

7.0 ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

INTRODUCTION

- 7.1 This chapter of the ES assesses the likely significant impacts of the proposed development on the environment with regard to archaeology and cultural heritage. It also describes the methods used to assess the impacts; the baseline conditions currently existing at the site and in the surrounding area; the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects; and the likely residual impacts after these measures have been adopted.
- 7.2 This Chapter has been prepared by Claudia Jorge MA(Hons) MCiFA, who has over 5 years' experience, and reviewed by Eddy Stratford MCiFA, who has over 15 years' experience, from The Environmental Dimension Partnership, on behalf of the applicant.

POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

- 7.3 Both the proposed heritage baseline assessment and the ES Chapter will, where relevant, be informed by the following legislation and national and local planning policy:
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990;
 - Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979;
 - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2023¹); and
 - Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010 – 2030 (2016)

National Planning Policy

- 7.4 The revised NPPF was published in 2023 and Section 16 sets out the government's approach to the conservation and management of the historic environment, including both listed buildings and conservation areas, through the planning process. The opening paragraph, 189 recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.
- 7.5 Paragraph 194 concerns planning applications, stating that:

“In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been

¹ Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, 2023. National Planning Policy Framework.

consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.”

- 7.6 Paragraph 199 considers the weighting given within the planning decision with regard to impacts on designated heritage assets, stating that:

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

- 7.7 Paragraph 200 considers the level of harmful effects on designated heritage assets and states that:

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

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

- 7.8 With regard to the decision-making process, paragraphs 201 and 202 are of relevance. Paragraph 201 states that:

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

- The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;*
- No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;*
- Conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.”*

7.9 Paragraph 202 states that:

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

7.10 The threshold between substantial and less than substantial harm has been clarified in the Courts. Paragraphs 24 and 25 of Bedford BC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2013] EWHC 2847 are of relevance here in the way they outline the assessment of ‘harm’ for heritage assets:

“What the inspector was saying was that for harm to be substantial, the impact on significance was required to be serious such that very much, if not all, of the significance was drained away.”

7.11 Plainly in the context of physical harm, this would apply in the case of demolition or destruction, being a case of total loss. It would also apply to a case of serious damage to the structure of the building. In the context of non-physical or indirect harm, the yardstick was effectively the same. One was looking for an impact which would have such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either vitiated altogether [i.e. destroyed] or very much reduced.

7.12 In other words, for the ‘harm’ to be ‘substantial’, and therefore require consideration against the more stringent requirements of paragraph 201 of the NPPF compared with paragraph 202, the proposal would need to result in the asset’s significance either being *“vitiating altogether or very much reduced.”*

7.13 Paragraph 203 refers to non-designated heritage assets identifying that:

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

Local Planning Policy

7.14 The site is located within Cornwall Council and its local plan, the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010 – 2030, was formally adopted in November 2016. Of its policies, the relevant one in heritage terms comprise Policy 24: Historic Environment. Full details are included within Technical Appendix 7.1.

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

7.15 The following guidance has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in Technical Appendix 7.1:

- The baseline review of archaeological and heritage issues was completed with recourse to the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (CIfA 2020²);
- The identification and assessment of potential 'setting' effects, heritage receptors, was undertaken with regard to Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second Edition) (HE 2017³); and
- The assessment of the significance of heritage assets references Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: (HE 2015⁴).

Defining the Study Area

- 7.16 As a result of baseline analysis, together with an understanding of the nature and scale of the development, and the likely extent and distribution of effects on heritage assets, the assessment defines a 1km study area measured from the boundaries of the site which was used for the assessment of the archaeological potential (as agreed with the Archaeological advisor to the Cornwall Council), and a 15km study area measured from the boundaries of the site for the assessment of possible impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets.

Assessment Process

- 7.17 In line with industry standard best-practice guidance (as set out above), the assessment first identifies the heritage significance of relevant assets through a proportionate narrative analysis, and thereafter assesses the impact of the proposals on that significance. Impacts are not harmful unless they adversely affect a heritage asset's significance.
- 7.18 Having established the significance of heritage assets, and those that are sensitive to change resulting from the proposals, Tables 7.1 to 7.2 set out the criteria that is then employed in attributing 'sensitivity' to archaeological and heritage assets, identifying the magnitude of any changes to them (i.e. the impact) and assessing the significance of the resulting effects in EIA terms.
- 7.19 The sensitivity of the heritage assets identified is assessed on the basis of Table 6.4. The magnitude and significance of potential effects on archaeological remains and built heritage resources, arising from the implementation of the Proposed scheme, will be identified and appropriately assessed, based on Tables 7.3 and 7.4.
- 7.20 The significance of effect is assessed with reference to the receptor's (i.e., the heritage asset's) sensitivity and the magnitude of impact.

² Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2020. *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment*. Reading.

³ Historic England (HE), 2017. *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second Edition)*. London.

⁴ Historic England (HE), 2015. *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2*. London.

7.21 The attribution of the sensitivity of a heritage asset is a question of professional judgement derived from an assessment of its heritage significance. The sensitivity of the receptor (heritage asset) is defined by its importance in terms of national, regional, or local statutory or non-statutory protection and grading of the asset. The non-statutory criteria used by the Secretary of State for scheduled monuments provide relevant criteria to assist this process, as do the HE Listing Selection Guides and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings document. Table 7.1 below sets out the criteria for assessing sensitivity.

Baseline Data

7.22 The following studies were prepared in order to inform the ES Chapter:

- Archaeology and Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (EDP 2023⁵; Technical Appendix 7.1). This assessment will present a baseline of historic environment information for the site and its environs (as required by NPPF, 2021), and in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (CIfA 2020)). With recourse to desk-based sources of historic environment data (inclusive of the Cornwall Historic Environment Record (CHER)), and a site walkover, it will define the site's potential to contain potentially significant archaeological remains utilising a 1km radius study area. It will also identify any designated heritage assets within a 15km study area, describe their setting and its contribution to their heritage value, and whether and to what degree the site also contributes in order to inform the operational development assessment.
- Geophysical survey of the site (Sumo 2023⁶). The requirement for this work was required by the Archaeological Advisor to the Cornwall Council to further inform on the archaeological potential of the site. Survey works was undertaken in two phases due to logistical issues but the results were combined into a single report. The report includes the turbine locations and the cable routes and is fully considered within the Archaeology and Heritage Desk-Based Assessment and is Technical Appendix 7.1.
- Archaeological evaluation. Following discussion with the Archaeological Advisor to the Cornwall Council, and informed by the results of the geophysical survey undertaken (Sumo 2023), a targeted archaeological evaluation will be carried out. This will follow a methodology and scope agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to the Cornwall Council, set out and agreed through the submission of a Written Scheme of Investigation/Method Statement (forthcoming).

Assessment and Evaluation of Effects

7.23 The assessment of likely significant environmental effects as a result of the proposals has taken into account the construction and operational stages. The following sections define

⁵ EDP, 2023. Laneast Cold Northcott Wind Farm: Archaeology and Heritage Assessment

⁶ SUMO, 2023. Laneast Cold Northcott Wind Farm, Cornwall: Geophysical Survey Report no.10824

the approach adopted within the assessment for the determination of sensitivity (or value/importance), magnitude of change/impact, the level of effect and significance.

Determining Sensitivity of Receptor

7.24 The sensitivity of affected receptors has been considered on a scale of high, medium, low, or negligible (Table 7.1).

Table 7.1: Preliminary Assessment of Effects

Receptor	Sensitivity of receptor (s)				
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
<i>World Heritage Site</i>					
<i>Scheduled Monument</i>					
<i>Grade I or II* Listed Building</i>					
<i>Grade I or II* Registered Park or Garden</i>					
<i>Registered Battlefield</i>					
<i>Other Nationally important Heritage Asset</i>					
<i>Grade II Listed Building</i>					
<i>Grade II Registered Park or Garden</i>					
<i>Conservation Area</i>					
<i>Other asset of regional or county importance</i>					
<i>Locally important asset with cultural or educational value</i>					

Receptor	Sensitivity of receptor (S)				
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Heritage site or feature with very limited value or interest					

Determining the Magnitude of Change

- 7.25 The magnitude of change has been considered as the change experienced from the current baseline conditions at the sensitive receptor and has been considered on a scale of large, medium, small, or negligible.
- 7.26 The classification of the magnitude of change to heritage assets will be based on consistent criteria. It will take account of such factors as the physical scale and type of disturbance and whether features or evidence would be lost that are fundamental to their historic character, integrity and therefore significance. Both physical and nonphysical (e.g. visual) changes to heritage assets will be considered. The magnitude of impact is assessed using the criteria in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2: Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of change				
Large	Medium	Small	Negligible	None
Change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is completely altered or destroyed				
	Change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is significantly modified			
		Change to the significance of a heritage asset so that it is		

Magnitude of change		
	noticeably different	
		Change to the significance of a heritage asset that hardly affects it
		No change to the significance of an asset

7.27 Following the evaluation of the sensitivity of specific cultural heritage receptors, and the magnitude of the impact upon them, the significance of the effect will be assessed using a matrix approach in accordance with the overarching EIA methodology.

Determining the Level of Effect

7.28 The level of effect has been informed by the magnitude of change due to the proposals and the evaluation of the sensitivity of the affected receptor. The level of effect has been determined using professional judgement and Table 7.1 has been a tool which has assisted with this process.

7.29 Whilst Table 7.1 provides ranges, the level of effect is confirmed as a single level and not a range, informed by professional judgement. For each effect, it has been concluded whether the effect is ‘beneficial’ or ‘adverse’.

Table 7.3: Matrix to Support Determining the Level of Effect

		Sensitivity (or value/ importance)			
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Magnitude of change / impact	Large	Major	Moderate to major	Minor to moderate	Negligible
	Medium	Moderate to major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Small	Minor to moderate	Minor	Negligible to minor	Negligible
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

7.30 The following terms have been used to define the level of the effects identified and these can be ‘beneficial’ or ‘adverse’:

- Major effect: where the proposals are likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions and the receptor has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity;
 - Moderate effect: where the proposals are likely to cause either a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which has a degree of adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or a less than considerable change at a receptor that has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability;
 - Minor effect: where the proposals are likely to cause a small, but noticeable change from the baseline conditions on a receptor which has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity; or where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which can adapt, is tolerant of the change or/and can recover from the change; and
 - Negligible: where the proposals are unlikely to cause a noticeable change at a receptor, despite its level of sensitivity or there is a considerable change at a receptor which is not considered sensitive to a change.
- 7.31 The duration of the effect has been assessed as either 'short-term', 'medium-term' or 'long-term'. Short-term is considered to be up to 1 year, medium-term is considered to be between 1 and 10 years, and long-term is considered to be greater than 10 years.
- 7.32 The assessment matrix defined in Table 7.3 is not intended to be 'prescriptive', but rather it allows for the employment of professional judgement to determine the most appropriate level of effect for each heritage asset that is identified.
- 7.33 Effects have been categorised with regard to their nature (adverse, beneficial or neutral) and their permanence (permanent, temporary or reversible). For all forms of heritage asset (receptor); including archaeological sites and remains, historic buildings, places and areas; and historic landscapes; the sensitivity of the receptor is combined with the predicted magnitude of change to heritage significance to arrive at the significance of effect in EIA terms.
- 7.34 The combination of sensitivity and magnitude of change is undertaken with reference to the matrix in Table 7.3, with those effects defined as severe or major being deemed 'significant'. Judgment is also to be applied to whether a moderate effect might be reported as a significant effect in certain high impact cases, on a case-by-case basis.

Determining Significance of effect

- 7.35 For each residual effect, a statement has been made as to whether the level of effect is 'Significant' or 'Not Significant'. This determination has been based on professional judgement and/or relevant guidance/legislation where applicable.
- 7.36 Significance of effect has only been concluded for residual effects (i.e. following the identification of secondary mitigation).

Limitations and Assumptions

- 7.37 Specific assumptions and limitations of the assessment can be found in the supporting technical documents of the chapter. In summary, there are no assumptions or limitations that will overtly affect the quality or robustness of the assessment.
- 7.38 The analysis of potential buried archaeological remains includes an inherent degree of predictive modelling, as is an industry accepted approach, but is informed by primary data gathered through a geophysical survey and the analysis of available data (i.e., Historic Environment Record, LiDAR, aerial photography and historic cartography, etc). Whilst the results of the trial trench evaluation are not yet available, this additional fieldwork is forthcoming and will further inform the conclusions of the ES Chapter.

Consultation

- 7.39 Consultation has been undertaken with the following consultees as summarised within Table 7.4 below.

Table 7.4: Summary of Consultations

Summary of Matter Raised	Reference in ES Chapter
Archaeological Advisor to Cornwall Council	
Request for an archaeological and heritage assessment	Baseline summary of the desk-based assessment discussed within this chapter
Request for a geophysical survey of the turbine locations (with a 1ha radius) and of the track and cable routes, substations, and other associated development areas	Geophysical survey being undertaken in phases due to logistical constraints. Phase 1 report included and discussed within this chapter. Phase 2 forthcoming.
Cornwall Council	
Pre-application advice letter which established the requirements for the undertaking of desk-based assessment, geophysical survey and this chapter. Establishment of the study area.	Baseline information discussion which informed the impact assessment.

BASELINE CONDITIONS

- 7.40 This section identifies the relevant archaeology and cultural heritage receptors (heritage assets) within the extents of the site and its wider zone of influence. It draws upon the results of the supporting baseline assessment and investigative fieldwork reports (Appendices 7.1 and 7.2), which address the site.

- 7.41 A detailed description of the baseline situation at, and around, the site is set out in Appendix 7.1. Provided below is a summary of the baseline assessment with regard to cultural heritage.

Designated Heritage Assets

- 7.42 There are four Grade II Listed Buildings located within proximity of the site. The site does not include or extend within any other types of designated assets such as World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, Battlefields or Conservation Areas.
- 7.43 Given the characteristics of the proposals, and as mentioned above, the study area extended to 15km measured from the boundaries of the site. This means that the number of designated assets considered for this assessment was of several hundreds. For practicality they were compiled into tables included as appendices to Technical Appendix.
- 7.44 All assets within this area were considered, using a combination of GIS analysis, NHLE data and the examination during the walkover, which considered, amongst other factors, the surrounding topographic and environmental conditions, built form, vegetation cover, and lines of sight, within the context of the assets' heritage significance.
- 7.45 An extensive array of photographs of the assets, and their views to and from the site was compiled and a summary of relevant photographs was included within Technical Appendix 7.1. Some locations were visited only from the nearest public right of way due to their private nature, but to make sure observations were as accurate as possible, alternative routes around the assets were taken when possible. Each selected photograph includes a caption summarising the direction of view and landscape elements of note visible as well as their relation to the site.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

Archaeology

- 7.46 A detailed description of the baseline situation at, and around, the site is set out in Appendix 7.1, Section 4. Provided below is a summary of the baseline assessment with regard to archaeology.
- 7.47 The CHER records several known and potential remains within the site which relate to the prehistoric, medieval and post-medieval periods. These remains are mostly comprised of findspots, a now destroyed barrow and potential field systems, quarries and other agricultural features. The geophysical survey detected numerous anomalies of archaeological interest which, due to their characteristics, can be prehistoric or medieval to post-medieval in date, as well as a number of undetermined/unclear features (i.e. they could be archaeological or agricultural). Cornish field boundaries have been mapped, along with former ridge and furrow and modern ploughing and match with the features recorded on the LiDAR and on the historic cartography record (see below). Natural variations, areas of ferrous disturbance, a former track and an underground pipe have also been identified.

- 7.48 The study area includes extensive and similar evidence, with an emphasis of possible remains recorded from the analysis of historic aerial photography and that appear as either cropmarks or low earthworks. Although the settlements and systematic utilisation of the landscape from the prehistoric period onwards seems well established in the study area more studies are necessary to corroborate some of the sites since there is a lack of actual archaeological investigation.
- 7.49 The Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) for the study area categorises the site as comprising areas of Farmland Medieval, Modern Enclosed Land, Upland Rough Ground and Post-Medieval Enclosed Land. These categories reflect the character of the land but also the estimated period of field formation. They are quite common within the area and are not considered to be of heritage significance in and of themselves.
- 7.50 The historic landscape category attributed to the site by the HLC is considered to be of no more than low sensitivity.

CONSTRUCTION PHASE EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- 7.51 The following section identifies and describes each effect that is predicted to arise, as a result of the proposals, on both designated and non-designated heritage assets. These have been assessed in terms of effects during construction, where direct physical impacts may be anticipated, and also the operation phases where impacts, in terms of an asset's setting, may be anticipated; and whether these effects are adverse or beneficial.

Designated Heritage Assets

- 7.52 The assessment has identified that there is no potential for any impact during the construction phase on any of the designated heritage assets within the 15km study area.
- 7.53 The sensitivity of the said assets is considered to vary from high to low. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be no adverse effect on any of the designated heritage assets within the 15km study area.

Mitigation Measure

- 7.54 No mitigation to the effects on the designated heritage assets is identified as necessary.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

- 7.55 The baseline assessments have demonstrated some potential for the presence of buried archaeological remains within the site. The surveys undertaken until now have revealed remains of likely archaeological origin. Only these potentially hitherto unidentified remains are the heritage receptors to be affected by the construction phase of the proposed scheme.
- 7.56 The sensitivity of the potentially hitherto unidentified archaeological remains within the site is considered to be low to medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be large. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be major.

Mitigation Measure

- 7.57 For the site the mitigation for the major significance of effect on potentially hitherto unidentified archaeological remains will comprise a targeted archaeological investigation to the areas affected by groundworks. These works will be carried out under Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) that conform to recognised standards and guidance and which will be prepared in consultation with and approved by the Cornwall Council Archaeology Advisor and secured through a Condition.

OPERATIONAL PHASE EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- 7.58 The following section provides an assessment of the effects on cultural heritage receptors likely to arise as a result of the operational stage of the proposed scheme.

Designated Heritage Assets

- 7.59 The proposals include the repowering and replacing of 22 turbines within an agricultural landscape which already includes a number of working and decommissioned wind turbines. The character of this landscape will not be altered, retaining its agricultural uses and aesthetic. This means that the setting of any designated heritage assets within the site's visual reach will not be considerably changed or altered. As such, the proposals are assessed in terms of the NPPF at the level of no harm (MHCLG 2021), since all the contributors to the character and appearance of the designated heritage assets will remain unchanged.
- 7.60 The changes expected to the views of designated heritage assets and arising from the proposals are expected to be negligible. This is considering the proposals consist of the repowering and replacement of turbines within an extensive agricultural landscape which already includes these elements of built form, and others, and can accommodate them, without changing or blocking possibly significant views to and from the designated heritage assets.
- 7.61 The sensitivity of the designated heritage assets is considered to range from high to low. The magnitude of change through the operation of the proposals is considered to be small/negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Mitigation Measure

- 7.62 No mitigation to the effects on the designated heritage assets is identified as necessary.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

- 7.63 The sensitivity of potentially hitherto unidentified archaeological remains within the site is considered to be low. The magnitude of change, following mitigation, comprising a programme of archaeological investigation and recording implemented pre-construction and as a condition of planning permission, is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse residual effect on archaeological remains within the site, which is considered to be negligible.

Mitigation Measure

- 7.64 No additional mitigation to the effects on the designated heritage assets is identified as necessary.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

- 7.65 Cumulative and in-combination effects will generally occur where there might be simultaneous or sequential effects on heritage assets of two or more developments or where the consideration of other schemes would increase an effect identified.
- 7.66 This assessment has considered the cumulative effect of the proposed scheme alongside the effect of other developments in the geographical area as set out in Chapter 5 Assessment Methodology which includes the list of the cumulative schemes.
- 7.67 The identified schemes are sufficiently detached (geographically) from the site so as not to make a material difference to the assessment of effects. Therefore, no cumulative effects are anticipated on the cultural heritage resource.

SUMMARY AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Designated Heritage Assets

Construction Phase

- 7.68 There will be no residual effects on the designated heritage assets given that no impacts or effects are identified through the construction phase of the proposed scheme.
- 7.69 There are no residual effects on the designated heritage assets, these are then considered to be not significant in EIA terms.

Operational Phase

- 7.70 The sensitivity of the designated heritage assets is considered to range from high to low. The magnitude of change through the operation of the proposed scheme is considered to be small/negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse residual effect which is considered to be minor.

Non-designated Heritage Assets

Construction Phase

- 7.71 The sensitivity of potentially hitherto unidentified archaeological remains within the site is considered to be low. The magnitude of change, following mitigation, comprising a programme of archaeological investigation and recording implemented pre-construction as a condition of planning permission, is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse residual effect on archaeological remains within the site, which is considered to be negligible.

- 7.72 The residual effects on the archaeological remains within the site is considered to be not significant in EIA terms.

Operational Phase

- 7.73 The sensitivity of potentially hitherto unidentified archaeological remains within the site. The magnitude of change, following mitigation, comprising a programme of archaeological investigation and recording implemented pre-construction and as a condition of planning permission, is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse residual effect on archaeological remains within the site, which is considered to be negligible.

Table 7.5: Summary and Residual Effects

Effect	Sensitivity of Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Effect Significance (Pre-mitigation)	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect Significance (Post-mitigation)
<i>Construction Phase</i>					
Changes to the setting of designated heritage assets within 15km study area	High to low	Negligible	Negligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation implemented 	Negligible
Destruction of possible hitherto unidentified archaeological remains within the footprint of the proposals.	Medium to low	Large	Major	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program of archaeological investigation secured through a Condition 	Negligible
<i>Operational Phase</i>					
Changes to the setting of designated heritage assets within 15km study area	High to low	Negligible	Negligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation required 	Minor
Destruction of possible hitherto unidentified archaeological remains within the footprint of the proposals.	Low	Negligible	Negligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation required 	Negligible