



Historic England

**PLANNING ACT 2008 (AS AMENDED) – SECTION 89 AND THE  
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE) RULES 2010 (AS  
AMENDED) - RULE 8**

**APPLICATION BY SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL FOR AN ORDER GRANTING  
DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR LAKE LOTHING THIRD CROSSING**

**APPLICATION REF: TR010023**

**REPRESENTATIONS OF THE HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND MONUMENTS  
COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND (HISTORIC ENGLAND)**

---



Historic England, Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge CB2 8BU  
Telephone 01223 58 2749 [HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://HistoricEngland.org.uk)

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



## Contents

### Summary

1. Introduction
2. Comments in relation to the Environmental Statement
3. Comments in relation to the WSI
4. Other matters (DCO, SOCG etc)



## Summary

Historic England's written representation considers the statement we have already made in relation to the impact of the proposal on the significance of a number of designated heritage assets through development within their setting. These are the South Lowestoft and Oulton Broad Conservation Areas, and the grade II\* listed Royal Norfolk and Suffolk Yacht Club and a group of Grade II listed buildings such as Port House. We have also commented on non-designated heritage assets and the need for adequate mitigation thereof.

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (HBMCE), known as Historic England, is the Government's adviser on all aspects of the historic environment in England – including historic buildings and areas, archaeology and historic landscape – and have a duty to promote public understanding and enjoyment. HBMCE are an executive Non-Departmental Public body sponsored by the Department for Digital Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and we answer to Parliament through the Secretary of State for Digital Culture, Media and Sport. Our remit in conservation matters intersects with the policy responsibilities of a number of other government departments for example, the Department of Communities and Local Government. The National Heritage Act (2002) also gave HBMCE responsibility for maritime archaeology in the English area of the UK Territorial Sea.
- 1.2. In previous correspondence in relation to this project and in our Section 56 Representation (dated 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018 Ref: PL00075248) we identified that this development had the potential to impact upon the historic environment, and that without mitigation this impact has the potential to be significant in relation to some heritage receptors.
- 1.3. We note that the Examining Authorities have not issued any 'Written Questions and Requests for Information' specific to heritage, and therefore there are no matters to be addressed in that regard.

### 2. Comments in relation to Environmental Statement

- 2.1. We had previously raised concerns in relation to the impact of the development upon on the South Lowestoft and Oulton Broad Conservation Areas and on the significance of a number of designated heritage assets through development within their setting. In particular the Royal Norfolk and Suffolk Yacht Club which is listed at Grade II\* and a group of Grade II listed buildings such as Port House. We were pleased to see that the Environmental Statement (ES) included specific



Historic England, Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge CB2 8BU  
Telephone 01223 58 2749 [HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://HistoricEngland.org.uk)

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



Cultural Heritage and Townscape and Visual Impact Chapters (ES Volume 1 Chapters 9 and 10) as well as visualisations and photomontages.

- 2.2. We note that although the new development will be highly visible, and will bring about change to the townscape as a whole, the additional visual material provided by the applicant suggests that the development would be visible only in limited views from the designated heritage assets themselves and therefore would only result in a minor residual impact upon their setting. Furthermore the development has a common form and functionality that, although large, is not necessarily one that would look out of place in this context. We therefore consider that the visualisations and accompanying commentary in the ES provide sufficient information to allow the level of harm to be determined and the balance to be weighed by the determining authority
- 2.3. In policy terms, therefore, any resulting harm would in our view be less than substantial, and would need to be considered within policy 196 of the National Planning and Policy Framework although the determining authority would need to give due regard to policies 193 and 194 . As noted in our representation we do not consider it necessary to explore these issues any further, but would be happy to provide further clarification on request.
- 2.4. We have also raised concerns about the direct impact of the development upon non-designated heritage assets within the area of the development footprint, including palaeoenvironmental deposits dating to the Holocene and also the potential for the recovery of earlier deposits.
- 2.5. We have therefore supported the production of the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment or DBA (see ES Vol 3 Appendix 9A) and have made various comments on draft documents. In particular, the applicant has produced a specific Deposit Model (ES Vol 3 Appendix 9B) to map the known evidence for the geological deposits with a view to predicting the likelihood of finding deposits of a possible anthropogenic nature. The applicant has also undertaken a programme of mitigation during preliminary ground works and we are aware that the application and full ES now includes a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for future mitigation (see ES Vol 3 Appendix 9F). This sets out how the proposed project would mitigate against impact to the historic environment.

### 3. Comments in relation to the WSI

- 3.1. As noted in our previous representation, the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) needs to include a project specific WSI that can be put in place should consent be granted, and the DCO conditioned with suitable wording. The WSI



Historic England, Brooklands, 24 Brooklands Avenue, Cambridge CB2 8BU  
Telephone 01223 58 2749 [HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://HistoricEngland.org.uk)

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



must therefore be agreed prior to the project commencing, and before any further pre-construction surveys take place.

- 3.2. The WSI has been subject to considerable consultation with Historic England with regards to agreeing the draft document. The current draft (Document Reference: SCC/LLTC/EX/30 Dated December 2018) is acceptable to Historic England subject to a clarification of the wording of paragraph 5.2.1 of the document, and subject to any comments from the Local Authority Archaeological Service.

#### 4. Other matters (DCO, SOCG etc)

- 4.1. We note (email to Historic England dated 10/10/2018) that the WSI will be secured by requirement 10 of the draft DCO (see *pp* 50), and support this requirement, provided the revisions we have recommend are made. Please also note there is a typo in the first paragraph at the top of page 49 of the DCO.
- 4.2. We are currently engaged in finalising a Statement of Common Ground with the applicant (21/12/2018). This document is currently subject to minor changes which will bring the document in line with our statutory remit.

**Dr William Fletcher**  
**Inspector of Ancient Monuments**

