottery). Any outreach programme, for example including possible workshops, would be delivered as part of a mitigation programme for the scheme and so was not seen as appropriate during the evaluation phase of works. The local pottery expert was consulted by the archaeological contractor on the 1st September 2022 and attended site visits from September 2022.</p> <p>The excavation of an area focused on the burials will be undertaken as part of the programme of archaeological mitigation and was not considered appropriate during the evaluation phase of works.</p>
<p>Email from Lincolnshire Council to the applicant</p> <p>5th August 2022</p>	<p>Agreed additional trenches for the burial site identified in Cottam 1, Parcel G, and enquired if an area would be opened focused on the burials.</p>	<p>Additional trenches were aimed at identifying the extent, significance and character of the burial ground by further examining the relationship between the ditches identified adjacent to the burials.</p> <p>The excavation of an area focused on the burials will be undertaken as part of the programme of mitigation and was not considered appropriate during the evaluation phase of works.</p>
<p>Site Visit – Cottam 1, Field G and Cottam 3a, Field K14 with Lincolnshire County Council and the applicant</p> <p>11th August 2022</p>	<p>Agreed there was a good correlation between results of the non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Trenches signed of in the north-west of Parcel G.</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council reiterated the request for the involvement of a local pottery expert with the scheme i.e. used for specialist work, was included in site visits and a series of workshops for site staff was provided.</p> <p>Agreed 'blank' trenches could be signed off from further investigation remotely using trench sign off sheets.</p>	<p>The archaeological contractors undertaking the evaluation trial trenching would also deliver post-excavation assessment works, including the production of any specialist reports (i.e. pottery). Any outreach programme, for example including possible workshops, would be delivered as part of a mitigation programme for the scheme and so was not considered appropriate during the evaluation phase of works. The local pottery expert was consulted by the archaeological contractor on the 1st September 2022 and attended site visits from September 2022.</p>
<p>Email /phone conversation between Lincolnshire County Council and the applicant</p> <p>25th August 2022</p>	<p>Lincolnshire County Council requested that the burial site in Cottam 1, Parcel G, be fenced off and removed from further damage from agricultural activity.</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council notes that mitigation in the form of excavation will be required post-determination and the evaluation has provided sufficient information.</p>	<p>Site visit undertaken with landowner on the 24th August. Request that agricultural activity be minimised (i.e. no ploughing) in area where the burial ground had been identified.</p> <p>Agreed that mitigation by record in the form of open-area archaeological excavation would be required prior to any development works in the area where burials had been encountered.</p>
<p>Site Visit – Cottam 3a, Field K18 with Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Agreed there was a good correlation between results of the non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching.</p>	<p>The local pottery expert was consulted by the archaeological contractors and invited on site visits from September 2022.</p>

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
<p>and the applicant, and pottery session with local pottery expert, Lincolnshire County Council, the archaeological contractor and the applicant.</p> <p>1st September 2022</p>	<p>Pottery session with local specialist and archaeological contractor. Lincolnshire County Council reiterated the request for the pottery expert to be included on site tours and the provision of a series of workshops for site staff. It was agreed that the local pottery specialist would be brought on subsequent site tours.</p> <p>Agreed no need for further site visits for Cottam 3a.</p>	<p>Any outreach programme, for example including possible workshops, would be delivered as part of a mitigation programme for the scheme and so was not considered appropriate during the evaluation phase of works.</p>
<p>Site Visit – Cottam 3b with Lincolnshire County Council, a local pottery expert, and the applicant</p> <p>13th September 2022</p>	<p>Agreed there was a good correlation between results of the non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Trenches signed off from further investigation by Lincolnshire County Council and could be backfilled.</p>	<p>All parties pleased with progress and quality of works undertaken and that acquired data would provide an informed and appropriate mitigation strategy.</p>
<p>Site Visit – Cottam 1, Fields D14 and D16 with Lincolnshire County Council a local pottery expert, and the applicant</p> <p>27th September 2022</p>	<p>Agreed there was a good correlation between results of the non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Agreed that there was no need for further site visits for D14/D16.</p>	<p>All parties pleased with progress and quality of works undertaken and that acquired data would provide an informed and appropriate mitigation strategy.</p>
<p>Site Visit – Lincolnshire County Council a local pottery expert, and the applicant</p> <p>13th October 2022</p>	<p>Agreed no site visit necessary for Cottam 2, Parcel H10 and that trenches could be signed off from further investigation remotely using a blank trench sign off sheet.</p>	<p>All parties pleased with progress and quality of works undertaken and that acquired data would provide an informed and appropriate mitigation strategy.</p>
<p>Site Visit – Cottam 1, Field C5 with Lincolnshire County Council a local pottery expert, and the applicant</p> <p>26th October 2022</p>	<p>Agreed there was a correlation between results of the non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching, partly obscured by geological deposits.</p> <p>Agreed that a subsequent meeting was required once features had been tested from all open trenches to discuss sampling strategy of encountered features.</p>	<p>All parties pleased with progress and quality of works being undertaken. Further data required to provide an informed and appropriate mitigation strategy. This would be reassessed in subsequent site meeting.</p>

Consultee and Date	Summary of consultation and engagement feedback	Response
Site Visit – Cottam 1, Field C5 with Lincolnshire County Council a local pottery expert, and the applicant 10th November 2022	Agreed on site that features had be sufficiently tested and that backfill would be undertaken once features were finished being recorded	All parties pleased with the quality of works undertaken and that acquired data would provide an informed and appropriate mitigation strategy.

Section 42 Response Table

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)	<p>"In respect of the Cottam PEIR report, LCC noted they were pleased by the progress which has been made and by mutual engagement with finding a reasonable approach to undertaking sufficient archaeological field evaluation, however this accord has not been reflected throughout the document. As it stands the response to this PEIR must reflect our concern particularly with the proposed mitigation approach which is firmly believed to be ill advised and unworkable."</p>	<p>Archaeological evaluation trenching was undertaken that was considered sufficient to understand the archaeological potential of features identified through non-intrusive survey techniques (i.e. desk-based research, LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, geophysical survey etc.), as well as the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As agreed with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, this equated to 2% (+2% contingency as required) of areas where concentrations of archaeological deposits had been identified.</p> <p>No agreement was made for regarding areas that are considered to have a negligible/low potential i.e. where baseline information had not identified any possible buried archaeological deposits. To test the results of the geophysical survey, several 'blank' areas adjacent to concentration of archaeology were also assessed at a 2% sample.</p> <p>Baseline information has successfully established the absence/presence/extent/form/preservation of concentrations of buried archaeological remains within the Scheme, and has been used to identify areas where mitigation will be required (the majority of which were agreed on site with the Lincolnshire County Archaeologists).</p> <p>The mitigation strategy (both 'embedded' and 'additional' mitigation) is detailed in a detailed Written Scheme of Investigation provided in ES Appendix 13.7 and is in line with national guidance and consistent with other solar-based developments of a similar nature.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	<p>"Regarding the report itself, it would be helpful to have allocated reference numbers throughout the document including the tables to allow for easier reference."</p>	<p>The individual Site, Parcels and Fields that comprise the Scheme have all been given 'unique identifier' (UID) references. UIDs have also been provided for non-designated archaeological remains in Table 13.9 - 13.15 of the ES, and for non-designated historic buildings in Tables 13.23 - 13.26 of the ES. A UID has also been given to each individual area of proposed mitigation - see Section 6 of the Archaeological Mitigation WSI (Appendix 13.7) and Table 13.8-2 in Appendix 13.8 of the ES.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	<p>"In Table 31.1 Consultation Responses [of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)], the third Where Consultation Comment is Addressed on page 359 currently says 'Discussion with LCC regarding trial trenching are ongoing'. Have now agreed to a trial trenching percentage of 2% with a 2% contingency, with</p>	<p>Evaluation trenching for specific areas of the Scheme, in which concentrations of archaeological features were identified by non-intrusive survey, was agreed with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, equating to 2% (+2% contingency as required) of individual Fields. No agreement was made on 2% evaluation trenching of the whole Scheme.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
	trench plans for individual parcels currently being discussed and agreed, ongoing.”	
Lincolnshire County Council	“Our fourth Lincolnshire County Council (Historic Environment Officer) 25 February 2022 Consultee Response on page 359 states that a full suite of evaluation including competently assessed desk-based information, geophysical survey and a robust programme of trial trenching are required to provide evidence for the site-specific archaeological potential of the development. This has not been completed.”	A full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken. This includes desk-based assessment, drawing on HER, NHLE, NHRE, HLC and PAS information, together with separately commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic assessments and geophysical survey. 450 archaeological evaluation trenches, measuring 2m by 30m, were excavated across the Scheme, targeting potential archaeological features identified through geophysical survey, desk-based assessment, and LiDAR and aerial photographic interpretation. These were undertaken to 'ground truth' the results of the non-intrusive surveys, and included 'blank' areas in which non-intrusive surveys had not identified any evidence for archaeological remains. All evaluation trenching was agreed in advance in an evaluation WSI with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, regular site meetings were held with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, and they were kept continually informed on progress of all work. Where changes to the scope were required by the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team - such as additional trenches or widening of excavation in order to more fully understand that character of archaeological remains - this was agreed and undertaken.
Lincolnshire County Council	“The fifth Where Consultation Comment is Addressed on page 359 which is the response to that above says 'Further assessment will be submitted alongside the ES as appropriate'. This statement is not acceptable and does not address our response. The results of all evaluation and the completed desk-based assessments will need to inform an appropriate mitigation strategy as part of the Environmental Statement (ES) which will be submitted with the DCO application. Please remove 'as appropriate' or clarify.”	The potential impacts of the Scheme are assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES, together with an overview of the programme of mitigation required to remove or reduce such impacts. Details of the programme of mitigation (including 'embedded' and 'additional' mitigation) are provided in a separate mitigation WSI (ES Appendix 13.7).
Lincolnshire County Council	“On page 361 the first Response for Lincolnshire Council Archaeologists representing Lincolnshire and Bassetlaw 31 March 2022 states that trenching will focus on areas that have been assessed to have archaeological potential. This is only part of our response, [we] have also consistently stated that it is necessary for comprehensive trenching across 'blank' areas where previous evaluation results have not established the archaeological potential.”	A broad range of evaluation techniques were used to collect high-quality baseline information and these techniques have successfully identified the presence/absence/extent/form/significance of potential concentration of archaeological features. Evaluation trenching was undertaken to 'ground truth' the results of the non-intrusive surveys, and included 'blank' areas in which non-intrusive surveys had not identified any evidence for archaeological remains. There was shown to be a high correlation between the archaeological remains identified by non-intrusive surveys and those identified through evaluation trenching. Non-intrusive surveys were accurate in

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
		<p>identifying both areas where archaeological sites were present, as well as 'blank' areas that were devoid of archaeological deposits. Where features were encountered in 'blank' areas that had not been recorded by non-intrusive surveys, they were primarily found to be of a low archaeological interest (i.e. likely caused by post-medieval agricultural activity).</p> <p>The extensive scope of non-intrusive survey work and the correlation between the results of non-intrusive surveys and the evaluation trenching, are considered sufficient to be able to establish that the archaeological potential for 'blank' areas is negligible/low. Consequently a large-scale programme of untargeted evaluation trenching across 'blank' areas was considered unnecessary and unreasonable, given the evidence produced by non-intrusive surveys which was supported by targeted evaluation trenching.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	<p>"Overall, however the greatest concern for Table 31.1 is that there are a number of consultation comments for which the Where Consultation Comment is Addressed column simply refers us to Appendices 13.1, 13.2 and 13.4 despite the information not being included in those appendices. As a single example the Historic England scoping response includes this statement: 'Noted the iterative approach to investigations set out in the report and will look forwards to early sight of the results of cartographic, geophysical survey, lidar and aerial photographic analysis...' The corresponding Where Consultation Comment is Addressed column says 'See Appendices 13.1, 13.2 and 13.4.' Apart from the geophysics, this analysis as required by HE has not yet been undertaken, rather the desk-based assessments are in a basic preliminary draft form consisting primarily of collation of information."</p>	<p>Consultation for the scheme is detailed in table 13.1 of the ES Cultural Heritage Chapter (13).</p> <p>The results of various assessments are detailed in appendices: Desk-Based Research (13.1) Geophysical Surveys (13.2), Geoarchaeological Surveys (13.3), Air Photo and LiDAR Assessment (13.4), Heritage Statement (13.5), Evaluation Trial Trenching (13.6), Mitigation Strategy (13.7), Impact Assessment Tables (13.8) and Cultural Heritage figures (13.9).</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	<p>"Section 13.4.1 discusses the ongoing preparation of desk-based assessments. These should have been completed and used to inform the trenching programme, further trenching may be required for those areas where this information is not available. Section 13.4.2 states that geophysical survey will be undertaken on the currently proposed cable routes and that HER information will be obtained for them. The full suite of evaluation is required for the full extent of the proposed development area including complete desk-based assessments with the required sources as quoted in the middle of page 360 not just geophysical survey and HER data as currently stated. A programme of trial trenching along the cable routes is also required to ascertain the presence or absence of archaeology, to provide evidence to inform the</p>	<p>Full and detailed desk-based assessments have been completed and have been used to inform the ES Chapter (13) and the production of a detailed mitigation strategy (WSI; Appendix 13.7). These include assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis (ES Appendices 13.1 and 13.4). These sources were all used in determining the location of trenches as part of the programme of archaeological evaluation trenching.</p> <p>Non-intrusive surveys have been undertaken along the cable corridor and have successfully identified the presence / absence of</p>

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
	route selection and to determine what mitigation will be required along the route. There is no reference to the use of Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) data which is included in the list of required sources which should also inform the trenching programme."	archaeological remains. In line with national guidance and other schemes of a similar nature, as well as with consideration to the high impact caused by the cable route, a programme of archaeological monitoring, including a watching brief and 'strip, map and sample' excavation where archaeological deposits are present, is considered appropriate 'additional' mitigation (WSI; Appendix 13.7).
Lincolnshire County Council	"Section 13.4.6 -assessments of significance should be undertaken for all designated assets to ensure any assets subject to proposed descopeing has an evidence base demonstrating the lack of direct or indirect impact upon the designated asset and its significance before it can be descopeed."	The assessment of significance for designated assets has been undertaken in accordance with the guidance set out in Historic England's <i>Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets</i> . This guidance recommends a staged approach whereby the assessment of the significance of heritage assets is undertaken following an initial assessment which identifies which heritage assets could be affected. It would not be proportionate to also assess the significance of heritage assets that would not be affected by the Scheme.
Lincolnshire County Council	"Section 13.4.7 -the proposed clustering of Grade II listed buildings is acceptable where they are for example part of the same settlement or estate. Given the proposal in 13.4.8 to reduce the assessment area of listed buildings from 5km to 2km [we] do not agree that individual listed buildings which do not exist in clusters should be assessed in clusters as the potential impact and any proposed mitigation maybe specific to that building. Regarding section 13.4.9, note that a geophysical survey for Cottam 1 has not been completed. This should be done immediately."	The assessment of Grade II Listed Buildings within the 2km study areas has been undertaken in accordance with this comment (ES Appendix 13.5). At the time of the PEIR submission it had not been possible to fully complete the geophysical survey of the Cottam 1 Site. This has now been completed in full (ES Appendix 13.2).
Lincolnshire County Council	"Only the Historic England National Heritage list has been listed separately on the sources for this PEIR therefore all other required information should have been included in the draft DBAs. As seen in 13.5.39 this has not yet been done. DBAs will also need to include the cable routes."	DBAs have been produced covering the whole Scheme, including the cable routes, comprising assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis (ES Appendix 13.1).
Lincolnshire County Council	"Section 13.5.36 to 13.5.39 states that HLC types will be obtained for Cottam 1, 2 and 3; that further assessment will be completed to inform the baseline; that 'further research and evaluation at the Cottam 1, 2 and 3 Sites will provide a greater understanding of the baseline conditions and inform future mitigation strategies 'and that 'The DBAs for the three Sites will be updated, to include evidence from historic map regression, LiDAR analysis and aerial photo mapping. This evidence, alongside the geophysical survey and geoarchaeological sampling results, will inform a scheme of further evaluation including targeted trial trenching in any areas where this is deemed appropriate. 'It	DBAs have been produced covering the whole Scheme, including the cable route, comprising assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis, and geoarchaeological assessment. The location and position of evaluation trenches were informed by the results of the DBA, together with the geophysical survey results, and trench plans were revised, and areas of trenching added, as updated information became available. Based on the results of the non-intrusive surveys, and supported by the

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
	<p>is agreed that all of this information and assessment is required and are disappointed that it has not been completed in timely fashion. Trenching plans which have and are being agreed will need reassessment as this information may reveal new evidence and this will result in unnecessary duplication of work and have potential knock-on effects for scheduling, budget and the production of an appropriate mitigation strategy which needs the full suite of evaluation results including trenching in order to be reasonable and fit for purpose. Please remove 'where this is deemed appropriate 'above, trenching is required across the full extent of proposed impact.'</p>	<p>results of the extensive programmes of targeted archaeological evaluation trenching, it was not considered that trenching was required across areas of the Scheme in which there is no evidence for archaeological activity. Non-intrusive assessment, backed up by the results of archaeological features and 'blank' areas ground-truthed through targeted trenching, is considered sufficient to inform the assessment of impact provided in the ES (Chapter 13) and to allow for the determination of a DCO. The results of the non-intrusive surveys and assessments, and targeted trenching, combined with the assessment of the differing potential impacts of the Scheme across its area, have been used to formulate a strategy of post-DCO decision archaeological mitigation (including 'embedded' and 'additional' mitigation) detailed in a WSI (ES Appendix 13.7).</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>"Section 13.5.42 states that geophysical survey will be undertaken along the cable routes with appropriate desk-based research and bolstered by targeted trenching. Full evaluation including comprehensive desk-based assessment and teaching of the 'blank' areas will be required to obtain baseline evidence across the full impact zone including the cable routes."</p>	<p>DBAs have been produced covering the whole Scheme, including the cable routes, comprising assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis.</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation trenching has been undertaken within the 'Shared Cable Corridor', which has the potential to comprise three or more cable routes from the Scheme and other proposed solar schemes, and so may have greater impact than for the majority of the Cottam Cable Route where just a single cable will be laid. Furthermore, several concentrations of archaeological features were identified by baseline information within the Shared Cable Corridor compared to the single cable route, where minimal potential archaeological features have been identified by non-intrusive surveys and assessment.</p> <p>Non-intrusive surveys have been undertaken along the cable corridor and have successfully identified the presence / absence of archaeological remains. In line with national guidance and other schemes of a similar nature, as well as with consideration to the high impact caused by the cable route, a programme of archaeological monitoring, including a watching brief and 'strip, map and sample' excavation where archaeological deposits are present, is considered appropriate mitigation.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>"Regarding the 'Future Baseline' discussed in sections 13.5.49 and 13.5.50, decommissioning must be considered and [we] do not agree that the impact will be minimal."</p>	<p>Potential impacts to heritage assets during decommissioning are considered in section 13.7 of Chapter 13 of the ES, and mitigation proposals are set out in section 13.8 of Chapter 13.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	<p>“Section 13.6.1 and the proposals for dealing with ‘on-site archaeological remains’ by ‘mitigation by design’. If what is meant by this in archaeological terms is ‘preservation in situ’ then it is not a case of simply not putting anchoring spikes or using concrete feet instead in these ‘mitigation by design’ areas. The full extent of the archaeological areas must be determined and each area must be fenced off and subject to a programme of monitoring.”</p>	<p>Mitigation by design (‘embedded’ mitigation) using non-intrusive concrete ground anchors is a nationally recognised approach for safeguarding archaeological remains against the impacts caused by the installation of solar panels. Where the extensive assessment, survey and evaluation trenching programme has identified areas in which remains may be present that are particularly sensitive to impact (such as human burials) it has been recommended that archaeological excavation is used to ‘preserve by record’ (‘additional’ mitigation).</p> <p>It should also be noted that agricultural activity is causing a high level of destruction to buried archaeological features, as witnessed during the evaluation trenching. Removing these sites from agricultural use, provides an opportunity to conserve archaeological deposits in situ and prevent further damage being caused by current land use.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	<p>“Throughout the construction and the decommissioning phases, and there will be no ground disturbance whatsoever which may disturb or affect the archaeological remains, including plant movement or storage. The proposal for the installation of concrete feet requires a full understanding of the depth, extent, importance and nature of the surviving archaeology across the site. Any proposal in archaeologically sensitive areas will require a firm evidence base proving that any proposed work including decommissioning will have no impact upon the archaeology including not only direct destructive impact through groundworks, compaction or reduction in the depth of soil necessary for protecting the archaeology but also through environmental changes which would be detrimental to the surviving archaeology.”</p>	<p>Details of the proposed ‘embedded’ and ‘additional’ mitigation for potential direct impacts to archaeological remains caused by ground disturbance that may occur during the construction phase are provided in the WSI (ES Appendix 13.7) and in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Proposed mitigation during decommissioning is addressed in section 13.7 of the ES.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	<p>“A mitigation entirely “by design” may result in a significant number and amount of fenced off no-go areas within the redline boundary and cable routes. This would lead to significant ongoing constraints in the construction and decommissioning phases which would affect not only the number of solar panels but the development works themselves including plant activity, the placement of associated infrastructure such as compounds and access routes and in the construction management plan itself.”</p>	<p>Mitigation by design using non-intrusive concrete ground anchors is a nationally recognised approach for safeguarding archaeological remains against the impacts caused by the installation of solar panels. Where the extensive assessment, survey and evaluation trenching programme has identified areas in which remains may be present that are particularly sensitive to impact (such as human burials) it has been recommended that archaeological excavation is used to ‘mitigate by record’. Where a high level of impact is likely to occur, mitigation by recording (i.e. archaeological monitoring) will be undertaken i.e. along the cable routes, and at the substations and compound areas. Areas where there are multiple environmental constraints have been removed from the Scheme (i.e. including but not limited to archaeology, heritage, ecology, flood</p>

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
		risk etc). No areas are recommended for 'fenced off no-go areas' as this is not considered to be a proportionate approach to mitigation.
Lincolnshire County Council	"There are no references to the other standard archaeological mitigation response known as 'preservation by record' through archaeological investigation and recording (archaeological fieldwork) through a range of techniques from set piece excavation and archaeological strip map and record to archaeological monitoring."	A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included in Appendix 13.7 that outlines the various mitigation options required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. The WSI details areas where, 'preservation by record' ('additional' mitigation), will be required either in the form of open excavation area, 'strip, map and sample' or an archaeological watching brief.
Lincolnshire County Council	"Given the large scale of this development, a suitable mitigation programme which includes archaeological mitigation by archaeological fieldwork would be expected and expect this to be acknowledged and included in this document, certainly it must be included in the Environmental Statement as it is essential as part of an effective, robust and reasonable mitigation strategy to deal with developmental impacts on archaeology."	A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI), including 'embedded' and 'additional' mitigation, is included in Appendix 13.7.
Lincolnshire County Council	"This document states that the full extent of the archaeological potential has not yet been established, the trenching programme is not complete and even the desk-based assessments have yet to be finished. Table 13.23 therefore with its proposed mitigation of either 'Targeted evaluation trenching and mitigation by design should this be warranted' or 'None' is entirely inappropriate and should be removed."	DBAs have been produced covering the whole Scheme, including the cable routes, comprising assessment of the full range of cartographic sources, and all available archaeological records, including PAS, HLC, NHRE, NHLE, NMP and HER data, as well as the results of specifically commissioned LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis and geophysical survey. A programme of evaluation trenching has been completed and confirmed the archaeological potential of features identified by non-intrusive surveys. The results of the evaluation assessments have been used to compile a detailed mitigation strategy (WSI, Appendix 13.7) that outlines where 'preservation by record' ('additional' mitigation), and 'preservation by design' ('embedded' mitigation), are appropriate to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. In low impact areas where baseline information, supported by the results of the evaluation trenching, has suggested a negligible/low potential for archaeological remains to be present, no further works are considered necessary/appropriate.
Lincolnshire County Council	"The appropriate mitigation response cannot be determined without the results of the trenching."	A programme of evaluation trenching has been undertaken, and the assessment reports are provided as Appendix 13.6 to chapter 13. The results of these have been used to inform a detailed 'embedded' and 'additional' mitigation strategy (WSI - Appendix 13.7).
Lincolnshire County Council	"The list [of archaeological assets?] is not complete as the specific sites come from an early phase of the evaluation programme."	A full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken. The results of these are detailed in Chapter 13 of the ES. Any former lists of sites have been

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
		updated with new information acquired from the various evaluation assessments.
Lincolnshire County Council	"The two proposed mitigations [mitigation by design or none?] are entirely insufficient (see above) archaeological fieldwork will also be required in the suite of mitigation."	<p>A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included in Appendix 13.7 that outlines where 'preservation by record' ('additional' mitigation), or 'preservation by design' ('embedded' mitigation), is considered to be required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. The WSI has been informed by an extensive programme of desk-based research and field evaluations (including LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, geophysical survey, and evaluation trenching), which have successfully established the form and extent of concentrations of buried archaeological remains within the Scheme, and have been used to identify areas where it is considered mitigation will be required (the majority of which were agreed on site with the Lincolnshire County Archaeologists).</p> <p>The mitigation approach detailed in Appendix 13.7 is in line with national guidance and consistent with other solar-based developments of a similar nature.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	"The phrase 'should it be warranted' is a dismissive tone for dealing with the archaeological impact with a proportionate and appropriate level of response."	A full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken and used to inform a WSI (Appendix 13.7) that identifies where 'embedded' or 'additional' archaeological mitigation is warranted and the form of mitigation that is appropriate to safeguard against the potential loss of or disturbance to archaeological remains.
Lincolnshire County Council	"Given the size of the proposed development there will undoubtedly be much more archaeology across the sites which will require mitigation than is included in the table. The geophysics report alone has identified many more sites of interest, the trenching programme which has only just begun has started to reveal more, including burials."	<p>The archaeological evaluation targeted concentrations of features identified through non-intrusive surveys, as well as 'bank' areas, where baseline information suggested a negligible/low potential for archaeological features to be present. The results of these demonstrated the validity of non-intrusive surveys for identifying the absence / presence / extent of concentrations of archaeological features. This included the discovery of an early medieval burial site, which was first identified by boundary ditches that were mapped as geophysical anomalies.</p> <p>Where features were encountered in 'blank' areas that had not been recorded by non-intrusive surveys, they were primarily found to be of a low archaeological interest (i.e. likely caused by post-medieval agricultural activity). No additional sites considered to have a local/regional archaeological interest were identified exclusively from the trial trench evaluation.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
Lincolnshire County Council	"This table suggests that there will be absolutely no archaeological mitigation by fieldwork and indeed that there will be no further archaeological work after the trenching is complete. This is a fundamentally flawed approach which does not allow for a reasonable, proportionate or appropriate level of archaeological mitigation as discussed above."	A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included in Appendix 13.7 that outlines where 'preservation by record' or 'preservation by design' is required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. Further archaeological work and mitigation has been secured in the WSI, which details areas where 'preservation by record' will be required either in the form of open excavation, 'strip, map and sample' or an archaeological watching brief.
Lincolnshire County Council	"Table 13.23 also lists a number of areas of surviving Medieval ridge and furrow earthworks with the mitigation response as 'None.' As with all earthworks which will be impacted by this development, full archaeological topographical survey and recording will be required in advance of any groundworks whatsoever and they will need to be reinstated if they are damaged or destroyed in whole or in part during associated groundworks. Thought will also need to be given for the decommissioning methodology to ensure the earthworks are protected."	Most of the ridge and furrow earthworks identified within the Scheme have now been levelled, including many that have been previously identified from air photographs (Appendix 13.4, para. 3.6.6). The LiDAR data indicates that those that do survive as earthworks are very low and denuded, and, as such, would be difficult to identify an accurately survey in the field, and would be more accurately represented by the LiDAR data. Provision is made in section 13.7 of the ES chapter for future surveys during decommissioning to identify whether it would be feasible to reinstate any earthworks that might be visible.
Lincolnshire County Council	"The information presented in this Cultural Heritage chapter appears some way behind the recent discussions and agreements between the developer's consultants and the LCC Historic Places Team. The approach for trenching for the main sites has been broadly agreed in principle and agreement on specific plans for each parcel is under way, and initial trenching has commenced. The value placed on the evidence from trenching in this document represents an earlier position that we are pleased to note in recent discussions has been revised, however this is not reflected in the document at all."	<p>A programme of evaluation trenching has been undertaken (Appendix 13.6), which was agreed with the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team, and sampled 2% (+2% contingency as required) of Fields where possible concentrations of archaeological deposits were identified. Several 'blank' areas, where baseline information suggested an absence of buried archaeological remains to be present, were also tested and found either to not contain any archaeological features or features of an indistinct nature, often associated with post-medieval or later agricultural activity.</p> <p>No agreement was made for regarding areas that are considered to have a negligible/low potential i.e. where baseline information did not identify any possible buried archaeological deposits.</p>
Lincolnshire County Council	"Of significant concern is the approach presented for archaeological mitigation of this scheme as expressed in this PEIR. The choice of either preservation in situ or no mitigation at all is wholly inadequate and comprehensively excludes the fundamental core of mitigation techniques including the full suite of archaeological mitigation fieldwork which includes set piece excavation, strip map and record and monitoring as well as earthwork recording. In development terms such an approach would exponentially increase the constraints across the development and have an extensive and lasting impact on the	A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included in Appendix 13.7 that outlines the various 'embedded' and 'additional' mitigation options required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme i.e. 'preservation by record' or 'preservation by design'. The WSI details areas where 'preservation by record' will be required either in the form of open excavation, 'strip, map and sample' or an archaeological watching brief. Where there is no evidence to suggest the presence of archaeological features, there is not considered a requirement for archaeological mitigation.

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
	<p>construction and decommissioning phases. In archaeological terms the choice of either preservation in situ or nothing as the only choice for the range and extent of archaeology which has and will come up across such a large development is fundamentally erroneous and unworkable."</p>	
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>"The Cottam PEIR addresses Cultural Heritage in Chapter 13. The bulk of the project is located within Lincolnshire, however the cable connection will run through Bassetlaw District connecting to the hub at the site of the former power station at Cottam. Consequently, this response concerns the proposals for the cable route and not main site."</p>	<p>The four solar sites are located in Lincolnshire. The western section of the cable route is located in the Bassetlaw district of Nottinghamshire, running from the west banks of the River Trent to the south of Trent Port to the Cottam Power Station. All works have been undertaken in consultation with relevant stakeholders in Lincolnshire and Bassetlaw.</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>"In terms of progress with gathering baseline data on Cultural Heritage, the PEIR does not accurately reflect the current situation on the ground. Sufficient progress is being made with regard to on-going desk-based research and the geophysical survey is underway. Data from evaluation trenching will also be required to support the Environmental Statement (ES) along the entire cable corridor route and this has yet to be agreed. As it stands, my response to this PEIR reflects what has been presented within the document and also my concern particularly with the proposed mitigation approach which is fundamentally flawed."</p>	<p>A programme of geophysical survey (Appendix 13.2) and evaluation trenching has been undertaken on the cable route in Bassetlaw (Appendix 13.6), which as agreed with Lincolnshire Historic Environment Team. The geophysical survey covered a 100% sample of accessible land within the Scheme. The trial trench evaluation sampled 1 - 1.1% of accessible areas along the 'Shared Cable Corridor'.</p> <p>The results of these field evaluations, along with desk-based research (including LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs), have been used to inform a detailed 'embedded' and 'additional' mitigation strategy (WSI; Appendix 13.7).</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>"The PEIR notes that the initial response to the scoping opinion has been supported by the Planning Inspectorate and that geophysics survey should be used to inform the design evolution of the route corridors. It further states that geophysical survey of the route corridors is underway and the results should be used to help inform the final routes."</p>	<p>Desk-based research (including LiDAR survey data, aerial photographs, as set out in Appendix 13.1) has identified areas where there is a potential for archaeological remains to occur within the cable route corridor. A programme of geophysical survey (Appendix 13.2) was undertaken along the cable route corridor to further understand the absence / presence / extent / form of buried archaeological remains. Baseline information has been used to inform the final cable route, including micro siting away from areas considered to have a high potential for substantial archaeological remains to be present.</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>"The cable route corridor geophysics results will also need to form a significant element of the baseline data for the ES Chapter and inform the overall mitigation strategy."</p>	<p>The ES Cultural Heritage Chapter (13) and mitigation strategy (WSI; Appendix 13.7) are informed by a full suite of archaeological assessments including desk-based research, aerial photographs, LiDAR data, geophysical survey, and evaluation trenching.</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>"On p359 in the 'Comment Addressed' column (Table 13.1), the applicant states 'Further assessment will be submitted alongside the ES as appropriate'. 'Appropriate' in this case will be the results of all evaluation including geophysics and trial trenching of the full length of the cable route corridor as well as the completed desk-</p>	<p>Archaeological evaluation trenching has been undertaken within assessable areas of the 'Shared Cable Corridor'. Evaluation trenching was considered appropriate within the 'Shared Cable Corridor' given the form / extent of archaeological features identified by baseline information and the possible higher level of</p>

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
	<p>based analysis. On p361 the first 'Response' column states that 'trenching will focus on areas that have been assessed to have archaeological potential'. It has been consistently stated that trenching is also required across 'blank' areas where previous evaluation results have not established the archaeological potential."</p>	<p>impact that will potentially occur due to it being used by up to three or more cable routes belonging to the Scheme and other proposed solar schemes.</p> <p>No evaluation trenching was considered necessary for the remainder of the Cottam Cable Route in Bassetlaw where a single cable is proposed, and where baseline information has suggested a minimal potential for archaeological features to be present as alternative mitigation was considered appropriate to safeguard against any potential loss of archaeological deposits present.</p> <p>Information collated by desk-based research and non-intrusive survey work, the validity of which has been proven by the results of the evaluation trenching, is considered sufficient to be able to establish that the archaeological potential for 'blank' areas is negligible/low. Consequently, a comprehensive programme across all 'blank' areas is not considered necessary.</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>"Of significant concern is the reference to Appendices 13.1, 13.2 and 13.4 where these do not adequately address the comments raised for the Scoping Report. While I appreciate the gathering of baseline data is an ongoing process, a certain level of attainment is expected at each stage to inform the next. The data from the Desk-Based Assessment, LiDAR & AP Assessment and Geophysical Survey should be largely completed and combined prior to the trenched evaluation so trenches can be targeted where necessary."</p>	<p>A full suite of archaeological assessment, survey and evaluation trenching has been undertaken as part of the Scheme. These assessments have been undertaken using a staged approach so that each phase of assessment works could inform the next (i.e. the location of evaluation trenches was based on information acquired through desk-based research and non-intrusive surveys). To maximise the knowledge and understanding attained through the various assessments and field evaluations, initial interpretation of baseline information has been re-examined using the results of subsequent works (i.e. the desk-based assessments were updated with the results of subsequent surveys). Data collected from desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys and the trial trench evaluation has been fully detailed and assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES.</p> <p>The results of various assessments are detailed in appendices: Desk-Based Research (13.1) Geophysical Surveys (13.2), Geoarchaeological Surveys (13.3), Air Photo and LiDAR Assessment (13.4), Heritage Statement (13.5), Evaluation Trial Trenching (13.6), Mitigation Strategy (13.7), Impact Assessment Tables (13.8) and Cultural Heritage figures (13.9).</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>"Section 13.4.2 states that geophysical survey will be undertaken on the currently proposed cable routes and that HER information will be obtained for them. The full suite of evaluation is required for the full extent of the proposed development area including complete desk-based assessments with the required sources as quoted in the middle of p360 not just</p>	<p>Desk-based research (HER, NHLE, NHRE, HLC, PAS and cartographical information), along with non-intrusive surveys (assessments of LiDAR, aerial photographs and geophysical survey) has been undertaken to create a comprehensive suite of baseline information.</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation trenching has been</p>

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
	<p>geophysical survey and HER data as currently stated. As mentioned previously, a programme of trial trenching along the cable routes is also required to ascertain the presence or absence of archaeology, to provide evidence to inform the route selection and to determine what mitigation will be required along the route.”</p>	<p>undertaken within assessable areas of the 'Shared Cable Corridor' in Bassetlaw. Evaluation trenching was considered appropriate within the 'Shared Cable Corridor' given the form / extent of archaeological features identified by baseline information and the higher level of impact that will potentially occur due to it being used by up to three or more cable routes belonging to the Scheme, and other, proposed solar schemes. No evaluation trenching was considered necessary for the majority of the Cottam Cable Route in Lincolnshire where a single cable is proposed, and baseline information has suggested a minimal potential for archaeological features to be present as alternative mitigation was considered appropriate to safeguard against any potential loss of archaeological remains which could be present.</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>“Section 13.5.42 states that 'geophysical survey will be undertaken along the cable routes with appropriate desk-based research and bolstered by targeted trenching'. As above, full evaluation including comprehensive desk-based assessment and trenching of the 'blank' areas will be required to obtain baseline evidence across the full impact zone including the cable routes.”</p>	<p>Desk-based research (HER, NHLE, NHRE, HLC, PAS and cartographical information), along with non-intrusive surveys (Assessments of LiDAR, aerial photographs and geophysical survey) has been undertaken to create a comprehensive suite of baseline information.</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation trenching has been undertaken within assessable areas of the 'Shared Cable Corridor' in Bassetlaw. Trial trench evaluation was considered appropriate within the 'Shared Cable Corridor' given the form / extent of archaeological features identified by baseline information and the higher level of impact that will potentially occur due to it being used by up to three or more cable routes belonging to the Scheme and other proposed solar schemes.</p> <p>No evaluation trenching was considered necessary for the remainder of the Cottam Cable Route in Bassetlaw where a single cable is proposed, and baseline information has suggested a minimal potential for archaeological features to be present. Alternative mitigation was considered appropriate to safeguard against any potential loss of archaeological deposits present.</p>
<p>Bassetlaw District Council</p>	<p>“Regarding section 13.6.1 and the proposals for dealing with 'on-site archaeological remains' by 'mitigation by design'. This implies significant levels of 'preservation in situ' which is not possible in regard to the cable routes. Archaeological mitigation within the corridor routes is likely to require archaeological excavation and there is no reference in the document to the other standard archaeological mitigation response known as 'preservation by record' through archaeological investigation and recording (archaeological fieldwork).”</p>	<p>A detailed 'embedded' and 'additional' mitigation strategy (WSI) is included in Appendix 13.7 that outlines where 'preservation by record' or 'preservation by design' is required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. The WSI details areas where 'preservation by record' ('additional' mitigation) will be required (i.e. in high impact areas such as the cable route), and the form that it should take based on the potential for archaeological remains to be present (i.e. open excavation, 'strip, map and sample' or an archaeological watching brief). Baseline information was used to inform the</p>

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
		design of the Scheme. Where possible, mitigation by design ('embedded' mitigation) has been used to avoid impact to areas of archaeological interest either through the removal of sensitive areas from the Scheme or by using construction methodologies that enable the avoidance of ground disturbance.
Bassetlaw District Council	Given the large scale of this development, a suitable mitigation programme which includes archaeological mitigation by archaeological fieldwork would be expected and I would expect this to be acknowledged and included in this document, certainly it must be included in the ES as it is essential as part of an effective, robust and reasonable mitigation strategy to deal with developmental impacts on archaeology."	A detailed mitigation strategy (WSI) is included in Appendix 13.7 that outlines where 'preservation by record' ('additional' mitigation) or 'preservation by design' ('embedded' mitigation) is required to safeguard archaeological assets within the Scheme. The WSI details areas where 'preservation by record' will be required either in the form of open excavation, 'strip, map and sample' or an archaeological watching brief.
West Lindsey District Council	"13.4.1 – The ES will need to set out how non-designated heritage assets have been identified i.e. through the Historic Environment Register and 'local listing'. Whilst 1km is likely to be reasonable in most cases – "setting" is "the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. The extent to which the development may affect the setting of the asset will depend upon the asset itself."	Full details of the sources of information used for the identification of non-designated heritage assets is set out in section 13.4 of Chapter 13. This includes information identified from the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record, but the Lincolnshire Local List has yet to be populated, which is beyond the control of the Applicant. Settings of designated heritage assets of the 'highest significance' (e.g. Grade I and II* Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens and Scheduled Monuments) within a 5km study area have been assessed, and the settings of Grade II Listed Buildings within 2km study areas surrounding the sites have been assessed (ES Appendix 13.5)
West Lindsey District Council	"13.4.6 – we are encouraged to note that the study area has been extended to up to 5km for designated assets 'of the highest significance'. This will then be subject to a 'sifting' exercise. The Local Planning authority wishes to be kept informed of this exercise and be given the opportunity to comment."	The results of this 'sifting' exercise are set out in the Heritage Statement (ES Appendix 13.5) and there will be opportunity to comment upon these results during the DCO examination period.
West Lindsey District Council	"13.4.8 – it is noted that there are 158 GII listed buildings within the 5km zone and that "proposed that the assessment of Listed Buildings within 2km of the Cottam Sites previously included in the Scoping Report is built upon as part of the further assessment, bolstered by 'ground-truthing' visits where feasible. The resultant evidence base will be agreed with the local authority, if possible, prior to the 'scoping out' of assets where appropriate." We will wish to be kept informed and consulted upon any intentions to "scope out" designated heritage assets, after these assessments have taken place."	The evidence base justifying the 'scoping out' of designated heritage assets from further assessment is provided in section 3.1 of the Heritage Statement (ES Appendix 13.5) and there will be opportunity to comment upon this during the DCO examination period.
West Lindsey District Council	"Table 13.6 – As a designated heritage asset – Grade II Listed Buildings should also be valued as "high". This is consistent with paragraph 5.8.14 of EN-1 which states that "Loss [of significance] affecting any designated heritage	Valuing Grade II Listed Buildings as 'High' would not be in accordance with the assessment methodology adopted for the ES which is derived from <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> (DMRB 2008) (ES Chapter 13, Table 13.6).

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
	asset should require clear and convincing justification.”	Valuing them as ‘Medium’ would still be consistent with paragraph 5.8.14 of EN-1 which states that “Loss [of significance] affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.”
West Lindsey District Council	“13.6.1 It is acknowledged that baseline and further baseline data is to be completed, and that a “full impact assessment” has yet to be undertaken and will be included in the ES once all of the results have further evaluation have been completed. West Lindsey DC will wish to be consulted and kept informed, ahead of its inclusion within the ES.”	Unfortunately it would not be feasible to provide all of the disparate strands of baseline information which have been collated into the ES prior to their incorporation into the overarching document, but there will be an opportunity to review this information and comment upon the impact assessment during the DCO examination period.
West Lindsey District Council	“13.7.1 – it is noted that cumulative impacts will be considered, particularly in regard to views from the Lincoln Edge escarpment.”	The cumulative effects assessment is set out in ES Chapter 13, section 13.10.
Historic England	“We welcome the scope of the Historic Environment assessment set out in the PEIR and the ongoing assessment work currently underway. In particular we note the necessity of geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching to inform a proportionate approach to the significance of below ground heritage assets and their individual sensitivity and importance. We refer you to the advice of Local Government archaeological advisors with regards to the methodologies for and assessment of trial trenching results (we are supporting out Local Government colleagues with the expertise of our Regional Science Advisor). Panel arrays and associated structures, cable runs and substations have the potential for significant environmental effects through physical impacts upon buried remains. These impacts will vary depending upon the particular character and sensitivity of such remains (for instance field systems are generally less sensitive to localised intrusions than burial grounds or Roman villas). Appropriate consideration of impacts and proportionate design adaptation and mitigation is only possible where significance and importance are well understood prior to determination (up to and including public benefit balances in respect of harm to assets of demonstrable equivalent importance to scheduled monuments).”	A full suite of archaeological assessment has been undertaken to understand the archaeological potential of the proposed development site (desk-based research, air photo and LiDAR assessment, geophysical survey, geoarchaeological surveys and evaluation trenching). The results of these assessments have successfully identified the absence / presence / extent / form / preservation of buried archaeological features and have informed a proportionate mitigation strategy, including ‘embedded’ and ‘additional’ mitigation, which takes into consideration the archaeological interest of buried deposits that were identified during the various investigations (WSI, Chapter 13.7).
Historic England	“Deposit modelling is crucial in areas of alluvium and aeolian deposits - see our guidance https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/ . A shared Trent river crossing option that combines Cottam, West Burton and other adjacent Solar NSIPS accessing the grid via these outgoing coal burning power station connections is highly desirable to minimise archaeological impacts. Early attention should be paid to investigating crossing point options in	A desk-based geoarchaeological survey was undertaken to identify the paleoenvironmental potential of the Scheme and trial trench evaluation along the shared cable route (informed by the results of non-intrusive surveys). Particular attention was given to areas adjacent to the River Trent, where there was a heightened potential for alluvium and aeolian deposits. Assessment works were undertaken in collaboration with other proposed solar schemes and have been used to inform the final

Respondent	Comment	Applicant response
	<p>this complex and dense archaeological landscape. The reach of the Trent from around Marton / Littleborough to Torksey presents particularly acute archaeological risks with the combination of Roman and Viking activity and the presence of windblown sand and alluvial deposits and it will be important to allow as much time as possible to plan the design and mitigation of works in this area."</p>	<p>cable route in order to minimise impact on the archaeological landscape running adjacent to the River Trent.</p>
Historic England	<p>"We welcome a dynamic approach to setting assessment which is not overly constrained fixed radii (see our GPA 3 Setting of Heritage Assets) https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/ work should focus upon the particular significance of the assets under assessment and the impacts of the scheme thereon. In EIA scoping advice we highlighted the setting of the following assets (without prejudice to other issues that may emerge through assessment), viz the Grade I listed Church of St Mary, Stow, the scheduled Site of college and Benedictine abbey of St Mary, Stow, the Grade I listed Church of St Laurence, Corringham, the scheduled Medieval Settlement and Moated Site at Coates, the Grade I listed Church of St Edith, Coates by Stow, the Scheduled Medieval Settlement, Thorpe, the Grade II* Church of Andrew, Fillingham and Conservation Area, and the Grade I listed Fillingham Castle and GII Registered Park."</p>	<p>Assessment of the settings of designated heritage assets has been undertaken in accordance with the methodology proposed in the PEIR, which follows the guidance provided in Historic England's GPAN3: The Settings of Heritage Assets. This includes an assessment of Grade I listed Church of St Mary, Stow, the scheduled Site of college and Benedictine abbey of St Mary, Stow, the Grade I listed Church of St Laurence, Corringham, the scheduled Medieval Settlement and Moated Site at Coates, the Grade I listed Church of St Edith, Coates by Stow, the Scheduled Medieval Settlement, Thorpe, the Grade II* Church of Andrew, Fillingham and Conservation Area, and the Grade I listed Fillingham Castle and GII Registered Park (ES Appendix 13.5).</p>
Historic England	<p>"We made a site visit with the applicant's consultants on 13th May 2022 to Cottam 1 to initially assess impacts upon the significance of the Thorpe le Fallows Scheduled Monument (deserted medieval village earthworks) NHLE ref 1016978 Thorpe Medieval settlement. We have no in principal objection to the proposals within Cottam 1, but we may need to see some offset of development from immediately adjacent to the northern edge of the scheduled monument to better address its significance and avoid what could otherwise be a likely significant environmental effect (as noted at PEIR para 13.6.3). This should be subject to further assessment of the setting relationship between scheduled remains and the fields and field boundaries to the immediate north which appear to fossilise the pattern of associated groups of field strips and hence historic landscape setting. We raised no other objections on the basis of that initial inspection in relation to the Cottam 2 and 3 sites but look forward to structured setting assessments to assist us in coming to a considered view in respect of designated assets (as noted above)."</p>	<p>'Embedded mitigation' incorporated into the design of the Scheme includes the setting back of panels 50m from the northern edge of the Scheduled area. Additional mitigation measures include proposals to screen the Scheme from the Scheduled Monument with new hedgerow planting, and it is recommended that further consultation with Historic England regarding this design is undertaken during the Examination Period.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement (ES Appendix 13.5) assesses the setting of the <i>Thorpe Medieval Settlement</i> Scheduled Monument, as well as providing a structured setting assessment of other designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the Scheme in accordance with the methodology set out in <i>Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning. Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets</i> (Historic England 2017).</p>