

SP MANWEB

Reinforcement to the North Shropshire Electricity Distribution Network



Document Reference: 6.8
Environmental Statement Chapter 8
Historic Environment

PINS Reference: EN020021
Regulation Reference: 5(2)(a)
November 2018

SP MANWEB

**Reinforcement to the North Shropshire
Electricity Distribution Network**

**CHAPTER 8
HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**

Environmental Statement

**DCO Document 6.8
November 2018
PINS Reference EN020021**

This page is intentionally blank

The Planning Act 2008**The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure)****Regulations 2009****Regulation 5(2)(a)****Reinforcement to the North Shropshire Electricity Distribution Network****Environmental Statement: Chapter 8 – Historic Environment**

Document Reference No.	6.8
Regulation No.	Regulation (5)(2)(a)
Author	Network Archaeology
Date	09 November 2018
Version	V1
Planning Inspectorate Reference No.	EN020021

SP Manweb plc, Registered Office: 3 Prenton Way, Prenton, CH43 3ET. Registered in England No. 02366937

This page is intentionally blank

CONTENTS

8.1 INTRODUCTION	1
8.2 LEGISLATION AND POLICY BACKGROUND	2
International Policy and Conventions.....	2
National Planning Policy	3
Local Planning Policy.....	8
Statutory Provisions.....	11
8.3 METHODOLOGY, SCOPE, ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS	14
Methodology	14
Scope – Study Area.....	15
Desk-based Assessment	16
Field Surveys	16
Significance of Heritage Assets	17
Assumptions and Limitations	18
Determining the Significance of Effects	19
8.4 CONSULTATION	20
8.5 BASELINE DESCRIPTION	31
Existing Historic Environment Baseline	31
Future Baseline.....	33
8.6 ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS	34
Effects during Construction.....	34
Sources of Construction Effects.....	34
Historic Environment Assessment	36
Effects during Operation	37
Sources of Operational Effects	37
Historic Environment Assessment	38
Significance of Effect	40
8.7 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	43
8.8 MITIGATION AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS	43
8.9 SUMMARY	44

Environmental Statement Documents

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT		
DCO Document	Chapter	Document
6.1	1	Introduction
6.2	2	Alternatives and Design Evolution
6.3	3	Proposed Development
6.4	4	Approach and General Methodology
6.5	5	Planning Considerations
6.6	6	Landscape and Visual
6.7	7	Ecology and Biodiversity
6.8	8	Historic Environment
6.9	9	Flood Risk, Water Quality and Water Resources
6.10	10	Socio-Economics
6.11	11	Land Use and Agriculture
6.12	12	Cumulative Effects
6.13	13	Summary of Environmental Effects
6.14		Environmental Statement Figures
6.15		Non-Technical Summary
6.16		Glossary

Reference is also made to the following DCO documents:

DCO Document	Document
5.1	Consultation Report
6.3.2	Draft Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
7.1	Planning Statement

CHAPTER 8: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

8.1 INTRODUCTION

8.1.1 This chapter identifies and assesses the likely significant environmental effects on the historic environment, which could result from the Proposed Development described in Chapter 3 'The Proposed Development' (**DCO Document 6.3**).

8.1.2 This chapter describes the methodology used to assess the effects on the historic environment, the baseline conditions that currently exist and any mitigation measures proposed. It considers the significance of heritage assets and their settings within and around the study area (as defined in Section 8.3 of this chapter) and key viewpoint locations that are representative of the assets and their settings and the effects experienced.

8.1.3 Further details relating to this chapter including methodology, baseline information and assessment findings are presented in the following appendices and figures:

- Appendix 8.1: Historic Environment Assessment Methodology (**DCO Document 6.8.1**);
- Appendix 8.2: Historic Environment Baseline and Assessment (**DCO Document 6.8.2**);
- Appendix 8.3: Historic Environment Heritage Asset Tables (**DCO Document 6.8.3**);
- Appendix 8.4: Historic Environment Viewpoints (**DCO Document 6.8.4**);
- Appendix 8.5: Historic Environment: Scoping Opinion Response (**DCO Document 6.8.5**); and
- Figure 8.1: Historic Environment Study Area, Heritage Assets and Viewpoints (**DCO Document 6.14**).

8.2 LEGISLATION AND POLICY BACKGROUND

8.2.1 Planning policy considerations are presented in Chapter 5 'Planning Considerations' (**DCO Document 6.5**) and include international conventions, and national and local development policies. The following text refers to the key pieces of planning policy and guidance relevant to historic environment concerns which provide the context for and are considered relevant to the historic environment assessment of the Proposed Development.

International Policy and Conventions

8.2.2 Heritage conservation is required of the UK as a signatory to international conventions and charters on the protection of architectural heritage, archaeological heritage, landscape and setting (e.g. 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention)¹.

8.2.3 The approach adopted to assessing the significance of heritage assets, using a criteria-based approach and to considering the impact of the Proposed Development on the historic environment, is in line with the aims of the international conventions and instruments to:

- Protect World Heritage Sites;
- Promote measures for the general enhancement of the environment, in the surroundings of monuments, within groups of buildings and within sites;
- Conserve landscapes;
- Ensure that environmental impact assessments and the resulting decisions involve full consideration of archaeological sites and their settings; and
- Recognise that setting extends beyond the physical and visual aspects of heritage assets to embrace a wide range of other considerations.

¹ UNESCO. (Adopted in) 1972. World Heritage Convention. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>

8.2.4 Although charters do not carry legal weight, they are international statements of best practice. Heritage conservation arising from the aims of these European policies is embedded in the UK’s national planning policies.

National Planning Policy

8.2.5 National Policy Statements (NPS) set out Government policy for the delivery of major energy infrastructure. The granting of development consent for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) must have regard for NPS. NPS EN-1² and NPS EN-5³ are relevant to both the Proposed Development and historic environment considerations.

NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-5

8.2.6 EN-1 addresses the significance of both designated and non-designated heritage assets, and discusses generic impacts on the historic environment, resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of energy infrastructure.

8.2.7 Tables 8.1 provides a summary of how the assessment has complied with the requirements of NPS EN-1.

Table 8.1 – Compliance with NPS EN-1	
NPS EN-1 Paragraph	Location in ES
Paragraph 5.8.8 requires applicants to provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected by the proposal and the contribution of their setting to that significance. It also advises applicants to include details proportionate to the importance of the heritage assets.	A description of the significance of the heritage assets potentially affected by the Proposed Development and the contribution of their setting to that significance is presented in Section 8.6 of this chapter and also in Appendix 8.2 (DCO Document 6.8.2). The details presented are proportionate to the significance of each heritage asset.

² Department for Energy and Climate Change (July 2011), Overarching Energy National Policy Statement (EN-1)

³ Department for Energy and Climate Change (July 2011), National Policy Statement for Electricity Energy Infrastructure (EN-5)

Table 8.1 – Compliance with NPS EN-1	
NPS EN-1 Paragraph	Location in ES
<p>Paragraph 5.8.14 indicates that there should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets; the more significant the asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation.</p>	<p>The guiding principle that heritage assets constitute a finite and non-renewable resource that must be preserved, unless there are convincing and overriding reasons for their damage or destruction, is outlined in Paragraph 1.3.5 of Appendix 8.1 (DCO Document 6.8.1).</p> <p>The greater the presumption in favour the conservation of assets of more significance, with the conservation of designated assets carrying the highest weighting, is addressed in Paragraph 1.3.5 and I Table A8.1.7 of Appendix 8.1 (DCO Document 6.8.1). The response adopted by this assessment to this guiding principle, preservation in situ by avoidance, is outlined in Section 8.8 of this chapter and in Paragraph 1.3.5 of Appendix 8.1 (DCO Document 6.8.1).</p>
<p>Paragraph 5.8.15 advises that any harmful effects on designated heritage assets should be weighed against public benefit of the development.</p>	<p>The balancing between potential public benefits and harmful effects on designated heritage assets of the development proposal in policy terms is considered in Paragraph 8.3.25 of this chapter and Appendix 8.1 (DCO Document 6.8.1).</p>

8.2.8 The NPS for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) does not address the historic environment directly, unlike other environmental issues, but does refer to heritage assets in the context of undergrounding (NPS EN5, 2011, Undergrounding, Section 2.8.9). This is discussed further in the Planning Statement (**DCO Document 7.1**).

8.2.9 Significant weight is attached to these over-arching policy documents (EN-1 and EN-5), which provide the policy context for NSIP.

National Planning Policy Framework

8.2.10 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides national planning policies to be used in the preparation of development plan documents and determining planning applications. The NPPF does not contain specific policies for NSIP. However, matters that the decision-maker considers 'important and relevant' when making decisions on NSIP applications, (which is equivalent to a material consideration in the Town and Country Planning Act) may include the NPPF itself. Whilst the NPS are the primary policy tools for determination of applications for development consent, the NPPF remains relevant in terms of shaping and guiding the environmental topic assessments.

8.2.11 The revised NPPF⁴, published in July 2018, incorporates policy proposals previously consulted on in the Housing White Paper⁵ and the 'Planning for the right homes in the right places'⁶ consultation. Section 12 of the NPPF is relevant to the Proposed Development in that it relates to 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment'. The opening paragraph (184) relates to the guiding principle that heritage assets constitute a finite and non-renewable resource and states that:

'These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.'

8.2.12 In consideration of proposals that affect heritage assets, paragraphs 189, 190 and 192 state that:

⁴ Revised National Planning Policy Framework, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (July 2018)

⁵ Housing White Paper, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (February 2017)

⁶ Planning for the right homes in the right places: consultation proposals, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (Updated March 2018)

'In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.'*

8.2.13 With regard to the impact of proposals on the significance of a heritage asset, paragraphs 193 and 194 are relevant and read as follows:

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

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

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

8.2.14 In the context of the above, it should be noted that paragraph 195 reads as follows:

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

- a. the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*

- b. no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c. conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d. the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.'*

8.2.15 Paragraph 196 goes on to state:

'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.'

8.2.16 With regards to non-designated heritage assets, paragraph 197 of NPPF states that:

'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'

Local Planning Policy

8.2.17 The Local Plan for Shropshire comprises several planning documents. The two key documents are the:

- Core Strategy DPD – adopted 24 February 2011, notably policies:
 - CS6 Sustainable Design and Development and
 - CS17 Environmental Networks

- Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan – adopted 17 December 2015⁷. The key policies for the historic environment are:
 - MD2: Sustainable Development
 - MD8: Infrastructure Provision
 - MD13: The Historic Environment

8.2.18 An emerging policy is Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Consultation Draft: March 2016. The relevance of this document to the Proposed Development is that the SPD supports the NPPF, Policy MD13 and promotes current best conservation and archaeological practice.

8.2.19 Policies within the Local Plan typically seek to protect and enhance the historic environment:

- MD13: The Historic Environment:

'In accordance with Policies CS6 and CS17 and through applying the guidance in the Historic Environment SPD, Shropshire's heritage assets will be protected, conserved, sympathetically enhanced and restored by:

- 1. Ensuring that wherever possible, proposals avoid harm or loss of significance to designated or non-designated heritage assets, including their settings.*
- 2. Ensuring that proposals which are likely to affect the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset, including its setting, are accompanied by a Heritage Assessment, including a qualitative visual assessment where appropriate.*
- 3. Ensuring that proposals which are likely to have an adverse effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, including its*

⁷ Shropshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2010-2020

setting, will only be permitted if it can be clearly demonstrated that the public benefits of the proposal outweigh the adverse effect.

4. *Encouraging development which delivers positive benefits to heritage assets, as identified within the Place Plans.'*

The explanation to this policy states that:

'This policy is based on the following hierarchal approach:

i) wherever possible, avoid harm or loss to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings;

ii) where development proposals can be justified in terms of public benefits which outweigh the harm to the historic environment, provide mitigation measures for any loss of significance to the affected heritage asset, including the setting;

iii) where a development proposal results in the partial or total loss of significance to an asset, including the understanding of that significance.'

- **Policy MD2: Sustainable Development:**

....'for a development proposal to be considered acceptable it is required to:

1. *Respond positively to local design aspirations, wherever possible,*
2. *Contribute to and respect locally distinctive or valued character and existing amenity by,*
- iii. *Protecting, conserving and enhancing the historic context and character of heritage assets, their significance and setting, in accordance with MD13;*
7. *Demonstrate how good standards of sustainable design and construction have been employed ...'*

The explanation to this policy states that:

'To respond effectively to local character and distinctiveness, development should not have a detrimental impact on existing amenity value but respond appropriately to the context in which it is set. As such, new development should respect the existing pattern of development, both visually and in relation to the function of spaces, retain and enhance important views and landmarks and respond appropriately to local environmental and historic assets....'

- Policy MD8: Infrastructure Provision:

'3. Applications for new strategic energy, transport, water management and telecommunications infrastructure will be supported in order to help deliver national priorities and locally identified requirements, where its contribution to agreed objectives outweighs the potential for adverse impacts. Particular consideration will be given to the potential for adverse impacts on:

iv. Natural and heritage assets.'

Statutory Provisions

8.2.20 The historic environment assessment has identified and assessed the potential effects which may arise during the construction and operation phases of the North Shropshire Reinforcement Project, in accordance with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (the EIA Regulations)⁸.

8.2.21 The principal heritage legislation is:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979: This provides statutory protection to Scheduled (Ancient) Monuments. It is important to note that there is no duty within the 1979 Act to have regard to the desirability of preservation of the setting of a Scheduled Monument.

⁸ The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) (2009), Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (as amended)

Scheduled Ancient Monuments and their setting are a material consideration in the NPPF;

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This applies special protection to buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest. Listed Buildings are classified into three grades (I, II* and II), all of which are considered to be of national significance. The Act requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of a Listed Building, and it also requires planning proposals to meet the test of determining the extent to which a development affects views to and from a Listed Building. It also requires planning proposals to meet the test of determining the extent to which a development affects views to and from such an area.
 - Section 66 (1) of the act states that:

‘In considering whether to grant planning permission [or permission in principle] for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.’
 - Section 72 (1) of the act states that:

‘In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any [functions under or by virtue of] any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.’

- Whilst not directly applicable, on account that Scheduled Consent and Listed Building Consent is not a requirement for the Proposed Development, by extension, the same principles as outlined in Section 66 (1) and Section 72 (1) are assumed to be applied in the grant of development consent.

8.2.22 The Hedgerow Regulations 1997: Under the regulations, a hedgerow is deemed to be 'important' if it has existed for 30 years or more and meets at least one of the criteria in Part II of Schedule 1. In the case of the archaeology and history criteria, a hedgerow is important if:

- The hedgerow marks the boundary, or part of the boundary, of at least one historic parish or township; and for this purpose, 'historic' means existing before 1850;
- The hedgerow incorporates an archaeological feature which is -
 - (a) included in the schedule of monuments compiled by the Secretary of State under section 1 (schedule of monuments) of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979(7); or
 - (b) recorded at the relevant date in a Sites and Monuments Record;
- The hedgerow -
 - (a) is situated wholly or partly within an archaeological site included or recorded as mentioned in paragraph 2 or on land adjacent to and associated with such a site; and
 - (b) is associated with any monument or feature on that site.
- The hedgerow -
 - (a) marks the boundary of a pre-1600 AD estate or manor recorded at the relevant date in a Sites and Monuments Record or in a document held at that date at a Record Office; or

(b) is visibly related to any building or other feature of such an estate or manor.

- The hedgerow -

(a) is recorded in a document held at the relevant date at a Record Office as an integral part of a field system pre-dating the Inclosure Acts (8) [For the purposes of the regulations, this is defined as any field boundary that can be shown to pre-date the General Enclosure Act 1845, this being the date of the earliest Inclosure Act mentioned in the Short Titles Act of 1896 (DEFRA 2002).]; or

(b) is part of, or visibly related to, any building or other feature associated with such a system, and that system -

(i) is substantially complete; or

(ii) is of a pattern which is recorded in a document prepared before the relevant date by a local planning authority, within the meaning of the 1990 Act (9), for the purposes of development control within the authority's area, as a key landscape characteristic.

8.3 METHODOLOGY, SCOPE, ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Methodology

8.3.1 The detailed methodology for the historic environment assessment is presented in Appendix 8.1 (**DCO Document 6.8.1**). It is based on the method set out in DMRB Volume II Section 3 Part 2 HA 208/07⁹, which complies with the requirements of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1).

⁹ Highways Agency (2007), Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2, Ha 208/07

- 8.3.2 What matters is the impact of the Proposed Development on the significance of heritage assets resulting from physical impact to their material remains and change to their setting.
- 8.3.3 In accordance with DMRB, impacts can be beneficial, adverse, direct, indirect, short-, medium- or long-term; temporary or permanent, and cumulative. Impacts may affect assets materially, or their settings.
- 8.3.4 Direct impacts are those that arise as straightforward consequences of the scheme. This can mean physical damage to an asset, but it can also mean impacts on its setting. For a listed building, for instance, visual intrusion on its setting would constitute a direct impact.
- 8.3.5 Indirect impacts are those that arise from the scheme via a complex route. For instance, hydrological changes affecting important palaeo-environmental deposits could result a distance away from where a scheme has changed local land drainage.
- 8.3.6 The fact that an impact is 'indirect' does not necessarily mean it is less damaging than a 'direct' effect.

Scope – Study Area

- 8.3.7 The historic environment assessment focused on those areas which were likely to experience significant effects, as per the requirements of the EIA Regulations (Schedule 4 Part 1 Para 20)¹⁰.
- 8.3.8 The study area accords with Shropshire Council's response to scoping (see Figure 8.1 'Historic Environment Study Area and Heritage Assets' (**DCO Document 6.14**)).
- 8.3.9 For heritage assets recorded within existing heritage databases, study areas were determined in relation to their significance (Table 8.2). These study areas appear on Figure 8.1 (**DCO Document 6.14**).

¹⁰ The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) (2009), Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (as amended).

Table 8.2 – Study Area for Heritage Assets (by asset significance) to either side of the Order Limits for the Proposed Development, as applicable

Asset Significance	1km from OL	2km from OL	5km from OL
Low	✓		
Medium	✓	✓	
High and very high	✓	✓	✓

8.3.10 The primary purpose of the study areas was to establish the impact of the Proposed Development on the setting of heritage assets that are unlikely otherwise to be impacted physically by the Proposed Development.

8.3.11 Generally, the higher the significance of an asset the greater the distance over which significant effects may be experienced by the asset. Distances of 1km, 2km and 5km from the Order Limits for low, medium and higher significance assets respectively were considered to be the thresholds (i.e. the likely maximum distances) at which significant effects would be generated by the Proposed Development for assets of each significance level. Further details of the study areas and how they were established are presented within Appendix 8.1 (DCO Document 6.8.1).

Desk-based Assessment

8.3.12 In addition to the identification and assessment of heritage assets from existing databases, further desk-based research including the study of aerial photographs and historic maps was targeted within 100m on either side of the Proposed Development.

Field Surveys

8.3.13 Field survey work for the historic environment assessment took place within the footprint of the Proposed Development. The fieldwork included: a) ground truthing assets recorded in heritage databases, b) identifying and recording new heritage assets (i.e. those not recorded in existing heritage databases),

c) identifying the extent of setting surrounding heritage assets, d) determining potential impacts on the setting of assets resulting from the Proposed Development and e) identifying the locations or viewpoints which were most representative of views of key heritage assets to/from the Proposed Development.

8.3.14 A viewpoint assessment schedule, including how they were selected and what they represent, is provided in Appendix 8.4 (**DCO Document 6.8.4**).

8.3.15 Invasive archaeological fieldwork did not take place as part of this assessment.

Significance of Heritage Assets

8.3.16 The significance of heritage assets was broadly attributed in accordance with criteria laid out in the DMRB.

8.3.17 Scheduled monuments, listed buildings, and registered parks and gardens were assigned high significance by virtue of their national importance as designated assets. Conservation areas were determined by professional judgement to be either of medium or high significance. Non-designated assets were determined by professional judgement to be of low, medium or high significance.

8.3.18 In accordance with GPA2¹¹, this assessment considered the nature, extent, and level of significance of a heritage asset. It also considered the heritage values an asset may hold, as identified in Historic England's Conservation Principles¹², these being evidential value, historical value, aesthetic value and communal value.

8.3.19 In accordance with GPA3¹³, this assessment considered whether, how and to what degree setting made a contribution to the significance of heritage assets.

¹¹ Historic England (2015), Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2, Managing Significance in Decision; Taking in The Historic Environment

¹² Historic England (formerly English Heritage) (2008), Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment

¹³ Historic England (2015), Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3; The Setting of

Assumptions and Limitations

8.3.20 A number of assumptions and limitations were made in relation to the information presented in this chapter:

- Access to private land and properties was not sought. The assessment was therefore based on judgements made from nearby publicly accessible land.
- All assessment work applied a precautionary principle and a realistic worst-case scenario was assessed in determining the likely magnitude of potential effects on heritage assets:
 - e.g. particularly those assets which possess height (e.g. buildings with upper floors).
 - e.g. effects on setting were determined in relation to the Order Limits to take account of the flexibility for micro-siting of wood poles (from indicative positions) within the Order Limits, as permitted within the DCO.
- Given the type of development being proposed it is assumed that predicted effects would be adverse (negative), as opposed to beneficial, unless otherwise stated;
- There was uncertainty over the location, extent, interpretation or significance of some of the known heritage assets and some of the new sites discovered by recent field survey as part of this assessment; and
- Historic environment ‘viewpoints’ were used to assist in the understanding of effects on important heritage assets and their settings as part of larger programme of field assessment. Single viewpoints cannot capture the totality of potential impacts on setting and should not therefore be considered in isolation from the full assessment

(Appendix 8.2 (**DCO Document 8.6.2**)).

Determining the Significance of Effects

- 8.3.21 As explained further in Appendix 8.1 (**DCO Document 6.8.1**), and in accordance with the DMRB, to determine significance of effect, separate judgements about the significance of heritage assets and the magnitude of effect were combined to allow a final judgement to be made about the overall significance of effect and whether or not the determined effect should be considered 'significant'. This involved a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessment and the application of professional judgement.
- 8.3.22 The rationale behind each judgment (of effect on each receptor) is set out in the main assessment supported by the list of heritage assets.
- 8.3.23 The existing historic environment baseline forms the basis for the identification, description and assessment of any effects that may result from the Proposed Development.
- 8.3.24 A detailed historic environment baseline and assessment is provided in Appendix 8.2 (**DCO Document 6.8.2**), with a brief summary of the baseline provided below in Section 8.5. A full list of heritage assets is provided in Appendix 8.3 (**DCO Document 6.8.3**).
- 8.3.25 It is important to note that effects judged to be significant do not necessarily equate in policy terms to 'Substantial Harm' (which is a high test) and do not mean that the Proposed Development becomes unacceptable in planning terms. Ratings of significance are independent of 'acceptability' which is a judgement above and beyond that of significance. Acceptability is about the overall balance of benefits and harm from the proposals as viewed or weighted by national policy and development plan policies and determined in this case through the DCO examination process.

8.4 CONSULTATION

8.4.1 To inform the preparation of the application for an Order granting development consent, SP Manweb undertook a thorough pre-application consultation process, which included publication of the following documents:

- Scoping Report¹⁴ submitted to the PINS (9th March 2017);
- Scoping Opinion¹⁵ received from the Secretary of State (25th April 2017) and
- Statutory consultation (in accordance with sections 42, 47 and 48 of the Planning Act 2008 and the EIA Regs 2009) on a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR¹⁶) (November 2017).

8.4.2 Detailed responses to the points raised in the Scoping Opinion is provided in Appendix 8.5 (**DCO Document 6.8.5**).

8.4.3 Information on the statutory and non-statutory consultation is provided in the Consultation Report (**DCO Document 5.1**).

8.4.4 Consultation on the contents of the EIA, relevant to the historic environment, are outlined in Table 8.3.

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
Shropshire Council		
12/04/2016 Request to Shropshire Council (SC)	Request by Network Archaeology	HER data received by email on 12/04/2016

¹⁴ <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020021/EN020021-000027-Scoping%20Report.pdf>

¹⁵ <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020021/EN020021-000012-Scoping%20Opinion.pdf>

¹⁶ https://www.spenergynetworks.co.uk/userfiles/file/SPM_NSRP_PEIR.pdf

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
Email	(NA) to SC for HER data	
02/09/2016 Natural & Historic Environment Manager, SC Email	Request by NA for: 1) Comments on a) consultation material relating to the proposed 132 kV overhead line, issued on 29th June, as the consultation period ends on 9th September, and b) potential effects on any non-registered parks (e.g. Woodhouse) and also the Roman marching camp at Perry Farm, east of Babbinswood.	Site visit planned (with SC's retained landscape consultant) on Thursday 6th October. Opinion on potential effects on the non-designated parklands to follow. At this stage, SC states that they 'would be keen to ensure that any effects on their settings are avoided or minimised'. In terms of the marching camp at Perry Farm, SC summarises the evidence and states that 'the main potential effect of the line would potentially be to detract to some degree from the ability to appreciate the landscape context of the fort'. More detailed HER entry for the site was also provided.

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
	2) Prior notification if the current response is likely to result in any charge for time incurred.	
27/09/2016 Natural & Historic Environment Manager, SC Email	Request by NA for SC to review selected HER sites, considered by NA to be of potential regional importance and confirm SC's view as to whether any HER sites should be added to or removed from the list. File attachment containing	SC provided a preliminary reply on 20/10/2017, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WWII Practice trenches within Old Oswestry scheduled hillfort – national importance in own right – no concerns • Middleton cluster of listed buildings and non-designated buildings – no concerns • Halston Hall and park – no concerns • Woodhouse (cluster of listed and non-designated buildings) – no concerns • Woodhouse park – no concerns • Paradise (Lower Lees) Farm (SHER MSA22938) – local importance only – no concerns • Hordley – no concerns about Option 2A if preferred

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
	selected HER sites attached.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stanwardine (cluster of listed and non-designated buildings and SM) – no concerns • Cockshutt - Preference for Option 3b • Stanwardine Grange - potentially of regional importance – Preference for Option 3b • Noneley – cluster of (cluster of listed and non-designated buildings) – concern expressed over potential views of the scheme to south <p>SC provided a full response in a letter dated 20/10/2017, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC confirmed agreement with a previously supplied provisional list of heritage assets classified as being of regional significance, with the exception of the WWI Practice Trenches (SHER MSA 33916) located within the Scheduled Monument of Old Oswestry hillfort (SHER MSA 261), which should be considered as of national significance in their own right; • SC commented on the low number of buildings classified as being of regional significance and suggested that Stanwardine Grange (SHER MSA

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
		<p>30370), near Cockshutt, is one potential candidate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC commented that Paradise (Lower Lees) Farm (SHER MSA 22938) should be considered of local significance only, and expressed no concerns about the Preferred Route; • SC commented on the small cluster of listed buildings and non-designated buildings at Middleton, south-east of Oswestry, expressing no concerns about the Preferred Route to the north; • SC commented on the settings of Halston Hall Park (SHER MSA 4075) and Woodhouse Park (SHER MSA 4092), stating that the Preferred Route would not have any significant effects, and noted that the cluster of listed buildings and associated non-designated buildings, including Woodhouse itself, at the centre of the park are screened from preferred route by woods. The principle elevations of the house are also oriented south and east, away from the Preferred Route; • SC commented on the cluster of heritage assets at Stanwardine,

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
		<p>comprising a Scheduled Monument (SM 1017240) a listed building (LB 1176127) and non-designated buildings, suggesting that there would be no effect on the settings of these assets, on account of intervening landform;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC expressed a preference for Option 3b to the south of Cockshutt, on account of a) increasing the distance between the Proposed Development and heritage assets in Cockshutt, b) minimising impacts on the setting of Stanwardine Grange, and c) retaining the visual connections with Cockshutt; the current Preferred Route broadly adopts Option 3b; • SC expressed a preference for the overhead line to be routed to the north of the cluster of listed buildings (LB 1212917, LB 1366490) and non-designated buildings in the hamlet of Noneley. As a consequence, further viable routes in this area were sought, and this has resulted in the identification of the Noneley North

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
		<p>Option, which has been included in this Scoping Report;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC commented on the non-designated marching camp at Perry Farm (SHER MSA 655) suggesting that the main potential effect of the Proposed Development would potentially be to detract to some degree from the ability to appreciate the landscape context of the fort; and • SC also expressed a preference that any effects on the settings of non-designated parklands are avoided or minimised.
<p>17/10/2016 Natural & Historic Environment Manager, SC Email</p>	<p>Enquired if the planned site visit took place on 4th October. Asked if SC had anything to add to their interim feedback of 27th September Asked if SC had reviewed the list of sites of potential</p>	<p>SC confirmed that the site visit did take place. SC would call NA to discuss.</p>

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
	regional importance	
01/03/2017 Natural & Historic Environment Manager, SC Email	NA sent a draft copy of the Scoping Report requesting comments	Meeting held at SC office in Shrewsbury on 02/03/2017 Preliminary feedback provided in an email via SC. Key point related to definitions and use of words significance/ importance.
01/03/2017 Principal Conservation & Design Officer, SC Email	NA sent a draft copy of the Scoping Report requesting comments	Meeting held at SC Office in Shrewsbury on 02/03/2017. Preliminary feedback provided annotated notes on a draft copy of the Scoping Report Key points included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • definitions and use of words significance/ importance and values/ interests; • reference para. 72 of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act; • in terms of defining durations of effects use construction, operation and residual rather than periods of time; • define sensitivity and add methodology; • reference sources of tables.

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
06/06/2017 Principal Conservation & Design Officer, SC Email	Gillespies sent the proposed HE viewpoints	SC stated that they felt they were broadly representative and acceptable, but commented that when taking individual heritage assets into account, as per the Historic England Good Practice Advice note 3, the setting of these is likely to be broader than a specific view; SC would expect the HE assessment to reflect this, as contained within his proposed scoping methodology
8/11/2017 Email to SC	SP Manweb requested comments from Shropshire Council on the draft PEIR	Comments received on Appendix 9.2 Baseline and Assessment and Chapter 9 Summary
Historic England		
20/05/2016 Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Historic England (HE) conference call	Initiated by SP Manweb and attended NA HE’s informal view of the Red Line route in relation to Whittington	HE responded that in their informal opinion, and based on current information, the Red Line route was 'unlikely to cause concern' to Historic England

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
	Castle was sought	
02/09/2016 Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments, HE Email	Request by NA for: 1) Comments on a) consultation material relating to the proposed 132 kV overhead line, issued on 29th June, as the consultation period ends on 9th September, and b) potential effects on Whittington Castle 2) Prior notification if the current response is likely to result in any charge for time incurred.	03/10/2016 HE replied <i>"Having looked at our previous correspondence on this I would confirm that the alternative route options 1A and 1B would be more likely to have a greater impact on the significance of Whittington Castle than the preferred route. In choosing the route corridor, however, it will be necessary to balance impacts on the historic environment overall"</i>

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
17/10/2016 Principal Inspector of Ancient Monuments, HE Email	<p>NA:</p> <p>1) Acknowledged HE’s previous reply and feedback</p> <p>2) Asked if HE intended to provide any further feedback on Whittington Castle or any other scheduled monuments</p> <p>3) Enquired if in the absence of any comments, we can assume that the proposals do not cause concern to HE.</p>	<p>HE replied by letter on 22/12 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HE stated broad support of the approach taken to date in the identification and consideration of impact upon HE assets. • HE provided some feedback on the Route Corridor Options Report, including the terms and definitions. • HE recommended that the EIA assessment should incorporate the advice and methodology set out in Historic England’s ‘Good Practice Advice in Planning Notes’ (GPAs) • HE noted that the preferred route option 3B was closer to Stanwardine scheduled moated site than the earlier version Section 3. HE recommended the impact of the Proposed Development on Stanwardine scheduled moated site (SM 1017240) is assessed at the EIA stage by using the methodology set out in advice note GPA3, The Setting of Heritage Assets (Ref. 10.8); • HE commented that for Whittington Castle (SM 1019450) the Preferred Route is likely to have a ‘less than

Table 8.3 – Summary of EIA Relevant Consultation Responses		
Date	Summary of Contact	Response
		substantial' impact (in terms of the NPPF definitions), although this would also need to be assessed further at EIA stage;

8.5 BASELINE DESCRIPTION

8.5.1 The following text summarises the historic environment baseline for the study area. A more detailed description of the study area and its wider surroundings is provided in Appendix 8.2 **(DCO Document 6.8.2)**.

Existing Historic Environment Baseline

8.5.2 Within the 5km Study Area there are a total of 1,786 assets, comprising 763 designated assets (including non-statutory registered assets) and 1,023 non-designated assets.

8.5.3 The designated assets include 34 Scheduled Monuments, seven Conservation Areas, 720 Listed Buildings and two Registered Parks and Gardens. These assets are all of high significance.

8.5.4 Of the 34 scheduled monuments of two are prehistoric, twelve are early medieval, and the remainder are buildings and other structures dating from medieval through to modern. There are no scheduled monuments within the Study Area dating to the Roman period.

8.5.5 Of the 720 listed buildings, nine are Grade I and 33 are Grade II*. The listed buildings mostly date to the post-medieval and early modern periods and a small number are medieval.

8.5.6 The two registered parks and gardens within the Study Area, are both post-medieval to early modern.

- 8.5.7 Of the 1,023 non-designated assets, 815 are recorded in existing heritage databases. The Shropshire Council Historic Environment Records (SHER) lists 320, the Portable Antiquities record 50 find spots, the National Monument Records list 20 assets, the Defence of Britain Project (DOBP) records seven assets and English Nature records two assets. In addition, the desk-based assessment recorded 624 assets, and the field reconnaissance survey recorded a further 5 sites.
- 8.5.8 Eight non-designated assets have been assigned high significance by virtue of their relationship with designated assets. These include: Wat's Dyke (HER 0100a, HER 0100b), Petton Park Moated Site (HER 01129), Wem Castle (HER 01135), Oswestry Castle (HER 05782), Oswestry Town Defences (HER 00493), Cultivation Terraces at Shelf Bank (HER 01580) and WWI training trenches (HER 31097).
- 8.5.9 Thirty-four non-designated assets have been assigned medium significance by virtue that they have the potential to address regional research priorities. These include: ring ditch (HER 04034), ring ditch and possible pit alignment (HER 02402), cremation burial (HER 04287), bronze shield (HER 00900), Roman marching camps (HER 00935 and HER 02449), medieval chapel (HER 00338), medieval DMV (HER 00993), Park Hall park and garden (HER 07632), Fernhill Hall Park (HER 07624), Tilley park (HER 07609), Halston Hall Park (HER 07627), Kenwick Park (HER 07588), Stanwardine in the Wood Park (HER 07606), Tedsmore Hall Park and Gardens (HER 07638), Loppington House Park (HER 07590), Loppington Hall Garden (HER 07589), Petton Hall Park (HER 07597), Frankton Grange Park (HER 30594), Woodhouse Park (HER 07644), Bagley Hall (HER 12253), Loppington House (HER 12281), Petton Park, Country House (HER 16183), Stanwardine Grange (HER 26708), Vyrnwy Aqueduct (HER 21491), Montgomery Canal (HER 00927), Railway yard (HER 05704), Oswestry & Newtown Railway (HER 05778), Oswestry, Ellesmere & Whitchurch Railway (Cambrian) (HER 05892), the Shrewsbury & Chester Railway (HER 08444), Tenement plots (HER 05790), Wem post-medieval urban form (HER 05576), Prisoner of War

(POW) Camp, Ordnance Supply Depot (HER 29140), German POW Cemetery (HER 31834) and peat deposits (HER 08353).

- 8.5.10 Of the 981 non-designated assets which are of low significance 41 are prehistoric, 18 are Roman, three are early medieval, 96 are medieval, 63 are post-medieval, 574 are early modern, 26 are modern and 160 are of undetermined date.
- 8.5.11 The Proposed Development oversails 116 field boundaries, 88 of which are potentially 'historic' (i.e. pre-enclosure), as they meet the archaeological criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations. Of these potentially 'historic' boundaries, 64 include an 'Important Hedge'.
- 8.5.12 Former river channels and peat deposits of potential palaeo-environmental importance are recorded in the Study Area.
- 8.5.13 There is potential for below-ground archaeology, as yet undiscovered along the route of the Proposed Development.

Future Baseline

- 8.5.14 All landscapes can be dynamic and influenced by social, economic, technological and climatic changes, all of which can influence patterns of land use, land cover and land management. As such, the baseline for the historic environment assessment is constantly evolving. Because of this, consideration is given by this assessment to how the historic environment may change in the future irrespective of the Proposed Development. There are several ways in which the historic environment future baseline conditions could differ from current baseline conditions. For example, if an asset's designated status is altered or any, as yet unknown heritage assets with archaeological interest, are identified through third party (e.g. local archaeology groups) surveys within the Order Limits. However, as baseline data gathering included consultation with the relevant statutory and non-statutory consultees responsible for designations and for dissemination of third-party survey data, the likelihood of either circumstance occurring is low

and, in any event, would not necessarily alter the assessment of effects undertaken, as this has been undertaken on a realistic worse-case basis. Therefore, the baseline conditions reported in this chapter are taken to also represent future baseline conditions (at the time of construction). The mitigation measures proposed below will be subject to on-going discussion with the relevant consultees, and, in the unlikely event that the baseline conditions do alter, this can be taken into account as mitigation measures are refined, agreed and implemented.

8.6 ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

8.6.1 This section of the chapter presents the assessment of the likely significant historic environment effects of the Proposed Development as described in Chapter 3 'The Proposed Development' (**DCO Document 6.3**).

8.6.2 An assessment of all identified historic environment effects is provided in Appendix 8.2 (**DCO Document 6.8.2**).

Effects during Construction

Sources of Construction Effects

8.6.3 The construction of high voltage electricity connections can give rise to physical impacts (direct and indirect) and impacts on setting.

8.6.4 Construction activities that have the potential to generate direct physical impacts on heritage assets, and which have been considered in this assessment include:

- The mechanical excavation of open-cut trench for:
 - the underground section of the new high voltage electricity connection,
 - the diversion underground of existing low voltage overhead cables; and
- The mechanical excavation of overburden within compounds, temporary working areas and along permanent accesses. The

mechanical excavation of the post-pits and temporary winch pits for the wood pole overhead line, albeit that any such impacts would be limited on account of the small-scale nature of these works

- Clearance of trees and hedgerows;
- Ground investigations for geotechnical and other purposes;
- Handling and storage of build components;
- Handling and storage of soil; and
- Reinstatement works.

8.6.5 Construction activities that have the potential to generate indirect impacts on heritage assets, and which have been considered in this assessment include:

- The mechanical excavation of open-cut trench for the underground section of the new high voltage electricity connection and the diversion underground of existing low voltage overhead cables, potentially resulting in a) changes to ground hydrology causing drying/ desiccation or b) microbial decay of preserved organic remains.

8.6.6 Direct physical impacts and indirect impacts would be permanent and irreversible.

8.6.7 Construction activities that have the potential to generate visual intrusion on heritage assets and their settings, and which have been considered in this assessment include:

- Plant undertaking mechanical excavation;
- Construction equipment during the erection of poles and the stringing of conductors; and
- Delivery and maintenance traffic.

8.6.8 The effects of visual intrusion on heritage assets and their settings from working practices during construction would be short-term and temporary.

Historic Environment Assessment

8.6.1 Table 8.4 summarises the assessed counts of adverse direct physical effects on heritage assets by asset significance resulting from construction of each component of the Proposed Development.

Table 8.4 – Summary of Count of Adverse Direct Physical Effects on Heritage Assets by Asset Significance for Construction of each Component of the Proposed Development				
Development Component	Non-Designated			Designated
	L	M	H	H
Oswestry Sub-station Extension	0	0	0	0
Underground Line	17	1	0	0
Overhead Line	166	0	0	0
Wem Sub-station Extension	1	0	0	0
Access Tracks and Lay-down Areas	214	0	0	0
LV Diversions	32	0	0	0
Totals	430	1	0	0

KEY: L=Low Significance; M=Medium Significance; H=High Significance

8.6.2 All of the construction effects are direct and physical. The vast majority (almost 99%) are effects on non-designated assets of low significance - predominantly former field boundaries. There are only six effects on non-designated assets of medium significance and there are no effects on non-designated assets of high significance or on designated assets.

8.6.3 The total count of effects is 431, but the actual number of affected assets is 341. This is because 90assets would experience multiple effects from different components of the Proposed Development.

8.6.4 Construction of the overhead line is predicted to generate up to 166 effects, but of these only 46 will result from erection of the wood poles for the

overhead line itself. The other effects are a worst-case count based on 100% impact within the entire footprint of the Order Limits.

- 8.6.5 Construction of the and lay-down areas and use of the access tracks is predicted to generate up to 214 effects, but this is also a worst-case count based on 100% impact within the entire footprint of the access tracks and lay-down areas. Lay-down areas only impact three assets. The majority of access would be via pre-existing tracks, where the likelihood of vehicular impacts would be low.
- 8.6.6 Indirect construction effects have not been identified by this assessment.
- 8.6.7 Effects on the settings of heritage assets resulting from construction of the Proposed Development have not been identified on account of the types/size and low volume of construction vehicles and equipment, and the short duration of construction activities in each area, which do not differ significantly from normal seasonal agricultural activities.
- 8.6.8 None of the identified adverse direct physical effects on heritage assets resulting from construction of the Proposed Development have been assessed as being significant.
- 8.6.9 Further details can be found in Appendix 8.2 (**DCO Document 6.8.2**).

Effects during Operation

Sources of Operational Effects

- 8.6.9 The operation of high voltage electricity connections can give rise to physical impacts and impacts on setting.
- 8.6.10 The working practices during operation that have the potential to generate direct physical effects on heritage assets, and which have been considered in this assessment include:
- Ongoing inspection, maintenance and repair visits by SP Manweb to the Proposed Development, albeit that these would be infrequent.

8.6.11 The direct effects of these working practices would be permanent and irreversible.

8.6.12 The operation of above-ground electrical infrastructure has the potential to generate visual intrusion on heritage assets and their settings. Those which have been considered in this assessment include:

- The new high voltage overhead line;
- The new sub-station extensions; and
- The existing low voltage overhead lines, which are to be diverted underground.

8.6.13 These operational effects would be long-term and reversible.

Historic Environment Assessment

8.6.14 Table 8.5 summarises the assessed counts of adverse effects on the settings of heritage assets by asset significance resulting from the operation of each component of the Proposed Development.

Table 8.5 – Summary of Count of Adverse Effects on the Settings of Heritage Assets by Asset Significance Resulting from Operation of each Component of the Proposed Development				
Development Component	Non-Designated			Designated
	L	M	H	H
Oswestry Sub-station Extension	0	3	0	1
Underground Line	0	0	0	0
Overhead Line	19	8	0	17
Wem Sub-station Extension	1	0	0	0
Access Tracks and Lay-down Areas	0	0	0	0
LV Diversions	0	0	0	0
Totals	20	11	0	18

KEY: L=Low Significance; M=Medium Significance; H=High Significance

- 8.6.15 All of the operational effects result from change to the settings of heritage assets. Almost two-thirds are effects on the settings of non-designated assets of low or medium significance and there are no effects on the settings of non-designated assets of high significance. The settings of designated assets would be subject to 18 effects.
- 8.6.16 The total count of effects on settings is 49, but the actual number of affected assets is 47. This is because the settings of two assets would experience multiple effects from different components of the Proposed Development.
- 8.6.17 Operation of the overhead line is predicted to generate the majority of the effects (44, almost 90%), while the remainder would be generated by the extensions to the two sub-stations.
- 8.6.18 Operation of the overhead line is predicted to generate effects on the settings of two scheduled monuments and 16 listed buildings, four of which are graded II*.
- 8.6.19 None of the identified adverse effects on the settings of heritage assets resulting from the operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed as being significant.
- 8.6.20 Further details can be found in Appendix 8.2 (**DCO Document 6.8.2**).
- 8.6.21 Table 8.6 summarises the assessed counts of beneficial effects on the settings of heritage assets by asset significance resulting from the operation of each component of the Proposed Development.

Table 8.6 – Summary of Count of Beneficial Effects on the Settings of Heritage Assets by Asset Significance Resulting from Operation of each Component of the Proposed Development

Development Component	Non-Designated			Designated
	L	M	H	H
Oswestry Sub-station Extension	0	0	0	0

Table 8.6 – Summary of Count of Beneficial Effects on the Settings of Heritage Assets by Asset Significance Resulting from Operation of each Component of the Proposed Development

Development Component	Non-Designated			Designated
	L	M	H	H
Underground Line	0	0	0	0
Overhead Line	0	0	0	0
Wem Sub-station Extension	0	0	0	0
Access Tracks and Lay-down Areas	0	0	0	0
LV Diversions	5	1	0	0
Totals	5	1	0	0

KEY: L=Low Significance; M=Medium Significance; H=High Significance

- 8.6.22 All of the beneficial effects on the settings of heritage assets result from the planned LV Diversions, which involve the removal of short sections of existing LV overhead line from the landscape.
- 8.6.23 Beneficial effects are predicted for the settings of five non-designated assets of low significance and one non-designated asset of medium significance.
- 8.6.24 None of the identified beneficial effects on the settings of heritage assets resulting from the operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed as being significant.

Significance of Effect

- 8.6.25 Table 8.7 summarises the assessed adverse counts of significance of effect by asset type.

Table 8.7 – Summary of Count of Adverse Significance of Effect by Asset Type								
Asset Type	Significance of Effect							
	Large/ Very Large	Large	Moderate/ Large	Moderate	Moderate/ Slight	Slight	Neutral/ Slight	Neutral
Designated Assets								
Conservation Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Listed Building (Grade I)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Listed Building (Grade II*)	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	29
Listed Building (Grade II)	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	666
Registered Parks and Garden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	32
Total of Designated Assets	0	0	0	0	2	16	0	745
Non-Designated Assets								
High significance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Medium significance	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	25
Low significance	0	0	0	0	43	131	276	621
Totals of Non-Designated Assets	0	0	0	0	43	137	282	654
GRAND TOTALS	0	0	0	0	45	153	282	1399

8.6.26 As explained in Appendix, 8.1, significance of effect is the combination of the significance of an asset and the magnitude of effect experienced by the asset as a result of the Proposed Development. The significance of effect is

ascertained from a matrix which illustrates the relationship between these three rankings (Table A8.1.6 in Appendix 8.1 (**DCO Document 6.8.1**)).

- 8.6.27 Appendix 8.1 further explains that this process is not mechanical, not quantitative, but relies upon observable facts and professional judgement at each step.
- 8.6.28 A significance of effect of slight/moderate was generated by the matrix for the following designated assets:
- Malt Kiln Farmhouse (LB 1056039);
 - The Shayes Farmhouse (LB 1056054); and
 - Asset Group: Stanwardine Moated Site and Fishpond (SM 1017240), Stanwardine Hall (LB 1176127), Stanwardine House (LB 1055938), Sundial LB (1308013), Terraces, walls and gate piers (LB 1366554).
- 8.6.29 For Malt Kiln Farmhouse and The Shayes, the conclusion of the assessment was that the significance of effect for both assets would not cross the threshold into moderate. This judgement derives from a) the assets being towards the lower end of high significance on account of their Grade II status (i.e. at the lower end of the range of listed building grades), b) the assessed contribution of setting to the significance of the assets being medium and c) the assessed magnitude of effect being at the upper end of minor.
- 8.6.30 For the Stanwardine Group, the conclusion of the assessment was that the actual significance of effect experienced by the asset group would be slight (i.e. it would not be slight/moderate and would not cross the threshold into moderate) primarily on account of the magnitude of effect being towards the lower end of minor.
- 8.6.31 A significance of effect of slight/moderate adverse was generated by the matrix for 43 non-designated assets. The conclusion of the assessment was that the significance of effect experienced by the assets would not cross the threshold into moderate and therefore the effects are not significant.

8.6.32 None of the identified effects on heritage assets resulting from the construction or operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed as significant.

8.6.33 Neutral/slight beneficial effects are predicted for six non-designated assets, including one of medium significance and five of low significance.

8.7 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

8.7.1 There are no developments (please refer to those identified in Chapter 4 'Approach and General Methodology' (**DCO Document 6.4**)) which would give rise to significant cumulative inter-project historic environment effects during the construction or operational phase of the Proposed Development. This is primarily due to the distance between the Proposed Development and the developments considered in the cumulative assessment, and the differing nature and scale of the developments.

8.7.2 Further detail on the cumulative effects assessment is provided in Appendix 8.2 (**DCO Document 6.8.2**) for further detail

8.8 MITIGATION AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

8.8.1 Effects during the construction period would be reduced by ensuring good construction and environmental working practices as outlined in the draft Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Appendix 3.2 (**DCO Document 6.3.2**)).

8.8.2 As explained in Chapter 3 'The Proposed Development' (**DCO Document 6.3**) and Section 4.6 of Chapter 4 'Approach and General Methodology' (**DCO Document 6.4**), the main strategy for minimising any adverse environmental effects of the Proposed Development has been avoidance through careful planning, design and routeing in accordance with the Holford Rules. This has led to the Proposed Development which is the subject of this ES and the application for an Order granting Development Consent.

8.8.3 Given the level of work undertaken to identify the final route of the Proposed Development and the absence of identified significant effects, SP Manweb do

not consider that any further mitigation measures, for example new planting, are necessary.

- 8.8.4 Therefore, the residual significant effects are as per the effects reported in Section 1.6 of this Appendix 8.2 (**DCO Document 6.8.2**).

8.9 SUMMARY

- 8.9.1 There would be no significant historic environment effects during the construction or operational phases of the Proposed Development.