UK Onshore Scheme

Environmental Statement

Volume 2 Document ES-2-B.08

Chapter 12

Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Proposed Underground DC Cable)

VKL-08-39-G500-009

August 2017

Co-financed by the European Union
Connecting Europe Facility

Environmental Statement Volume 2			
ES Reference	**Chapter**	**Chapter Title**	
ES-2-A.01	Ch01	Introduction	
ES-2-A.02	Ch02	Development of the UK Onshore Scheme	
ES-2-A.03	Ch03	The UK Onshore Scheme	
ES-2-A.04	Ch04	Environmental Impact Assessment Methods	
ES-2-B.01	Ch05	The Proposed Underground DC Cable	
ES-2-B.02	Ch06	Intertidal Zone	
ES-2-B.03	Ch07	Geology & Hydrogeology	
ES-2-B.04	Ch08	Water Resources & Hydrology	
ES-2-B.05	Ch09	Agriculture & Soils	
ES-2-B.06	Ch10	Ecology	
ES-2-B.07	Ch11	Landscape & Visual Amenity	
ES-2-B.08	**Ch12**	**Archaeology & Cultural Heritage**	
ES-2-B.09	Ch13	Socio-economics & Tourism	
ES-2-B.10	Ch14	Traffic & Transport	
ES-2-B.11	Ch15	Noise & Vibration	
ES-2-B.12	Ch16	Register of Mitigation	
ES-2-C.01	Ch17	The Proposed Converter Station	
ES-2-C.02	Ch18	Geology & Hydrogeology	
ES-2-C.03	Ch19	Water Resources & Hydrology	
ES-2-C.04	Ch20	Agriculture & Soils	
ES-2-C.05	Ch21	Ecology	
ES-2-C.06	Ch22	Landscape & Visual Amenity	
ES-2-C.07	Ch23	Archaeology & Cultural Heritage	
ES-2-C.08	Ch24	Socio-economics & Tourism	
ES-2-C.09	Ch25	Traffic & Transport	
ES-2-C.10	Ch26	Noise & Vibration	
ES-2-C.11	Ch27	Register of Mitigation	
ES-2-D.01	Ch28	Cumulative Effects	
ES-2-D.02	Ch29	Summary of Assessment & Conclusions	

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

The following figures are referenced within this chapter and can be found in Volume 3 Part B Figures (ES-3-B.01).

List of Appendices

The following appendices are referenced within this chapter and can be found in Volume 4 Part C Technical Appendices (ES-4-B.08).

Glossary & Abbreviations

Glossary of Terms	
Term	**Meaning**
Corieltavi/Coritani	A Celtic tribe that were agriculturally orientated and centred on a swathe of territory stretching across Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, and Lincolnshire. Since they were not warriors, the tribe appear to have put up little resistance to the Roman invasion and subsequently were absorbed by "romanisation".
Cropmarks	Cropmarks are formed when the underlying moisture levels varies which effects the growth of agricultural produce (Appendix 12.2). This can be from an increase in moisture levels, from a negative feature such as a ditch or pit which produces a richer crop, or a reduced moisture level, from a positive feature such as a wall which results in a poorer yield. The best response for cropmarks is between June and July each year. This is however subject to many factors and the absence of crop marks may not indicate the absence of archaeological features (Appendix 12.2).
Datum	Datum is an ordnance survey term for sea level.
Domesday Book	The Domesday Book is a manuscript record of the 'Great Survey' which was conducted in most of England and Wales and commissioned by William the Conqueror. The first draft was completed in August 1086 and written in Medieval Latin. Its original purpose was to establish what taxes had been owed during the reign of King Edward the Confessor, this helped William to reassert the right of the Crown and assess where the power lay in the land. The book contains the records of 13,418 settlements.
Geophysical survey	The earth produces magnetic (magnetometry) fields. Technology such as fluxgate gradiometers (for magnetometry) are scanned over the ground surface and pick up subtle variations in localised fields whilst removing the background of the earth's magnetic field. The interference or anomalies can be manmade or natural in origin. Their interpretation can give indications into the archaeological potential for a site. If the ground is not susceptible to these anomalies i.e. the machine cannot detect the difference between archaeological features and back ground geology, the results may incorrectly indicate no archaeology present.
LiDAR	LiDAR (light detection and ranging), also known as Airborne Laser Altimetry, is used to produce accurate horizontal and vertical evaluation measurements. This data has considerable potential for archaeological investigation (Appendix 12.2).
Magnetometry	This geophysical survey technique relies on the variations in the soil magnetic susceptibility, which often results from past human activities, when compared to natural background levels.

Glossary of Terms	
Term	**Meaning**
Purple Route Corridor	One of two proposed route sections which was consulted upon during the early stage of the Scheme. This area was subject to early archaeological walkover surveys to accommodate alterations to the route whilst providing sufficient baseline information for the assessment.
Quern stone	Quern stones are stone tools used for hand grinding a wide variety of materials i.e. wheat or cereals. They are used in pairs; the lower stationary stone is called the quern while the upper stone is called the handstone, upper stone, rubber or mouler.
Trial trenching	Trial trenching is an archaeological investigation technique and a form of archaeological evaluation. The trenches vary in length but can be placed over cropmarks or geophysical anomalies. The trenches are to test to see the amount, date, and complexity of the archaeological features in a particular area. The trial trenching results can inform as to whether further archaeological investigation is needed.

List of Abbreviation	
Abbreviation	**Meaning**
AC	Alternating Current
AD	Anno Domini is Medieval Latin for “in the year of the Lord”, AD is referred to the time after the birth of Christ
AGLV	Areas of Great Landscape Value
AOD	Above Ordnance Datum
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BBC	Boston Borough Council
BC	Before Christ refers to the time before the death of Christ
CBM	Ceramic Building Material
DBA	Desk Based Assessment
DC	Direct Current
BBLP	Boston Borough Local Plan
CLLP	Central Lincolnshire Local Plan
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
ELDC	East Lindsey District Council

List of Abbreviation	
Abbreviation	**Meaning**
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ELLP	East Lindsey Local Plan
ES	Environmental Statement
GPA	Good Practice Advice
HDD	Horizontal Direct Drilling
HER	Historic Environment Record
HLC	Historic Landscape Character
LB	Listed Building
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MoD	Ministry of Defence
NKDC	North Kesteven District Council
NMP	National Mapping Programme
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
SELLP	South East Lincolnshire Local Plan
SHDC	South Holland District Council
SHLP	South Holland Local Plan
SM	Scheduled Monument
TCC	Temporary Construction Compound
TWA	Temporary Works Area
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
WHS	World Heritage Site

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This chapter has been prepared by Arcadis Consulting. It reports the results of baseline studies and the assessment of the potential impacts on archaeology and cultural heritage from the proposed Direct Current (DC) cable route. A detailed description of the proposed DC cable route is contained in The Proposed Underground DC Cable (ES-2-B.01, Chapter 05). Table 12.1 below sets out the structure of the Environmental Statement (ES) with respect to archaeology and cultural heritage. Reference should be made to other documents which form part of the ES as appropriate; in particular, Volume 2 Chapter 16, Register of Mitigation (ES-2-B.12) and the technical appendices of this chapter.

1.1.2 This chapter considers the direct and indirect impact of the proposed DC cable route on cultural heritage, including buried archaeological sites, historic buildings, and historic landscapes. It identifies the likely impacts on these 'heritage receptors' (considered to be anything which may provide additional understanding to human activity of the past) - in terms of the potential for direct physical disturbance and changes within the settings of the receptors - it also assesses the overall significance of effect.

1.1.3 Impacts on archaeology and cultural heritage are interrelated with visual impacts on the historic landscape character of the Lincolnshire Fens and Lincolnshire Wolds and where relevant reference has been made to the Landscape and Visual Amenity chapter (Chapter 11, ES-2-B.07). In addition, changes in noise and traffic levels during construction and operation have the potential to impact on heritage receptors through changes to their setting. Where relevant, reference has been made to the Noise and Vibration chapter (Chapter 15, ES-2-B.11) and the Traffic and Transport chapter (Chapter 14. ES-2-B.10).

Table 12.1 Environmental Statement: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage

ES Reference	ES Volume	ES Chapter	Content
ES-2-B.08	**2**	**12**	**Main Report: Proposed Underground DC Cable**
ES-2-C.07	2	23	Main Report: Proposed Converter Station
ES-3-B.01	3	12	Figures: Proposed Underground DC Cable
ES-3-C.01	3	23	Figures: Proposed Converter Station
ES-4-B.08	4	12	Technical Appendices: Proposed Underground DC Cable
ES-4-C.07	4	23	Technical Appendices: Proposed Converter Station

1.2 Chapter Structure

1.2.1 The remainder of this chapter is structured as follows:

- Section 2. Approach to Assessment. Sets out the methodology used to establish the baseline conditions and the criteria used to establish impact and effect.
- Section 3. Basis of Assessment. Sets out the key assumptions which have been made in undertaking the impact assessment.
- Section 4. Planning Policy and Legislative Considerations. Provides an outline of any relevant legislation and guidance protecting the archaeological receptors impacted by the proposed DC cable route.
- Section 5. Baseline Conditions. Reports the results of desktop and field studies undertaken to establish existing conditions.
- Section 6. Potential Impacts. Identifies the potential impacts on archaeology & cultural heritage which may occur as result of construction and operation.
- Section 7. Mitigation. Identifies the mitigation which is proposed including measures which are incorporated into the siting, design and construction of the underground cable.
- Section 8. Residual Effects. Reports the residual effects which remain taking into account proposed mitigation and identifies whether these are significant or not.
- Section 9. Cumulative Effects. Identifies the inter-project cumulative effects which may occur in combination with other developments.
- Section 10. Summary of Assessment. Provides a summary of the key findings of the impact assessment.

2 Approach to Assessment

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 This section describes the approach to the identification and assessment of impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed DC cable route on archaeology and cultural heritage.

2.2 Summary of Consultation

Scoping Opinion Review

2.2.1 Table 12.2 summarises the issues raised in the scoping opinion in relation to archaeology and cultural heritage and outlines how and where this has been addressed in subsequent chapters of the ES. A copy of the scoping opinion is included in Volume 4 Appendix 4.1 (ES-4-A.04).

Table 12.2 Scoping Opinion (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)

Consultee	Summary of Comment	How and where addressed
Historic England	General advice was received which highlighted that the EIA should contain a thorough assessment of the likely effects that the Scheme may have upon the significance of heritage receptors. The level of information needs to be proportional to the severity of potential issues that may arise from the Scheme.	The assessment has acknowledged the designations of heritage receptors in the approach to assigning value and considering significance. It is recognised that all designated heritage assets are of national importance and high significance.
Historic England	Assessment should consider mitigation measures. Geophysics, trial trenching and any additional fieldwork is recommended to be reported on prior to the submission of a planning application.	Mitigation measures are outlined in section 7. The results of the geophysical survey, LiDAR and aerial photographic assessment are presented in Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report; Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report.
Historic England	The use of LiDAR (light detection and ranging) in assessment is recommended.	The results of the LiDAR and aerial photographic assessment are presented in Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report.

Table 12.2 Scoping Opinion (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)		
Consultee	**Summary of Comment**	**How and where addressed**
Historic England	The approach to assessment should consider the sensitivity of individual receptors and groups of receptors.	The Desk Based Assessment (DBA) and ES considers the sensitivity of receptors as individual receptors and, where appropriate, as part of a related group.
Historic England	The approach to the significance of designated heritage receptors should be reflective of the assessment criteria for the full designation process.	The methodology is detailed in section 2.5. and follows established EIA methodology. A consideration of the effect of change within the setting of receptors on those receptor's significance is presented in section 8.
Historic Environment Officer for Lincolnshire County Council	There is an expectation that the EIA will include the results of the geophysical and fieldwalking surveys and these will inform any trial trenching strategy. These results should indicate the level of impact on underlying archaeological remains, it should also include a robust mitigation strategy.	The results of the DBA, geophysical survey, LiDAR, and aerial photograph assessment are presented in Appendix 12.1-3 and the results of these assessments have been used to determine the archaeological potential of the Scheme. The mitigation strategy is presented as a separate document (VKL-08-39-G500-009) (Appendix 12.4 Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (Underground Cable).
Historic Environment Officer for Lincolnshire County Council	There is also a requirement to assess the visual impacts on the setting of heritage receptors within the EIA.	An assessment of the impacts on heritage receptors arising from changes in their setting (including visual where relevant) is presented in section 8.
Historic Environment Officer for Lincolnshire County Council	Also, an expectation that air photos and LiDAR data is included as part of the baseline data collection.	The results of the LiDAR and aerial photograph assessment are presented in Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report and the results of these assessments have been used to determine the archaeological potential of the Scheme.

Additional Consultation

2.2.2 Table 12.3 Additional Consultation (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage) summarises additional consultation undertaken with relevant statutory and non-statutory consultees in relation to

archaeology and cultural heritage and outlines how and where this has been addressed in subsequent chapters of the ES.

Table 12.3 Additional Consultation (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)

Consultee	Nature of additional consultation	How and where addressed
Historic England	Correspondence to agree the scope of assessment. Advised to include all heritage receptors regardless of period in assessment and to produce detailed site maps to assist in assessing the historic environment impacts of the proposed DC cable route.	Appendix 12.1 Desk Based Assessment Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable) presents details of all the heritage receptors within the Zone of Influence (see 2.3.4), of all periods, and details of all heritage receptors assessed in the ES are presented in the Baseline Conditions section of this chapter. Detailed figures showing the location of heritage receptors in relation to the Scheme are included in Volume 3 of this ES. During the cable route selection process, archaeology and cultural heritage was considered proportionately. As the route became more refined, more detailed archaeological and heritage studies were undertaken to allow for further refinement and route development where possible.
Historic Environment Officer for Lincolnshire County Council	Detailed desk top assessment combined with archaeological field walking and geophysical survey would be required to support the ES. Trial trenching required in areas where the other assessment techniques have returned less favourable results.	The results of the DBA including site walkover, geophysical survey, trial trenching, LiDAR and aerial photographic assessment are presented in Appendix 12.1-12.4. The results of assessments are presented within Chapter 12 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Appendices and have been used to determine the archaeological potential of the Scheme.

Table 12.3 Additional Consultation (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)		
Consultee	**Nature of additional consultation**	**How and where addressed**
Heritage Lincolnshire	No specific comment has been received from Heritage Lincolnshire that differs from the comments received from other consultees.	n/a

2.3 Scope of Assessment

Aspects to be assessed

2.3.1 The archaeology and cultural heritage assessment seeks to identify, predict, and evaluate the significance of potential effects to designated and non-designated heritage receptors. The assessment covers the following:

Designated/protected heritage sites

- National Heritage List for England – ArcGIS shapefiles and full descriptions of scheduled monuments, listed buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens; and
- Local Plans – conservation area designation plans and conservation area appraisals.

Non-designated sites

- Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record (HER) - ArcGIS shapefiles and long descriptions of archaeological sites and events, grey literature reports of relevant previous archaeological investigations and Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) data;
- Receptors identified through assessment work for this project.

Unknown archaeology

- The potential for archaeological remains to be present within the route of the Scheme

Direct/indirect impacts

- Direct impacts are those that arise as straightforward consequences of a development. For archaeological receptors and historic buildings this could include physical damage to, or physical improvement of, the fabric of the receptor but also includes impacts to the setting of heritage receptors; and
- Indirect impacts are impacts that arise where the connection between the Scheme (the UK components of the Viking Link project) and the impact is complicated, unpredictable, or remote. For example, an indirect impact on the historic landscape could arise from an agricultural holding being severed leading to a change in farming regime resulting in an alteration in the historic land use pattern in areas away from the Scheme. Indirect impacts are not necessarily less damaging than direct impacts.

2.3.2 Whilst the landscape and visual assessment in Chapter 11 (Landscape and Visual Amenity) considers the contribution of historical elements and features to the character of the existing landscape and evaluates views it does not assess potential impacts on the cultural or historical value of these elements or consider effects on the historic context of locations.

Spatial Scope

2.3.3 The archaeology and cultural heritage assessment will seek to identify, predict, and evaluate the significance of potential effects on designated and non-designated heritage receptors.

2.3.4 A Zone of Influence of 250 m either side from the proposed DC cable route has been identified making 500 m in total. The Zone of Influence is shown on Figure 12.1, Volume 3, Part A. The extent of the Zone of Influence has been informed by a review of the maximum parameters of the Scheme, desk-based research, the options appraisal, knowledge of the area, consideration of other topics' approach and professional judgement and is focused on potential significant effects. This includes the extent of the Limits of Deviation.

2.3.5 The Zone of Influence falls within Boston Borough Council (BBC), East Lindsey District Council (ELDC), South Holland District Council (SHDC) and North Kesteven District Council (NKDC).

Temporary Impacts

2.3.6 Temporary impacts upon heritage receptors will occur during the construction phase of the Scheme. These impacts have the potential to affect the setting of receptors during the construction phase of the Scheme and whilst temporary construction areas are in use. Impacts arising from changes in setting of heritage receptors as a result of the proposed DC cable are temporary and reversible.

Operational, longer term and permanent impacts

2.3.7 Due to the underground nature of the proposed DC cable, impact on the setting of heritage receptors, both within the planning application boundary and 500 m Zone of Influence, will be temporary during the construction phase. Impacts arising from changes to setting as a result of the construction of the proposed DC cable route are temporary and reversible.

2.3.8 Due to the nature of the construction process for the proposed DC cable route permanent impacts will occur to receptors which lie within the planning application boundary. The impact of construction of the proposed DC cable route has the potential to include direct physical impacts on known and unrecorded archaeological remains.

2.4 Identification of Baseline Conditions

Desk Studies

2.4.1 The baseline is informed by collating data on known designated and non-designated heritage receptors from the following sources:

- National Heritage List for England;
- Lincolnshire HER;
- East Lindsey District Council (conservation areas within East Lindsey);
- Boston Borough Council (conservation areas within Boston Borough);
- North Kesteven District Council (conservation areas within North Kesteven); and
- South Holland District Council (conservation areas within South Holland District Council).

2.4.2 To identify the potential archaeology and cultural heritage that may be affected by the Scheme, data has been collected from a variety of sources with regard to the guidance in the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (Ref: 12.1). The data has been collected for the Zone of Influence and has been collected from the following sources:

Designated Receptors:

- National Heritage List for England – ArcGIS shapefiles and full descriptions of scheduled monuments, listed buildings and registered parks and gardens; and
- Local Plans – conservation area designation plans and conservation area appraisals.

Non-designated Receptors

- Lincolnshire HER - ArcGIS shapefiles and long descriptions of archaeological sites and events, grey literature reports of relevant previous archaeological investigations, Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) data, National Mapping Programme (NMP) data.

Cartographic Sources:

- Historic Ordnance Survey editions obtained from Landmark Information Group; and
- Pre-Ordnance Survey maps including tithe and/ or estate maps obtained from Lincolnshire Archives (Lincoln) and appropriate local studies libraries.

Other data sources:

- Background information on the general development of the historic environment from other sources held at county record offices and local studies libraries;
- Historic England Archive;
- Regional Research Frameworks;
- Reports on recent archaeological investigations within the Zone of Influence that are not yet included in the HER (where available);

- Aerial photographic assessment of the proposed DC cable route (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report); and
- LiDAR assessment of the proposed DC cable route (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report).

2.4.3 In undertaking a review of baseline data including the National Heritage List for England, Local Plans, HER data, historic mapping, and the regional research framework professional judgement has been used to assess the potential for unknown archaeology to be present.

Field Studies

2.4.4 Archaeological walkover survey was undertaken along the Scheme, this covered an earlier, wider version of the proposed DC cable route, the purple route corridor. Archaeological walkover survey was undertaken only where access was permitted, the results are detailed within the DBA (Appendix 12.1 Desk Based Assessment Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)). This survey confirmed whether any surface based features or deposits identified during the desk top review were visible and identified and examined the location of any features visible on the surface or deposits that had not previously been recorded. It also identified areas of modern disturbance that may have impacted the presence or condition of known or unknown buried archaeological deposits.

2.4.5 Due to ground conditions and access arrangements within selected areas archaeological geophysical survey has only been undertaken on selected areas of the Scheme. This has been a magnetic survey (undertaken using magnetometers) to identify below ground anomalies that may be indicative of archaeological remains. The data returned by the geophysical survey has been processed and analysed and the anomalies categorised as either agricultural, geological, or archaeological in origin. Some surveys maybe undertaken post submission where access hasn't been agreed in advance.

2.4.6 A judgement of the likely impact the Scheme will have on receptors, identified through either archaeological walkover survey or geophysical survey, is presented in this ES chapter. Assessment of a receptor's value and significance is made based upon the identified receptor's known potential, and in comparison, with known HER heritage receptors of similar characterisation.

2.5 Assessment Methodology

Assessment Guidance

2.5.1 There is no methodology consistently adopted by the archaeology and cultural heritage profession for assessing impacts on historic environment receptors as part of an EIA. In the absence of any industry accepted methodology, the archaeology and cultural heritage impact assessment has been carried out broadly in accordance with the methodology laid out in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume II Section 3 Part 2 HA 208/07 (Ref: 12-2). The DMRB provides a methodology for assigning value to receptors, magnitude of impact and

significance of effects. The criteria used in this methodology are presented in Tables 12.4 to 12.6. Not all elements of DMRB are relevant to the Scheme, therefore in places the assessment will diverge from the DMRB methodology. Where a departure from the approach set out in the DMRB has occurred, explanation in text notes the deviation. This assessment has also considered the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to describe the significance of heritage receptors, including any contribution made by their setting. In addition, comments from Historic England are considered when assessing the significance of heritage receptors. To assess potential effects on the significance of heritage receptors in line with the requirement of the NPPF, it is necessary to consider potential impacts to the setting of those receptors. Guidance on how to assess the setting and significance of heritage receptors is provided by Historic England (Ref: 12-3 and Ref 12-4) and specific guidance on assessing impacts to views is provided in Historic England's 'Seeing the History in the View' (Ref: 12-5). The guidance provided in 'The Setting of Heritage Assets GPA' (Ref: 12-4) outlines the approach to assessing and managing change within the settings of heritage receptors. This is achieved by considering whether, how and to what degree setting contributes to the significance of those receptors and to what extent, if any, a proposed development would affect that significance, through changes to setting.

2.5.2 The Setting of Heritage Assets GPA recommends the following broad approach to assessment, undertaken as a series of steps that apply proportionately to complex or more straightforward cases:

- Step 1 Identify which heritage receptors and their settings are affected.
- Step 2 Assess whether, how and to what degree these settings contribute to the significance of the heritage receptor(s).
- Step 3 Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance.
- Step 4 Explore the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm.
- Step 5 Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

2.5.3 Current national guidance for the assessment of the significance of heritage receptors is provided by Historic England in the document 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment' (Ref: 12-3) in which significance is weighed by consideration of the potential for the receptor to demonstrate the following value criteria:

- Evidential value. Deriving from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.
- Historical value. Deriving from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. It tends to be illustrative or associative.
- Aesthetic value. Deriving from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.

- Communal value. Deriving from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory. Communal values are closely bound up with historical (particularly associative) and aesthetic values, but tend to have additional and specific aspects.

Assessment Criteria

Sensitivity or Value of Receptors

2.5.4 Table 12.4 sets out the criteria for assessing the value of heritage receptors that are applied in this assessment. The values ascribed to heritage receptors are considered alongside their significance.

2.5.5 Grade II listed buildings are defined for EIA purposes as having medium value. All listed buildings are nationally important and have high significance. The valuation of Grade II listed buildings as having medium value is not inconsistent with this as the valuation of medium recognises the 'lower'grading of a Grade II listed building in comparison to a Grade II* or Grade I listed building. Although all listed buildings enjoy a national level designation, and are nationally significant, the category embraces receptors which in practice range from those of the highest worth and quality in Grades I and II* to those that are important but more numerous in Grade II. The valuation of Grade II listed buildings for EIA purposes as having medium value accords with this. Nevertheless, professional judgement is used when considering the value of all receptors on a case by case basis. In particular circumstances, the value of individual Grade II listed buildings could be elevated from medium to high when professional judgement is used.

Table 12.4 Receptor Value Criteria (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)

Value	Description
Very High	World Heritage Sites (WHS) (including nominated sites) Assets of acknowledged international importance Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives Other buildings of recognised international importance Historic landscapes of international value, whether designated or not Extremely well preserved historic landscapes with exceptional coherence, time-depth, or other critical factor(s)

Table 12.4 Receptor Value Criteria (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)	
Value	**Description**
High	Scheduled monuments (including proposed sites) Undesignated assets of schedulable quality and importance Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings Other listed buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations not adequately reflected in the listing grade Conservation areas containing very important buildings Undesignated structures of clear national importance Undesignated historic landscapes of outstanding interest Undesignated historic landscapes of high quality and importance, and of demonstrable national value Well preserved historic landscapes, exhibiting considerable coherence, time-depth or other critical factor(s)
Medium	Designated or undesignated assets that contribute to regional research objectives Grade II listed buildings Historic (unlisted) buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations Conservation areas containing buildings that contribute significantly to its historic character Historic townscape or built up areas with important historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures) Undesignated historic landscapes that would justify special historic landscape designation, landscapes of regional value Averagely well-preserved historic landscapes with reasonable coherence, time-depth or other critical factor(s)
Low	Designated and undesignated assets of local importance Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations Assets of limited value, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives 'Locally listed' buildings Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association Historic townscape or built up areas of limited historic integrity in their buildings or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures) Robust undesignated historic landscapes Historic landscapes with importance to local interest groups Historic landscapes whose value is limited by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations

Table 12.4 Receptor Value Criteria (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)	
Value	**Description**
Negligible	Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest Buildings of no architectural or historical note; buildings of intrusive character Landscapes with little or no significant historical interest
Unknown	The importance of the resource has not been ascertained Buildings with some hidden (i.e. inaccessible) potential for historic significance

2.5.6 In addition to determining the value of heritage receptors this chapter will also consider the significance of each receptor as directed by the NPPF. The significance of a heritage receptor contributes to its value.

Magnitude of Impacts

2.5.7 Table 12.5 sets out the criteria for assessing the magnitude of impacts to heritage receptors that are applied in this assessment.

Table 12.5 Impact Magnitude Criteria (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)	
Magnitude	**Description**
High	Change to most or all key archaeological materials, such that the resource is totally altered Comprehensive changes to setting Change to key historic building elements, such that the resource is totally altered or lost Comprehensive changes to the setting of historic buildings Change to most or all key historic landscape elements, parcels or components; extreme visual effects; gross change of noise or change to sound quality; fundamental changes to use or access; resulting in total change to historic landscape character unit.
Medium	Changes to many key archaeological materials, such that the resource is clearly modified Considerable changes to setting that affect the character and significance of the receptor Change to many key historic building elements, such that the resource is significantly modified Changes to the setting of an historic building, such that it is significantly modified and its significance is affected Changes to many key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, visual change to many key aspects of the historic landscape, noticeable differences in noise or sound quality, considerable changes to use or access; resulting in moderate

Table 12.5 Impact Magnitude Criteria (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)	
Magnitude	**Description**
	changes to historic landscape character.
Low	Changes to key archaeological materials, such that the receptor is slightly altered Slight change to setting that affects its significance Change to key historic building elements, such that the receptor is slightly different Change to setting of an historic building, such that it is noticeably changed and its significance is affected Changes to few key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, slight visual changes to few key aspects of historic landscape, limited changes to noise levels or sound quality; slight changes to use or access; resulting in limited changes to historic landscape character.
Negligible	Very minor changes to archaeological materials, or setting Slight changes to historic building elements or setting that hardly affect it Very minor changes to key historic landscape elements, parcels or components, virtually unchanged visual effects, very slight changes in noise levels or sound quality; very slight changes to use or access; resulting in a very small change to historic landscape character.
No Change	No change to archaeological receptors No change to fabric or setting of historic buildings No change to elements, parcels, or components of the historic landscape; no visual or audible changes; no changes arising from amenity or community factors.

2.5.8 Impacts to heritage receptors can be both direct and indirect. Direct impacts are those that arise as straightforward consequences of a development. For archaeological receptors and historic buildings this could include physical damage to, or physical improvement of, the fabric of the receptor but also includes impacts to the setting of heritage receptors as stated in the Historic England guidance (Ref:12-3 and Ref: 12-4) on the setting of heritage receptors.

2.5.9 Indirect impacts are impacts that arise where the connection between the Scheme and the impact is complicated, unpredictable, or remote. For example, an indirect impact on the historic landscape could arise from an agricultural holding being severed, leading to a change in farming regime, resulting in an alteration in the historic land use pattern in areas away from the Scheme. Indirect impacts are not necessarily less damaging than direct impacts.

2.5.10 Where the significance of a heritage receptor is informed by its relationship with another heritage receptor, this relationship has been considered as part of the assessment (e.g. a direct impact on one heritage receptor could also result in an indirect impact on another heritage receptor if it results in a change in the relationship between the two receptors). To ensure that this potential impact is captured as part of the assessment of significance the contribution made by associated receptors has been considered.

Assessing the Significance of Effects

2.5.11 Table 12.6 illustrates how information on the value of the heritage receptor and the magnitude of impact is combined to arrive at an assessment of the level of effect arising from the Scheme. The matrix in Table 12.6 is not intended to 'mechanise' judgement of the significance of effect but to act as a check to ensure that judgements regarding value, magnitude of impact and significance of effect are reasonable and balanced.

2.5.12 To allow for professional judgement in some cases the individual attributes of a specific receptor, along with any relevant site-specific factors and consideration of other influencing elements, have been taken into account in considering whether the significance of effect suggested by the matrix is the most appropriate.

2.5.13 Based on professional judgement and the guidance set out in the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 (Ref: 12-6), a 'significant' effect is considered of moderate significance or above and/or one where it can be said that a receptor would experience substantial harm.

Table 12.6 Assessment of Significance (Archaeology & Cultural Heritage)

Magnitude of Impact	Sensitivity or Value of Receptor				
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	Major	Major	Moderate	Moderate	Minor
Medium	Major	Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Low	Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	Negligible
Negligible	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

2.6 Assumptions and Limitations

2.6.1 This assessment was compiled using heritage data obtained from third party sources and the prediction of effects is based on the accuracy of that data. Whilst the data from these sources is generally valid, there can be instances where data is mislabelled, placed in the wrong geographical location, or omitted altogether.

2.6.2 The conclusion of further data collection and other methods of archaeological investigation allows the potential for the presence of currently unknown heritage receptors to be assessed and reported in detail in the DBA and other technical appendices and the potential effects of the Scheme on this resource are assessed based on the information contained in these sources.

2.6.3 Due to the nature of archaeological remains, their identification and assessment necessarily requires an element of assumption. In particular, the nature, extent, survival, and even the precise location, of buried archaeological remains are often uncertain, as the majority of such sites have never been subject to archaeological investigation to modern standards. Assessment of the value of such sites (as part of the assessment process) is often, therefore, heavily reliant

on informed extrapolation from limited data, comparison with similar receptors in similar contexts and, ultimately, on professional judgement.

2.6.4 An archaeological walkover survey was carried out over the Scheme, where access was made available and is detailed within the DBA (Appendix 12.1 Desk Based Assessment Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)). Permission to carry out the walkover was sought for the whole of the Scheme and access was taken for all areas where this was granted, and the land was surveyable. However, 47% of the survey areawas not accessed, this was primarily due to access not being granted or that the land was not surveyable due to dense tree cover for example.

3 Basis of Assessment

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The following section outlines the basis under which this assessment has been carried out. The approach taken has been to assume a realistic worst-case scenario in terms of effects on heritage receptors.

3.1.2 The assessment takes account of mitigation that has been incorporated within the planning application boundary, i.e. the stated effects are those that will occur with the designed-in mitigation in place. The design mitigation measures include the following:

- Materials and finishes.
- Landscape planting.
- Archaeological fieldwork to be carried out in advance of construction

3.1.3 Due to the commitment to embed mitigation through archaeological fieldwork in advance of construction into the planning application boundary it is possible that the residual effects reported in section 8 of this chapter remain unchanged from those reported in Section 6 Potential Effects.

3.1.4 Multiple assessment methods have been used to either cross check third-party data, or gather new data on previously unrecorded heritage receptors. These include walkover survey, aerial photographic and LiDAR interpretation, and geophysical survey (Appendix 12.1-3). Professional judgement, based on the existing baseline, has been used to assess the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to be present.

3.2 Design Mitigation

3.2.1 The routing of the proposed DC cable route combined constraints from multiple environmental disciplines to produce a preferred route. During this process heritage receptors were graded to enable options to be compared. Designated receptors where given highest priority with non-designated receptors divided by receptors of greater and lesser significance. All designated receptors were ultimately excluded from the planning application boundary. Consideration was given to their setting, for example where monuments demonstrated close interrelationships such as monuments of the same period and function routeing was chosen to avoid the setting of these monuments. This resulted in design mitigation that in some instances reduced impacts and others that removed receptors from the Zone of Influence completely.

3.3 The Proposed DC Cable

3.3.1 The Limits of Devation (LoD) have been used to assess the potential impacts of the proposed DC cable route on heritage receptors. These represent the maximum possible variation of the

proposed DC cable route allowed. Adopting a worst case scenario for the assessment, it has therefore been assumed that all remains identified within the LoD will be impacted by the proposed DC cable route.

3.3.2 The proposed DC cable route is considered for its impact on heritage receptors through a 500 m Zone of Influence, 250 m either side of the planning application boundary, for designated receptors.

3.3.3 The proposed DC cable working width is typically 30 m wide and comprises the following:

- Trench in which the DC cables are laid and then backfilled
- Temporary drainage/water management measures
- Access track including laybys for offloading cable drums
- Areas for temporary top and sub-soil storage

3.3.4 Assessment is made for a worst-case scenario for the proposed DC cable route. Construction activities will be contained within the 30 m wide working width and the trench excavated will be a small proportion of this area.

3.3.5 As part of the DC cable installation there is also a requirement for temporary construction facilities to be established including:

- Temporary Works Areas (TWA).
- Temporary Construction Compounds (TCC) for the storage of plant and material as well as site offices and welfare facilities for staff with an area of 2 hectares; and

3.3.6 The impacts from the DC cable working width, including stripped areas and soil storage areas would form a linear change within the setting of heritage receptors throughout the route. However, once the construction phase and reinstatement have been completed the impacts would be reversed. Additionally, TCCs and TWAs would have a similar effect. Impacts on below ground archaeological remains within the DC cable working width will also be experienced.

3.4 Any other assumptions

Assessment criteria and assignment of significance

3.4.1 The assessment of cultural heritage receptors looks to identify how particular parts of a place and different periods in its evolution contribute to, or detract from, identified heritage significance associated with the proposed DC cable route. This approach considers the present character of the Scheme based on the chronological sequence of events that produced it, and allows management strategies to be developed that sustain and enhance the significance of heritage receptors, in line with the requirements of the NPPF.

3.4.2 Routeing ensured that nationally important scheduled monuments do not fall within with the planning application boundary. The total length of the proposed DC cable route is 67.16 km and it is routed through ELDC, BBC, NKDC, and SHDC. The proposed DC cable route is considered for its impact on heritage receptors through a 250 m Zone of Influence for designated receptors.

4 Planning Policy and Legislative Considerations

4.1 Relevant Legislation

4.1.1 The relevant parliamentary act which provides the legislative framework for development is the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 provides the statutory framework for legal protection of historic buildings, conservation areas and designated archaeological remains respectively.

4.1.2 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Ref: 12.7) applies special protection to buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest.

4.1.3 Section 66 (1) of the act states that *"In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or 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".*

4.1.4 The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (Ref: 12.8) gives statutory protection to any structure, building or work which is of particular historic or archaeological interest and regulates any activities which may affect such areas. Under the Act any work that is carried out on a scheduled monument must first obtain scheduled monument consent.

4.2 Relevant National Policy

4.2.1 The current national policy applicable to this ES chapter comprises section 12, Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment of the NPPF (Ref: 12.9). This section sets out policy and provides guidance in respect of the conservation and investigation of heritage receptors and requires local authorities to take the following into account: -

- *The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- *The wider social, cultural, economic, and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;*
- *The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.*

4.2.2 Scheduled monuments and their setting are a material consideration of the NPPF.

4.3 Relevant Local Policy

East Lindsey District Council

4.3.1 The statutory development plan for East Lindsey District Council currently comprises 'saved' policy from the East Lindsey Local Plan (ELLP). The ELLP was originally adopted in 1995, was then updated in 1999. The policies were then reviewed in 2007 and either 'saved' where relevant or deleted where not. In the circumstances where the policies within the Local Plan are not consistent with the NPPF then that they should be afforded reduced weight or no weight.

4.3.2 The Council are in the process of preparing a replacement for the ELLP, the East Lindsey District Council Local Plan (Submissions Modifications Draft) which comprises the Core Strategy and the Settlement Proposals document. The Plan is currently (May 2017) at draft stage (Submissions Modification) and due to its advanced stage of preparation it is considered a material consideration in the determination of the planning applications.

4.3.3 Taking into account the discussion above, the policies from both of the previously mentioned plans which have been considered to be of relevance to the Proposed Development have been summarised and are outlined in the following sections.

East Lindsey Local Plan Alteration 1999 (Saved Policies, September 2007)

4.3.4 Policy A5 (Ref 12.10) (Quality and Design of Development) provides support to new development which improves the quality of the environment and does not conflict with other policies within the plan. The policy states that new development will only be permitted where:

a) *"Its design - including its layout, density, scale, appearance or choice of materials - does not detract from the distinctive character of the locality;*

b) *It retains or incorporates features or characteristics which are important to the quality of the local environment including important medium and long-distance views;*

c) *It is integrated within a landscaping scheme appropriate to its setting."*

4.3.5 Policy A5 goes on to state that:

"Greatest attention will be paid to the design of development in the following areas, statutorily designated or recognised as having special character and which must be retained and respected:

- *The Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;*
- *The Coastal Conservation Areas, including the National Nature Reserves and the*
- *Special Area of Conservation;*
- *Conservation areas; and*
- *Historic parks and gardens*

Particular attention will also be paid to other areas where special character has been identified such as the Areas of Great Landscape Value and the Fens and Marshes."

4.3.6 The policy also further describes the guidance the Council judge should be used in determining the appropriateness of development, provides detail on the desired approach to Landscaping in development, and outlines specific development considerations within the Fen and Marsh areas.

4.3.7 Policy C11 (Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Areas of Great Landscape Value) states that:

A. *"The Council will protect the natural beauty of the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the distinctive character of the Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) by not permitting development which would:*

- *harm landscape features which contribute to the character of the area;*
- *harm the distinctive character, role or regional or local historic significance of the area; or*
- *inhibit the quiet enjoyment of the AONB.*

4.3.8 Policy C2 Development and Demolition affecting a Listed Building states that:

"Planning permission will be given for development which is within the curtilage of, or affects the setting of, a Listed Building only where its form, scale, proportions, materials, siting, boundary treatment and associated landscaping preserves or enhances the special architectural or historic interest, viability or long-term use of the Listed Building."

The policy also states that:

"Consent will only be granted for the demolition, or substantial demolition, of a grade I or II Listed Building in wholly exceptional circumstances and of a grade II Listed Building in exceptional circumstances and, in every case, only where:*

a) It can be shown that there is no suitable alternative to development; and

b) Proposals for redevelopment have been approved; and

c) The valid contract has been let for the approved redevelopment."

<u>East Lindsey Core Strategy (Submissions Modifications Draft, March 2017)</u>

4.3.9 Strategic Policy 11 (SP11 Historic Environment) (Ref: 12.11) states that:

"The Council will support proposals that secure the continued protection and enhancement of heritage assets in East Lindsey, contribute to the wider vitality and regeneration of the areas in which they are located and reinforce a strong sense of place.

Proposals will be supported where they adhere to the following criteria (not limited to):

- *Protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting;*
- *Preserve and enhance the special character, appearance and setting of the District's Conservation Areas;*
- *Have particular regard to the special architectural or historic interest and setting of the District's Listed Buildings;*
- *Do not harm the site or setting of a Scheduled Monument; any unscheduled nationally important or locally significant archaeological site;*

- *Preserve or enhance the quality and experience of the historic landscapes and woodland of the District and their setting;*
- *Promote a sustainable and viable use which is compatible with the fabric, interior, surroundings and setting of the heritage asset; and,*
- *Conserve heritage assets identified as being at risk, ensuring the optimum viable use of an asset is secured where it is consistent with the significance of the heritage asset."*

4.3.10 The policy text defines clearly the assets it considers under the wider definition of 'Heritage Assets'. The policy also provides further direction relating to at risk assets.

4.3.11 Strategic Policy 23 (SP23 – Landscape) advises that the District's landscapes will be protected, enhanced, used, and managed to provide an attractive and healthy working and living environment. Development will be guided by the District's Landscape Character Assessment and landscapes defined as highly sensitive will be afforded the greatest protection.

It further states that:

"Development will be supported where it allows for greater public access to the countryside and naturalistic coast, and helps provide additional employment opportunities.

The Council will ensure that the distinctive character of the District's landscapes whether they are of cultural, natural, or historic significance, will not be compromised. In particular, the highest level of protection will be given to the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The Council will support development that conserves and enhances designated and historic landscapes (Winceby Battlefield, Lincolnshire Wolds, Coastal Country Park, Conservation Areas, Historic Parks and Gardens, setting of listed buildings within the landscape)."

4.3.12 Strategic Policy 27 (SP 27 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy) advises that Large-scale renewable and low carbon energy development, development for the transmission and interconnection of electricity, and infrastructure required to support such development, will be supported where their individual or cumulative impact is, when weighed against the benefits, considered to be acceptable in relation to:

a) *"residential amenity;*
b) *surrounding landscape, townscape and historic landscape character, and visual qualities;*
c) *the significance (including the setting) of a historic garden, park, battlefield, building, conservation area, archaeological site or other heritage asset;*
d) *sites or features of biodiversity or geodiversity importance, or protected species;*
e) *the local economy;*
f) *highway safety; and*
g) *water environment and water quality."*

4.3.13 Development within or affecting the setting of the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB, and landscape areas defined as highly sensitive within the East Lindsey LCA, will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, where the development is in the public interest and considering the following:

- *"National considerations, and the impact upon the local economy;*
- *the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, and,*
- *any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be satisfactorily moderated."*

Boston Borough Council

4.3.14 The statutory development plan for Boston Borough Council currently comprises the 'saved' parts of the Boston Borough Local Plan (BBLP) and the Boston Borough Interim Plan (Non-Statutory Development Control Policy) 2006. The BBLP was originally adopted in 1999, with the policies then being reviewed in 2007 and either 'saved' where relevant or deleted where not. In the circumstances where the policies within the Local Plan are not consistent with the NPPF then that they should be afforded reduced weight or no weight.

4.3.15 The 2006 Boston Borough Interim Plan was produced as a replacement for the BBLP but had to be withdrawn from the statutory adoption process in February 2006. Boston Borough Council subsequently adopted a revised version of the Interim Plan for development control purposes. However, due to significant objection received during the production of the plan, the policies contained within the Interim Plan are judged not to carry weight and therefore will not be considered.

4.3.16 Boston Borough Council, South Holland District Council, and Lincolnshire County Council are in the process of preparing a new local plan, the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), which will guide development in the area until 2036 and act as a replacement for the BBLP. The Plan is currently (May 2017) at draft stage and therefore is considered a material consideration in the determination of the planning applications. It is anticipated that the plan will be adopted in Spring 2018.

4.3.17 The policies from both the BBLP (2007 saved policies) and the SELLP which have been considered to be of relevance to the NGVL Scheme have been summarised and are outlined in the following sections.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (Publication Version, March 2017)

4.3.18 Policy 3 (Development Management) (Ref: 12.12) is a strategic policy relating to new development advising that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to:

1. *"size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses;*
2. *quality of design and orientation;*
3. *maximising the use of sustainable materials and resources;*
4. *access and vehicle generation levels;*

5. *the capacity of existing community services and infrastructure;*
6. *impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion;*
7. *sustainable drainage and flood risk; and*
8. *impact or enhancement for areas of natural habitats and historical buildings and heritage assets."*

4.3.19 Policy 25 (The Historic Environment) seeks to respect the historical legacy, varied character, and appearance of South East Lincolnshire's historic environment. Development proposals will conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated and non-designated heritage assets, such as important archaeology, historic buildings, conservation areas, monuments, street patterns, streetscapes, landscapes, parks, river frontages, structures, and their settings through high-quality sensitive design.

4.3.20 Policy 26 (Pollution) advises that proposals will not be permitted where, individually or cumulatively, there are adverse impacts on light, noise, odour, fumes, vibration and waste materials and as a consequence have adverse impacts upon:

1. *"health and safety of the public;*
2. *the amenities of the area; and*
3. *the natural, historic, and built environment;*

by way of:

1. *air quality, including odour;*
2. *background noise and light levels;*
3. *land quality and condition; and*
4. *surface and groundwater quality."*

South Holland District Council

4.3.21 The statutory development plan for South Holland District Council currently comprises the 'saved' parts of the South Holland Local Plan (SHLP). The SHLP was originally adopted in 2006, and the policies were then reviewed in 2009 and either 'saved' where relevant or deleted where not. If the policies within the Local Plan are not consistent with the NPPF then policy dictates that they should be given reduced weight or none at all.

4.3.22 The South-East Lincolnshire Local Plan (Ref: 12.12) is also relevant to the area of SHDC.

North Kesteven District Council

4.3.23 The statutory development plan for North Kesteven currently comprises the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) which was adopted by the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee in April 2017 and replaced the Local Plans of the City of Lincoln, West Lindsey and North Kesteven District Councils.

4.3.24 The policies from the CLLP considered to be of relevance to the Proposed Development are summarised and outlined in the following sections.

Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (Adopted, April 2017)

4.3.25 Policy LP25 (The Historic Environment) (Ref: 12.13) states that development proposals should protect, conserve, and seek opportunities to enhance the historic environment of Central Lincolnshire.

4.3.26 In instances where a development proposal would affect the significance of a heritage asset (whether designated or non-designated), including any contribution made by its setting, the applicant will be required to undertake the following, in a manner proportionate to the asset's significance:

- *"Describe and assess the significance of the asset;*
- *Identify the impact of the proposed works; and,*
- *Provide justification for the works, so that any harm can be weighed against public benefits."*

4.3.27 Unless it is explicitly demonstrated that the proposal meets the tests set out in the NPPF, permission will only be granted or development affecting designated or non-designated heritage assets where the impact of the proposal(s) does not harm the significance of the asset and/or its setting.

4.3.28 Proposals will be supported where they protect the significance of assets (and non-designated assets) and their setting and promote opportunities to better reveal heritage assets and enhance existing features.

4.3.29 The policy provides more detailed guidance on Listed Buildings, Conservations Areas, and archaeological remains and how proposals will be assessed in relation to these assets.

5 Baseline Conditions

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The following section presents the baseline conditions for heritage receptors that have the potential to experience effects from the Scheme. This document presents an assessment of the impacts to heritage receptors located within the planning application boundary. In addition, where nearby heritage receptors have been identified whose setting may be affected by the Scheme these have been included for assessment. Where the DBA has identified that a receptor has no potential to be affected by the Scheme it has not been carried forward into this chapter for assessment.

5.1.2 Heritage receptors are split between designated and non-designated receptors. All designated receptors are considered for impacts arising from changes in their setting. In addition, some non-designated heritage receptors are considered for impacts arising from changes in their setting where the assessment has identified that the receptor has a setting that extends beyond the boundary of the receptor.

5.1.3 Figures 12.1 and 12.2 detail the receptors that fall within the Zone of Influence as outlined in section 2 and which may potentially be impacted by the proposed DC cable route. Each receptor is labelled with their Project I.D which is noted in bold text when introduced.

5.1.4 A detailed account of the known archaeological, built heritage, and historic landscape baseline within the Zone of Influence is provided in the Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (Appendix 12.1 Desk Based Assessment Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)).

5.2 Background

5.2.1 The proposed DC cable route is located along the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Fens, with a vast range of archaeological receptors.

5.2.2 Across the proposed DC cable route, a range of geologies and superficial deposits fluctuate. At the point of the Proposed Landfall site at Boygrift, East Lindsey (Route Section One), is a Burnham Chalk, with a Blown Sand superficial deposit. Across Route Section 1, a form of chalk formation is the predominant geology with a Till-Diamicton superficial deposit formed up to 3 million years ago. Route Section 2, sees further variations in chalk formations, alongside quick changes to mudstone, Spilsby Sandstone, and Kimmeridge Clay. No superficial deposit is recorded. Further variations of the same deposits are noted across Route Section 3, with Route Section 4 resulting in an Oxford Clay formation bedrock made predominantly of Mudstone and a superficial deposit of a Tidal Flat deposit; both being the dominant deposits in the Donington area.

5.2.3 The Wolds landscape has an exceptional ritual landscape with the densest distribution of long barrows in the country. This Neolithic activity stretches into the edges of the Fen landscape with examples of flint scatters, particularly in and around East and West Keal and near Stickford. The Lincolnshire Fens are archaeologically rich in their nature, with a large range of artefactual examples from the Prehistoric period. Nothing of Mesolithic (10,000 BC- 4,000 BC) date has been recorded within the Zone of Influence for the proposed DC cable route, with Mesolithic activity concentrated on higher ground, particularly in the southern Lincolnshire Wolds.

5.2.4 The presence of the River Witham within the Lincolnshire Fens provided an important artery into the Fens and in the Iron Age (800 BC-AD43) was exploited and venerated by the local tribe Corieltavi. Consequently, significant areas of the Fens seem to have been occupied in the Iron Age and there are significant examples of Prehistoric cropmarks mapped in an area to the north-west of Donington.

5.2.5 The Roman invasion of Britain in AD 43 brought the establishment of military infrastructure including a fort at Lincoln (Lindum). Whilst Lincoln developed into a colonia, with a road network including Ermine Street and Fosse Way, rural settlements continued in use from the Iron Age into the Roman period (AD 43-410). Significant trade routes were established for the continuation of the salt-making industry with routeways such as Salter's Way connecting Donington with the Roman settlement of Saltersford and beyond. The Romans continued to exploit the Fens with evidence for Roman occupation provided through cropmarks.

5.2.6 Occupational continuity of the Fens continued into the Early Medieval (410-1066) period with evidence for Early Medieval settlements, such as Stickford with Roman origins. While the Wolds are particularly populated with examples of Early Medieval settlement sites, there are limited examples for the presence of Early Medieval sites at the southern end of Route Section 4 with place name evidence indicates Viking contact at locations further north such as Huttoft and Brothertoft.

5.2.7 The Medieval (1066- 1540) period sees a similar pattern in Lincolnshire as the previous periods, with examples for settlement activity continuing throughout the Wolds. Evidence comes primarily from a high number of deserted Medieval villages, seen distributed along the first three sections of the proposed DC cable route. Key examples of early fenland settlements are Swineshead and Boston which prosper and developed into towns seen in the present era. A key feature of the Early Medieval period is the presence of ridge and furrow dotted around nucleated settlements; a feature seen within the Zone of Influence of the proposed DC cable route.

5.2.8 The Lincolnshire Fens continued to offer a rich source of food, fuel, and pasture in the Post-Medieval (1540-1901) period. However, the landscape changed dramatically with the coming of the Industrial Revolution. The need for increased agricultural production saw a 1762 Act of Parliament authorising major drainage works in the River Witham. Due to the Fens, low lying landscape, flooding presented a risk for the area, and the construction of pumping stations, looked to remove excess water back to the higher ground of the River. The area around Route Section Four is represented by a significant presence of agricultural farms surrounding the site.

5.3 Designated Receptors

Route Section 1 Proposed Landfall to Well High Lane (See Figure 12.2, sheet 1-4)

5.3.1 No designated receptors are located within the planning application boundary within this section of the proposed DC cable route.

5.3.2 There are three designated receptors that are situated within the Zone of Influence.

5.3.3 The Cottage at Markby (**LB33**) is a Grade II listed late seventeenth century farmhouse that has been subsequently altered. This receptor is situated 195 m to the north of the planning application boundary. Its setting is informed by its location on the outskirts of Markby and the surrounding agricultural land. Its setting informs its significance, and although this receptor is not located within the planning application boundary its setting extends to within it. This receptor has historic and aesthetic significance as evidence of seventeenth century design and is of **medium** value.

5.3.4 The Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse (**LB27**) is situated 90 m to the north of the planning application boundary. This receptor is a farmhouse which dates to the mid eighteenth century however it has subsequently had alterations. The house is situated in a moated enclosure. This receptor's setting is informed by its location on the outskirts of Saleby and the surrounding rural landscape, with which it has a functional and historical association. Its setting informs its significance and extends to within the planning application boundary, consequently it forms part of the baseline. This receptor is of **medium** value and **has historic and aesthetic** significance.

5.3.5 Ailby House Farmhouse (**LB34**) is a Grade II listed farmhouse which dates to the seventeenth century but has had subsequent alteration. It is situated 240 m to the south of the planning application boundary. The setting of this receptor is informed by its location within the village of Ailby and the surrounding farmland, its setting informs its significance. Although this receptor is not located within the planning application boundary; its setting extends to within the planning application boundary. The receptor is of **medium** value and **has historic and aesthetic** significance.

Summary of Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section1)

Table 12.7 Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 1)

Project ID	Name	Period	Grade	Value
LB33	The Cottage	Post Medieval	II	Medium
LB27	Manor Farmhouse	Post Medieval	II	Medium
LB34	Ailby House Farmhouse	Post Medieval	II	Medium

Route Section 2 Well High Lane to A16 (Keal Road) (See Figure 12.2, sheet 4-9)

5.3.6 No designated receptors are located within the planning application boundary within this section of the proposed DC cable route.

5.3.7 There are three designated receptors that are within the Zone of Influence.

5.3.8 The scheduled monument of a Neolithic long barrow which is situated 465 m to the north-west of Dexthorpe (**SM5**) has been damaged by ploughing however it survives beneath the present-day ground surface. This receptor's setting is informed by nearby contemporary receptors to the north of the receptor which include Spellow Hills long barrow (1013919) and the Neolithic long barrow 650 m to the south of Langton Grange Cottage (1013910). Its setting is also informed by its upland location with far reaching views which would have informed its original siting. Its setting informs its significance. Although this receptor is located 130 m outside of the planning application boundary, its setting extends to within the planning application boundary. It is of **high** value and **has evidential, historic, and aesthetic** significance.

5.3.9 The scheduled monument of Ring Holt bowl barrow (**SM3**) dates to the Bronze Age and is situated on a south west facing hill slope above a tributary of the River Lymm. The circular mound measures 30 m in diameter and is 1.5 m high. It has a flattened top which is believed to be a result of arable erosion and weathering. Within the northern arc of the barrow there are traces of an infilled ditch. There is no evidence which indicates that the site has been subject to archaeological excavation. The barrow is not located within the planning application boundary of the proposed DC cable route; however, it is surrounded by the planning application boundary consequently the monuments' setting extends to within it. Its setting is informed by its upland location with far reaching views. Its setting contributes to its significance and extends to within the planning application boundary. This receptor has **evidential and aesthetic** significance and **high** value.

5.3.10 Brickfields (**LB28**) is a Grade II listed house which dates to the eighteenth century but was subsequently altered. This receptor is situated to the north of Mardon Hill and 70 m to the north of the planning application boundary. Its setting is informed by its rural location surrounded by open farmland. Its setting contributes to its significance and extends to within the planning application boundary consequently it was included within the baseline. This receptor is of **medium** value and **has historic and aesthetic** significance.

Summary of Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 2)

Table 12.8 Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 2)

Project ID	Name	Period	Grade	Value
SM5	Neolithic long barrow 465m north west of Dexthorpe	Prehistoric	n/a	High

Table 12.8 Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 2)				
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Grade**	**Value**
SM3	Ring Holt bowl barrow	Prehistoric	n/a	High
LB28	Brickfields	Post Medieval	II	Medium

Route Section 3 A16 (Keal Road) to River Witham (See Figure 12.2, sheet 9-16)

5.3.11 No designated receptors are located within the planning application boundary within this section of the proposed DC cable route, however there is one Grade II listed building which has a setting that extends to within the planning application boundary.

5.3.12 The Bridge over Twenty Foot Drain (**LB32**) is Grade II listed and dates to 1812 however it has had subsequent alterations. It is situated just outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting is informed by the Twenty Foot Drain and the minor road on which it is situated. This receptor is of **medium** value and has **historic and aesthetic** significance.

Summary of Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 3)

Table 12.9 Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 3)				
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Grade**	**Value**
LB32	Bridge over Twenty Foot Drain	Post Medieval	II	Medium

Route Section 4 River Witham to the Proposed Converter Station (See Figure 12.2, sheet 16-20)

5.3.13 No designated receptors are located within the planning application boundary within this section of the proposed DC cable route.

5.3.14 No designated receptors are located within the Zone of Influence within this section of the proposed DC cable route.

Summary of Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 4)

Table 12.10 Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 4)				
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Grade**	**Value**
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

5.4 Non-designated Receptors

Route Section 1 Proposed Landfall to Well High Lane (See Figure 12.2, sheet 1-4)

5.4.1 There are a total of 31 heritage receptors within Route Section 1. These are described by period below, and shown on Figure 12.2.

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

5.4.2 There is one heritage receptor which dates to the Prehistoric period within the planning application boundary. This receptor was identified through LiDAR and aerial photo analysis and consists of a circular mound and linear features (**300**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). This receptor is located on the southern perimeter of the planning application boundary. It has **evidential** significance as evidence of past human activity and is of **low** value.

Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

5.4.3 The Sea Bank at Huttoft (**160**) is known as the Roman Bank. However, it is believed to be Medieval in origin and was marked on the 1905 Ordnance Survey map. It crosses the planning application boundary south-east north-west 370 m from the eastern end of the proposed DC cable route. The planning application boundary covers a width of c.200 m of the Sea Bank which has a total span of 3.4 km. The Sea Bank has **evidential, aesthetic, and historic** significance through the evidence it supplies about occupation and land use within the Zone of Influence. This receptor is of **low** value.

5.4.4 A probable Late Medieval earthwork enclosure and field boundary were identified through the National Mapping Programme (NMP) at Huttoft (**159**). This likely formed part of a larger landscape within the Medieval period and may have related to settlement at Yarlsgate or South Farms. The receptor lies adjacent to Boy Grift Drain and was likely impacted during the construction of the drain. The probable enclosure (**159**) lies approximately half within the planning application boundary with half lying beyond the northern edge of the planning application boundary. This receptor has **evidential** significance as an indicator of past land use and divisions within the local area and is of **low** value.

5.4.5 Archaeological walkover survey identified a former field boundary and ridge and furrow to the north of Wold View Farm (**261**). The northern sector of ridges and furrow was confirmed through the results of the geophysical survey (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). The receptor would have formed part of a wider Medieval agricultural landscape, and has **evidential** significance as evidence of past human activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.6 LiDAR and aerial photo analysis identified wide ridging at Markby (**299**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). This receptor is located across the planning application boundary and has **evidential** significance as evidence of past human activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.7 The deserted Medieval village of Asserby (**267**) lies 190 m to the south of the planning application boundary. Its setting extends to within the planning application boundary although

does not form a major part of its significance. It has **evidential** and **historical** significance, and is of **medium** value.

5.4.8 The shrunken Medieval village of Saleby (**103**) is evidenced by earthwork crofts, boundaries, enclosures and ridge and furrow which was recorded by the NMP. This receptor is significant both as a standalone monument and as part of the setting for the village of Saleby. This receptor would have also formed part of the wider Medieval agricultural landscape within the area.

5.4.9 The receptor (**103**) lies to the north of the planning application boundary with only a small portion entering the northern edge of the planning application boundary. This receptor has **evidential and aesthetic** significance as part of the Medieval landscape of Saleby through its upstanding earthwork features and buried remains. It also has **historical** significance through it illustration of the continual settlement of the area, linking the Medieval village of Saleby and the current settlement. This receptor is of **medium** value as the regional research agenda has identified a need and importance to confirm the extent of shrunken Medieval villages such as Saleby, and to clarify the nature of the desertion of sites, to update the HER accordingly (Ref: 12-14).

5.4.10 Within the shrunken Medieval village of Saleby (**103**), at its southern extent is a moated site (**104**) evidenced by partial earthworks. Only the southern edge of the moated site enters the planning application boundary.

5.4.11 The regional research agenda highlights that a better understanding of early manorial sites is needed, and identifies a requirement for synthesis of the evidence for moated sites within the region. This receptor has the potential to contribute to this research objective (Ref: 12-14). Moats also have the potential to hold well-preserved waterlogged deposits. This receptor (**104**) has **evidential and historic** significance as contributes to the Medieval landscape of the region and, together with the shrunken Medieval village (**103**), provides a picture of the land-use in the area during the Medieval period. It is of **medium** value.

5.4.12 Ridge and furrow was identified to the south of Rigsby Wood (**174**), it was not visible during the archaeological walkover survey. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.13 Rigsby Medieval settlement (**269**) is visible as earthworks surrounding the village of Rigsby, and is located 90 m to the south-west of the planning application boundary. Its setting extends to within the planning application boundary but only contributes in part to its significance. It has **evidential**, **aesthetic,** and **historical** significance, and is of **medium** value.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

5.4.14 Sea Bank Farm at Huttoft (**22**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead which lies 55 m to the south of the planning application boundary. Its setting extends within the planning application boundary but only contributes partially to its significance. It has **historical** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.15 LiDAR and aerial photo analysis identified a linear hollow (**295**) which has been interpreted as a boundary/drain crossing and other earthworks that were visible on the nineteenth century

mapping (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). This receptor is located to the west of Sea Bank Farm and crosses the planning application boundary.

5.4.16 Ridge and furrow was identified to the north-east of Yarlsgate Farm (**296**). This receptor is located within the planning application boundary. Both receptors (**295, 296**) have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value.

5.4.17 To the west of Yarlsgate Farm and located across the planning application boundary is a disused railway (**411**). This railway has **aesthetic** significance as a linear feature within the landscape, **historic** significance for its links with the industrial past of Sutton on Sea and communal significance for its current use as a public footpath. It is of **low** value.

5.4.18 Former field divisions (**298**) were recorded at Wold View Farm through LiDAR and aerial photo analysis and are believed to date to the nineteenth century (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.19 Two nineteenth century farms are located in Mablethorpe and Sutton with settings that extend into the planning application boundary. South Farm (**26**) lies 35 m to the north-east of the planning application boundary, and America Farm (**179**) 80 m to the north-west. The settings of these receptors are informed by the agricultural land in which they are situated. Both have **historical** and **communal** significance and are of **low** value.

5.4.20 Two partially extant, nineteenth century farms are located in Huttoft, with settings that extend into the planning application boundary. Yarlsgate Farm (**23**) lies 30 m to the north-east of the planning application boundary, and Wold Farm (**24**) 35 m to the south-west. The settings of these receptors are informed by the agricultural land in which they are situated. Both have **historical** and **communal** significance and are of **low** value.

5.4.21 A tramway is recorded between Sutton on Sea and Alford (**117**). The tramway was opened in 1884 but had limited success. It was a 2 ft, 6 in. tramway which required a level surface, evidence of this levelling was found during a watching brief.

5.4.22 The tramway (**117**) has **evidential and historic** significance as part of the economic development of the local area and of industrial development within this period. It also has aesthetic significance as an upstanding feature within the landscape. The tramway crosses the planning application boundary running north south for 480 m and travels for an overall length of 10 km.

5.4.23 The regional research framework highlights the need for fieldwork and research to establish the nature and development of linear transport systems (Ref: 12-15), therefore this receptor is of **medium** value.

5.4.24 A partially extant nineteenth century farmstead (**426**) is recorded at Furze Hill and 110 m outside the planning application boundary. The setting of this receptor is informed by the farmland within which it is situated. This setting extends to within the planning application boundary although does not make a large contribution to its significance. It has **historical** and **communal** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.25 Mill House Farm is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead (**427**) that is recorded at Beesby with Saleby. This receptor is located 210 m outside of the planning application boundary however its setting, which is informed by the farmland within which it is situated, extends to within the planning application boundary. Its setting contributes to its **evidential** and **communal** significance. This receptor is of **low** value.

5.4.26 The Wesleyan Methodist Chapel at Saleby (**453**) was built in 1885 but is currently in a state of disrepair. The setting of this receptor is informed by the settlement of Saleby and the surrounding dispersed settlement. Although the receptor is situated 250 m to the north of the planning application boundary its setting extends to within it and forms part of its significance. This receptor has **communal**, **historical,** and **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.27 Home Farm at Saleby (**180**) at Saleby is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead which is located 240 m to the north-east of the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located 240 m outside of the planning application boundary its setting which is informed by the farmland within which it is situated extends to within it. Its setting informs its **historical** significance and it is a **low** value receptor.

5.4.28 Also located within Saleby but 105 m to the north of the planning application boundary is Saleby Manor (**181**) which is a redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead. Although this receptor is not located within the planning application boundary its setting which is informed by the farmland within which it is situated, extends to within the planning application boundary and informs its **historical** significance. This receptor is of **low** value.

5.4.29 To the west of Ailby House Farm, former field boundaries and wide ridging that dates to the nineteenth century was recorded (**302**). These receptors have **evidential** significance as offer evidence of past human activity and are of **low** value.

Modern Period (AD 1914 – Present)

5.4.30 No heritage receptors dating to the modern period have been identified within the planning application boundary within this section of the proposed DC cable route.

Unknown Date

5.4.31 LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis identified a sinuous water course to the west of Yarlsgate Farm (**297**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). This receptor could have previously unrecorded archaeological activity associated with it. It has **evidential** significance through its potential to yield evidence about past human activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.32 LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis identified former field divisions, wide ridging, and a possible pond/quarry pit at Ailby House Farm (**301**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.33 Former field boundaries including ridge and furrow and a strip field (255) were identified during walkover survey. Likely to be associated with Ailby deserted medieval village. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.34 Also within the planning application boundary and to the west of Ailby House Farm is a series of pits which were identified through geophysical survey (**407**) (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). Geophysical survey also identified a potential plough damaged ditch to the north-west of Rigsby (**408**). These receptors have **evidential** significance through their potential to yield evidence about past human activity and are of **low** value.

Summary of Non- Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 1)

Table 12.11 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 1)

Project ID	Name	Period	Value
300	Circular mound and rectilinear earthworks at Furzehill	Prehistoric	Low
160	Sea Bank at Huttoft	Medieval to Modern	Low
159	Probable Late Medieval earthwork enclosure and field boundary, Huttoft	Medieval to Post Medieval	Low
261	Relict field boundary and ridge and furrow, north of Wold View Farm	Medieval	Low
299	Wide ridging at Markby	Medieval to Post Medieval	Low
267	Deserted Medieval village of Asserby	Medieval	Medium
103	Shrunken Medieval village of Saleby	Medieval	Medium
104	Moated site in Saleby Medieval Shrunken Village	Medieval	Medium
174	Ridge and furrow earthworks south of Rigsby Wood, Rigsby with Ailby	Medieval	Low
269	Rigsby Medieval settlement	Medieval	Medium
22	Sea Bank Farm at Huttoft	Post Medieval	Low
295	Liner Hollow	Post Medieval	Low

Table 12.11 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 1)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
296	Ridge and Furrow	Post Medieval	Low
411	Disused Railway	Post Medieval	Low
298	Former Field Boundaries	Post Medieval	Low
26	South Farm	Post Medieval	Low
179	America Farm	Post Medieval	Low
23	Yarlsgate Farm	Post Medieval	Low
25	Wold Farm	Post Medieval	Low
117	Sutton on Sea to Alford Tramway	Post Medieval	Medium
426	Farmstead at Furze Hill	Post Medieval	Low
427	Mill House Farm	Post Medieval	Low
453	Wesleyan Methodist Chapel	Post Medieval	Low
180	Home Farm, Saleby	Post Medieval	Low
181	Saleby Manor	Post Medieval	Low
302	Former field divisions and wide ridging west of Ailby House Farm	Post Medieval	Low
297	Sinuous watercourse to the west of Yarlsgate Farm	Unknown	Low
301	Former field divisions, wide ridging and pond/quarry pit at Ailby House Farm	Unknown	Low
255	Former field boundaries including ridge and furrow and a strip fields.	Unknown	Low

Table 12.11 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 1)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
407	Potential pits, W Ailby House Farm	Unknown	Low
408	Potential ditch, NW Rigsby	Unknown	Low

Route Section 2 Well High Lane to A16 (Keal Road) (See Figure 12.2, sheet 4-9)

5.4.35 There are a total of 65 heritage receptors within Route Section 2. These are described by period below and shown in Figure 12.2.

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

5.4.36 There are 16 Prehistoric receptors within the planning application boundary of the proposed DC cable route, many of these receptors relate to settlement activity and funerary monuments.

5.4.37 A liner cropmark feature (**125**), south of East Driby, was identified through aerial photography. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.38 To the west of Deersleap, 387 m, is a cropmark enclosure (**124**) which has **evidential** significance as evidence of Prehistoric human activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.39 A possible Bronze Age round barrow cropmark (**119**) was recorded as visible on aerial photographs to the south of Fulletby. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.40 Cartographic analysis identified a findspot of a stone axe (**266**) at Langton Hill which was marked on the 1956 1:10,000 Ordnance Survey mapping. This receptor has **evidential** significance as evidence of past human activity. It is of **negligible** value and provides a negligible potential for previously unrecorded below ground archaeology. As the receptor has been removed, no impact to the artefact will be encountered by the proposed DC cable route, and the receptor is subsequently not considered further.

5.4.41 Possible Prehistoric cropmarks of enclosures and boundaries (**144**) are recorded on the perimeter of the planning application boundary, to the north-west of Langton Hill. This receptor has **evidential** significance derived from its potential to yield evidence about past human activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.42 To the south-east and 825 m to the north-west of Dalby is a cropmark of a possible round barrow (**120**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and **medium** value due to its location within a ceremonial landscape and therefore its ability to contribute to the regional research framework (Ref: 12-16).

5.4.43 Located within the planning application boundary and to the south of Dalby Bar is a receptor which was identified through geophysical survey (**397**) (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). This receptor has been interpreted as a ring ditch which is situated to the north of several ditch like anomalies. It seems to have a break in the south however a ditch-like anomaly

partially masks the picture, it is unclear if the ditch is associated with the ring. There are also several pit-like responses within this area. The proximity of this receptor to Ring Holt bowl barrow indicates that this receptor is potentially a previously unrecorded barrow. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **medium** value due to its location within a ceremonial landscape and therefore its ability to contribute to the regional research framework.

5.4.44 Situated north of Dalby and just west of Dexthorpe is a cropmark site consisting of a hut circle and enclosures which have been interpreted as a possible later Prehistoric farmstead (**230**). These heritage receptors offer **evidential** significance as have the potential to yield evidence about Prehistoric human activity. These receptors are of **low** value.

5.4.45 A prehistoric cropmark (**146**) is located c.482 m west of Home Farm, Dalby. The receptor is recorded as comprising huts circles and enclosures. This receptor is of **evidential** significance and **low** value.

5.4.46 Located 82 m to the south of the prehistoric cropmark (**146**) is the find spot of a Neolithic Stone Axe (**90**) which is recorded as a small rough axe. This receptor has **evidential** significance as evidence of Prehistoric human activity and is of **low** value This receptor may indicate potential for further Prehistoric remains within the area. It is this potential which will be considered further, regarding the impact the proposed DC cable route may have on these as yet, potentially unknown associated artefacts.

5.4.47 Several barbed and tanged arrowheads (**99**) were discovered in Langton by Spilsby, c.760 m to the south-west of Dalby. This receptor has evidential significance as evidence of Prehistoric human activity and is of **low** value. This receptor may indicate potential for further Prehistoric remains within the area. It is this potential which will be considered further, in regard to the impact the proposed DC cable route may have on these as yet, potentially unknown associated artefacts.

5.4.48 Located in Langton by Spilsby parish, approximately 1 km east of Sausthorpe is a scatter of Bronze Age flints and scrapers seen at Langton Hall in 1955. Said to have been found near America Farm (**98**). This scatter may be indicative of buried Bronze Age receptors in the area.

5.4.49 The regional research agenda has highlighted the need to gain an understanding of Neolithic and Bronze Age societies alongside their access to resources by looking at the distribution patterns of sites and artefacts within the East Midlands region, alongside characterising the sources of lithic materials (Ref:12-16). Consequently, this location has the potential to contribute to the regional research agenda, therefore this receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **medium** value. It is this potential, for associated artefacts dating to the Prehistoric period, which will be considered further, regarding the impact the proposed DC cable route may have on these as yet, potentially unknown associated artefacts.

5.4.50 Situated within the southernmost area of this route section at East Keal are multiple finds assemblages which were identified during a rapid fieldwalking survey along the proposed route of the East Keal bypass route. These finds include a concentration of Mesolithic flints (**115**), a late Neolithic/ early Bronze Age flint assemblage (**76**), and Early and Middle Bronze Age pottery and

burnt stone (**80**). These receptors have **evidential** significance as evidence of Prehistoric human activity and are of **low** value. Collectively, they provide a potential for further archaeological remains, dating to the Prehistoric period, too be present within this area of route section 2 of the DC route. It is this potential which will be considered further, regarding the impact the proposed DC cable route may have on these as yet, potentially unknown associated artefacts.

5.4.51 Prehistoric cropmark enclosures were recorded by the NMP at to the north of Highfield Farm West Keal. The eastern side of this complex impinges into the western edge of the planning application boundary (**123**). This was not visible during the archaeological walkover survey. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

Roman Period (AD 43 – 410)

5.4.52 Five receptors of Roman date are recorded within this route section, these receptors relate to settlement activity.

5.4.53 Aerial photographic analysis identified cropmarks of field boundaries and enclosures (**385**) at Langton Grange Farm. These features are believed to date to the Iron Age/Romano-British period. They have **evidential** significance, as evidence of past human activity and are of **low** value.

5.4.54 Analysis of aerial photographs and Google Earth imagery identified enclosures, field boundaries and a trackway to the north-east of Stirbeck Plantation (**386**). These cropmarks have been interpreted to be of possible Iron Age or Romano-British date. They have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value.

5.4.55 Located 1.3 km to the north-east of Sausthorpe and on the eastern perimeter of the planning application boundary is a cropmark of Roman enclosures and boundaries (**145**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.56 To the north of Raithby cross roads, LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis identified an enclosure and field boundaries (**315**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.57 At East Farm, Partney, LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis also identified cropmarks of enclosures, field boundaries and pits (**387**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). This receptor has **evidential** significance and **low** value.

Early Medieval Period (AD 410 – 1066)

5.4.58 There is one recorded heritage receptor within this route section that dates to the Early Medieval period, this is an Early/Middle Saxon site (**108**) that is recorded at the southern end of the route section at East Keal. This site consists of three or more concentrations of pottery within a soil mark. Other finds include a burnt piece of amber, rectangular piece of polished bone, a lava quern and slag. This receptor is of **medium** value due to the rarity of sites which date to this period and its ability to contribute to the regional research framework.

Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

5.4.59 There are 15 receptors of Medieval date are recorded within this route section.

5.4.60 Ailby deserted Medieval village (**219**) is located 250 m to the south-west of the planning application boundary. The setting of this receptor is informed by its association with the settlement of Ailby, Ailby House Farm (**LB34**) and the surrounding agricultural land. The setting of this receptor (**219**) does extend within the planning application boundary. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **medium** value.

5.4.61 Former field boundaries, including ridge and furrow and a strip field (**255**) were identified 160 m to the south-west of the planning application boundary. The setting of this receptor does extend into the planning application boundary. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **medium** value.

5.4.62 Aerial photographic analysis identified a feature which has been interpreted as an old field boundary or a drain to the north-west of Dalby Bar (**311**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value. It is situated on the eastern most edge of the planning application boundary.

5.4.63 The site of a deserted medieval village which survives as earthworks is recorded at Dexthorpe (**444**). This site is recorded 105 m outside of the planning application boundary however its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. The receptor's setting informs its **evidential** significance, it is of **medium** value.

5.4.64 Potential ridge and furrow was identified from geophysical survey within a Prehistoric ceremonial landscape to the south of Dalby Bar (**398**) (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.65 Two areas of ridge and furrow have been identified around Dalby (**149**, **388**). Both receptors have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value.

5.4.66 The Medieval Chapel of Well (**92**) is centrally located within the planning application boundary and to the south-west of Dalby. This receptor if of **low** value and **evidential** significance.

5.4.67 Four receptors are recorded at Raithby, three of which relate to agricultural activity. A substantial area of earthwork ridge and furrow was identified by the NMP to the north of the central area of the settlement at Raithby (**130**) and on the eastern perimeter of the planning application boundary. This ridge and furrow was recorded as earthworks however consultation of Google Earth imagery in 2013 has led to the possibility that it has since been ploughed out. Within the area of ridge and furrow at Raithby (**130**), near to the road edge are earthworks of stretch of Medieval trackway (**129**). At the western perimeter of the planning application boundary, also at Raithby, is a further area of ridge and furrow (**132**). This was not visible during the archaeological walkover survey but remnants are visible on aerial photos. To the south of Raithby and 10 m outside the planning application boundary is earthwork ridge and furrow which dates to the Late Medieval period (**128**). Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. These receptors have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value.

5.4.68 The Medieval Settlement of Mavis Enderby (**134**) consists of earthwork crofts, boundary and ridge and furrow. The setting of this receptor is informed by the current settlement of Mavis Enderby and the surrounding agricultural land. Although this receptor is located 40 m outside of the planning application boundary, its setting extends to within it. This receptor's setting informs its significance but does not form a major contribution to its **evidential** and **historical** significance. This receptor is of **medium** value.

5.4.69 Geophysical survey identified possible ridge and furrow to the north-west of Glebe Farm (**401** and to the south at Mardon Hill (**402**) (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). These receptors have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value.

Within the southernmost part of Route Section 2 at East Keal a large quantity of Medieval pottery was recovered from Field 2 of the East Keal bypass (**107**). This receptor has **evidential** significance as evidence of past human activity and is of **negligible** value. This receptor represents a potential for further archaeological remains to be present which may be impacted by the proposed DC cable route. It is this potential which is carried forward in this report.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

5.4.70 There are 12 Post Medieval receptors recorded within this route section.

5.4.71 A disused railway is recorded to the north-west of Alford (**412**). This is of **medium** value and has **historic** significance due to its potential to contribute to the regional research framework which highlights the importance of establishing the nature and development of linear transport systems (Ref: 12.15).

5.4.72 Two chalk pits (**264**), c.400 m south-west of Deersleap, were identified on the 1887-1888 1:10560 OS map of Lincolnshire but are lost by the 1975-76 OS map. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.73 Red House (**185**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is recorded at Raithby. This receptor is located 165 m to the south-east of the planning application boundary however its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. The setting of this receptor informs its **evidential** significance. It is of **low** value.

5.4.74 Glebe Farm (**429**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead recorded to the south of Raithby. The receptor is located 65 m outside the planning application boundary however its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. The setting of this receptor informs its **evidential** significance. It is of **low** value.

5.4.75 Raithby Grange Farm (**430**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead recorded to the south of Raithby. The receptor is located 204 m outside the planning application boundary however its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. The setting of this receptor informs its **evidential** significance. It is of **low** value.

5.4.76 East Farm at Sausthorpe (**32**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead. It is located 95 m to the south-east of the planning application boundary however its setting which is informed by

the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. Its setting informs its **evidential** significance, and the receptor is of **low** value.

5.4.77 A partially extant farmstead is recorded to the north of Mardon Hill (**35**). This is located to 40 m outside of the planning application boundary however its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. Its setting informs its **evidential** significance, this is a **low** value receptor.

5.4.78 Highfield Farm (**36**) is a nineteenth century farmstead that is recorded to the north-west of the planning application boundary and 60 m to the south-east of the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. Its setting informs its **evidential** significance. This receptor is of **low** value.

5.4.79 The Brick and Tile Works at Mardon Hill which survive as earthworks (**251**) and the disused quarry which is also at Mardon Hill (**250**) are both recorded outside the planning application boundary (5 m and 10 m respectively). Although these receptors are outside the planning application boundary, their settings which are informed by each other and the surrounding agricultural land extend to within it. Their settings inform their **aesthetic** and **evidential** significance. They are both of **low** value.

5.4.80 East Keal Park (**168**) was recorded on the first edition c.1880 and c.1905 Ordnance Survey maps and represents the enclosure of this area within the Post Medieval period. The area of park affected by the planning application boundary, appears to be largely under arable. This receptor has **historical** significance for its association with East Keal Hall and **aesthetic** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.81 Fair View at East Keal (**37**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is recorded 40 m to the east of the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. Its setting informs its **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

Modern Period (AD 1914 – Present)

5.4.82 One heritage receptor which dates to the Modern period is recorded within this route section. Archaeological walkover survey to the south-west of Ulceby Cross identified a memorial to the crash site of Lancaster PB476 on March 4 1945 (**409**). The aircraft is considered to have been shot down by enemy action, it crashed and burnt out (Ref: 12-17). The exact location of this crash site is not currently known however research has indicated that it may fall within the planning application boundary. If the aircraft broke up in the air, debris may be spread over an area greater than 1 km. Alternatively, if the aircraft made direct impact with the ground, debris could be spread over 1,000 $m^{2,}$ if a large bomb exploded on impact it could be spread over 1 km from the central impact area (Ref: 12-17). Research has indicated that this is not a Military War Grave however it is likely that there will be debris within the planning application boundary. It is considered unlikely that live or practice bombs will remain at the site. However, the presence of

munitions cannot be discounted as small arms ammunition may remain (Ref: 12-17). This receptor is of **medium** value and has **evidential and historic** significance.

Unknown Date

5.4.83 There are Fifteen recorded receptors of unknown date within this route section. Aerial photography has identified cropmarks of enclosures and trackways (**126**) to the north west of Ulceby Cross within an area that has a dense concentration of Prehistoric cropmarks. The site itself is recorded to cross the entire span of the planning application boundary (an area of 2.2 hectares), the cropmarks are recorded to span an area of 21 hectares. Geophysical survey confirmed the presence of this receptor and identified a series of disjointed anomalies which form a small rectilinear enclosure, a string of small pit-like features and a possible ring-ditch were also identified at this location (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.84 Two cropmarks are recorded at Langton by Spilsby (**142**, **143**). One of these receptors comprises cropmarks of a field boundary, an enclosure, and a boundary (**142**) whilst the other is a cropmark of an enclosure (**143**). Both receptors have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value

5.4.85 Also at Langton by Spilsby an early trackway site is recorded to run along and within the planning application boundary (**94**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.86 To the east of Dalby and on the eastern perimeter of the planning application boundary a substantial area of cropmarks, which include a field boundary and linear feature, have been identified through aerial photography (**147**). These cropmarks are to the south of Ring Holt Bowl Barrow (**SM3**). This receptor has **evidential** value through its potential to yield evidence of past human activity and is of **low** value.

5.4.87 LiDAR analysis identified two banks that run parallel to one and other, to the south of Partney Road (**319**, **320**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). These banks do not conform to the current field layout and they are situated across the planning application boundary. They have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value.

5.4.88 Located c.1 km to the east of Sausthorpe and on the eastern perimeter of the planning application boundary is a possible undated settlement which comprises cropmark boundaries and enclosures (**137**). 700 m to the south-east of Sausthorpe is a sand pit that was recorded on the Ordnance Survey 1:10560 map (**114**). These receptors have **evidential** value, and have the potential to yield evidence of past human activity. They are of **low** value.

5.4.89 LiDAR analysis identified a curvilinear hollow to the south-west of Sausthorpe (**314**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). This has been interpreted as a former boundary or drain/watercourse. This receptor is located within the planning application boundary and it is located adjacent to cropmarks of an enclosure and field boundaries (**315**). The hollow (**314**) is of **low** value and **evidential** significance due to its potential association within adjacent archaeological activity.

5.4.90 Undated pits were identified 1.2 km to the south-west of Sausthorpe in June 2011 through magnetometer survey (**66**). These pits are located within the planning application boundary.

5.4.91 Located to the south-west and 870 m to the north-north-west of Raithby is an undated cropmark trackway (**131**). This trackway spans the entire width of the planning application boundary within this area. This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.92 To the south-east of Wheelabout Wood and within the planning application boundary, geophysical survey identified part of an enclosure and several ditch-like anomalies (**399**) (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). This enclosure appears to have been subdivided and contain several pit-like responses. Another ditch is attached to the north-west corner and a possible ring-ditch. An area of increased magnetic response is located to the north and this extends beyond the geophysical survey area, these reflect a complex of archaeological features. This receptor has **evidential** significance, with the potential to yield evidence about past human activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.93 Geophysical survey identified two linear anomalies, believed to form an enclosure, a cluster of possible pits or other cut-features, were also identified at this location (**400**), to the north of Glebe Farm (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). These receptors have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value.

5.4.94 At Mardon Hill, geophysical survey identified an uncertain linear anomaly which could be a possible ditch (**403**) (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

Summary of Non- Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 2)

Table 12.12 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 2)

Project ID	Name	Period	Value
125	Linear Cropmark	Prehistoric	Low
124	Cropmark Enclosure	Prehistoric	Low
119	Possible Bronze Age Round Barrow	Prehistoric	Low
266	Stone Axe findspot	Prehistoric	Negligible
144	The possible cropmarks of enclosures and boundaries to the north-west of Langton Hill	Later Prehistoric	Low

Table 12.12 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 2)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
120	Possible round barrow cropmark west of Dalby Carr	Bronze Age	Medium
397	Dalby Bar Ring ditch and ditches	Prehistoric	Medium
230	Prehistoric cropmarks, Dalby	Later Prehistoric	Low
146	Cropmark	Prehistoric	Low
90	Stone Axe findspot	Prehistoric	Low
99	Barbed and Tanged Arrowheads	Prehistoric	Low
98	Bronze Age Flint Scatter	Prehistoric	Medium
115	Findspots at East Keal	Mesolithic	Low
76	Neolithic finds from field 2, East Keal bypass	Neolithic	Low
80	Bronze Age finds from field 2, East Keal Bypass	Bronze Age	Low
123	Prehistoric cropmarks, West Keal	Later Prehistoric	Low
385	The cropmarks of field boundaries and enclosures at Langton Grange Farm	Iron Age? Romano-British	Low
386	The enclosures, field boundaries and trackway to the north-east of Skirbeck Plantation	Iron Age? Romano-British	Low
145	The enclosure and boundary cropmarks to the east of Sausthorpe	Roman	Low

Table 12.12 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 2)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
315	The enclosure and field boundaries that were identified to the north of Raithby cross roads	Romano-British/? Medieval	Low
387	Cropmarks of enclosures, field boundaries and pits at East Farm, Partney	Iron Age? to Post Roman	Low
108	The early/middle Saxon site at East Keal	Early Medieval/Dark Age	Medium
129	Medieval trackway, Raithby	Medieval	Medium
255	Former Field Boundaries	Medieval	Medium
311	Field boundary/ drainage to the north-west of Dalby Bar	? Medieval	Low
444	Site of Deserted Medieval Village at Dexthorpe	Medieval	Medium
398	The ridge and furrow at Dalby Bar	Medieval	Low
149, 388	Two areas of Ridge and Furrow	Medieval	Low
92	Medieval Chapel of Well	Medieval	Low
130	Medieval Field System, Raithby	Medieval	Low
132	Medieval ridge and furrow, Raithby	Medieval	Low
128	Ridge and Furrow	Medieval	Low
129	Earthwork Trackway	Medieval	Low
134	Medieval Settlement of Mavis Enderby	Medieval	Low

Table 12.12 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 2)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
402	Ridge and Furrow at Mardon Hill	Medieval	Low
107	Pottery Finds	Medieval	Negligible
412	The disused railway to the north-west of Alford	Post Medieval	Medium
264	Two Chalk Pits	Post Medieval	Low
185	Red House Farm	Post Medieval	Low
429	Glebe Farm	Post Medieval	Low
430	Raithby Grange Farm	Post Medieval	Low
32	East Farm	Post Medieval	Low
35	Farmstead north of Mardon Hill	Post Medieval	Low
36	Highfield Farm	Post Medieval	Low
251	Brick and Tile Works	Post Medieval	Low
250	Disused Quarry	Post Medieval	Low
168	East Keal Hall park, East Keal	Post Medieval to Modern	Low
37	Fair View Farm at East Keal	Post Medieval	Low
409	The crash site of the Lancaster Bomber at Ulceby Cross	Modern	Medium

Table 12.12 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 2)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
126	enclosure and trackways cropmarks to the north-west of Ulceby Cross	Unknown	Low
143	The cropmarks at Langton by Spilsby	Unknown	Low
142	The cropmarks at Langton by Spilsby	Unknown	Low
94	The early trackway site at Langton by Spilsby	Unknown	Low
147	Cropmarks to the east of Dalby	Unknown	Low
319, **320**	The two banks to the south of Partney Road	Unknown	Low
137	Possible undated settlement, Sausthorpe	Unknown	Low
114	Sand-pit to the south-east of Sausthorpe	Unknown	Low
314	The curvilinear hollow to the south-west of Sausthorpe	Unknown	Low
66	Undated Pits, Raithby	Unknown	Low
131	Undated cropmark trackway to the north-north-west of Raithby	Unknown	Low
399	Enclosure and ditches to the south-east of Wheelabout Wood	Unknown	Low
400	Enclosure and ditches to the north of Glebe Farm	Unknown	Low
403	Potential ditch at Mardon Hill	Unknown	Low

Route Section 3 A16 (Keal Road) to River Witham (See Figure 12.2, sheet 9-16)

5.4.95 There are a total of 48 heritage receptors within Route Section 3. These are described by period below and shown in Figure 12.2.

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

5.4.96 To the north-west of Stickford, there are three findspots of Early and Middle Bronze Age pottery and flints which are all within approximately 300 m of each other. They are interpreted as evidence of Early and Middle Bronze Age activity in this area (**83**, **86,** and **87**) forming an area of higher potential for this period

5.4.97 The regional research agenda has highlighted the need to gain an understanding of Neolithic and Bronze Age societies alongside their access to resources by looking at the distribution patterns of sites and artefacts, alongside characterising the sources of lithic materials (Ref: 12-16). Although these receptors have since been removed there is the potential for more unrecorded finds to be at this location, therefore contributing to the research agenda. These receptors therefore have **evidential** significance and are of **medium** value. Collectively, these receptors provide a potential for further, unrecorded archaeology to be present in the area, as part of a settlement site. It is this potential that may be impacted by the proposed DC cable route, and is subsequently carried forward in this report.

Roman Period (AD 43 – 410)

5.4.98 A scatter of Roman pottery and quern fragments (**201**) was found west of Stickford. These were recovered within an area of Medieval ridge and furrow (**171**) that is located to the north-west of Mager Farm. The geophysical survey at this location identified two weak linear anomalies which could be indicative of the settlement site (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). This receptor (**201**) represents potential settlement activity within this area dating to the Roman period. The finds are also indicative of potential settlement shift within the area as by the Medieval period the land use had changed to agriculture. The finds have **evidential** significance and **low** value. This receptor provides a potential for further unrecorded archaeology to be present in the area, as part of a settlement site. It is this potential that may be impacted by the proposed DC cable route, and is subsequently carried forward in this report.

Early Medieval Period (AD 410 – 1066)

5.4.99 No heritage receptors dating to the Early Medieval period have been identified within the planning application boundary within this section of the proposed DC cable route.

Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

5.4.100 Earthwork ridge and furrow is recorded by the HER to the east of the A16 at East Keal (**172**). The HER records that these two areas of ridge and furrow have largely been destroyed by later

cultivation, however the archaeological walkover survey confirmed the presence of upstanding ridge and furrow at this location. This receptor has **evidential** significance, as provides evidence of Medieval agricultural activity. It is of **low** value and lies just on the western perimeter of the planning application boundary.

5.4.101 Manor House and site of moats at West Keal (**203**) consists of a nineteenth century Manor House and the site of medieval moats which are visible on aerial photos that date to 1946. Although this receptor is located 110 m outside the planning application boundary its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land and nearby, contemporary receptors extends to within it. This receptor is of **medium** value due to its potential to contribute to the regional research agenda (Ref: 12-14). This receptor's setting contributes to its **evidential** significance.

5.4.102 Geophysical survey identified ridge and furrow to the north of Limes Farm at Keal Cotes (**405**) (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). This receptor has **evidential** significance, as provides evidence of Medieval agricultural activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.103 Earthwork ridge and furrow was recorded by the NMP at Stickford (**171**), however the earthworks are believed to have been destroyed by later cultivation. The ridge and furrow was not recorded during the archaeological walkover survey, the results of this survey are detailed within the DBA (Appendix 12.1 Desk Based Assessment Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)). This receptor (**171**) offers **historic** significance as evidence of past land use and agricultural practices within the area but this is limited as the receptor is no longer extant. It is of **low** value.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

5.4.104 There are 22 heritage receptors dating to the Post Medieval period within this section of the proposed DC cable route.

5.4.105 LiDAR analysis identified three receptors of Post Medieval date within the planning application boundary (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). To the north of Manor House at Keal Cotes, slight banks, which are likely to include former field divisions, were identified (**323**). This receptor is located to the north of a known Medieval site, Manor House and site of moat which is outside of the Zone of Influence. It is of **low** value and has **evidential** significance, as evidence of Medieval activity. It is located across the planning application boundary.

5.4.106 Manor House in West Keal (**187**) is a nineteenth century unlisted farmstead that was visible during walkover surveys. The receptor is located 76 m outside the planning application boundary, to the south-east. However, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. The setting of this receptor informs its **historical** significance. It is of **low** value.

5.4.107 A former field boundary and widely spaced ridging was identified to the west of Limes Farm (**326**). This receptor is located on the eastern edge of the planning application boundary and is of **low** value and has **evidential** significance.

5.4.108 Glebe Farm (Limes Farm) in West Keal (**39**) is a partially extant nineteenth century unlisted farmhouse. The receptor is located 100 m outside the planning application boundary however its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. The setting of this receptor informs its **historical** significance. It is of **low** value.

5.4.109 Staunch Farm in Stickford (**189**) is a redeveloped nineteenth century out farm in an isolated location. The receptor is located 74 m outside the planning application boundary however its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. The setting of this receptor informs its **historical** significance. It is of **low** value.

5.4.110 There is one area of widely spaced ridging which has been interpreted as possible dylings at Hagnaby Lock (**329**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and **medium** value due to the rarity of dylings.

5.4.111 Bowser's Farm (**45**) and Fen Farm (**46**) lie outside the planning application boundary but their settings are informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. Bowser's Farm (**45**) is a redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead which lies 123 m to the east of the planning application boundary. Fen Farm (**46**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead which lies 32 m to the west of the planning application boundary. The setting of these **low** value receptors informs their **historical** significance.

5.4.112 Medlam Farm (**435**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead at Medlam. This receptor is located 130 m outside the planning application boundary however its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. The setting of this receptor informs its **evidential** significance. It is of **low** value.

5.4.113 Skirbeck Farm (**193**) is a nineteenth century farmstead which is recorded at Sibsey and 40 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. Its setting informs its **historical** significance. This is a **low** value receptor.

5.4.114 An unnamed partially extant farmstead is recorded at West Fen (**190**). A demolished farmstead is also recorded at Sibsey (**194**). These receptors have **evidential and historical** value, as evidence of Post Medieval agricultural activity within the region. They are of **low** value.

5.4.115 Sycamore Farm (**465**) is located 245 m to the south-east of the planning application boundary and to the south-east of Carrington. The setting of this receptor which is an unlisted redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead extends to within the planning application boundary. It is of **low** value and **evidential** significance.

5.4.116 Harvest Man Inn (**191**) is an extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 50 m to the south-east of the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within the planning application boundary. Its setting contributes to its **historical** significance. This is a **low** value receptor.

5.4.117 Primrose Hill Farm (**195**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is recorded at Thornton-Le-Fen. This receptor is recorded 12 m outside the planning application boundary and

its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting informs its **historical** significance.

5.4.118 Mill Farm (**196**) is also recorded at Thornton-Le-Fen. It is a redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead that is located 65 m to the south of the planning application boundary. Its setting is informed by the surrounding agricultural land and it extends to within the planning application boundary. This **low** value receptor's setting informs its **historical** significance.

Castle Dike Farm at Thornton-Le-Fen (**199**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is recorded 65 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.119 An unnamed nineteenth century farmstead is recorded at Thornton-Le-Fen (**197**), this receptor is located 250 m from the planning application boundary. Its setting is informed by the surrounding agricultural land and it extends to within the planning application boundary. This **low** value receptor's setting informs its **historical** significance.

5.4.120 Elm Tree Cottage (**61**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is situated to the east of the River Witham and 20 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.121 To the south-east is Laburnum House (**442**) which is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is situated 50 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

Also to the east of the River Witham and 60 m outside the planning application boundary is Beech House Farm (**198**). Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.122 To the east of the River Witham a disused railway is recorded running through the planning application boundary (**413**). This receptor is of **medium** value and has historic significance due to its links with the industrial heritage of the region and potential to inform the regional research framework (Ref: 12.15). It also has **aesthetic** significance as a raised feature within the landscape and communal significance from its use as a footpath and cycle route.

Modern Period (AD 1914 – Present)

5.4.123 There is one heritage receptor which dates to the Modern period within the planning application boundary of this section of the proposed DC cable route. This receptor is the Pillbox at Short's Corner (**116**) which is a three-bay Type 23 example which dates to the Second World War. It is

of **medium** value and has **evidential and historic** significance due to its illustration of Second World War activity within the region. It has the potential to contribute to the regional research framework as this highlights that there is a need to survey, record, and investigate the nature, extent and changing nature of defensive and defensive facilities throughout the period (Ref: 12.15).

Unknown

5.4.124 LiDAR analysis identified former field divisions to the south-east of West Keal (**321**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). These divisions are visible on nineteenth century mapping and are located across the planning application boundary. They are of **low** value and have **evidential** significance.

5.4.125 Geophysical survey identified two linear anomalies to the north of Limes Farm at Keal Cotes (**404**), however these are difficult to categorise due to the absence of any other evidence (Appendix 12.3 Geophysical Survey Report). This receptor has **evidential** significance, as has the potential for inform about past human activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.126 LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis identified a further twelve receptors (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). Former field divisions and a rectangular enclosure (**327**) were identified to the south-west of Mager Farm. This rectangular enclosure could relate to the Romano-British settlement which is recorded to the north of the site (**201**). It is of **low** value and has **evidential** significance with the potential to yield information on Romano-British activity.

5.4.127 A linear hollow was identified to the north-west of Hagnaby Lock (**330**). This hollow is of a different alignment to modern boundaries and is situated across the planning application boundary. It is of **low** value and has **evidential** significance.

5.4.128 To the north-west of Kingfisher Farm a tributary roddon (**331**) that drains into the roddon system at West Fen (**332)** was identified. Both receptors are of **low** value and have **evidential** significance due to their potential to have previously unrecorded archaeological activity associated with them.

5.4.129 To the south-east of Skirbeck Farm (**335**) a major roddon system was identified to drain West Fen towards Prehistoric Witham. This receptor is located within the planning application boundary and is of **low** value and has **evidential** significance due to its potential to have previously unrecorded archaeological activity associated with it.

5.4.130 Two roddon systems were identified within the Short's Corner region (**336**, **337**). These receptors have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value due to their potential to have previously unrecorded archaeological activity associated with them.

5.4.131 A further seven roddon systems were located within this route section (**338**, **339**, **340**, **341**, **342**, **343, 344**). These receptors have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value due to their potential to have previously unrecorded archaeological activity associated with them.

5.4.132 Archaeological walkover survey identified a relict field boundary at Castle Dike Farm (**244**) which has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.133 To the north-east of North Forty Foot Bank, a former artificial channel of the River Witham was identified through LiDAR analysis (**346**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). This is the former course of River Witham prior to eighteenth century canalisation, and was known as the Langrick 'long reach'. This receptor has **evidential and historical** significance as evidence of eighteenth century activity and is of **low** value.

Summary of Non- Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 3)

Table 12.13 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 3)

Project ID	Name	Period	Value
83, 86, 87	Prehistoric find spots at Stickford	Early Bronze Age to Middle Bronze Age	Medium
201	Scatter of Roman pottery and Quern fragments	Roman	Low
172	Ridge and furrow located at East Keal	Medieval	Low
203	Manor house and moated site	Medieval	Medium
405	Ridge and Furrow at Keal Cotes	Medieval	Low
171	Ridge and furrow located to the west of Stickford	Medieval	Low
323	The potential former field divisions at Keal Cotes	Medieval/Post Medieval	Low
187	Manor House in West Keal	Post Medieval	Low
326	The former field boundary and widely spaced ridging to the west of Limes Farm	Medieval/Post Medieval	Low
39	Glebe Farm West Keal	Post Medieval	Low
189	Staunch Farm	Post Medieval	Low
329	The potential dylings at Hagnaby Lock	Medieval/Post Medieval	Medium

Table 12.13 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 3)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
45	Bowser's Farm	Post Medieval	Low
46	Fen Farm	Post Medieval	Low
435	Medlam Farm	Post Medieval	Low
193	Skirbeck Farm	Post Medieval	Low
190	Partially extant farmstead at West Fen	Post Medieval	Low
194	Demolished farmstead at Sibsey	Post Medieval	Low
465	Sycamore Farm	Post Medieval	Low
191	Harvest Man Inn	Post Medieval	Low
195	Primrose Hill Farm	Post Medieval	Low
196	Mill Farm	Post Medieval	Low
199	Castle Dyke Farm	Post Medieval	Low
197	Farmstead at Thornton-Le-Fen	Post Medieval	Low
61	Elm Tree Cottage	Post Medieval	Low
442	Laburnum House	Post Medieval	Low
198	Beech House Farm	Post Medieval	Low
413	Disused railway that runs along the eastern side of the River Witham	Post Medieval	Medium
116	Pillbox at Short's Corner	Modern	Medium
321	The former field divisions to the south-east of West Keal	Unknown	Low
404	Linear anomalies to the north of Limes Farm	Unknown	Low
327	The former field divisions and the rectangular enclosure to the south-west of Mager Farm	Unknown	Low

Table 12.13 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 3)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
330	The linear hollow to the north west of Hagnaby Lock	Unknown	Low
331, 335, 332, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344	Twelve roddon systems	Unknown	Low
346	Former artificial channel of the River Witham	Medieval	Low

Route Section 4 River Witham to the Proposed Converter Station (See Figure 12.2, sheet 16-20)

5.4.134 There are a total of 43 heritage receptors within Route Section 4. These are described by period below and shown in Figure 12.2.

Roman Period (AD 43 – 410)

5.4.135 Aerial photographic analysis identified cropmarks of Romano-British field boundaries (**354**) at Swineshead Bridge that are associated with a watercourse (**353**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.136 Aerial photographic analysis identified cropmarks of an enclosure, field boundaries, trackway, and a sinuous watercourse to the east of Old Sixteen Foot Drain (**358**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.137 To the west of Holt Hills aerial photographic analysis identified a complex of field boundaries, an enclosure, trackway, and sinuous watercourse (**359**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.138 Field boundaries and a sinuous roddon with flanking ditches were identified to the south-west of Eau End Farm through aerial photographic analysis (**366**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

5.4.139 There is one receptor of Roman date - a cropmark of a Prehistoric/ Romano-British settlement at Donington (**21**). This could not be seen on the ground during the walkover survey. Archaeological trial trenching at this location identified a range of artefacts including Roman pottery dated predominately between the second and fourth centuries, and evidence for farming through deposited animal bones and environmental samples uncovering agricultural activity (Appendix 25.4 Trial Trenching Report). This is indicative of a Romano-British settlement which

had trade links to sites across Lincolnshire and Peterborough and have **evidential** significance and are of **medium** value.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

5.4.140 There are three receptors which date to the nineteenth century within this section of the proposed DC cable route.

5.4.141 The former farm buildings at Grant's Farm in Holland Fen (**141**) is a multi-phase receptor that dates to the Post Medieval period. It is located 90 m outside the planning application boundary. Also at this location is Home Farm (**53**) which is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead. Although these receptors are located outside the planning application boundary, their setting which is informed by each other and the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. These **low** value receptors' setting contributes to their **historical** significance.

5.4.142 Located to the south-west and 20 m outside the planning application boundary is Pear Trees (**54**) which is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.143 Gillbridge Farm (**56**) is recorded at Gill Bridge. This is a nineteenth century farmstead that is located 60m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.144 A demolished nineteenth century farmstead is recorded at Holland Fen with Brothertoft (**55**). This has **evidential and historical** significance as evidence of local agricultural activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.145 The settlement of Amber Hill in Holland Fen (**154**) is a plot of land of 30 acres allotted under the Holland Fen Enclosure Award to provide materials for repairing the roads of several parishes having rights of common in Holland Fen. The parish was formed in 1880 by uniting the fen allotments of Algarkirk and Sutterton and the extra-parochial place of Amber Hill. No physical features relating to this historical activity were present during the field walkover survey. This receptor has **historical and communal** significance for its connections with the current settlement of Amber Hill. It is of **low** value.

5.4.146 Mob's Eye at Amber Hill (**440**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.147 To the north of Skerth Drain and 35 m outside the planning application boundary is an unnamed redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead (**58**). Although this receptor is located outside the

planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.148 Rakes Farm at Heckington (**47**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 45 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.149 Swineshead House (**59**) in Swineshead is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 80 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.150 Park House and Parkland (**451**) at Swineshead is a house and associated parkland that is located 230 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land and the settlement of Swineshead extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.151 An unnamed farmstead at Great Hale (**48**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 15 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.152 White House Farm (**437**) at Great Hale is a nineteenth century farmstead that is located 80 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.153 South Forty Foot Drain (**456**) crosses the planning application boundary to the west of Vicarage Drove. It is a **low** value receptor that was first dug in the 1630s to drain the land and allow for the Fenmen to fish (Ref: 12.18). It is of **aesthetic, communal, and historical** significance.

5.4.154 A demolished farmstead is recorded at Little Hale (**52**) which has **evidential and historical** significance as evidence of local agricultural activity. It is of **low** value.

5.4.155 An unnamed redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead (**438**) recorded at Little Hale is situated 220 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.156 An unnamed redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead (**49**) is recorded at Little Hale. Although this receptor is located 115 m outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.157 An unnamed outfarm (**8**) is recorded at Bicker and 160 m to the south-east of the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.158 Eau End Farm (**7**) at Helpringham is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 100 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.159 Middle Fen (**5**) at Donington is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 50 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.160 River Farm (**10**) at Helpringham is a redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead that is located 250 m outside the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

5.4.161 An unnamed redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead (**11**) is recorded in the parish of Donington and 215 m outside of the planning application boundary. Although this receptor is located outside the planning application boundary, its setting which is informed by the surrounding agricultural land extends to within it. This **low** value receptor's setting contributes to its **historical** significance.

Unknown date

5.4.162 LiDAR and aerial photographic analysis identified 15 roddon systems within this route section (**347**, **348**, **349**, **350**, **351**, **353**, **355**, **356**, **357**, **360**, **361**, **362**, **363**, **364**, **367**) (Appendix 12.2 Aerial Photography and LiDAR Report). These receptors have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value due the potential for previously unrecorded archaeology to be found associated with them.

5.4.163 Aerial photographic analysis identified field boundaries and a trackway to the north-west of Laburnum House (**345**). This receptor is believed to be associated with the Romano-British enclosures to the west of Holt Hills (**359**). This receptor has **evidential** significance and is of **low** value.

Summary of Non- Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 4)

Table 12.14 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 4)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
354	Cropmarks of field boundaries and a watercourse at Swineshead Bridge	Romano-British/?Medieval	Low
353	Roddon system at Gibbet Hills	Unknown	Low
358	Cropmarks of an enclosure field boundaries, a trackway and sinuous watercourse to the east of Old Sixteen Foot Drain	? Romano-British	Low
359	Cropmarks of an enclosure, field boundaries, a trackway and sinuous watercourse to the west of Holt Hills	? Romano-British	Low
366	Cropmark field boundaries and a sinuous roddon to the south-west of Eau End Farm	? Romano-British	Low
21	Probable cropmark Prehistoric or Romano-British settlement evidence, Donington	Early Neolithic to Roman	Medium
141	Grant's Farm Holland Fen	Post Medieval	Low
53	Home Farm Holland Fen	Post Medieval	Low
54	Pear Trees	Post Medieval	Low
56	Gillbridge Farm	Post Medieval	Low
55	Unnamed Farmstead at Holland Fen	Post Medieval	Low
154	Late Post-Medieval settlement/parish of Amber Hill	Post Medieval to Modern	Low
440	Mob's Eye Farm	Post Medieval	Low

Table 12.14 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 4)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
58	Unnamed Farmstead north of Skerth Drain	Post Medieval	Low
47	Rakes Farm at Heckington	Post Medieval	Low
59	Swineshead House	Post Medieval	Low
451	Park House and Parkland	Post Medieval	Low
48	Unnamed Farmstead at Great Hale	Post Medieval	Low
473	White House Farm	Post Medieval	Low
456	South Forty Foot Drain	Post Medieval	Low
52	(Demolished Farmstead at Little Hale	Post Medieval	Low
438	Redeveloped Farmstead at Little Hale	Post Medieval	Low
49	Redeveloped Farmstead at Little Hale	Post Medieval	Low
8	Unnamed Outfarm at Bicker	Post Medieval	Low
7	Eau End Farm	Post Medieval	Low
5	Middle Fen at Donington	Post Medieval	Low
10	River Farm	Post Medieval	Low
11	Redeveloped Farmstead at Donington	Post Medieval	Low

Table 12.14 Non-Designated Heritage Receptors (Route Section 4)			
Project ID	**Name**	**Period**	**Value**
347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 355, 356, 357, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 367	Roddon systems	Unknown	Low
345	Cropmarks of field boundaries and a trackway to the north-west of Laburnum House	Medieval	Low

6 Potential Impacts

6.1 Overview of Potential Impacts

6.1.1 For the purpose of this ES impacts on heritage receptors can be temporary or permanent. In relation to the heritage receptors discussed in this chapter temporary impacts are considered to occur only during the construction phase and are restricted to impacts arising from changes in the setting of heritage receptors due to construction activity. Once construction is completed, the only above ground infrastructure will be in the form markers, located at field boundaries. (See Section 3). An example of a temporary impact could be an impact arising from a change in a receptor's setting due to construction activity associated with the proposed DC cable route. This impact would be reversed once reinstatement of the cable trench is complete and the disturbed vegetation has regrown. In some cases, if the proposed DC cable route were to sever an important relationship between two receptors then the impact may not be considered as temporary. Permanent impacts can occur at either the construction or operation phase of the Scheme and are not reversible. Examples of permanent impacts include direct physical impacts on below ground archaeological remains which occur during the construction phase.

6.1.2 Where a receptor will experience impacts from more than one element of the Scheme the impacts will only be discussed once to avoid double counting. However, when the impacts are discussed all elements of the Scheme causing impacts will be referred to.

6.1.3 All the effects identified are considered to the negative and adverse, unless stated otherwise. The likely impacts on heritage receptors as a result of the Scheme are described below.

6.2 Temporary Impacts

6.2.1 All temporary impacts will be contained within the planning application boundary but experienced beyond it.

6.2.2 Impacts to the setting of heritage receptors could also arise from increased traffic on the roads and within the proposed DC cable working width in the form of construction traffic. This increased activity would impact setting by detracting from the rural character of some receptors, as well as forming a part of the general intrusion within the proposed DC cable working width.

6.2.3 The designated heritage receptors outside of the planning application boundary are also considered within the Landscape and Visual chapter of this ES (Chapter 11). The potential temporary impact to their setting has been discussed in the DBA (Appendix 12.1 Desk Based Assessment Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)).

6.2.4 Some non-designated heritage receptors are considered for impacts arising from changes in their setting where the assessment has identified that the receptor has a setting that extends beyond the boundary of the receptor. Where temporary impact to non-designated heritage receptors

during construction would be minimal and in all likelihood negligible the impact has not been detailed. The assessment has sort to be proportional to the value of the receptor and to the magnitude of impact to it.

6.2.5 Temporary impacts are by their nature impermanent and are therefore not considered to have a significant negative impact. Temporary impacts would have a **negligible impact to significance** on any receptor within the Zone of Influence or planning application boundary which would last only during the construction phase of the Scheme. The temporary impact to any heritage receptors identified outside of the planning application boundary is less than those within it. The impact to the receptors' significance, outside of the planning application boundary, from a temporary impact to their setting would be **minor** and when restored the impact will no longer occur.

Designated Heritage Receptors

Route Section 1 Proposed Landfall to Well High Lane (See Figure 12.2, sheet 1-4)

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914

6.2.6 The Cottage at Markby (**LB33**) is situated 230 m to the north-east of the planning application boundary. However, its setting extends to within the planning application boundary consequently it will be temporarily impacted by activities relating to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. These temporary impacts would comprise visual intrusion into the immediate and wider setting of the receptor by activity within the proposed DC cable working width within the immediate setting of the receptor. However, these impacts would last only within the construction phase and would be removed once the works were complete. Therefore, this receptor would experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.2.7 Manor Farmhouse (**LB27**) is situated 90 m from the planning application boundary. However, this receptor's setting extends to within the planning application boundary and the construction of a temporary construction compound 85 m to the south-west of the receptor will temporarily impact its setting. These temporary impacts would comprise visual intrusion into the immediate and wider setting of the receptor by activity within the proposed DC cable working width, construction activity within the immediate setting of the receptor. The temporary impacts will also comprise the visual and noise intrusion from the construction and operation of the temporary construction compound. However, these impacts would last only within the construction phase and would be removed once the works were complete. Therefore, this receptor would experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.2.8 Ailby House Farmhouse (**LB34**) is situated 240 m to the south of the planning application boundary, However, its setting extends to within the planning application boundary consequently it will be temporarily impacted by activities relating to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. These temporary impacts would comprise visual intrusion into the immediate and wider setting of the receptor by activity within the proposed DC cable working width and increased traffic within the immediate setting of the receptor. However, these impacts would last only within

the construction phase and would be removed once the works were complete. Therefore, this receptor would experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

Route Section 2 Well High Lane to A16 (Keal Road) (See Figure 12.2, sheet 4-9)

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

6.2.9 Two scheduled monuments, outside the planning application boundary, are likely to be temporarily affected by the construction phase of the proposed DC cable route. A Neolithic long barrow (**SM5**) 465 m to the north-west of Dexthorpe and Ring Holt Bowl barrow (**SM3**) 1.9 km to the north-west of Dalby. These impacts will be visual with an increase in traffic and construction related activity within the area which could affect the intervisibility of these sites with other contemporary and related heritage receptors within this area. Therefore, these receptors would experience a potential magnitude of impact of **low** resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate.**

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540-1914)

6.2.10 Brickfields (**LB28**) has **historic and aesthetic** significance and is of **medium** value. The receptor is situated 55 m to the north of the planning application boundary, however its setting extends to within the planning application boundary. This receptor will be temporarily impacted by the construction phase of the proposed DC cable route from elements associated with the construction activity. Therefore, this receptor would experience a potential magnitude of impact of **low** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor** which is adverse.

Route Section 3 A16 (Keal Road) to River Witham (See Figure 12.2, sheet 9-16)

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540-1914)

6.2.11 The Bridge over Twenty Foot Drain (**LB32**) is located on the very outskirts of the planning application boundary. Although the receptor will not be permanently impacted by the installation of the proposed DC cable route it will be temporarily impacted. These temporary impacts would be from construction activity which will disrupt the setting of the receptor. The magnitude of impact to this **medium** value receptor would therefore by **low**, resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

Route Section 4 River Witham to the Proposed Converter Station

6.2.12 There are no designated heritage receptors that will experience temporary impacts as a result of the Scheme in Route Section 4.

Non-designated Heritage Receptors

Route Section 1 Proposed Landfall to Well High Lane (See Figure 12.2, sheet 1-4)

Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

6.2.13 The Sea Bank at Huttoft (**160**) is linear and would be affected by impacts resulting from works within the planning application boundary for only a small portion of its length. This receptor would experience both temporary and permanent impacts (see 6.3.10) related to the works within the proposed DC cable working width. These temporary impacts would comprise visual intrusion into the immediate and wider setting of the receptor by activity within the proposed DC cable working and increased traffic within the immediate setting of the receptor. However, these impacts would last only within the construction phase and would be removed once the works were complete. Therefore, this receptor would experience a potential magnitude of impact of **low** resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible.**

6.2.14 The Late Medieval earthwork enclosure and field boundary at Huttoft (**159**) lies partially within the planning application boundary with the planning application boundary covering around half of the receptor. The receptor has already been partially impacted by the cutting of Boy Grift Drain in the eighteenth century to the north.

6.2.15 This receptor would experience both long term (see 6.3.12) and temporary impacts as part of the proposed DC cable route works. The temporary impacts would be experienced by that part of the receptor not within the planning application boundary and would include visual intrusion from the construction activity within the proposed DC cable working width.

6.2.16 These effects would be experienced from the public footpath (Hutt/6/2) which passes through the planning application boundary and across Boy Grift Drain 34 m to the west of the receptor. The construction work has the potential to cut off this receptor from both its immediate and wider setting through the imposition of temporary visual barriers to the south and west. However, these impacts would last only within the construction phase and links would be re-established once the works were complete. Therefore, this low value receptor would experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

6.2.17 The deserted Medieval village of Asserby (**267**) lies 190 m outside of the planning application boundary however its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This medium value receptor would therefore experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.18 The shrunken Medieval village of Saleby (**103**) and the moated side within it (**104**) lie on the northern edge of the planning application boundary. These receptors would be affected by both permanent (see 6.3.16) and temporary impacts related to works within the proposed DC cable working width. The temporary impacts of the works would comprise visual impacts from the

proposed DC cable construction. These impacts have the potential to separate the receptors from their wider context to the south in the form of the village of Thoresthorpe and the agricultural landscape south and west of Saleby. However, these impacts would last only within the construction phase and would be removed once the works were complete. Therefore, these receptors would experience a **low** magnitude of impact **r**esulting in a significance of effect of **minor.**

6.2.19 Rigsby Medieval settlement (**269**) is situated 90 m outside of the planning application boundary however its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This medium value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **minor** significance of effect.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

6.2.20 The tramway between Sutton on Sea and Alford (**117**) crosses the planning application boundary running north south for 480 m and travels for an overall length of 10 km.

6.2.21 The receptor is linear and would be affected by impacts resulting from works within the planning application boundary for only a small portion of its length. This receptor would experience both temporary and permanent (see 6.3.19) impacts related to the works within the proposed DC cable working width. These temporary impacts would comprise visual intrusion into the immediate and wider setting of the receptor by activity within the proposed DC cable working width. However, these impacts would last only within the construction phase and would be re-established once the works were complete. Therefore, this receptor would experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

6.2.22 Sea Bank Farm at Huttoft (**22**) is situated 55 m outside of the planning application boundary, however its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.23 The two nineteenth century farmsteads in Mablethorpe and Sutton (**26**, **179**) are both situated outside the planning application boundary (35 m and 80 m respectively) however their settings will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once

the works are complete. These low value receptors would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.24 The two partially extant nineteenth century farms that are located in Huttoft (**23**, **24**) are both situated outside the planning application boundary (30 m and 35 m respectively) however their settings will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. These **low** value receptors would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.25 The partially extant nineteenth century farmstead at Furze Hill (**426**) is situated 110 m outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.26 Mill House Farm (**427**) is located 210 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complet3. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.27 The Wesleyan Methodist Chapel at Saleby (**453**) is located 250 m outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.28 Home Farm at Saleby (**180**) is located 240 m outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.29 Saleby Manor (**181**) is located 105 m outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

Route Section 2 Well High Lane to A16 (Keal Road) (See Figure 12.2, sheet 4-9)

Medieval Period (AD 1066-1540)

6.2.30 Ailby deserted medieval village (**219**) is located 250 m outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This medium value receptor would therefore experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.31 The former field boundaries and ridge and furrow that were recorded at Ailby (**255**) and 160 m outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.32 The site of the deserted Medieval village at Dexthorpe (**444**) is located 105 m outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **medium** value receptor would therefore experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.33 The construction phase of the proposed DC cable route will have a temporary impact on areas of Medieval ridge and furrow at Raithby (**131, 132, 128**) and the Medieval trackway (**129**) which have been identified on the perimeter of the planning application boundary at Raithby. These temporary impacts will primarily be visual as the views to and from this area of ridge and furrow and the trackway will be interrupted and for a temporary period it will not be largely uninterrupted

agricultural land. Therefore, these receptors would experience a **low** magnitude of impact which would result in a significance of effect of **negligible**. The edges of the ridge and furrow and the northern end of the trackway will also experience permanent impacts where they are crossed by the planning application boundary (see 6.3.49).

6.2.34 The Medieval settlement of Mavis Enderby (**134**) is located 40 m outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **medium** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **minor** significance of effect.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

6.2.35 Red House (**185**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is recorded at Raithby 165 m to the south-east of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.36 Glebe Farm (**429**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is recorded at Raithby 65 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.37 Raithby Grange Farm (**430**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is recorded at Raithby 204 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.38 East Farm at Sausthorpe (**32**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is recorded at Raithby 85 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily

impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.39 A partially extant farmstead north of Mardon Hill (**35**) is located 40 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.40 Highfield Farm (**36**) is located 60 m beyond the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.41 The Brick and Tile Works (**251**) and disused quarry (**250**) at Mardon Hill are located 5-10 m outside the planning application boundary. The setting of these receptors would be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. These **low** value receptors would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.42 East Keal Park (**168**) will be temporarily and permanently affected by the construction activities related to the proposed DC cable route. Approximately 90% of the park is outside the planning application boundary or on its perimeter. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **low** due to its location at the edge of the planning application boundary, this would result in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.43 Fair View at East Keal (**37**) is located 40 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once

the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

Route Section 3 A16 (Keal Road) to River Witham (See Figure 12.2, sheet 9-16)

Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

6.2.44 Manor house and the site of moats at West Keal (**203**) is located 110 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.45 The ridge and furrow earthwork located to the west of Stickford (**171**) lies approximately half within and half outside the planning application boundary and would be affected by both long term and temporary impacts associated with works within the proposed DC cable working width. Temporary impacts would be visual impacts on the half of the receptor to the south-east of the planning application boundary and would relate to the disruption to the setting of the receptor caused by construction activity within the planning application boundary. However, the setting of this receptor would still be appreciable to the south and east, towards Stickford. There would be **negligible** magnitude of impact on the receptor resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible.**

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540- 1914)

6.2.46 Manor House in West Keal (**187**) is a nineteenth century unlisted farmstead located 76 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.47 Glebe Farm (Limes Farm) in West Keal (**39**) is a nineteenth century unlisted farmstead located 100 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.48 Staunch Farm in Stickford (**189**) is a nineteenth century unlisted farmstead located 74 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.49 Bowser's Farm (**45**) and Fen Farm (**46**) are located 123 m and 32 m outside the planning application boundary respectively. The setting of these receptors would be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. These **low** value receptors would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.50 Medlam Farm (**435**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead which is located 130 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.51 Skirbeck Farm (**193**) is located 40 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.52 Sycamore Farm (**465**) is located 245 m to the south-east of the planning application boundary however its setting will be temporarily impacted by the construction activities which are related to the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **low** due to its location outside the planning application boundary, this would result in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.53 Harvest Man Inn (**191**) is located 50 m to the south of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition,

noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.54 Primrose Hill Farm (**195**) at Thornton-Le-Fen is recorded 12 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.55 Mill Farm (**196**) is located 65 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.56 Castle Dyke Farm (**199**) at Thornton-Le-Fen is located 65 m outside the bases Scheme design. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.57 An unnamed nineteenth century farmstead is recorded at Thornton-Le-Fen (**197**) is located 250 m from the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.58 Elm Tree Cottage (**61**) lies 20 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once

the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.59 Laburnum House (**442**) is located 250 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.60 Beech House Farm (**198**) is located 60 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

Route Section 4 River Witham to the Proposed Converter Station (See Figure 12.2, sheet 16-20)

Post Medieval Period (AD1540-1914)

6.2.61 The former farm buildings at Grant's Farm in Holland Fen (**141**) is a multi-phase receptor that dates to the Post Medieval period. It is located 90 m outside the planning application boundary. Also at this location is Home Farm (**53**) which is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead. Their setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. These **low** value receptors would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.62 Located to the south-west and 20 m outside the planning application boundary is Pear Trees (**54**) which is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.63 Gillbridge Farm (**56**) is recorded at Gill Bridge. This is a nineteenth century farmstead that is located 60 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction

activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.64 Temporary impacts from the proposed DC cable route would occur during the construction phase to the late Post-Medieval settlement/parish at Amber Hill (**154**). Only the northern edge of this receptor lies within the planning application boundary. The area that lies outside consists of some nineteenth century buildings which will experience temporary visual impacts and could potentially affect intra-visibility between the receptor and contemporary associated receptors. Further temporary impacts also include temporary access roads, TCCs, and TWAs. These temporary impacts would also include an increase in noise, traffic, and dust. Therefore, this **low** value receptor would experience a **negligible** magnitude of impact resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**. The small part of the receptor that lies within the planning application boundary would also experience permanent impact (see 6.3.95).

6.2.65 Mob's Eye at Amber Hill (**440**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead is located outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.66 To the north of Skerth Drain and 35 m outside the planning application boundary is an unnamed redeveloped nineteenth century Farmstead (**58**) is located outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.67 Rakes Farm at Heckington (**47**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 45 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.68 Swineshead House (**59**) in Swineshead is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 80 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.69 Park House and Parkland (**451**) at Swineshead is a house and associated parkland that is located 230 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.70 An unnamed farmstead at Great Hale (**48**) is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 15 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.71 White House Farm (**437**) at Great Hale is a nineteenth century farmstead that is located 80 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.72 An unnamed redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead (**438**) recorded at Little Hale is situated 220 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.73 An unnamed redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead (**49**) is recorded at Little Hale is located 115 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.74 An unnamed outfarm (**8**) is recorded at Bicker and 160 m to the south-east of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.75 Eau End Farm (**7**) at Helpringham is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 100 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.76 Middle Fen (**5**) at Donington is a partially extant nineteenth century farmstead that is located 50 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.77 River Farm (**10**) at Helpringham is a redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead that is located 250 m outside the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.2.78 An unnamed redeveloped nineteenth century farmstead (**11**) is recorded in the parish of Donington and 215 m outside of the planning application boundary. Its setting will be temporarily impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. This impact would arise from construction activity being visible within the setting of the receptor. In addition, noise of construction activity would also lead to impacts arising from changes in the assets setting. However, the impact would only last during the construction phase and would be reversed once the works are complete. This **low** value receptor would therefore experience a **low** magnitude of impact resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.3 Longer Term, Operational and Permanent Impacts

6.3.1 There will be no permanent above ground infrastructure except for marker posts at locations along the route.

6.3.2 These marker posts have the potential to provide a **minor** visual intrusion within the settings of some heritage receptors. For the purposes of the assessment it has been assumed that cable markers would be above ground posts of up to 1200 mm in height which would mark the DC cable route at field boundaries, crossings, and changes in direction.

6.3.3 Currently the above ground marker posts would produce a minor visual intrusion into the setting of some heritage receptors, however the long-term impact of these markers is believed to be negligible and no mitigation is required.

6.3.4 The construction phase of the proposed DC cable route also has the potential to have direct impacts on heritage receptors within the planning application boundary. These direct impacts would in most cases entail permanent removal of part or whole of the heritage receptor. Heritage receptors most likely to be affected by these types of permanent impacts are archaeological receptors within the planning application boundary and those which lay within the proposed DC cable working width.

6.3.5 In general, archaeological receptors lie within 1 m of the ground surface level and as such are sensitive to any changes which occur within this depth or on the ground surface above them.

6.3.6 The potential removal of archaeological features in whole or part would be due to the stripping of the proposed DC cable working width, TCCs, and TWAs to the top of the natural geology, as detailed above. In addition, within these areas the receptors would be further impacted by pressure applied from plant and site traffic moving within the working area. Soil storage areas can cause similar compression.

6.3.7 Finally, the trenches for the DC cable and the fibre cable would likely extend beyond the depth of any potential archaeological receptors resulting in the complete removal of the receptor in whole or part through excavation of these areas.

Designated Heritage Receptors

6.3.8 There are no designated heritage receptors that will experience longer term, operational and permanent impacts as a result of the Scheme in Route Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Non-designated Heritage Receptors

Route Section 1 Proposed Landfall to Well High Lane (See Figure 12.2, sheets 1-4)

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

6.3.9 The circular mound and linear features that were identified through LiDAR analysis at Furzehill (**300**) were assessed to have evidential significance and be of **low** value. Due to its location on the perimeter of the planning application boundary this receptor has the potential to be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact on this receptor is therefore **low** resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

6.3.10 The Sea Bank in Huttoft (**160**) has been assessed as a receptor with historic, evidential, and aesthetic significance which is of low value. Temporary impacts upon this receptor have already been discussed (see section 6.2.13)

6.3.11 This receptor would experience permanent impacts related to works within the proposed DC cable working width which would result in the removal of part of the receptor located within the planning application boundary due to activities within the planning application boundary. The receptor has a total length of 3.4 km of which 200 m has the potential to be affected by works within the proposed DC cable working width, approximately 5% of the total length of the receptor. Therefore, the magnitude of the impact upon this receptor are assessed as **low** resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**

6.3.12 The earthwork enclosure and field boundary at Huttoft (**159**) has evidential significance and is of **low** value. Temporary impacts upon this receptor have already been discussed (see 6.2.14).

6.3.13 This receptor would experience permanent impacts related to works within the proposed DC cable working width which would result in the removal in part or in whole of that part of the receptor which lies within the planning application boundary. This would be due to activities within the planning application boundary. The magnitude of impact would be **high** due to the nature of the change to the southern half of the receptor. The impacts would therefore have a **moderate** significance of effect and once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.14 The former field boundary and ridge and furrow to the north of Wold View Farm (**261**) have **evidential** significance and are of **low** value. This receptor would experience permanent impacts related to works within the proposed DC cable working width which would result in the removal in part or in whole of that part of the receptor which lays within the planning application boundary.

The magnitude of impact would be **high** due to the nature of the change to the northern half of the receptor. The impacts would therefore have a **moderate** significance of effect. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.15 The wide ridging at Markby (**299**) was assessed to be of **low** value and have evidential significance. It will be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact would be **medium** due to its location across the planning application boundary resulting in a significance of effects of **minor**.

6.3.16 The shrunken Medieval village of Saleby (**103**) and its moated site (**104**) have **evidential, historic, and aesthetic** significance but of **medium** value. Temporary impacts upon these receptors have already been discussed (see 6.2.18).

6.3.17 These receptors would experience permanent impacts related to works within the proposed DC cable working width which would result in the removal in part or whole of features within a small area of the receptor constituting <1% of the total receptor area. The magnitude of impact would be **negligible** as, though parts of the receptors have potential to be removed, this comprises only a very small portion of the receptor. The **medium** value of these receptors combined within the **negligible** magnitude of impact would result in a **negligible** significance of effect..

6.3.18 The ridge and furrow to the south of Rigsby Wood (**174**) would experience permanent impacts because of the installation of the proposed DC cable route. These impacts would entail the removal of part of this receptor. Due to the receptor's location on the very edge of the planning application boundary the magnitude of impact upon this **low** value receptor would be **low** resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible.**

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

6.3.19 The tramway between Sutton on Sea and Alford (**117**) has been assessed as having **evidential and historic** significance and therefore **medium** value. Temporary impacts upon this receptor have already been discussed. This receptor would experience permanent impacts related to works within the proposed DC cable working width which would result in the removal of part of the receptor located within the planning application boundary. The part of the receptor which lies within the planning application boundary comprises approximately 1.5% of the total receptor length of 10 km. The magnitude of impact is therefore **negligible to low** due to the small percentage of the receptor which would be affected by these impacts. The **medium** value of the receptor and the **negligible to low** magnitude of impact would result in a significance of effect of **negligible to minor**.

6.3.20 The linear hollow to the west of Sea Bank Farm (**295**) was assessed to be of **low** value and has evidential significance. Due to the receptor's location across the planning application boundary this receptor could be removed in part by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is therefore **medium**, resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.21 The ridge and furrow to the north-east of Yarlsgate Farm (**296**) was assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. Due to the receptors location, predominantly within the planning application boundary it has the potential for the majority of it to be removed. Consequently, the magnitude of impact is **medium**, resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.22 The disused railway to the west of Yarlsgate Farm (**411**) was assessed to be of **medium** value and have **historical, aesthetic, and communal** significance. Due to the receptor's location across the planning application boundary this receptor could be removed in part by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is therefore **medium**, resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.23 The former field divisions at Wold View Farm (**298**) are located on the perimeter of the planning application boundary consequently they are at risk of being partially removed by the activities related to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact will therefore be **low** resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

6.3.24 The former field boundaries at Ailby House Farm (**302**) are situated within the planning application boundary consequently there is a large proportion of the receptor that is likely to be removed by the activities related to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact will therefore be **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

Unknown Date

6.3.25 The watercourse to the west of Yarlsgate Farm (**297**) was assessed as **low** value and has evidential significance due to the potential for previously unrecorded archaeology to be associated with it. This receptor will be removed due to the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. It will therefore have a magnitude of impact of **medium**, resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.26 The former field divisions, wide ridging, and a possible pond/quarry pit at Ailby House Farm (**301**) were assessed to have **evidential** significance and be of **low** value. A large proportion of this receptor is likely to be removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. It will therefore have a magnitude of impact of **medium**, resulting in a significance of effects of **minor**.

6.3.27 Former field boundaries including ridge and furrow and a strip field (**255**) were assessed to have **evidential** significance and be of **low** value. This receptor has the potential to be removed either wholly or in part by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. It will therefore have a magnitude of impact of **medium**, resulting in a significance of effects of **minor**.

6.3.28 The pits to the west of Ailby House Farm (**407**) and the potential plough damaged ditch to the north-west of Rigsby (**408**) will both be permanently impacted by construction of the proposed DC cable route. These receptors were assessed to be of **low** value. The magnitude of impact is **high** due to their location wholly within the planning application boundary resulting in a

significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

Route Section 2 Well High Lane to A16 (Keal Road) (See Figure 12.2, sheet 4-9)

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC- AD 43)

6.3.29 The below ground archaeological remains associated with the cropmarks to the south-east of Driby (**124** and **125**) will be permanently impacted by the construction of the proposed DC cable route. Construction will result in the permanent loss of these receptors which are within the planning application boundary and could also result in the damage of the receptors from construction traffic and the compression from soil storage. The magnitude of impact to this **low** value receptor is **high** due to its location entirely within the planning application boundary which would result in a **moderate** significance of effect. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.30 The cropmark of a possible barrow to the south of Fulletby (**119**) will be will be permanently impacted by the construction of the proposed DC cable route. Construction will result in the permanent loss of the receptor which is within the planning application boundary and could also result in the damage of the receptors from construction and site traffic and the compression from soil storage. The magnitude of impact to this **low** value receptor is **medium** which would result in a **minor** significance of effect.

6.3.31 The possible Prehistoric cropmarks of enclosures and boundaries to the north-west of Langton Hill (**144**) were assessed to be of low value and have **evidential** significance. The installation of the proposed DC cable route will result in the permanent loss of any below ground archaeological remains associated with this receptor that are within the planning application boundary. The magnitude of impact to this **low** value receptor is **low** which would result in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.3.32 Permanent impact will also be made on the cropmark of the possible round barrow which is located to the north-west of Dalby (**120**). This cropmark is within the planning application boundary and construction of the proposed DC cable route will result in the removal of part or all of this receptor. Further damage to the below ground remains will be caused by compression caused by site and construction traffic alongside soil storage. The magnitude of impact to this **medium** value receptor is **high** due to its location wholly within the planning application boundary which would result in a **moderate** significance of effect. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.33 The ring ditch and ditches to the south of Dalby Bar (**397**) will be permanently impacted by the activities related to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. This receptor has been interpreted to be of **medium** value. The magnitude of impact to this receptor is **high** due to its location wholly within the planning application boundary which results in a **moderate** significance of effect. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.34 The Prehistoric cropmark sites at West Keal (**123**) and at Dalby (**230**) lie partially within the planning application boundary therefore small areas of these **low** value buried remains will experience **medium** magnitude of impact resulting in in a **minor** significance of effect.

6.3.35 A further cropmark site (**146**) to the west of Dalby lies entirely within the planning application boundary and will experience a **medium** magnitude of impact resulting in in a **minor** significance of effect.

6.3.36 Although the findspots of barbed and tanged arrowheads at Langton by Spilsby (**99**) and the Neolithic stone axe to the south-west of Dalby (**90**) are no longer in situ they provide the potential for further previously unknown archaeology. As it is of **low** value, the potential for there to be a wider extent and previously unrecorded archaeology would experience a **medium** magnitude of impact resulting in a **minor** significance of effect.

6.3.37 The Bronze Age flint scatter at Langton by Spilsby (**98**) falls partly within the planning application boundary however its position is marked by a point on the map which might not be representative of the actual extent of the scatter or the settlement it represents. An unknown extent of this receptor would experience permanent impacts. As it is of medium value, the potential for there to be a wider extent of this receptor would experience a **medium** magnitude of impact given its position, the significance of effect would be **moderate.** Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.38 Further permanent impacts resulting from the construction of the proposed DC cable route will be to the various Prehistoric find scatters which were discovered at East Keal (**115**, **76**, **80**). Although find scatters are no longer in situ the construction of the proposed DC cable route will result in the permanent removal of any potential material which is associated with them. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological material associated with these **low** value receptors is **medium** due to their location across the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **minor.**

Roman Period (AD 43- 410)

6.3.39 The cropmarks of field boundaries and enclosures at Langton Grange Farm (**385**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. The installation of the proposed DC cable route will result in the permanent removal of a large area of this receptor. The magnitude of impact is therefore **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.40 The enclosures, field boundaries and trackway that were identified to the north-east of Skirbeck Plantation (**386**) were assessed to have **evidential** significance and be of **low** value. This receptor is located on the perimeter of the planning application boundary consequently it is at risk of being partially removed by the activities that are associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is therefore **low** resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

6.3.41 Although the cropmarks of Roman enclosures and boundaries (**145**) to the north-east of Sausthorpe are located on the eastern perimeter of the planning application boundary the

construction of the proposed DC cable is likely to permanently remove part of the below ground archaeological remains. The compression from the site, construction traffic and the soil storage areas are likely to permanently damage a proportion of the below ground archaeological remains. The magnitude of impact to this **low** value receptor is **low** due to its location on the very edge of the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **negligible.**

6.3.42 The enclosure and field boundaries that were identified to the north of Raithby cross roads (**315**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor is located predominantly within the planning application boundary consequently it is likely to be largely removed by the activities that are associated with the construction of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact would therefore be **medium** resulting in a significance of effects of **minor**.

6.3.43 The cropmarks of enclosures, field boundaries and pits (**387**) at East Farm Partney were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor is situated on the perimeter of the planning application boundary consequently it is at risk of being partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact will therefore be **low**, resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

Early Medieval Period (AD 410- 1066)

6.3.44 The construction of the proposed DC cable route is likely to permanently impact the Early/Middle Saxon site at East Keal (**108**). The planning application boundary travels through the site which is recorded as a soil mark with associated finds, consequently the construction of the DC cable route will remove the below ground archaeological remains within this area. The magnitude of impact to this **medium** value receptor is **medium** due to its location on the very edge of the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **moderate.** Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

Medieval Period (AD 1066-1540)

6.3.45 The old field boundary/drain to the north-west of Dalby Bar (**311**) was assessed to be of **low** value and has **evidential** significance. It is located on the perimeter of the planning application boundary consequently it has the potential to be partially removed by the activities relating to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impacts is therefore **low** resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

6.3.46 The construction of the proposed DC cable route will have a direct permanent impact on the below ground archaeological remains of the areas of ridge and furrow which are recorded at Dalby Bar (**398**). The magnitude of impact to this **low** value receptor is **medium** due to its location within the planning application boundary which would result in a **minor** significance of effect.

6.3.47 The two areas of ridge and furrow that were identified at Dalby (**149**, **388**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. The installation of the proposed DC cable route will

result in the permanent removal of a proportion of the below ground remains which are associated within this receptor. This would result in a **low** magnitude of impact and a **negligible** significance of effect upon **149**. However, the magnitude of impact to **388** would be greater at **medium** due to its location largely within the planning application boundary which results in a **minor** significance of effect.

6.3.48 The Medieval Chapel of Well (**92**) was assessed to be of **low** value with **evidential** significance. The receptor is located wholly within the planning application boundary and therefore a worst-case scenario is that the receptor will be totally removed. This will result in a magnitude of impact of **high** resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate**.

6.3.49 The ridge and furrow at Raithby (**130**, **132**) and Mardon Hill (**401**, **402**) as well as the northern end of the Medieval trackway (**129**) were all assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. The magnitude of impact to the ridge and furrow and trackway at Raithby (**130**, **132**, **129**) is **low** due to their location on the very edge of the planning application boundary, this would result in a **negligible** significance of effect. The magnitude of impact to the ridge and furrow at Mardon Hill (**401**, **402**) is **high** due to their location wholly within the planning application boundary resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.50 Further impacts relating to the construction of the proposed DC cable route will be upon the potential for further remains to be associated with the pottery finds assemblage which was recorded at East Keal (**107**). Although the recorded finds are no longer in situ the construction and related activities will permanently remove any related material that could still be in situ. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **negligible** value receptor is **low** due to its location across the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **minor**.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540- 1914)

6.3.51 The disused railway to the north-west of Alford (**412**) was assessed to be of **medium** value. Its location across the planning application boundary means that a proportion of the receptor will be permanently removed during the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact upon this receptor would be **medium**, resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.52 The two chalk pits (**264**), c.400 m south-west of Deersleap, lie largely within the planning application boundary. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **medium** based on a worst-case scenario where the receptor is almost completely removed. This would result in a significance of effect of **moderate.** Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.53 East Keal Park (**168**) will be temporarily and permanently affected by the construction activities related to the proposed DC cable route. These impacts will result in the removal of any below ground archaeological remains which relate to the park within the proposed DC cable route. The

magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **medium** due to its location across the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **minor.**

Modern Period (AD 1914 – Present)

6.3.54 As it is likely that the planning application boundary will pass through an area that will have debris that is associated with the crash site of the Lancaster Bomber (**409**), the construction of the proposed DC cable route will result in the removal of any debris and material associated with the crash site within the Scheme. Construction and site related traffic alongside, soil storage areas will also likely cause compression of the ground which would also impact below ground archaeological remains. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **medium** value receptor is **medium** due to its location across the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **moderate.** Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

Unknown

6.3.55 The cropmarks of enclosures and trackways to the north-west of Ulceby Cross (**126**) will be permanently impacted by the construction of the proposed DC route corridor. It is likely that the construction phase will result in the removal of a proportion of the archaeological remains which are associated with the cropmarks and that lie within the planning application boundary. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **medium** due to its location across the planning application boundary but there is a large proportion of the receptor that lies beyond the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **minor.**

6.3.56 The cropmarks recorded at Langton by Spilsby (**142**, **143**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. Receptor **143** is situated wholly within the planning application boundary consequently it will be completely removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. Consequently, the magnitude of impact is **high** resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Receptor **142** does not lie wholly within the planning application boundary, however a large proportion of it does. Consequently, this receptor will be partially removed by the installation of the proposed DC cable route which results in a **medium** magnitude of impact and a **minor** significance of effect.

6.3.57 The early trackway at Langton by Spilsby (**94**) was assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor falls partially within the planning application boundary consequently the installation of the proposed DC cable route will result in the partial removal of the receptor. This results in a **low** magnitude of impact and a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.3.58 The cropmarks to the east of Dalby (**147**) will be permanently impacted by the construction phase of the proposed DC cable route. This phase of work will result in the permanent removal of part of this receptor which is within the planning application boundary, however there is a substantial

portion of the site which is beyond the planning application boundary to the south. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **medium** due to its location across the planning application boundary but there is a large proportion of the receptor that lies beyond the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **minor.**

6.3.59 The two banks which were identified to the south of Partney Road (**319**, **320**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. A large proportion of these receptors has the potential to be removed by activities relating to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is therefore **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.60 The undated settlement c.1 km to the east of Sausthorpe (**137**) will be in part permanently impacted by the construction of the proposed DC cable route. The construction phase will result in the permanent removal of part of the below ground archaeological remains of this cropmark. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **medium** due to its location over the edge of the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **minor.**

6.3.61 The sand-pit that is located 700 m to the south-east of Sausthorpe (**114**) is located wholly within the planning application boundary consequently it is likely that the construction of the proposed DC cable route will result in the permanent removal of the below ground archaeological remains. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **high** due to its location wholly within the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **moderate.** Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.62 The curvilinear hollow to the south-west of Sausthorpe (**314**) was assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor is wholly within the planning application boundary consequently it has the potential to be completely removed by activities related to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is therefore **high** resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.63 The undated pits (**66**) which are recorded 1.2 km to the south-west of Sausthorpe are likely to be permanently removed by the construction of the proposed DC cable route corridor. The construction phase will result in the permanent removal of below ground archaeological remains that are associated with this receptor. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **high** due to its location wholly within the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.64 The undated cropmark trackway that is located 870 m to the north- west of Raithby (**131**) will be permanently impacted by the construction of the proposed DC cable route. The construction phase will result in the partial removal of the below ground archaeological remains that are associated with the cropmark. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground

archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **medium** due to its location across the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **minor.**

6.3.65 The enclosure and ditches which were identified to the south-east of Wheelabout Wood (**399**) will be permanently impacted by the activities relating to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. This receptor is of **low** value, the magnitude of impact is **high** due to its location wholly within the planning application boundary resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.66 The enclosure and ditches which were identified to the north of Glebe Farm (**400**) will be permanently impacted by the activities relating to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. This receptor is of **low** value, the magnitude of impact is **high** due to its location wholly within the planning application boundary resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.67 The potential ditch which at Mardon Hill (**403**) will be permanently impacted by the activities relating to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. This receptor is of **low** value, the magnitude of impact is **high** due to its location wholly within the planning application boundary resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

Route Section 3 A16 (Keal Road) to River Witham (See Figure 12.2, sheet 9-16)

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

6.3.68 The Prehistoric find spots at Stickford (**83**, **86, 87**) provide the potential for settlement activity and associated receptors, to be located within the planning application boundary. Consequently, the potential, as yet unknown receptors may be impacted either wholly, or in part, during construction activity within the proposed DC cable route working width. Due to the features being contained entirely within the planning application boundary the magnitude of the impact would be **high** as the whole of the area of potential would be affected. Therefore, the potential receptors associated with the findspots would be subject to impacts which have a **moderate** significance of effect and impacts on the area of potential Prehistoric settlement would have also experience **moderate** significance of effect. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

Roman Period (AD 43 – 410)

6.3.69 The scatter of Roman pottery and Quern fragments (**201**) to the west of Stickford provides the potential for settlement activity and associated receptors, which will be permanently impacted during the works within the proposed DC cable route working width. These impacts would result in the removal of the potential settlement activity either in whole or in part. The magnitude of impact would therefore be **high** resulting in **moderate** significance of effect. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

6.3.70 Ploughed out earthworks of ridge and furrow at East Keal (**172**) were assessed to have a **medium** magnitude of impact which would result in a **minor** significance of effect.

6.3.71 The ridge and furrow to the north of Limes Farm at Keal Cotes (**405**) will be permanently impacted by the activities related to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. This receptor is of **low** value, with a magnitude of impact of **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.72 The ridge and furrow located to the west of Stickford (**171**) has been assessed as having evidential significance and of low value as it has been largely removed by later agricultural activity. This receptor lies approximately half within and half without the planning application boundary and that part within the planning application boundary and would be both temporarily (see 6.2.44) and permanently affected by the installation of the proposed DC cable route There is potential for evidence of the ridge and furrow to survive beneath the level of modern plough activity and as such this receptor would be at risk of being removed wholly or in part within the planning application boundary. As the receptor is only partially within the planning application boundary this magnitude of impact would be **medium** and would result in a **minor** significance of effect.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

6.3.73 The potential former field divisions at Keal Cotes (**323**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor crosses the planning application boundary, however there is a large portion of the receptor that is located outside of it, so it will not be wholly removed by the activities relating to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact are therefore **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

6.3.74 The former field boundary and widely spaced ridging to the west of Limes Farm (**326**) was assessed to have **evidential s**ignificance and be of **low** value. This receptor partially crosses the planning application boundary consequently it will be partially removed during the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is therefore **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

6.3.75 The possible dylings at Hagnaby Lock (**329**) were assessed to be of **medium** value and **evidential** significance. Much of this receptor is situated within the planning application boundary consequently it will largely be removed as a result of the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is therefore **medium** which results in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.76 The below ground remains which are associated with the partially extant farmstead at West Fen (**190**) will be permanently removed, either in part or completely during the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact to this **low** value receptor will therefore be **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.77 The below ground remains associated with the demolished farmstead at Sibsey (**194**) could potentially be wholly removed by the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact would therefore be **high** due to its location wholly within the planning application boundary which results in a **moderate** significance of effect. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

6.3.78 The disused railway that runs along the eastern side of the River Witham (**413**) will be permanently impacted by its removal, in part, as a result of the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact to this **medium** value receptor is therefore **medium** which results in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

Modern Period (AD 1914 – Present)

6.3.79 The Pillbox at Short's Corner (**116**) is located wholly within the planning application boundary. It has the potential to be permanently affected by the installation of the proposed DC cable route which could result in the complete or partial removal of the heritage receptor. The magnitude of impact to this **medium** value receptor is therefore **high** which results in a significance of effect of **moderate**. Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

Unknown Date

6.3.80 The former field divisions to the south-east of West Keal (**321**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. Much of this receptor is located within the planning application boundary consequently it is likely to be removed by the construction of the DC cable route. The magnitude of impact will therefore be **medium** with a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.81 The two linear anomalies which were identified through geophysical survey to the north of Limes Farm (**404**) will be permanently impacted by activities relating to the installation of the proposed DC cable route. This is a **low** value receptor with a magnitude of impact of **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.82 The former field divisions and the rectangular enclosure to the south-west of Mager Farm (**327**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor will be partially removed by the installation of the proposed DC cable. The magnitude of impact will be **low**, resulting in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

6.3.83 The linear hollow to the north west of Hagnaby Lock (**330**) was assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor will be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact will be **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.84 The 12 roddons which were identified through the analysis of LiDAR were all assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance (**331**, **332**, **335**, **336**, **337**,**338**, **339**, **340**, **341**, **342**, **343, 344**). These receptors and the potential associated unrecorded archaeology will be partially

removed as a result of the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact would be **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.85 The relict field boundary at Castle Dike Farm (**244**) has been assessed to have **evidential** significance and **low** value. This receptor is situated on the edge of the planning application boundary, consequently only a small area of the receptor would be impacted by the proposed DC cable route. As the receptor is only partially within the planning application boundary this magnitude of impact is **low** and would result in a **negligible** significance of effect.

6.3.86 The former artificial channel of the River Witham (**346**) was assessed as **low** value and **evidential and historic** significance. This receptor will be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

Route Section 4 River Witham to the Proposed Converter Station (See Figure 12.2, sheet 16-20)

Roman Period (AD43-410)

6.3.87 The Romano-British field boundaries which were recorded at Swineshead Bridge (**354**) were assessed to have **evidential** significance and **low** value. This receptor will be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact will be **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor.**

6.3.88 The cropmarks of an enclosure, field boundaries, trackway, and sinuous watercourse to the east of Old Sixteen Foot Drain (**358**) was assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor will be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.89 The field boundaries, enclosure, trackway, and sinuous watercourse to the west of Holt Hills (**359**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor will be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.90 The field boundaries and sinuous roddon to the south-west of Eau End Farm (**366**) were assessed to have **evidential** significance and **low** value. This receptor will be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact will be **medium**, resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.91 The construction phase of the proposed DC cable route will have a direct impact on the below ground remains of the Prehistoric/Romano-British cropmark complex (**21**). It is likely that the construction phase of the proposed DC cable route will entail the permanent removal of much of this heritage receptor. Areas of the heritage receptor which are not directly impacted by the construction are likely to be impacted by pressure applied from the plant and site traffic moving within the working area, the soil storage areas will cause similar compression. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **medium** value receptor is **medium** due to its location across the planning application boundary. This would

result in a significance of effect of **moderate.** Once construction mitigation is included a **minor** significance of effect would result.

Post Medieval Period (AD1540-1914)

6.3.92 The construction of the proposed DC cable route is likely to remove part of the demolished former 19th century farmstead at Holland Fen with Brothertoft (**55**). Further permanent impacts to this buried receptor will result from the compression of the area from the movement of plant and site traffic and the storage of soil. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **medium** due to its location within the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.93 The construction of the proposed DC cable route is likely to impact part of South Forty Foot Drain (**456**). The magnitude of impact to the below ground archaeological remains is **low** which results in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

6.3.94 The construction of the proposed DC cable route is likely to remove part of the demolished former nineteenth century farmstead at Little Hale (**52**). Further permanent impacts to this buried receptor will result from the compression of the area from the movement of plant and site traffic and the storage of soil. The magnitude of impact to the potential below ground archaeological remains associated with this **low** value receptor is **medium** due to its location within the planning application boundary, this would result in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.95 Permanent impacts from the proposed DC cable route would occur during the construction phase to the late Post-Medieval settlement/parish at Amber Hill (**154**). Only the northern edge of this receptor lies within the planning application boundary – an area where there are no buildings - and therefore the magnitude of impact to this receptor would be **low**. This would result in a significance of effect of **negligible**.

Unknown

6.3.96 The 15 roddon systems that are located within the route section (**347**, **348**, **349**, **350**, **351**, **353**, **355**, **356**, **357**, **360**, **361**, **362**, **363**, **364**, **367**) were assessed to have **evidential** significance and **low** value due to their potential to have previously unrecorded archaeology associated with them. They will be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact will therefore be **medium** which results in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.3.97 The field boundaries and trackway to the north-west of Laburnum House (**345**) were assessed to be of **low** value and have **evidential** significance. This receptor will be partially removed by the activities associated with the installation of the proposed DC cable route. The magnitude of impact is **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **minor**.

6.4 Decommissioning Impacts

6.4.1 The decommission phase of the Scheme will reverse any impacts to heritage receptors arising from changes in their setting. However, direct physical impacts on archaeological remains will not be reversed and will remain in any decommissioning phase.

7 Mitigation

7.1 Design Mitigation

7.1.1 Design mitigation for the proposed DC cable route has ensured that the proposed DC cable route planning application boundary avoids all designated receptors. These receptors are of **high** and **medium** value and include scheduled monuments and listed buildings.

7.1.2 Once the design mitigation has been implemented the residual impact would be that of temporary visual impacts to the designated receptors. These will have a **negligible** effect on the significance of the receptor and no long term or operational impacts.

7.1.3 In addition, at least one military aircraft crash site (**409**) has been identified within the DC cable route Zone of Influence. If the planning application boundary passes within 100 m of the crash site an MoD (Ministry of Defence) licence would need to be obtained to permit all excavation work within the 100 m protective zone.

7.1.4 Mitigation by design in this case would be to ensure that the proposed DC cable route is routed to avoid the 100 m buffer surrounding the crash site as much as is practicable. The exact location of the crash site has not been established.

7.2 Construction Mitigation

Temporary Impacts

7.2.1 Temporary impacts would be experienced only during the construction phase of the Scheme and would impact most receptors within the Zone of Influence indirectly to a greater or lesser degree.

7.2.2 Visual intrusion associated with works within the proposed DC cable working width would be difficult to mitigate due to large plant and the necessity of soil storage and vehicle movement within the proposed DC cable working width. Intrusion would be minimised by keeping the proposed DC cable working width to a minimum in all areas and ensuring the area is kept tidy and in good order during the construction phase.

7.2.3 Increased traffic resulting in visual and noise intrusion, and potential pollution increase, on heritage landscapes and receptors would be mitigated by the control of routes for traffic travelling to and from the planning application boundary for all traffic associated with the proposed DC cable route works.

7.2.4 Dust impacts can be mitigated through use of appropriate materials, which will not break down and produce dust as easily, and through techniques such as ‘damping down’ both along highways and within the planning application boundary, including the proposed DC cable working width, TCCs, and TWAs.

Longer Term, Operational, and Permanent Impacts

7.2.5 A levelled approach will be taken to construction mitigation measures for the proposed DC cable route. This approach would comprise four levels of mitigation:

- Archaeological Watching Brief
- Trial Trenching
- Strip, Map, and Sample
- Detailed Archaeological Excavation

7.2.6 Further detail on each level of mitigation is detailed in the Mitigation Strategy (Appendix 12.4 Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (Underground Cable) (Ref:12.19).

7.2.7 These measures would mitigate the long term/operational impacts of the proposed DC cable route through perseveration by record. All records produced during this mitigation would be used to produce a series of reports and site archives which would be deposited with the appropriate local repository, in consultation with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.2.8 Should the location of the aircraft crash site (**409**) fail to be established in enough detail to set a 100 m buffer or should the route, by necessity pass through the 100 m buffer around the crash site the construction mitigation would be a means of recovery of any artefactual evidence remaining of the aircraft. Any excavations which encounter remains within the 100 m buffer, or clearly relating to the wreckage of the aircraft should a buffer fail to be established, would require application for a licence for excavation from the Ministry of Defence.

7.2.9 Further investigations have been carried out by Zetica to determine the location and nature of unknown military sites, including aircraft crash sites within the planning application boundary (Ref: 12.17). However, further primary mitigation works may be conducted prior to excavation. This would be through a geophysical survey or a metal detecting survey, to attempt to establish a detailed location of the crash site and subsequently ascertain the impact the planning application boundary will have on the receptor.

7.2.10 The involvement of specialists is also strongly advised during such an excavation as hazardous materials and unexploded ordnance (UXO) may be encountered.

7.3 Route Section 1 Proposed Landfall to Well High Lane

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

7.3.1 Impacts to the potential features associated with the circular mound and linear features at Furzehill (**300**) could be mitigated through strip, map, and sample.

Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

7.3.2 Potential impacts to the Sea Bank at Huttoft (**160**) would be mitigated during the construction phase with HDD.

7.3.3 Mitigation for the earthwork enclosure and field boundary at Huttoft (**159**) could be informed through the geophysical survey. A further form of evaluation could take place as primary mitigation, in the form of trial trenching. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA. It is likely this receptor would be removed wholly or in part within the planning application boundary and so the focus would be on preservation by record.

7.3.4 The former field boundary and ridge and furrow to the north of Wold View Farm (**261**) could be mitigated by archaeological recording within the proposed DC cable working width with an aim to revealing any remains and preserving these by record. The mitigation could take the form of a watching brief for this receptor.

7.3.5 Impacts to the wide ridging at Markby (**299**) could be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.3.6 The shrunken Medieval village of Saleby (**103**) and its moated site (**104**) only enters the planning application boundary for a small percent of their total area. However, there is potential for associated features outside the monuments to be present within the planning application boundary. A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of archaeological features, if any, relating to the shrunken Medieval village within the planning application boundary. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.3.7 The ridge and furrow to the south of Rigsby Wood (**174**) is clipped by the red line boundary. However, impact to this receptor is considered negligible and practically nil, and as such, no mitigation is suggested.

7.3.8 An area of ridge and furrow (**261**) to the north of Wold View Farm could be mitigated through a watching brief.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

7.3.9 The tramway between Sutton on Sea and Alford (**117**) could be mitigated through archaeological recording with an aim to revealing any remains of the tramway and preserving these by record. The mitigation could take the form of a watching brief for this receptor.

7.3.10 The linear hollow to the west of Sea Bank Farm (**295**) could be mitigated through a watching brief to ascertain the nature of the below ground archaeological remains.

7.3.11 The ridge and furrow to the north-east of Yarlsgate Farm (**296**) could be mitigated through a watching brief to ascertain the nature of the below ground archaeological remains.

7.3.12 Impacts to the disused railway to the west of Yarlsgate Farm (**411**) could be mitigated through a watching brief to ascertain the nature of the below ground archaeological remains.

7.3.13 The former field divisions at Wold View Farm (**298**) could be mitigated through a watching brief to ascertain the nature of the below ground archaeological remains.

7.3.14 The field boundaries and wide ridging to the west of Ailby House Farm (**302**) could be mitigated through a watching brief to ascertain the nature of the below ground archaeological remains.

Unknown date

7.3.15 Impacts to the areas surrounding the watercourse to the west of Yarlsgate Farm (**297**) could be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.3.16 The potential pits to the west of Ailby House Farm (**407**) and the potential plough damaged ditch to the north-west of Rigsby (**408**) are both located within the planning application boundary as such the mitigation for this receptor would be a watching brief.

7.3.17 Impacts to the field boundaries including ridge and furrow and a strip field (**255**) at Ailby would be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.3.18 Impacts to the former field divisions, wide ridging, and possible pond/quarry pit at Ailby House Farm (**301**) would be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.4 Route Section 2 Well High Lane to A16 (Keal Road)

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

7.4.1 The cropmarks and geophysical anomalies which have been identified within this route section to be permanently impacted by the proposed DC cable route to the south-east of Driby (**124 and 125**), at Dalby (**120, 397**), at West Keal (**123**) and at Dalby **(230 and 146**) could have the impacts mitigated against prior to the construction phase. A primary phase of mitigation will take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of Prehistoric activity within the planning application boundary, relating to these receptors. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation would occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.4.2 Impacts to the potential barrow to the south of Fulletby (**119**) could be mitigated through a primary phase of trial trenching to establish the extent, to which the barrow lies within the planning application boundary, and the receptor's rate of survival. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation would occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.4.3 Impacts to the findspot on Langton Hill (**266**) could be mitigated through a watching brief to ascertain whether there is any previously unrecorded below ground archaeological remains associated with it.

7.4.4 Construction mitigation is proposed for the cropmarks of enclosures and boundaries to the north-west of Langton Hill (**144**). A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to

establish the extent and density of activity within the planning application boundary, relating to the enclosure and boundary cropmarks. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.4.5 Design mitigation measures have been applied to ensure that the planning application boundary does not contain scheduled monuments, this therefore mitigates against impacts to the scheduled monuments of a Neolithic long barrow (**SM5**) to the north-west of Dexthorpe and Ring Holt bowl barrow (**SM3**) to the north-west of Dalby.

7.4.6 Further construction mitigation is proposed to mitigate impacts to the potential below ground archaeological remains which relate to the Prehistoric find scatter recorded at East Keal (**115**, **76**, **80**), the Bronze Age flint scatter (**98**), the Neolithic stone axe findspot to the south-west of Dalby (**90**) and the findspots of barbed and tanged arrowheads (**99**) at Langton by Spilsby. A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of Prehistoric activity within the planning application boundary. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

Roman Period AD43 - 410)

7.4.7 Impacts to the cropmarks of field boundaries and enclosures (**385**) at Langton Grange Farm could be mitigated during the construction phase through strip, map, and sample. This would help to gain an understanding of the nature and extent of the receptor.

7.4.8 Impacts to the enclosures, field boundaries and trackway to the north-east of Skirbeck Plantation (**386 and 145**) could be mitigated through a phased approach. A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of Prehistoric and Roman activity within the planning application boundary. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation might occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.4.9 The enclosure and field boundaries to the north of Raithby Cross Roads (**315**) could have their impacts mitigated through a phased approach. A primary phase of mitigation will take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of Roman activity within the planning application boundary. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation would occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.4.10 Impacts to the cropmarks of enclosures, field boundaries and pits (**387 and 137**) at East Farm Partney could be mitigated through a strip, map, and sample. This would help to gain an understanding of the nature and extent of the receptor within the planning application boundary.

Early Medieval Period (AD 410 - 1066)

7.4.11 The impacted Early/Middle Saxon site at East Keal (**108**) will be subject to construction mitigation which could take phased approach. A primary phase of mitigation will take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of Early Medieval activity within the planning application boundary. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

Medieval Period (AD 1066-1540)

7.4.12 Impacts to the old field boundary/drain that is recorded to the north-west of Dalby Bar (**311**) could be mitigated through a watching brief. This would help to ascertain the nature and extent of the receptor.

7.4.13 Impacts to the ridge and furrow which were identified during geophysical survey to the south of Dalby Bar (**398**) could be mitigated during the construction phase through a watching brief. This would help to ascertain the nature of the underlying archaeological record.

7.4.14 Impacts to the two areas of ridge and furrow at Dalby (**149**, **388**) could be mitigated during the construction phase through a watching brief. This would help to ascertain the nature of the underlying archaeological record.

7.4.15 Impacts to the Medieval Chapel of Well (**92**) will be mitigated through a watching brief to identify and record the below ground archaeological remains.

Areas of ridge and furrow at Raithby (**130, 132**) and part of a Medieval trackway (**129**) have been identified as being clipped by the planning application boundary. Impact to these receptors from the project will be negligible and mitigation is therefore not required.

7.4.16 Construction mitigation is proposed for the potential below ground remains which relate to the pottery finds assemblage at East Keal (**107**). This mitigation could be part of the same phased approach, as receptors **115**, **76** and **80**, located in the same area and provides the potential for the site to be multi-period.

7.4.17 It has been identified that East Keal Park (**168**) will be permanently impacted by the proposed DC cable route. These impacts could be mitigated by the same phased approach as receptors **115**, **76**, **80** and **107**.

Post-Medieval Period (AD 1540-1914)

7.4.18 Impacts to the disused railway that is recorded to the north-west of Alford (**412**) could be mitigated through an archaeological watching brief to ascertain the nature and extent of the below ground archaeological remains.

Impacts to chalk pits south-west of Deersleap (**264**) could be mitigated through an archaeological watching brief to identify and record the nature and extent of the below ground archaeological remains.

7.4.19 Impacts to East Keal Park (**168**) could be mitigated through an archaeological watching brief to ascertain the nature and extent of the below ground archaeological remains relating to park activity.

Modern Period (AD 1914- Present)

7.4.20 It was identified above that the crash site of the Lancaster at Ulceby Cross (**409**) is likely to be permanently impacted by the construction of the proposed DC cable route. Design mitigation aims to avoid the crash site and be at least 100 m away from it, however this is reliant upon the successful locating of it. The Zetica report recommends that a non-intrusive magnetometer survey is undertaken at the site, to detect and investigate metallic features associated with the crash (Ref: 12.17). Once the location of the crash site is confirmed and if the proposed DC cable route passes within 100 m of it an MOD licence and full archaeological excavation could be required.

Unknown Date

7.4.21 As it was highlighted above the undated enclosure and trackway cropmarks to the north-west of Ulceby Cross (**126**) will be impacted in part by the construction of the proposed DC cable route. A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent, date and density of activity within the planning application boundary, relating to the enclosure and trackway cropmarks. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.4.22 Impacts to the two cropmarks at Langton by Spilsby (**142**, **143**) could be mitigated through a strip, map, and sample to establish the nature, extent and date of the potential underlying archaeological remains.

7.4.23 Impacts to the early trackway site which is also at Langton by Spilsby (**94**) could be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.4.24 Construction mitigation will be applied to the potential impacts to the cropmarks that are located to the east of Dalby (**147**). A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of activity within the planning application boundary, with the high potential for Prehistoric material to present, due to the location of Ring Holt Bowl Barrow (**SM3**) to the north of the cropmarks. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map,

and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.4.25 Impacts to the two banks that are located to the south of Partney Road (**319**, **320**) could be mitigated during the construction phase through a watching brief to ascertain the nature, extent, and date of the receptors.

7.4.26 Impacts to the settlement to the east of Sausthorpe (**137**) could be mitigated at the construction phase though either a watching brief or strip, map, and sample.

7.4.27 The sand-pit to the south-east of Sausthorpe (**114**) will be impacted by the construction of the proposed DC cable route, this will be mitigated at the construction stage with a watching brief.

7.4.28 Impacts to the curvilinear hollow to the south-west of Sausthorpe (**314**) will be mitigated through a watching brief to ascertain the nature and date of the below ground archaeological remains.

7.4.29 The permanent impact of the construction of the proposed DC cable route on the undated pits recorded 1.2 km to the south-west of Sausthorpe (**66**) could be mitigated prior to the construction phase. Mitigation could take the same phased approach as (**315**) and could be targeted during the same trial trenching phase. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.4.30 The permanent impacts to the undated cropmark trackway to the north-north-west of Raithby (**131**) could be mitigated during the construction stage. The nature, extent and date of the underlying archaeological record could be investigated through strip, map, and sample.

7.4.31 Permanent impacts to the enclosures and ditches (**399**, **400**) which were identified through geophysical survey could be mitigated through a strip, map, and sample. Mitigation for the potential ditch (**403**) at Mardon Hill could consist of a watching brief.

7.4.32 The permanent impacts to Ridge and Furrow (**401**) at Glebe Farm would be mitigated by archaeological watching brief.

7.5 Route Section 3 A16 (Keal Road) to River Witham

Prehistoric Period (30,000 BC – AD 43)

7.5.1 The Prehistoric find spots at Stickford **(83**, **86, 87**) demonstrate that there is potential for settlement activity within the area between the two findspots. A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of activity within the planning application boundary, with the high potential for Prehistoric material to present, due to the location of Ring Holt Bowl Barrow (**SM3**) to the north of the cropmarks. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

Roman Period (AD 43 – 410)

7.5.2 The scatter of Roman pottery and quern fragments (**201**) could be mitigated through archaeological watching for the potential for further Roman activity. This could be combined with the watching brief for Medieval ridge and furrow (**171**) at the same location.

Medieval Period (AD 1066 – 1540)

7.5.3 The ridge and furrow recorded at Keal Cotes and Stickford (**405**, **171**) could be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.5.4 Ridge and furrow located at East Keal (**172**) is slightly clipped by the planning application boundary. Therefore, impact will be negligible and no mitigation is suggested.

Post Medieval Period (AD 1540 – 1914)

7.5.5 Impacts to the former field divisions at Keal Cotes (**323**) could be mitigated through a watching brief to ascertain the nature and extent of the receptor.

7.5.6 Impacts to the former field boundary and wide spaced ridging to the west of Limes Farm (**326**) could be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.5.7 The impacts to the potential dylings at Hagnaby Lock (**329**) could be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.5.8 Impacts to the partially extant farmstead at West Fen (**190**) and the demolished farmstead at Sibsey (**194**) could be mitigated during the construction phase with an archaeological watching brief to ascertain the nature of the below ground archaeological remains.

7.5.9 Impacts to the disused railway that is recorded to the east of the River Witham (**413**) could be mitigated during the construction phase with an archaeological watching brief.

Modern Period (AD 1914 – Present)

7.5.10 Impacts to the Pillbox at Short's Corner (**116**) could be mitigated through a first preference of preservation in situ, by avoiding any impact the planning application boundary may have on the receptor. Should impacts to the structure become clear, then an appropriate building record should be captured to preserve the receptor by record.

Unknown Date

7.5.11 Impacts to the former field divisions (**321**), linear geophysical anomalies (**404**) and the linear hollow (**330**) will be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.5.12 Impacts to the former field divisions and the rectangular enclosure to the south-west of Mager Farm (**327**) will be mitigated through strip, map, and sample to ascertain the nature and extent of the underlying archaeology.

7.5.13 Impacts to the linear hollow to the north-west of Hagnaby Lock (**330**) will be mitigated through a watching brief to ascertain the nature and extent of the below ground archaeological remains.

7.5.14 Impacts to the areas surrounding the 12 roddons (**331**, **332**, **335**, **336**, **337**, **338**, **339**, **340**, **341**, **342**, **343, 344**) within this route section could be mitigated through a phased approach. A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of human interactions with the receptors. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.5.15 The relict field boundary at Castle Dike Farm (**244**) could be mitigated through a watching brief.

7.5.16 The impacts to the former artificial channel of the River Witham (**346**) would be mitigated at the construction phase. This mitigation would comprise a watching brief to help ascertain the nature of the receptor.

7.6 Route Section 4 River Witham to the Proposed Converter Station

Roman Period (AD43-410)

7.6.1 Impacts to the Romano-British field boundaries at Swineshead Bridge (**354**) could be mitigated through strip, map, sample. This would help to ascertain the nature and extent of the receptor.

7.6.2 The impacts to the cropmarks of an enclosure, field boundaries, trackway, and sinuous watercourse to the east of Old Sixteen Foot Drain (**358**) and to the west of Holt Hills (**359**) could be mitigated during the construction phase. A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of Romano-British activity. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.6.3 Impacts to the field boundaries and sinuous roddon to the south-west of Eau End Farm (**366**) could be mitigated prior to the construction phase. A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of human activity. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.6.4 It was highlighted above that the proposed DC cable route will have a permanent impact upon the Prehistoric/Roman cropmarks at North Ing Drove (**21**). Trial trenching has established the significant remains of a second to fourth century Romano-British settlement. These impacts could be mitigated through a combined approach of strip, map, and sample and open area excavation.

Post Medieval Period (AD1540-1914)

7.6.5 The permanent impact which was highlighted above to the demolished unnamed farmsteads at Holland Fen with Brothertoft (**55**) and Little Hale (**52**) could be mitigated through the construction stage by a watching brief.

7.6.6 Impacts to the South Forty Foot Drain (**456**) could be mitigated through a construction technique. HDD would occur at the point the proposed DC cable route reaches the receptor, resulting in the DC route, bypassing the receptor under the ground and consequently preserving the it situ.

Unknown Date

7.6.7 Impacts to the immediate areas surrounding the 15 roddon systems (**347**, **348**, **349**, **350**, **351**, **353**, **355**, **356**, **357**, **360**, **361**, **362**, **363**, **364**, **367**) within this route section could be mitigated by a two-phase approach. A primary phase of mitigation could take the form of trial trenching to establish the extent and density of human interactions with the receptors. Should significant archaeological remains be discovered, a secondary phase of mitigation could occur in the form of either open area excavation, strip, map, and sample or archaeological watching brief, following discussions with the archaeological advisor to the LPA.

7.6.8 Impacts to the field boundaries and trackway to the north-west of Laburnum House (**345**) would be mitigated at the construction phase. This mitigation would comprise a watching brief to ascertain the nature of the receptor.

8 Residual Effects

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 Due to the embedding of design mitigation and construction mitigation into the planning application boundary the residual effects of the Scheme will remain unchanged from the potential effects outlined in Section 6 above. This is because all design mitigation and construction mitigation has been taken into account when assessing potential effects. Therefore, the individual assessment of effects on each heritage receptor will not be repeated here. However, where this Scheme has assessed a significant effect on a heritage receptor this will be reported below.

8.2 Temporary Impacts

8.2.1 All temporary impacts on designated and non-designated heritage receptors remain unchanged from the potential effects assessed above. There are no significant temporary effects anticipated on heritage receptors.

8.3 Operational, Longer Term and Permanent Effects

Designated Heritage Receptors

8.3.1 All permanent impacts on designated heritage receptors remain unchanged from the potential effects assessed above. There are no significant temporary effects anticipated on designated heritage receptors.

Non-Designated Receptors

8.3.2 All permanent impacts on non-designated heritage receptors remain unchanged from the potential effects assessed above. Those receptors which experience significant effects are detailed below.

Route Section 1 Proposed Landfall to Well High Lane

8.3.3 No receptors have been identified as experiencing significant effects within Route Section 1.

Route Section 2 Well High Lane to A16 (Keal Road)

8.3.4 The Medieval Chapel of Well (**92**) lies within the planning application boundary to the south-west of Dalby and has been identified as have the potential to experience significant effects. This receptor would experience direct physical impacts which would result in the removal in whole or in part of that part of the receptor which lies within the planning application boundary.

8.3.5 This **low** value receptor has been assessed as experiencing a **high** magnitude of impact resulting in a **moderate** significance of effect.

Route Section 3 A16 (Keal Road) to River Witham

8.3.6 No receptors have been identified as experiencing significant effects within Route Section 3.

Route Section 4 River Witham to the Proposed Converter Station

8.3.7 Two non-designated heritage receptors have been assessed as experiencing significant effects. Direct physical impacts will be experienced by receptors of Roman origin located within the proposed converter station site. These receptors comprise a probable 2nd-4th century Roman settlement (**20**) established through trial trenching, and Roman activity (**21**) with limited remains found through trial trenching. These medium value receptors will experience impacts as a result of construction activity. The magnitude of impact will be **medium** resulting in a significance of effect of **moderate adverse.** These receptors are located primarily within the planning application boundary for the proposed converter station so dealt with more fully in Chapter 25.

9 Cumulative Effects

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 This section will consider inter-project cumulative effects on heritage only. The standalone cumulative assessment chapter which will also identify the developments to be considered within the assessment is found at Chapter 16.

9.2 Scope of Cumulative Assessment

9.2.1 The cumulative developments identified by this project in the vicinity of the proposed DC cable route that have the potential to have cumulative effects on heritage receptors are:

- Triton Knoll.
- Land at Willow Farm, Langham Road, Hogsthorpe. N/089/01630/14.
- Langton Grange Farm, Langton Road, Langton by Spilsby, PE23 49T. N/098/01313/15.
- Woodlands, Glebe Farm, Hundleby, Spilsby, Lincolnshire. S/045/01700/16.
- Westville Recycling Centre, Northlands Road, Westville, Boston, Lincolnshire, PE22 7HR. S/054/01504/16.
- Land off Folly Lane, Stickney, Boston. S/203/01106/15.
- Land adjacent to Sellars Farm, Sutterton Drove, Amber Hill, Boston. B/13/0357.
- Land at Six Hundred Farm, Six Hundred Drove, East Heckington. 15/0416/S36.

9.3 Cumulative Effects

9.3.1 Cumulative effects will impact the Sea Bank at Huttoft (**160**), these effects will result from Triton Knoll Electrical System which comprises an underground cable, and the proposed erection of an 11 kV overhead line on land at Willow Farm, Hogsthorpe (N/089/01630/14). Both applications have the potential to have a permanent impact upon this receptor with the removal of an area of the above and below ground archaeological remains, alongside a visual impact with respect to the overhead line. The permanent residual effect upon the Sea Bank as a result of the installation of the proposed DC cable route was assessed to be **negligible**. Once the cumulative effect of the Triton Knoll underground cable route and the proposed erection of an overhead line is accounted for the cumulative magnitude of impact upon this receptor is **medium** which results in a significance of effect of **minor**.

9.3.2 The approved planning application for the installation of 192 50 kW ground mounted solar panels which are to a maximum height of 2.4 m at Langton Grange Farm, Langton by Spilsby (N/098/01313/15) will form a cumulative effect upon the cropmark receptors within this area (**119**, **385**, **142**). This impact will comprise the removal of the below ground archaeological remains

that are potentially associated with these receptors, which could extend beyond their current recorded extents. The permanent residual effect upon these receptors was assessed to be **negligible** following the installation of the proposed DC cable route. Once the cumulative effect of the solar panels is accounted for the cumulative magnitude of impacts upon these receptors is **medium** resulting in a **minor** significance of effect.

9.3.3 The proposed installation of woodland at Glebe Farm Hundleby (S/045/01700/16) will form a permanent visual impact upon Brickfields (**LB28**). Although the proposed woodland will cause a permanent visual impact upon the setting of Brickfields (**LB28**), the visual impact from the installation of the proposed DC cable route will be temporary, therefore this is not considered to be a cumulative effect.

9.3.4 The proposed application for the installation of 19,230 5 mW solar panels to create a solar farm which includes associated works and a vehicular access on land off Folly Lane at Stickney (S/203/01106/15) has the potential to impact currently unknown archaeological remains. This would be a cumulative impact which would result in the permanent removal of below ground archaeological remains potentially associated with the roddon system at West Fen (**332**). The permanent impact to the potential below ground remains associated with this receptor were assessed to be **negligible**, considering the above planning application the cumulative magnitude of impact would be **minor** which results in a **negligible** significance of effect.

9.3.5 The approved planning application (S/054/01504/16) for an extension of a yard area and the construction of a bund to a maximum height of 2 m within an existing recycling centre at Westville Recycling Centre will have a visual impact upon the Bridge over Twenty Foot Drain (**LB32**). Whilst the visual impact from planning application S/054/01504/16 will be permanent, the visual impacts from the installation of the proposed DC cable route will be temporary. This is not considered to be a cumulative effect.

9.3.6 The application to dismantle and rebuild an overhead line on land at Sellars Farm at Amber Hill (B/13/0357) will potentially have a permanent impact upon potentially unknown below ground archaeological remains. This will result in a cumulative effect which will have a magnitude of impact of **minor** resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect.

9.3.7 The application of a proposed wind park at Six Hundred Farm, East Heckington (15/0416/S36) will result in a cumulative permanent impact to potentially unknown below ground archaeological remains. This will result in a cumulative effect which will have a magnitude of impact of **minor** resulting in a **negligible** significance of effect

9.3.8 At Swineshead Bridge, there will be a cumulative effect upon the below ground archaeological remains associated with the field boundary cropmarks (**354**) and roddon system (**355**). This cumulative effect results from the proposed routes of both Triton Knoll and the proposed DC cable route coming into this area. The permanent impact upon these receptors as a result of the proposed DC cable route was assessed to be negligible, taking into account the Triton Knoll underground cable the magnitude of impact upon these receptors is considered to be **medium** which results in a significance of effect of **minor**.

10 Summary of Assessment

10.1 Introduction

10.1.1 The following section presents a summary of the baseline conditions and residual effects of the proposed cable route on heritage receptors. The summary of baseline conditions and residual effects is presented for the whole proposed DC cable route, by route section. The residual effects are then presented again by Local Planning Authority. Some receptors span more than one planning authority, consequently there are instances whereby a receptor will be counted more than once.

10.2 Summary

Overview of Baseline Conditions

10.2.1 There are 34 heritage receptors within Route Section 1. Eight are of medium value and the remainder are of low value. The medium value receptors include three grade II listed buildings (**LB33, LB34**, **LB27**). The remaining receptors include a sea bank, a late Medieval earthwork enclosure and field boundary, a shrunken Medieval village with moated site and a tramway.

10.2.2 There are 68 heritage receptors within Route Section 2. Two are of high value, nine are of medium value and the remainder are of low value. The high value receptors comprise two scheduled monuments (**SM3**, **SM5**) of barrows which are not within the planning application boundary. The medium value receptors include a grade II listed building (**LB28**), barrow cropmarks (**397**,**120**), a scatter of Bronze Age flints (**98**), an Early/Middle Saxon settlement site (**108**), a WW2 crash site of a Lancaster bomber (**409**) and a disused railway (**412**). Other receptors within the route section include cropmarks of enclosures and trackways, including some of Prehistoric and Roman date and others that are undated; Medieval ridge and furrow; a Medieval trackway; a cropmark of a possible barrow and findspots dating to the Prehistoric and Roman periods.

10.2.3 There are 49 heritage receptors within Route Section 3, eight of which are of medium value whilst the remainder are of low value. The medium value receptors include a grade II listed building (**LB32**), findspots (**83**, **86**, **87**), potential dylings (**329**), a pillbox (**116**) and a disused railway (**413**). The low value receptors include findspots of Prehistoric flint and pottery and Roman pottery that could indicate settlement activity as well as Medieval ridge and furrow and a Post-Medieval park.

10.2.4 There are 43 heritage receptors within Route Section 4, one of which is of medium value and the remainder are of low value. The cropmark of Prehistoric/ Roman date (**21**) is of medium value. The remainder of the receptors include a Post-Medieval farmstead and a later Post-Medieval settlement/parish.

Overview of Residual Effects

10.2.5 The residual effects of the proposed cable route are detailed in section 8 above and outlined in Table 12.15 below. Overall most of heritage receptors will experience residual effects of negligible or minor following the application of mitigation.

10.2.6 Although the residual significance of effect upon the aircraft crash site (**409**) was assessed to be minor it has the potential to be moderate if the site location is confirmed to be located completely within the planning application boundary.

Residual Effects in East Lindsey District Council

10.2.7 There are 105 heritage receptors within East Lindsey that would experience residual effects.

10.2.8 Of these 19 are in Route Section 1 (**300, 159, 103, 104, 117, 160, 261, 299, 297, 301, 255, 407, 408, 174, 295, 296, 411, 298, 302**). Of these four would experience **negligible** effects, one **minor to negligible**, and 14 **minor** effects.

10.2.9 A further 51 are in Route Section 2 (**386, 145, 315, 387, 124, 125, 123, 120, 397, 230, 146, 90, 92, 99, 399, 400, 403, 155, 76, 80, 98, 108, 311, 130, 132, 401, 402, 107, 129, 168, 409, 264, 126, 147, 319, 320, 137, 114, 66, 131, 119, 144, 385, 398, 412, 143, 142, 94, 314, 149, 388**). Of these ten would experience **negligible** effects, 40 would experience **minor** effects, and one would experience **moderate** effects.

10.2.10 In Route Section 3 there are 31 (**83, 86, 87, 201, 171, 405, 172, 323, 326, 329, 244, 321, 404, 327, 330, 331, 332, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 190, 116, 465, 194, 413**) heritage receptors. Of these five would experience **negligible** effects and 27 would experience **minor** effects.

Residual Effects in Boston Borough Council

10.2.11 There are 20 heritage receptors within Boston Borough which would experience residual effects.

10.2.12 Of these two (**344, 346**) are in Route Section 3 and would experience **negligible** residual effects.

10.2.13 In Route Section 4 there are 18 (**347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 353, 355, 356, 357, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 367, 55, 354, 154**) heritage receptors which would experience **negligible** residual effects.

Residual Effects in North Kesteven District Council

10.2.14 There are 11 receptors in Route Section 4 that will experience residual effects in North Kesteven (**356, 357, 363, 364, 52, 360, 361, 362, 358, 359, 456**). These receptors will experience **negligible** residual effects.

Residual Effects in South Holland District Council

10.2.15 There are three receptors in Route Section 4 that will experience residual effects in South Holland (**21, 367, 366**). One of these receptors will experience **minor** residual effects (**21**) and the remainder (**367, 366**) experience **negligible** residual effects.

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
Route Section 1				
The circular mound and linear features at Furzehill (**300**)	Low	The effects of the Scheme on this receptor would comprise the removal in whole or part of up to half on the recognised heritage receptor by works within the proposed DC cable working width.	Negligible	No
The earthwork enclosure and field boundary at Huttoft (**159**)	Low	The effects of the Scheme on this receptor would comprise the removal in whole or part of up to half on the recognised heritage receptor by works within the proposed DC cable working width.	Minor	No
The shrunken Medieval village of Saleby (**103**)	Medium	The effects of the Scheme would be the removal of features associated with this receptor either in whole or in part where they lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The moated site at Saleby (**104**)	Medium	The effects of the Scheme would be the removal of features associated with this receptor either in whole or in part where they lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The tramway between Sutton on Sea and Alford (**117**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible to Minor	No
The Sea Bank at Huttoft (**160**)	Low	This receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part for the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
Former field boundary and ridge and furrow to the north of Wold View Farm (**261**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The wide ridging at Markby (**299**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The watercourse to the west of Yarlsgate Farm (**297**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The former field divisions, wide ridging and possible pond/quarry pit at Ailby House Farm (**301**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Former field boundaries including ridge and furrow and a strip field (255)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Pits to the west of Ailby House Farm (**407**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
Potential ditch to the north-west of Rigsby (**408**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Ridge and Furrow to the south of Rigsby Wood (**174**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No
Linear hollow to the west of Sea Bank Farm (**295**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Ridge and Furrow to the north-east of Yarlsgate Farm (**296**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The disused railway to the west of Yarlsgate Farm (**411**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The former field divisions at Wold View Farm (**298**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Negligible	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
The former field boundaries at Ailby House Farm (**302**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
Route Section 2				
The enclosures, field boundaries and trackway to the north-east of Skirbeck Plantation (**386**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No
The enclosure and boundary cropmarks to the east of Sausthorpe (**145**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No
The enclosure and field boundaries that were identified to the north of Raithby cross roads (**315**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The cropmarks of enclosures, field boundaries and pits at East Farm Partney (**387**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
Cropmarks to the south-east of Driby (**124**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Cropmarks to the south of East Drilby (**125**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Cropmarks at West Keal (**123**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Possible round barrow to the north-west of Dalby (**120**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Ring ditch and ditches to the south of Dalby Bar (**397**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Cropmarks at Dalby (**230**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
Cropmark west of Home Farm, Dalby (**146**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Neolithic Stone Axe findspot (**90**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Medieval Chapel of Well (**92**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Moderate	Yes
Barbed and Tanged Arrowheads findspot (**99**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Enclosure and ditches to the south-east of Wheelabout Wood (**399)**	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Enclosure and ditches to the north of Glebe Farm (**400**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
Potential ditch at Mardon Hill (**403**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Findspots at East Keal (**115**, **76**, **80**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Findspot at Langton by Spilsby (**98**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The early/middle Saxon site at East Keal (**108**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The old field boundary/drain to the north-west of Dalby Bar (**311**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No
Ridge and furrow at Raithby (**130,132**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
Ridge and Furrow at Mardon Hill (**401**, **402**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
Pottery Finds at East Keal	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
Medieval trackway at Raithby (**129**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No
East Keal Park (**168**)	Low	Partial loss of the receptor within the planning application boundary due to construction of the proposed cable route.	Minor	No
The crash site of the Lancaster Bomber at Ulceby Cross (**409**)	Medium	Loss of debris and material associated with the crash site within the planning application boundary due to construction of the proposed cable route.	Minor	No
Chalk Pits south-west of Deersleap (**264**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
enclosure and trackways cropmarks to the north-west of Ulceby Cross (**126**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
cropmarks to the east of Dalby (**147**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The two banks to the south of Partney Road (**319**, **320**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
undated settlement to the east of Sausthorpe (**137**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
sand-pit to the south-east of Sausthorpe (**114**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
undated pits to the south-west of Sausthorpe (**66**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
undated cropmark trackway to the north-north-west of Raithby (**131**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The cropmark of the possible barrow to the south of Fulletby (**119**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The possible cropmarks of enclosures and boundaries to the north-west of Langton Hill (**144**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No
The cropmarks of field boundaries and enclosures at Langton Grange Farm (**385**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The ridge and furrow at Dalby Bar (**398**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
The disused railway to the north-west of Alford (**412**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
The cropmarks at Langton by Spilsby (**143**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
The cropmarks at Langton by Spilsby (**142**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
The early trackway site at Langton by Spilsby (**94**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Negligible	No
The curvilinear hollow to the south-west of Sausthorpe (**314**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
Ridge and Furrow at Dalby (**149**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Negligible	No
Ridge and Furrow at Dalby (**388**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
Route Section 3				
Prehistoric find spots at Stickford (**83**, **86, 87**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Scatter of Roman pottery and Quern fragments (**201**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Ridge and furrow located to the west of Stickford (**171**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Ridge and Furrow at Keal Cotes (**405**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
Ridge and furrow located at East Keal (**172**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
The potential former field divisions at Keal Cotes (**323**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Negligible	No
The former field boundary and widely spaced ridging to the west of Limes Farm (**326**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Negligible	No
The potential dylings at Hagnaby Lock (**329**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
Relict field boundary at Castle Dike Farm (**244**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Negligible	No
The former field divisions to the south-east of West Keal (**321**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
Linear anomalies to the north of Limes Farm (**404**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
The former field divisions and the rectangular enclosure to the south-west of Mager Farm (**327**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Negligible	No
The linear hollow to the north west of Hagnaby Lock (**330**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
Twelve roddons (**331**, **332**, **335**, **336**, **337**, **338**, **339**, **340**, **341**, **342**, **343, 344**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
The partially extant farmstead at West Fen (**190**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
The demolished farmstead at Sibsey (**194**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
The disused railway that runs along the eastern side of the River Witham (**413**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
The Pillbox at Short's Corner (**116**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
The former artificial channel of the River Witham (**346**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
Sycamore Farm (**465**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be a temporary impact to the setting of the receptor.	Negligible	No
Route Section 4				
The Romano-British field boundaries at Swineshead Bridge (**354**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
The cropmarks of an enclosure, field boundaries, trackway and sinuous watercourse to the east of Old Sixteen Foot Drain (**358**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
The field boundaries, enclosure, trackway and sinuous watercourse to the west of Holt Hills (**359**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
The field boundaries and sinuous roddon to the south-west of Eau End Farm (**366**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No
Prehistoric/Roman cropmarks at North Ing Drove (**21**)	Medium	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Moderate	Yes
The demolished unnamed farmstead at Little Hale (**52**) and Holland Fen with Brothertoft (**55**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Minor	No
South Forty Foot Drain (**456**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary.	Negligible	No
The late Post-Medieval settlement/parish of Amber Hill (**154**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Negligible	No
Fifteen roddon systems (**347**, **348**, **349**, **350**, **351**, **353**, **355**, **356**, **357**, **360**, **361**, **362**, **363**, **364**, **367**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No

Table 12.15 Summary of Assessment: Archaeology & Cultural Heritage (Underground Cable)				
Description of Receptor	**Value / Sensitivity**	**Description of Residual Effect**	**Significance**	**Significant**
The field boundaries and trackway to the north-west of Laburnum House (**345**)	Low	The effect of the Scheme on this receptor would be the removal either wholly or in part of the remains of this receptor which lay within the planning application boundary	Minor	No

11 References

Ref: 12.1, CIFA Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment

Ref:12-2, Highways Agency, Transport Scotland, Welsh Assembly Government, the Department for Regional Development Northern Ireland, (2007), Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2: HA 208/07. Cultural Heritage.

Ref:12-3, English Heritage, (2008), Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment.

Ref:12-4, Historic England, (2015), Historic Environment Good Practice Guide in planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets.

Ref:12-5, Historic England, (2012), Seeing the history in the view: A method for assessing heritage significance within views.

Ref:12-6, Historic England, (2015), Managing significance in decision taking in the historic environment.

Ref: 12.7, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents

Ref: 12.8, Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46

Ref:12-9, Department for Communities and Local Government, (2012), National Planning Policy Framework.

Ref: 12. 10, East Lindsey Local Plan Alteration 1999. Available at: http://www.e-lindsey.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=1262

Ref 12.11, East Lindsey Core Strategy (Submissions Modifications Draft, March 2017). Available at: http://www.e-lindsey.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=1410&p=0

Ref 12.12, South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (Publication Version, March 2017). Available at: http://www.southeastlincslocalplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Publication-Version-March-2017-Text.pdf

Ref: 12.13, Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (Adopted, April 2017). Available at: https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/local-plan/

Ref:12-14, Lewis, C. (2006), The Medieval Period (850-1500). In N.J. Cooper ed. The archaeology of the East Midlands. An archaeological resource assessment and research agenda, Leicester Archaeology Monographs No.13. University of Leicester Archaeological Services, 185-216.

Ref:12-15, Campion, G., (2006), The Modern Period (1750-2000). In N.J. Cooper ed. *The archaeology of the East Midlands. An archaeological resource assessment and research agenda,* Leicester Archaeology Monographs No.13. University of Leicester Archaeological Services, 237-258.

Ref: 12.16, Clay, P. (2006), The Neolithic and Early to Middle Bronze Age. In N.J. Cooper ed. The archaeology of the East Midlands. An archaeological resource assessment and research agenda, Leicester Archaeology Monographs No.13. University of Leicester Archaeological Services, 69-88.

Ref:12-17, Jenkins, P. (2017), Viking Link, Lincolnshire- UXO Risk Assessment.

Ref: 12.18, Guffogg, J. P. 2012 South Forty Foot Drain and Black Sluice – Shared Description http://www.geograph.org.uk/snippet/8129 accessed 24/07/2017

Ref: 12.19, Arcadis, 2017, UK Onshore Scheme Environmental Statement Volume 4, Appendix 12.4. Archaeological Mitigation Strategy.

CONTACT US

You can find out more information by:

calling our freephone number:
0800 731 0561

Sending an email to:
vikinglink@communityrelations.co.uk

Writing to our freepost address at:
FREEPOST VIKING LINK

Visiting our website at:
www.viking-link.com

If you, or someone you know, would like information in Braille, audio, large print or another language, please call us on the freephone number above.